In the matter of an arbitration pursuant to Article 739 of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

PCA Case No. 2024-45

Permanent Court of Arbitration Peace Palace The Hague The Netherlands

Day 3

Thursday, 30 January 2025

Before:

DR PENELOPE JANE RIDINGS MNZM PROFESSOR HÉLÈNE RUIZ FABRI HON JUSTICE MR DAVID UNTERHALTER

THE EUROPEAN UNION

Complainant

-v-

THE UNITED KINGDOM

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Respondent

UK-SANDEEL ARBITRATION

Transcript produced by Trevor McGowan, Georgina Vaughn and Lisa Gulland. Trevor McGowan CR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE EUROPEAN UNION

MR ANTHONY DAWES, Agent -- member of the European Commission Legal Service MS DANIELA GAUCI, Agent -- member of the European Commission Legal Service DR BERNHARD HOFSTÖTTER, Agent -- member of the European Commission Legal Service MS JOSEPHINE NORRIS, Agent -- member of the European Commission Legal Service DR LAURA PUCCIO, Agent -- member of the European Commission Legal Service MS SOFIA COTA FRANCO, DG MARE, European Commission MS CAMILLE GALLOUZE, DG MARE, European Commission MR NORMAN GRAHAM, DG MARE, European Commission MS MAROUSO KYRIAKOU, DG MARE, European Commission MR PAUL SUSMAN, DG MARE, European Commission MS EVA MARIA CARBALLEIRA FERNANDEZ, DG MARE, European Commission PROFESSOR DR ANNA RINDORF, DTU Orbit MS NOURA ROUISSI, EU Delegation to UK

FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM

MR BEN JURATOWITCH KC, Essex Court Chambers MS CAMILLE BOILEAU, Essex Court Chambers MR NED WESTAWAY, FTB Chambers MR ALEX COOKE, Agent -- UK Government MR STEVEN FULLER, Agent -- UK Government MS CATHERINE DRUMMOND, 3 Verulam Buildings MR PABLO BENTES, Baker McKenzie MR CLAUDE CHASE, Baker McKenzie DR WEIWEI ZHANG, Baker McKenzie MR OLIVER BURROWS, UK Government MR NIALL MACENTEE, UK Government MS CONNIE CRAMP, UK Government MR MATT ROBSON, UK Government MS ZOE COMPSTON, UK Government MS MAGGIE NG, UK Government MS CATHERINE WHITE, UK Government MR MATTHEW NEAT, UK Government MS RUBY KOOPMAN, UK Government MR MICHAEL DOWELL, UK Government MS VICKI CASTRO-SPOKES, UK Government

MS IMOGEN CESSFORD, UK Government DR EWEN BELL, UK Government DR JACOB BENTLEY, UK Government MR ALLAN GIBB CBE, Scottish Government MS LAUREN REID, Scottish Government MS EMMA ROWLAND, FTB Chambers

FOR THE PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION

DR LEVENT SABANOGULLARI, Registrar and senior legal counsel MR JOSÉ LUIS ARAGÓN CARDIEL, senior legal counsel MS ANABEL BLANCO, legal counsel DR STEFAN SCHÄFERLING, assistant legal counsel MS ISABELLA KEITH, assistant legal counsel MS JOANNA SERHAN, case manager

ASSISTANT TO PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI

PROFESSOR EDOARDO STOPPIONI

Rebuttal statement on behalf of1
the European Union
By Ms Norris1
By Mr Dawes11
By Ms Norris24
By Mr Dawes29
Rebuttal statement on behalf of
the United Kingdom
By Mr Juratowitch
By Ms Boileau42
By Mr Juratowitch52
Tribunal questions
By Mr Westaway75
Tribunal questions
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL101

00.12.1		00.24 1	
09:13 1	Thursday, 30 January 2025	09:34 1	"an administrative arrangement" (Day 2/190:20-21) or
2	(9.31 am)	2	"administrative provisions" (Day 2/147:15). That
3	THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.	3	characterisation is wrong in law, and shows a complete
4	This morning we commence with the European Union's	4	disregard to the commitments which the United Kingdom
5	reply. The European Union has two hours for its reply.	5	negotiated and agreed to with the European Union when
6	And I wanted to let you know that the Tribunal will	6	entering into the TCA.
7	exercise restraint in its questions to allow you the	7	Let's now look at Annex 38 one more time. I would
8	two hours, and then also to allow the United Kingdom	8	ask the Tribunal to turn to core bundle page 59.
9	the two and a half hours for its preparation before it	9	The United Kingdom started with the first recital to
10	presents its counter-reply at 2.00 pm.	10	Annex 38, which reads:
11	So, Agent for the European Union Ms Norris, you have	11	"AFFIRMING the sovereign rights and obligations of
12	the floor.	12	independent coastal States exercised by the Parties"
13	Rebuttal statement on behalf of the European Union	13	This recital shows that the parties were alive to
14	MS NORRIS: Madam Chair, members of the Tribunal,	14	their regulatory autonomy. This is the context referred
15	environmental protection is an important and legitimate	15	to in the preamble. The parties then agreed how they
16	regulatory objective recognised under international law	16	would limit the exercise of that autonomy through the
17	and in the TCA.	17	grant of specific rights to each other.
18	A coastal state has sovereign rights in its	18	I would now ask the Tribunal to turn to page 60 and
19	territorial sea and exclusive economic zone, and it has	19	to look again at the terms of Article $2(1)$. This reads:
20	jurisdiction with regard to the protection and	20	" each Party shall grant to vessels of the other
21	preservation of the marine environment in those areas.	21	Party full access to its waters to fish:"
22	This is recognised under international law and confirmed	22	And under subparagraph (a), we read:
23	in the TCA.	23	" stocks listed in Annex 35 at a level that
23	This dispute does not require this Tribunal to	23	is reasonably commensurate with the Parties' shares
24	adjudicate on those issues. To paraphrase counsel for	25	of the fishing opportunities"
25	adjudicate on those issues. To paraphrase counsel for	25	of the fishing opportunities
	Page 1		Page 3
09:32 1	the United Kingdom, the European Union is not seeking to	09:35 1	Members of the Tribunal, this is not
09:32 1 2	the United Kingdom, the European Union is not seeking to impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of	09:35 1	Members of the Tribunal, this is not an administrative arrangement; this is binding language.
	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of		Members of the Tribunal, this is not an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There
2	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part.	2	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There
2 3	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level ofprotection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part.It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either.	2 3	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language.
2 3 4 5	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level ofprotection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part.It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either.The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about	2 3 4 5	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea.
2 3 4 5 6	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part.It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either.The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours"	2 3 4 5 6	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to
2 3 4 5 6 7	impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either.The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours"(Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also	2 3 4 5 6 7	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the contrary. Hence, the European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 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} $	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 of the TCA. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted in conformity with those provisions, the United Kingdom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 of the TCA. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted in conformity with those provisions, the United Kingdom must rebut that case; and if it does not, this would
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 of the TCA. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted in conformity with those provisions, the United Kingdom must rebut that case; and if it does not, this would breach not only Article 496, read with Article 494, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 of the TCA. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted in conformity with those provisions, the United Kingdom must rebut that case; and if it does not, this would
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 impeach the UK for seeking to pursue a high level of protection for the ecosystem of which sandeel form part. It is not inviting this Tribunal to do so either. The UK argued yesterday that this is "a case about catching fish in waters that are not yours" (Day 2/23:16-17). Counsel for the United Kingdom also told the Tribunal (Day 2/23:19-22) that: "The starting point [for your analysis] is that there is no right to go into another state's waters and take its living resources unless granted, and then only on the terms granted." The legal context in which this dispute has arisen is precisely one in which rights were granted by the United Kingdom to the European Union to go into the UK's waters to fish sandeel. What separates the parties, and what you must now determine, is the extent to which regulatory autonomy can be relied upon to justify an impairment or, in this instance, nullification of the right to access to waters to fish set down in Heading Five of the TCA, read together with Annex 38 of the TCA. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 an administrative arrangement; this is binding language. Sandeel in the North Sea is listed in Annex 35. There is an agreed EU share of the fishing opportunities in relation to sandeel in the North Sea. The right to access UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel is associated with economic and social benefits. That right may be impaired in a manner which is justified, and hence which does not give rise to a breach of the balance of rights and obligations under the TCA. The European Union has never argued the contrary. Hence, the European Union accepts that a fisheries management measure adopted in conformity with Article 496, read together with 494, could amount to a justifiable impairment of those rights. But that is precisely why the conditions under those provisions limiting the exercise of regulatory autonomy when deciding on such measures are so significant. Once the European Union has established a prima facie case that a measure has not been adopted in conformity with those provisions, the United Kingdom must rebut that case; and if it does not, this would breach not only Article 496, read with Article 494, but

09:37	1	Article 2(1) of Annex 38. That is the relevant starting	09:41 1	that because of the primacy of regulatory autonomy,
	2	point for this Tribunal.	2	it enjoys a very wide margin of discretion, and that the
	3	It is the relevant starting point because, by	3	function of this Tribunal is reduced to checking that
	4	design, Article 496, read together with Article 494(3),	4	the decision-maker has "grappled" with the principles.
	5	reflect the agreed limitations on the exercise of	5	The European Union disagrees on both counts.
	6	regulatory autonomy.	6	The European Union has already addressed this
	7	Madam Chair, members of the Tribunal, the	7	Tribunal on the role of the principles in relation to
	8	United Kingdom argues that some parts of the TCA are	8	the interpretation of the obligations in Article 496,
	9	about trade and some parts are about cooperation, and	9	both as regards basing measures on the best available
	10	that all of the provisions on fisheries can only be	10	scientific advice and applying proportionate and
	11	considered to be an aspect of cooperation.	11	non-discriminatory measures. We maintain those
	12	Let's be very clear: this is a dispute that requires	12	submissions. We use this rebuttal, however, to return
	13	this Tribunal to balance economic and social rights on	13	to the question of this Tribunal's powers of review.
	14	the one hand with the pursuit of the legitimate	14	In short, the European Union considers that the
	15	regulatory objective of marine conservation on the	15	intensity with which the Tribunal may and should examine
	16	other.	16	the consistency of the sandeel fishing prohibition with
	17	The European Union has never argued that WTO law has	17	the requirements in Heading Five of the TCA is far
	18	a special status when interpreting the "Fisheries"	18	greater than the United Kingdom has suggested in its
	19	chapter, but it welcomes the United Kingdom's	19	pleadings yesterday. In short, just as the United
	20	acknowledgement that international economic law may	20	Kingdom always overstates the role of regulatory
	21	provide relevant context for the exercise of	21	autonomy, it consistently understates the role of this
	22	interpreting those provisions. This is a necessary	22	Tribunal.
	23	concession given the explicit terms of Heading Six,	23	Members of the Tribunal, you are empowered to
	24	Articles 513, 515 and 516. This is not instead of or at	24	scrutinise the decision-making process. You are also
	25	the expense of other sources of international law. This	25	empowered to assess whether the output of that process
		Page 5		Page 7
09:39	1	is not a battle of norms between UNCLOS and the WTO	09:42 1	is consistent with the requirements in Heading Five and
09:39	1 2	is not a battle of norms between UNCLOS and the WTO agreements. The Tribunal may consider both.	09:42 1 2	is consistent with the requirements in Heading Five and Annex 38 of the TCA.
09:39				
09:39	2	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both.	2	Annex 38 of the TCA.
09:39	2 3	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union	2 3	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday
09:39	2 3 4	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of	2 3 4	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short
09:39	2 3 4 5	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the	2 3 4 5	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34).
09:39	2 3 4 5 6	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as	2 3 4 5 6	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These
09:39	2 3 4 5 6 7	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that:
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3).	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international	$ \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} $	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international agreement setting down binding obligations as regards	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice which it
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international agreement setting down binding obligations as regards access to waters to fish.	$ \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} $	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice. This is
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international agreement setting down binding obligations as regards access to waters to fish. Second, the role of regulatory autonomy has a direct	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice. This is an unreasonable construction of the burden of proof,
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international agreement setting down binding obligations as regards access to waters to fish.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice. This is
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	agreements. The Tribunal may consider both. As regards proportionality, the European Union maintains that it would not run contrary to Article 4 of the TCA for the Tribunal to also have regard to the meaning accorded to that principle under domestic law as part of the relevant context for interpreting the provisions. Counsel for the United Kingdom has not clearly explained why there can be no analogue with the manner in which the apex court of each of the parties has construed and applied those terms. The role of regulatory autonomy under the TCA is material to this Tribunal's resolution of each of the claims in this dispute. First, it informs the function served by Article 494(3) TCA and the principles set down in that provision. The United Kingdom maintains that because of regulatory autonomy, ultimately a party can decide on a fisheries management measure even if it is inconsistent with certain principles in Article 494(3). This interpretation does not befit an international agreement setting down binding obligations as regards access to waters to fish. Second, the role of regulatory autonomy has a direct	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	Annex 38 of the TCA. The United Kingdom opened its submissions yesterday by telling this Tribunal that there are "two short answers" to the European Union's claims (Day 2/1:23-34). Unsurprisingly, the European Union disagrees. These alleged shortcuts illustrate precisely the different conception not only of the rights and obligations under the TCA, but also the task of this Tribunal in weighing and balancing those rights and obligations. According to counsel for the United Kingdom (Day 2/1:25-2:5), the first short answer to this dispute is that: " whatever criticism the EU make[s] of the science [it does not] put[] forward other scientific advice, let alone any better scientific advice, concerning [this] issue. [And this] is dispositive of the claim under Article 496(2)" It cannot be right that under the TCA a party is precluded from challenging the consistency of a measure on the basis of Article 496(2) unless it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice. This is an unreasonable construction of the burden of proof,

09:44	1	understood to fall. It would effectively shield the	09:47 1	a subjective element, implying that it is only if
	2	parties from the scrutiny of their measures. It sets	2	a state decides not to ask for available advice, because
	3	the bar too high.	3	it "didn't want to know what the answer was"
	4	On this logic, even if there were evident flaws in	4	(Day 2/73:3), that this term has any relevance. This
	5	the scientific advice a measure is purportedly based	5	cannot be correct. There must be some objective
	6	upon, a party would be required to produce its own	6	assessment of whether other science could have
	7	scientific advice on the same issue simply to be able to	7	reasonably been obtained.
	8	claim a breach.	8	And what then is the link to the precautionary
	9	On questioning from the Tribunal, counsel for the	9	approach? Counsel for the United Kingdom argued that
	10	United Kingdom conceded that, in an extreme case,	10	if it turns out that the UK was wrong to consider the
	11	it might be possible to bring a claim without	11	sandeel fishing prohibition is based on the best
	12	undertaking this exercise. Yet later, in the afternoon	12	available scientific advice, the UK would and could have
	13	(Day 2/107:23-108:2), counsel for the UK contended that,	13	recourse to the precautionary approach.
	14	in this instance, the European Union would have needed	14	The precautionary approach is not a fallback. It is
	15	to have identified:	15	a manifestation of the precautionary principle, which
	16	" [a] superior ecosystem model of the North Sea	16	allows a party to adopt a measure where there is
	17	which was available to the United Kingdom at the time	17	objectively an absence of adequate scientific
	18	that the English scientific report was produced, and	18	information. It does not simply kick in where a party
	19	which could be used for the same purpose"	19	omits to base its measures on reasonably obtainable
	20	The European Union does not accept that it is	20	scientific information.
	21	dispositive of its claim that the European Union did not	21	Members of the Tribunal, at this juncture I will
	22	identify or produce another superior model. It has	22	pass the floor to my colleague, who will respond further
	23	pointed to flaws in the scientific advice relied upon,	23	on certain aspects of the model.
	24	and this Tribunal may assess the consistency of the	24	MR DAWES: Madam Chair, honourable members of the Tribunal,
	25	sandeel fishing prohibition with the obligation to base	25	the European Union will respond to five points made by
				D 11
		Page 9		Page 11
09:46	1	measures on the best available scientific advice on	09:49 1	the United Kingdom yesterday regarding the flaws in the
09:46	1 2	measures on the best available scientific advice on the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms.	09:49 1 2	the United Kingdom yesterday regarding the flaws in the model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated
09:46				
09:46	2	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms.	2	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated
09:46	2 3	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie	2 3	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model.
09:46	2 3 4	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be	2 3 4	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK
09:46	2 3 4 5	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the	2 3 4 5	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have
09:46	2 3 4 5 6	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there	2 3 4 5 6	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of
09:46	2 3 4 5 6 7	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality	2 3 4 5 6 7	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by status.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other existing components could have been used to extend 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} $	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other existing components could have been used to extend that model. 	$ \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} $	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that the 58% reduction this figure that you heard a lot about in fishing mortality that was used in the model, why the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other existing components could have been used to extend that model. When, then, does the term "available" come into play 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that the 58% reduction this figure that you heard a lot about in fishing mortality that was used in the model, why the UK could not have known that it was an overestimation of that fishing mortality.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other existing components could have been used to extend that model. When, then, does the term "available" come into play or, as counsel for the United Kingdom put it, "do the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that the 58% reduction this figure that you heard a lot about in fishing mortality that was used in the model, why the UK could not have known that it was an overestimation of that fishing mortality.
	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	 the basis of those, we say, valid criticisms. The European Union accepts that it has a prima facie burden, but the TCA does not dictate how this is to be met. Moreover, insofar as the concession made by the United Kingdom was confined to circumstances where there are errors which, in their view, undermine the quality of advice as "science", the European Union also disagrees. And this leads me to respond briefly to the UK's position on the meaning of the term "available". The UK appeared in its submissions to assimilate this to mean "at the disposal of the state" (Day 2/80:16-17). They also linked this term to refer to already-existing advice. The European Union takes issue with this interpretation. Where there is an existing model, the question is whether there was data that could reasonably have been obtained and used to parametrise the model, or if other existing components could have been used to extend that model. When, then, does the term "available" come into play or, as counsel for the United Kingdom put it, "do the work"? Here again the parties disagree. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 model, and in the simulated biomass increases generated based on that model. First, the European Union will explain why the UK was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have parametrised the model to take into account the age of sandeel consumed by predators. The second point the EU will explain is why the UK was wrong that it could not also have reasonably taken into account in the model the location of predators and of sandeel stocks. The third point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the existing model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. The fourth point that the European Union will address is why the United Kingdom was wrong to argue that it could not reasonably have known that the 58% reduction this figure that you heard a lot about in fishing mortality that was used in the model, why the UK could not have known that it was an overestimation of that fishing mortality.

UK-SANDEEL (Europear PCA Case)	n Union v Uni No. 2024-45	ted Kingdom) Thursday, 30 January 2
that it could not recomply have presented constally	09:55 1	Now the question is what is several by this
that it could not reasonably have presented separately	09:55 1	Now, the question is: what is covered by this
simulated biomass increases from two distinct groups of	_	dataset? The answer to that question is provided in
seabird species.	3	another exhibit which the Tribunal has on its record:
The European Union will start by addressing the	4	it is Exhibit R-0161, page 94. And if the Tribunal
Tribunal on why the United Kingdom is wrong to argue	5	could turn to that document, because it explains what
that it could not reasonably have taken into account in	6	this open-source database includes and how it allows
its model the age of sandeel consumed by predators.	7	a model to be updated. So it's Exhibit R-0161 and it's
Counsel for the United Kingdom yesterday [said]	8	page 94. (Pause)
and the European Union refers the Tribunal to page 139	9	If the Tribunal has the document before it, this is
of the transcript as of line 1:	10	this SMS dataset that I referred to. And if one looks
"The work that would be involved in order to address	11	at the third line, it explains it is a stock assessment
the other caveats, to produce a spatially defined model	12	model. And if one scrolls down the page, under
and a size-structured model"	13	"Outputs", which is the fifth heading from the
So that's the point about the age of the sandeel:	14	bottom Would the Tribunal need?
" or a model that included all three of those	15	And at the bottom of the page under "Outputs", so

And at the bottom of the page under "Outputs", so what does this database provide as an output that can then be plugged into an existing model? There are references to a number of factors, and it is stated:

"All outputs are by year, quarter, species and age" And that's the important part.

So this is one example, but there are others, of existing datasets that are available, and you can see

that they are available as open source. And one can see that in the second row from the bottom, "Model

accessibility": it is marked "Open source". So these

Page 15

"A functional group can be a single species (such as	09:57 1	datasets are available as open source and can be plugged
cod), a group of species (such as demersal fish)"	2	into an existing model.
And there, there is a reference to "an age	3	So the European Union's point is that on this
component". So the English scientific report accepts	4	important issue of age, there were datasets available to
that age can be a component of a model of this type.	5	the United Kingdom that could have been taken into
Now, the important point is that data on functional	6	account in order to adjust the model that was used.
groups which is broken down by age, or by size	7	Now, if the Tribunal could turn to the second point,
structure, which is the scientific term, that data	8	which is about the United Kingdom's argument that it
exists as open-source data. It can be plugged into	9	could not reasonably have taken into account in the
an existing model, and it can be done with a limited	10	model the location of predators and of the sandeel
need for adjustment.	11	stock. And again I refer the Tribunal to the statement
Now, this is not stated in the English scientific	12	by counsel for the United Kingdom, which is at page 133
report itself but it can be shown by reference to other	13	as of line 14 of the transcript:
documents that the Tribunal has on its record, and if	14	"One final point on the EU's criticism that this
I could take the Tribunal to two of those documents.	15	model is not spatially distributed:"
They are not in the core bundle, but they are in	16	So that means the location of predators and of
exhibits which the United Kingdom has annexed to	17	sandeel:
its submission.	18	" to develop such a model of the North Sea, both
So the first document, if the Tribunal has it, is	19	in respect of sandeel but also taking into account its
Exhibit R-108 (page 114). So there the Tribunal will	20	predators, would be an immense undertaking."
see a list of various datasets, and the second one	21	The European Union is surprised by this statement,
there are several examples, but we'll just take one for	22	given that and I will take the Tribunal to documents
present purposes. It's the second row of the table.	23	on the file the United Kingdom has the necessary data
There is a reference to a dataset which is called "SMS	24	to take into account the spatial distribution, and this
2013 Key run".	25	includes data compiled by one of the three authors of
Page 14		Page 16

Amended by the parties

09:53

the core bundle.

caveats, in my submission would have required

significant time, resources and expertise to develop."

scientific report itself. If I could ask the Tribunal

to turn to the document: it's in tab 15 of the core

When one reads that paragraph -- it's the third

paragraph on the page, and it's the paragraph that

begins "A functional group". So it says:

Page 13

However, this is simply contradicted by the English

bundle, which is also Exhibit C-45, and it's page 220 of

Day 3

09:59	1	the English scientific report itself.	10:03 1	"So the model was updated to enable it to be used
	2	If I could take the Tribunal to the relevant	2	for the purpose of the English scientific report, but it
	3	document: it is in the same exhibit which you were in,	3	was still the key run model; it was still aligned with
	4	R-161, and it is page 81; 81 of the numbering of the	4	the ICES key run that had been approved by the ICES
	5	exhibit itself.	5	Working Group."
	6	It's called "Ecopath with Ecosim (EwE) and	6	And it went on:
	7	Ecospace", and it says, first row, "Contact detail".	7	"And it's simply inaccurate for the EU to assert
	8	And there it says that the "Contact detail", or the	8	that by [doing so], it has somehow lost alignment with
	9	person who has compiled the database, is "Cefas", which,	9	the key run."
	10	as the Tribunal is aware, is one of the three authors of	10	And on this, there is a very simple answer: any
	11	the English scientific report.	11	change to input data requires a new model evaluation
	12	And what is relevant here: the Tribunal has already	12	before ICES can grant it key run status.
	13	heard about the Ecopath and Ecosim model, but there is	13	This the Tribunal will also see by reference to
	14	this extension here which is referred to as "Ecospace".	14	a document which it has on its record, if I could ask
	15	Now, what is Ecospace? And that is explained if the	15	the Tribunal to turn to Exhibit R-108. This is
	16	Tribunal turns two pages on in the exhibit to page 83.	16	a lengthy document, as many on the Tribunal's record,
	17	It's under the row where it says "Main Purposes". And	17	and if I could ask the Tribunal to turn to page 41 of
	18	there it is said:	18	the internal numbering of that document. It's the three
	19	"Ecospace: Evaluation of spatial management	19	lines at the top of page 41 of the internal numbering,
	20	strategies and changes in environmental conditions on	20	which starts "Key runs". It says:
	21	the distribution of species and fishing activity."	21	"Key runs are typically run every three years, or
	22	And there is a similar reference if the Tribunal	22	alternatively, when a substantive change is made to the
	23	returns to page 81. Towards the bottom, it says:	23	model parameters when sufficient new data becomes
	24	"Ecospace data for specification of spatial	23	available"
	25	distributions"	25	So the simple point was: by inputting this new data
			25	
		Page 17		Page 19
			10.05 1	
10:01		It's at the bottom of page 81, the last there are	10:05 1	into the model, the United Kingdom could reasonably have
10:01	2	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace	2	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its
10:01	2 3	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit.	2 3	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status.
10:01	2 3 4	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace.	2 3 4	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address
10:01	2 3 4 5	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further	2 3 4 5	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could
10:01	2 3 4 5 6	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already	2 3 4 5 6	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that:	2 3 4 5 6 7	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation.
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place.
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14:
10:01	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \end{array}$	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in
10:01	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ \end{array}$	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. So the key run, the Tribunal is aware,	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in which those Norwegian landings took place. Which means
10:01	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. So the key run, the Tribunal is aware, is what ICES grants a model once it has been approved by	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in which those Norwegian landings took place. Which means that the authors of the English scientific report, even
10:01	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. So the key run, the Tribunal is aware, is what ICES grants a model once it has been approved by the relevant ICES Working Group.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in which those Norwegian landings took place. Which means that the authors of the English scientific report, even if they had used the data, would not available to
10:01	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \end{array}$	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. So the key run, the Tribunal is aware, is what ICES grants a model once it has been approved by the relevant ICES Working Group. There again, to quote counsel for the United	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in which those Norwegian landings took place. Which means that the authors of the English scientific report, even if they had used the data, would not available to complete the exercise"
10:01	$\begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \end{array}$	five bullets at the bottom, and it says, "Ecospace data" on page 81 of the exhibit. So that explains just the concept of Ecospace. Then further up, if I can take the Tribunal further up on page 81, there is a reference to a study already from 1999 which explains in general that: "Ecospace extends Ecosim" So it is the third paragraph where it says "Model Type", if the Tribunal has it. It says: "Ecospace extends Ecosim capabilities to account for spatial dynamics of species and fishing fleets." And it says, next line, this is "a modular 'plug-in' approach". So this is something which can be taken, which is reasonably available, and can be plugged into a model. I will turn now to the third point made by the United Kingdom yesterday regarding its claim that it could not reasonably have known that by inputting new data into the model, this would deprive the model of its key run status. So the key run, the Tribunal is aware, is what ICES grants a model once it has been approved by the relevant ICES Working Group.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 been aware that this would cause the model to lose its key run status. The fourth point on which I would like to address the Tribunal is whether the United Kingdom could reasonably have known that the 58% reduction in fishing mortality that was used in the model was an overestimation. The European Union will not return to the debate about where to place the red line or not that we saw on the slides. But there is one point on which the European Union would like to return, and that was the claim that the United Kingdom and it was a subject of questions of the Tribunal about whether or not the United Kingdom could have known where the Norwegian catches took place. Counsel for the United Kingdom told the Tribunal yesterday and it's at page 125 of the transcript as of line 14: "There's no information about the ICES rectangles in which those Norwegian landings took place. Which means that the authors of the English scientific report, even if they had used the data, would not available to

in the Greater s: to the extent when one looks at vant consideration, d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the tte? These points ish scientific uprehensive overview g regarding
s: to the extent when one looks at vant consideration, d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the ite? These points ish scientific prehensive overview
when one looks at vant consideration, d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the ate? These points ish scientific aprehensive overview
when one looks at vant consideration, d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the ate? These points ish scientific aprehensive overview
vant consideration, d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the tte? These points ish scientific pprehensive overview
d have presented ss these issues. do] all these ant to the ite? These points ish scientific iprehensive overview
ss these issues. do] all these ant to the ite? These points ish scientific iprehensive overview
do] all these ant to the ate? These points ish scientific aprehensive overview
ant to the ate? These points ish scientific aprehensive overview
nte? These points ish scientific aprehensive overview
ish scientific prehensive overview
prehensive overview
g regarding
This is not in
ned, these
n of predators
nsumed by
inderstanding the
wever, the United
se elements in the
to use to quantify
f the measure that
that such
o the
other elements
the United
ice that the United
e sandeel fishing
U
best available
best available of Article 496,
best available of Article 496, 'CA.
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent.
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead.
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of
best available of Article 496, YCA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said:
best available of Article 496, ICA. Ins at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said: section of
best available of Article 496, ICA. Ins at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said: section of ty and
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said: section of ty and ed Kingdom] to
best available of Article 496, 'CA. ns at this -Agent. cis, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said: section of ty and ed Kingdom] to nate and
best available of Article 496, CA. ns at this -Agent. ris, go ahead. , according to the ort answer to one of yesterday's gdom said: section of ty and ed Kingdom] to
on on one of the second

- 22 "Surface-feeders were also generally in bad23 status ..."
- So that includes in the Greater North Sea. But thenthe next sentence:

Page 22

25 Once again, the European Union is conscious that it

and concluded that the measures were proportionate and

non-discriminatory, and thus the UK obviously performed

Page 24

22

23

24

that obligation."

-		1	
10.12 1	an ant agent time in its own and submissions avalaining	10:17 1	he arranded to reasonableness in the framework of
10:13 1	spent some time in its own oral submissions explaining	10:17 1 2	be expanded to reasonableness in the framework of a proportionality assessment. This is not because
2	its position as to what precisely the obligation under $\Delta right = 404(2)/6$	3	
3	Article 496, read together with Article 494(3)(f),		the European Union takes issue with the term "thin
4	implies. The UK's oral submission confirms that this is	4	rationality", and nor does it understand "thin
5	a point of significant divergence in interpretation	5	rationality" to mean that relationship does not matter
6	between the parties; in particular, both as to the	6	as part of the Tribunal's overall assessment. It is
7	extent of the obligation and of course also as to	7	because the concept of reasonableness would not add more
8	whether or not it was performed.	8	precision to the test the Tribunal must apply than the
9	This is also not a shortcut. It is not a shortcut	9	term "proportionate" itself.
10	c v	10	If a measure is proportionate by reference primarily
11		11	to the relationship with the end it pursues, then
12		12	a measure could be proportionate whenever it is adequate
13		13	to achieve its objective, regardless of the level of
14		14	contribution, of whether there is a less restrictive
15	6	15	alternative and of whether it imposes costs that are in
16	•	16	no way commensurate to the benefits. There is no
17		17	textual or contextual basis for construing the term
18		18	"proportionate" to be even less demanding than the term
19	0	19	"necessary" has [been] interpreted to be under the GATT
20		20	1994. Nor does a lenient reading seem to be justified
21	ambition, that it may disregard the requirement to	21	by the object and purpose of Article 494(3)(f).
22	e e	22	The relationship to the objective of the measure,
23		23	which must be one of those specified in Article 496, is
24		24	already addressed in that provision. Reading
25	made by the United Kingdom yesterday, adherence to	25	proportionality as something to be determined by
	Page 25		Page 27
	1 450 20		- ~ <u>6</u>
10:15 1	the principles cannot be essentially self-judging. This	10:18 1	reference primarily to the link to that objective would
2	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the	2	seem to water down the proportionality obligation.
2 3	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then	2 3	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another
2 3 4	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what"	2 3 4	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK
2 3 4 5	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant	2 3 4 5	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would
2 3 4 5 6	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review.	2 3 4 5 6	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at	2 3 4 5 6 7	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members 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} $	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from page 168 of the transcript (lines 18-19):	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so. With this in mind, I then pass the floor to my
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from page 168 of the transcript (lines 18-19): " existence or otherwise of [a] measure is	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so. With this in mind, I then pass the floor to my co-Agent to address certain evidential points on the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from page 168 of the transcript (lines 18-19): " existence or otherwise of [a] measure is something that might go to a balance"	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so. With this in mind, I then pass the floor to my co-Agent to address certain evidential points on the application of the proportionality yesterday.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from page 168 of the transcript (lines 18-19): " existence or otherwise of [a] measure is	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so. With this in mind, I then pass the floor to my co-Agent to address certain evidential points on the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	Tribunal has a role in scrutinising closely how the benefit and costs were defined and how they were then weighed and balanced. In other words, both the "what" and the subsequent weighing and balancing is relevant and subject to review. The European Union would like briefly to return at this point to a question raised by the Tribunal, and to the United Kingdom's response. Mr Justice Unterhalter asked counsel for the United Kingdom whether "a 'proportionate measure' is one that looks at the relationship between means and ends", and more specifically, "whether the relationship between ends and means is [a thin rationality or] more a sort of reasonableness test" (Day 2/167:3-9). The United Kingdom replied that they would not necessarily want to call it "thin rationality" because and I quote from page 167 of the transcript "it matters". The UK appears to agree that there still needs to be a weighing and balancing. Moreover, the United Kingdom stated that and again I quote, and this time from page 168 of the transcript (lines 18-19): " existence or otherwise of [a] measure is something that might go to a balance"	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	seem to water down the proportionality obligation. Now, as to the existence or otherwise of another measure, the European Union has advanced one. The UK must rebut the European Union's argument that this would be a proportionate alternative. In response to a question, the European Union acknowledged that it has been recognised by the Appellate Body, in the context of a WTO dispute looking at necessity, that there could be circumstances in which a tribunal might not have to consider an alternative measure. This was considered, for instance, to be the case where there is no restriction on trade. But this does not mean that in this claim it is heuristic for the Tribunal, or indeed the United Kingdom, to consider the EU's claim that an alternative proportionate measure was reasonably available. An alternative measure provides a mechanism to assess the sandeel fishing prohibition. Members of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom has not grappled with the European Union's alternative measure. It should do so. With this in mind, I then pass the floor to my co-Agent to address certain evidential points on the application of the proportionality yesterday.

-			
10:20 1	Mr Dowes	10:23 1	The third point that the European Union would make
	Mr Dawes.		The third point that the European Union would make on the benefits of the measure is that the United
2	MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.	2	
3	The European Union will respond to three series of	3	Kingdom confirmed yesterday to the Tribunal that the
4	points made yesterday by the United Kingdom regarding	4	measure was not justified as an emergency, and that
5	the application of the legal standard to the facts	5	the Tribunal will find at page 151 of yesterday's
6	before the Tribunal. The first group of points will	6	transcript.
7	relate to the UK's position that it was correct to	7	The United Kingdom did refer on two separate
8	maintain that it had not overstated the benefits of the	8	occasions during the course of its submissions to
9	measure; the second group of points will relate to the	9	a document which the Tribunal has at Exhibit C-43, which
10	United Kingdom's claim that it did not underestimate	10	was the call for evidence of October 2021. This was the
11	the costs of the measure; and the third group of points	11	first consultation document released by the United
12	relate to whether the United Kingdom was correct to	12	Kingdom. And there was a reference in that document to
13	maintain that it had properly weighed the costs and	13	the need for "urgent action".
14	benefits of the measure.	14	The European Union on that point simply would note
15	So starting with the overstatement of the benefits,	15	two things.
16	and there the European Union will make three points.	16	First, there is no reference to urgency in any of
17	The first point is, as the European Union has just	17	the subsequent documents that the Tribunal has on its
18	explained at length to the Tribunal, the updated model	18	record, so there is no reference to the need for any
19	and the simulated biomass increases generated by	19	urgent action.
20	the model, they lack the necessary scientific rigour	20	And the second point that the European Union would
21	required in order to be considered the "best available	21	stress is that this lack of urgency should be contrasted
22	scientific advice". And this is a factor that is	22	with the relevant context in which this measure was
23	relevant for the Tribunal's assessment of the benefits	23	adopted, which, as my co-Agent has recalled, was during
24	of the measure.	24	the adjustment period foreseen by Annex 38 of the TCA.
25	The second point regards the benefits of the measure	25	So that was why the United Kingdom was wrong to
	Page 29		Page 31
			1 450 01
10:21 1	specifically for marine mammals and for other fish.	10:25 1	maintain that it has not overstated the benefits of the
10:21 1	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for	10:25 1 2	measure.
	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to		measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and
2	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is	2	measure.
2 3	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to	2 3	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and
2 3 4	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke	2 3 4	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24):
2 3 4 5	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was	2 3 4 5	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United
2 3 4 5 6	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea.	2 3 4 5 6	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's
2 3 4 5 6 7	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward	2 3 4 5 6 7	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits	$ \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} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits were "of a lesser magnitude" and "less certain". 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} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full right of access to UK waters of the North Sea to fish
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits were "of a lesser magnitude" and "less certain". That's page 91 (lines 2-3).	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full right of access to UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel, there is no issue because these impacts can be
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits were "of a lesser magnitude" and "less certain". That's page 91 (lines 2-3). So those are also elements the Tribunal should bear	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full right of access to UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel, there is no issue because these impacts can be mitigated either by EU vessels fishing sandeel in EU
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits were "of a lesser magnitude" and "less certain". That's page 91 (lines 2-3).	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full right of access to UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel, there is no issue because these impacts can be
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	During oral submissions yesterday, counsel for the United Kingdom sought to explain what it referred to as the "quite straightforward" proposition which is at page 90 of the transcript as of lines 14 and 18 that given the dietary requirements of seals and minke whales, they would be more resilient if there was a higher or greater amount of sandeel in the North Sea. However, this proposition is not a straightforward one. Why? Because as the European Union explained, what the scientific evidence on which the United Kingdom bases its measure explains is that in the event of any localised sandeel depletion, marine mammals can and are able to prey on sandeel outside of the locally depleted area because of their ability to forage over a wider area. So one should be alive to the danger of points which may at first sight seem straightforward, but which do not disclose the full reality of the factual record. And as for fish, there the counsel for the United Kingdom made the necessary concession that the benefits were "of a lesser magnitude" and "less certain". That's page 91 (lines 2-3). So those are also elements the Tribunal should bear	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 measure. Turning now to the understatement of the costs, and there the European Union would make two points. The first point: counsel for the United Kingdom said yesterday (Day 2/152:19-24): "There's no reason to think that the [United Kingdom] would or lawfully could 'nullify' the EU's rights by 'prohibiting fishing in [the UK's waters] one stock after [an]other'." Because: "If that were what the [United Kingdom] wanted to do, it would have to satisfy the decision-making process in Article 496." At the same time, the Tribunal will have seen from the ministerial submissions on which the UK took its decision to approve the measure, and which both parties have taken the Tribunal through, the United Kingdom considers that there is no issue under Article 496, read together with Article 494, because the economic and social impacts of the nullification of the EU's full right of access to UK waters of the North Sea to fish sandeel, there is no issue because these impacts can be mitigated either by EU vessels fishing sandeel in EU

•		
10.27 1		10:21 1 further questions that the Tribund may have
10:27 1	waters.	10:31 1 further questions that the Tribunal may have.
2	And there the European Union would make the point	2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr Dawes and
3	that the inescapable conclusion is that the only moment	3 Ms Norris. You were very efficient in the use of your
4	when, on the United Kingdom's own submissions,	4 time this morning.
5	proportionality would prevent the United Kingdom acting	5 Can I ask the Tribunal members if you have any
6	in such a way would indeed be when there are no other	6 particular questions at this time? We will wait,
7	rights under Annex 38 left for the United Kingdom to	7 therefore, until the end of the day.
8	nullify, because otherwise there will always be other	8 So thank you very much. It is now adjourned. Our
9	stocks or other waters in which the European Union	9 schedule is to adjourn until 2.00 pm. (Pause)
10	could, on the United Kingdom's own submissions, mitigate	10 Because we are leaving our questions on the
11	its losses.	11 European Union's reply until the end of the day, we will
12	That was the first point.	12 take a three-hour break, until 1.30, and return at 1.30.
13	More generally, the second point is that the	13 Then this will allow further time towards the end of the
14	European Union does not accept, on a factual basis, the	14 day, so that we can not extend our hearing time too
15	hypothetical possibility for EU vessels to mitigate any	15 late.
16	economic and social impacts of the nullification of the	16 So thank you. We will adjourn then until 1.30.
17	EU's rights. That hypothetical possibility is based on	17 Thank you.
18	a number of unsubstantiated assumptions.	18 (10.32 pm)
19	To give the Tribunal one example, this assumes that	19 (Adjourned until 1.30 pm)
20	there is a sufficient amount of quota available to EU	20 (1.30 pm)
21	vessels, a sufficient amount of quota left for them to	21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.
22	fish other stocks. But as the Tribunal will see from	22 I now invite counsel for the United Kingdom.
23	Annex 35, there are a whole series of stocks, each of	23 Mr Juratowitch, you have the floor.
24	which is subject to quotas. So this assumption that	24 Rebuttal statement on behalf of the United Kingdom
25	somehow the EU vessels would be able to mitigate their	25 MR JURATOWITCH: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.
	Dec. 22	Dec. 25
	Page 33	Page 35
10:28 1	loss by fishing other quotas is simply something for the	13:30 1 To give the Tribunal a sense of our structure this
10:28 1 2	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated	2 afternoon, I will first address the question of which
	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take.	afternoon, I will first address the question of whichparty has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal
2	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the
2 3	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of
2 3 4	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the
2 3 4 5	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with
2 3 4 5 6	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2.
2 3 4 5 6 7	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits.	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits.	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits. So, members of the Tribunal, unless you have any	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written case at paragraphs 392 to 393 states that:
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits. So, members of the Tribunal, unless you have any further questions at this juncture, the European Union	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written case at paragraphs 392 to 393 states that: " [each] party shall have the burden of proving
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits. So, members of the Tribunal, unless you have any further questions at this juncture, the European Union would like to thank the Tribunal for hearing its	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written case at paragraphs 392 to 393 states that: " [each] party shall have the burden of proving facts relied upon to support its claim or defence."
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits. So, members of the Tribunal, unless you have any further questions at this juncture, the European Union	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that prima facie burden as Complainant, the burden then shifts to the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written case at paragraphs 392 to 393 states that: " [each] party shall have the burden of proving
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	United Kingdom to prove, it is an unsubstantiated assumption, and one which the Tribunal should not take. Finally, to turn to the weighing of the costs and benefits, it will not have escaped the Tribunal's attention that the United Kingdom considered it sufficient yesterday simply to identify various elements that formed part of the decision-making process. And this also prompted a question by Professor Ruiz Fabri. However, as the European Union explained, the Tribunal should, and is required to, go further and scrutinise not only the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. The European Union already took the Tribunal through these elements on Tuesday and explained why those elements do not disclose any proper weighing. The European Union need therefore only add that nothing in the additional paragraphs to which the Tribunal was taken yesterday by counsel to the United Kingdom disclosed any proper weighing of the costs and benefits. So, members of the Tribunal, unless you have any further questions at this juncture, the European Union would like to thank the Tribunal for hearing its	 afternoon, I will first address the question of which party has the burden on what. Ms Boileau will then deal with specific criticisms related to aspects of the English scientific report related to the modelling of ecosystem effects. I will then return and deal with the balance of claim 1, and Mr Westaway will then deal with claim 2. So if I could then start with burden. This, of course, was the Tribunal's seventh question. On the EU's approach, we heard the EU this morning and on Tuesday assert, without discernible reference to authority, that it, the EU, as the Complainant party, has a prima facie burden to establish its claims of breach of the TCA. The EU says that once it has met that the United Kingdom, as Respondent, to show that the United Kingdom's measures were justified. In its Written Submissions, the EU did not make any suggestion that there is a prima facie or shifting burden that applies under the TCA. The EU's written case at paragraphs 392 to 393 states that: " [each] party shall have the burden of proving facts relied upon to support its claim or defence."

10.00		10.04	
13:32 1	the procedural order governing this arbitration.	13:36 1	difficulties in discharging its burden of proof on
2	The EU, at the Written Submission stage, wasn't	2	matters of fact because of the particular circumstances
3	seeking to shrink its burden or to shift its burden down	3	of the case. An obvious example would be if one state
4	to a prima facie one or one that involved shifting the	4	has the burden of proving a fact to support its claim,
5	burden to the UK; that happened at the hearing. With	5	but all or a substantial part of the evidence that's
6	respect, the United Kingdom's position is that that is	6	necessary to support that claim is located within the
7	contrary to principle, and I turn now to the correct	7	territory or possession of the other party, which is
8	position.	8	refusing to produce it.
9	The starting point is that in international law,	9	In that kind of case, the first state may be
10	states are presumed to act in good faith; states are not	10	entitled to have more liberal recourse to inferences of
11	presumed to have breached their international	11	fact. But that is not a shifting of the burden, but
12	obligations. It follows that a state that is alleging	12	an alleviation of what might be required to meet it in
13	that another state has breached an international	13	quite specific circumstances.
14	obligation in this case, a treaty obligation	14	I mention that also for completeness, but of course we are not in that situation either: the UK has been
15 16	the state making that allegation has the burden of establishing its own claim. As Complainant, the EU	15 16	
10	therefore has the burden of establishing its own claims.	10	entirely transparent as to the evidence. What the EU seems to be doing is to seek to export
17	Members of the Tribunal, I would add two nuances to	17	approaches taken within some World Trade Organization
18	this. The first is that if a respondent relies on	18	jurisprudence to this different context. And whatever
20	an exception to a rule as a defence for breach of that	20	view might be taken as to whether that approach is
20	rule, then in those circumstances, if the applicant has	20	correct within its own WTO context, it is not something
21	established the breach of the rule, it will normally be	21	that the Tribunal should follow under the TCA.
22	incumbent on a respondent relying on the exception to	23	And that is not least because the treaty frameworks
23 24	establish that exception.	23	are different. In particular, there is no equivalent in
25	If a party's defence to an alleged breach of a rule	25	the TCA to Article 20 of the GATT, providing general
	Page 37		Page 39
13:34 1	is not just a denial of the breach of the rule but	13:38 1	exceptions to treaty obligations, on the basis of which
2	an argument that some other rule permitted it or	2	the UK is somehow seeking affirmatively to justify its
3	justified it or excused its otherwise unlawful conduct,	3	measures.
4	in those circumstances, then if the applicant succeeds	4	Members of the Tribunal, the UK considers the
5	in discharging its burden of establishing a breach of	5	orthodox approach, which I have outlined, to apply under
6	the first rule, it will be for the respondent to	6	
7	establish that the rule that it, the respondent, relies		the TCA. It is that the claimant has the burden of
	_	7	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any
8	on provides it with a defence.	7 8	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has
9	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden.	7 8 9	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact.
9 10	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to	7 8 9 10	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that
9 10 11	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which	7 8 9 10 11	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the
9 10 11 12	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely.	7 8 9 10 11 12	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden
9 10 11 12 13	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the
9 10 11 12 13 14	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The position is quite simply that the EU has brought	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this scientific advice is the best available scientific
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The position is quite simply that the EU has brought the claims and it is for the EU to establish them.	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this scientific advice is the best available scientific advice, and that the measures were based on it. But
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The position is quite simply that the EU has brought the claims and it is for the EU to establish them. That's the first nuance.	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this scientific advice is the best available scientific advice, and that the measures were based on it. But that is not an affirmative defence of any kind; it is
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The position is quite simply that the EU has brought the claims and it is for the EU to establish them. That's the first nuance. The second nuance is that in certain limited	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this scientific advice is the best available scientific advice, and that the measures were based on it. But that is not an affirmative defence of any kind; it is a straightforward denial of the EU's claim.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	on provides it with a defence. Now, that does not involve a prima facie burden. It is just that the burden can be on a respondent to make out a particular kind of defence on which a respondent might rely. That, members of the Tribunal, is not this case. The UK is not advancing any such defence. It is simply saying that the EU has not made out its case of breach. The burden of establishing the EU's claim therefore starts with, remains with and ends with the EU; it does not shift. And that burden obviously can't be discharged by resort to a prima facie standard. The position is quite simply that the EU has brought the claims and it is for the EU to establish them. That's the first nuance. The second nuance is that in certain limited circumstances, international courts and tribunals	$\begin{array}{c} 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	establishing a breach of the TCA, and insofar as any party wishes to establish a fact, then that party has the burden of proving that fact. I move, members of the Tribunal, to outline how that applies in respect of each claim in this case. In the context of claim 1, it means that the EU has the burden to prove that the English scientific report, the Scottish scientific report and the ICES Technical Service response was not the best available scientific advice. The EU equally has the burden to establish that the measures about which it complains were not based on that advice. The UK certainly takes the position that this scientific advice is the best available scientific advice, and that the measures were based on it. But that is not an affirmative defence of any kind; it is a straightforward denial of the EU's claim. That's claim 1.

Day 3

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
13:40 1	burden of showing that the UK did not have regard to the	13:43 1	it claims, wrongly, that this takes it out of alignment
2	principle of applying proportionate and	2	with the ICES key run; yet in the next breath,
3	non-discriminatory measures.	3	it suggests that the scientific failing of the English
4	It was said this morning that the EU has advanced	4	scientific report was in fact that it did not make
5	an alternative measure, and it is therefore for the UK	5	extensive structural changes to the model, which would
6	to rebut the EU's argument that this would be	6	have transformed the model into one that has no bearing
7	a proportionate measure.	7	to the ICES's key run.
8	Leaving aside for now whether the possibility of	8	The second point is this: the EU this morning
9	certain alternative measures has any role to play under	9	expressly affirmed and this is from the provisional
10	the applicable legal test, and just focusing on the	10	transcript at page 9, starting line 20 that it "did
11	question of burden, there is no justification in the TCA	11	not identify or produce another superior model". What
12	for the burden-shifting exercise proposed by the EU.	12	this means by reference to the word "available" in
13	What the EU says is that once it raises the possibility	13	Article 496(2) of the TCA is that if "available" means
14	of an alternative measure, it is somehow for the UK to	14	"to hand", as the UK contends, then the EU has not
15	show why that measure would not have been appropriate to	15	identified any superior model which was actually to
16	meet the UK's objective.	16	hand.
17	One can see the difficulty with that particularly	17	To situate then the present debate, we are in the
18	clearly on the facts of this case. The EU just says	18	universe of asking whether the scientific advice which
19	that it could have tolerated one or more partial	19	the EU suggests the UK ought to have produced, in the
20	closures based on the foraging range of chick-rearing	20	form of a superior model, was readily obtainable. What
21	seabirds. As I emphasised yesterday, it doesn't say how	21	the Tribunal has not seen from the EU is any evidence
22	many closures, of what size, or based on the foraging	22	from any scientist or modeller about how long it would
23	range of which kinds of seabirds. The EU can't just lob	23	take to develop a model that is free from the
24	something of that generality over the net and expect the	24	limitations of the model that was used in the English
25	UK to disprove that it would have been enough to satisfy	25	scientific report, or any evidence about the resources
	Page 41		Page 43
12.40 1		12.45 1	
13:42 1	the UK's objective.	13:45 1	involved in doing so.
2	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the	2	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would
2 3	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough	2 3	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does
2 3 4	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant	2 3 4	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the
2 3 4 5	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point	2 3 4 5	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that
2 3 4 5 6	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its	2 3 4 5 6	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model?
2 3 4 5 6 7	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden	2 3 4 5 6 7	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor. MS BOILEAU: Members of the Tribunal, I will address each of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific report. And in support of this submission, the EU took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor. MS BOILEAU: Members of the Tribunal, I will address each of the specific replies made this morning by the EU in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific report. And in support of this submission, the EU took the Tribunal to a reference in the English scientific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor. MS BOILEAU: Members of the Tribunal, I will address each of the specific replies made this morning by the EU in respect of the modelling exercise undertaken 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\end{array} $	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific report. And in support of this submission, the EU took the Tribunal to a reference in the English scientific report which referred to the fact that cod were divided
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor. MS BOILEAU: Members of the Tribunal, I will address each of the specific replies made this morning by the EU in respect of the modelling exercise undertaken in the English scientific report. Before I do so, I will advance two overarching points. The first point is that in one breath the EU appears	$ \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 Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific report. And in support of this submission, the EU took the Tribunal to a reference in the English scientific report which referred to the fact that cod were divided into different age components: juvenile and mature.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	As it happens, I demonstrated yesterday that the foraging range of chick-rearing seabirds would be enough to justify a full closure, if that were the relevant test, and the EU was noticeably silent on that point this morning. But that goes to the EU not meeting its burden; it is not an acceptance that there is any burden on the UK. The EU has and retains the burden of establishing that the UK did not have regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures, and it has and retains the burden of establishing any fact on which it seeks to rely for that purpose. Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on burden. I'm of course at the Tribunal's disposal if I can assist it on that topic. Otherwise, Ms Boileau will now make submissions concerning the modelling. THE CHAIRPERSON: Please, Ms Boileau, you have the floor. MS BOILEAU: Members of the Tribunal, I will address each of the specific replies made this morning by the EU in respect of the modelling exercise undertaken in the English scientific report. Before I do so, I will advance two overarching points.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	The Agent for the EU has implied that it would seemingly be a simple step to develop a model which does not have those limitations. The EU suggests that the data is already available, so why not simply add that data into the model? Even if the data were available and the EU has not proven that fact the changes that the EU are suggesting are not about adding more or recent data to the existing model. The changes being suggested would fundamentally alter the structure of the model, as I will come to shortly. Turning then to the specific criticisms that the EU rebutted this morning. The first rebuttal by the EU pertained to its assertion that a model that was size-structured for sandeel was available or more precisely, readily obtainable to the authors of the English scientific report. And in support of this submission, the EU took the Tribunal to a reference in the English scientific report which referred to the fact that cod were divided into different age components: juvenile and mature. What the EU did not take the Tribunal to is the 2015

Page 44

-		1	
10.47		10.51 1	
13:47 1	it would be clear that sandeel are not size-structured	13:51 1	available were used in the ensemble modelling. And as
2	in the EwE model. I'll give the Tribunal the reference	2	stated there, that means that to the extent that
3	for that, but in the interests of time, I won't take the	3	size-structured models were available, they were in fact
4	Tribunal to those pages.	4	deployed in the English scientific report.
5	The exhibit is R-108. At page 102, it refers to	5	What we do say is that the North Sea EwE model is
6	the fact that there are 69 functional groups in the	6	not size-structured for sandeel. The North Sea EwE
7	North Sea EwE model; and then starting at page 106,	7	model is the only model of the entire ecosystem of the
8	there's a table with those functional groups listed out.	8	North Sea which could be used to explore the effects of
9	And what one can see from that table is that there are	9	altering sandeel fishing in the North Sea.
10	some fish species, such as cod, which are split into	10	Other models, such as the SMS model referred to by
11	different functional groups based on their size; but	11	the EU, do not have all the species of the North Sea, so
12	sandeel, as shown in that table, are not.	12	they were not suitable for purpose. The SMS model, for
13	To come then to the work that would be involved to	13	example, has only 20 functional groups, which only
14	break sandeel down into different sizes, this would not	14	covers part of the food web, primarily fish. The EwE
15	be as simple an undertaking as the EU suggests. Adding	15	model, on the other hand, has 69 functional groups,
16	a new functional group to the model and indeed,	16	which covers the entire food web.
17	that's what would be required: at least one additional	17	Turning then to the second point addressed by the EU
18	functional group, to break sandeel down into juvenile	18	this morning. Here the EU sought to establish that
19	and mature sandeel that would require the entire	19	the model could have taken into account a spatial
20	model to be recalibrated.	20	distribution in respect of both sandeel and its
21	Making this one change has a domino effect on	21	predators. The EU made the remarkable suggestion that
22	the model, because if you split sandeel into adults and	22	such a model appears already to exist, and it referred
23	juvenile, you first have to re-estimate all the	23	here to an Ecospace model. It does not.
24	parameters relating to sandeel, and then you have to	24	There are, members of the Tribunal, different types
25	look at all of the other predators of sandeel, and split	25	of modelling software. Ecopath with Ecosim, EwE, is one
	Page 45		Page 47
	r age 45		rage 47
13:48 1	their diets into the proportions which consume adult	13:52 1	kind of modelling software. Having a piece of software
13:48 1	their diets into the proportions which consume adult sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel.	13:52 1 2	kind of modelling software. Having a piece of software is not the same as having a model of a particular
2	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel.	2	is not the same as having a model of a particular
2 3	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data	2 3	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software.
2 3 4	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the	2 3 4	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question
2 3 4 5	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example,	2 3 4 5	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in
2 3 4 5 6	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks	2 3 4 5 6	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software.As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in
2 3 4 5 6 7	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that	2 3 4 5 6 7	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ \end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run
$ \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} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom mentioned as much in its Written Submission at	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\end{array} $	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the exhibit on which the EU relies, does not have this
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom mentioned as much in its Written Submission at footnote 513, projected on the slide (13). In the final	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the exhibit on which the EU relies, does not have this Ecospace component; it doesn't take into account
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom mentioned as much in its Written Submission at footnote 513, projected on the slide (13). In the final sentence of that footnote, it can be seen that the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the exhibit on which the EU relies, does not have this Ecospace component; it doesn't take into account the spatial distribution of sandeel. But if it already
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom mentioned as much in its Written Submission at footnote 513, projected on the slide (13). In the final	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the exhibit on which the EU relies, does not have this Ecospace component; it doesn't take into account
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	sandeel compared to juvenile sandeel. And that's just the start of it. But even that data is unlikely to be easily obtainable for many of the predators that eat sandeel. So we do know, for example, members of the Tribunal, that certain seabird chicks prefer to eat small sandeel, but we don't know that information about all of the predators of sandeel in the ecosystem. That is the kind of information that would need to be known, or in relation to which expert opinion would need to be obtained, in order to update the model. The EU then took the Tribunal to R-108, which is the SMS model. The EU referred to this as a "dataset" or a "database" of size-structured fish. That database is not shown on this slide; I'll come to that in a moment. But R-108, and the page that the EU referred to, shows that the SMS model is a model. It's just that; it's not a database, it's not a dataset. The United Kingdom has never denied that there are other models which exist which are size-structured in respect of certain fish. Indeed, the United Kingdom mentioned as much in its Written Submission at footnote 513, projected on the slide (13). In the final sentence of that footnote, it can be seen that the	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	is not the same as having a model of a particular ecosystem in that software. As arose yesterday in an interaction, in a question from Madam Chairperson, the EwE software was in existence before the North Sea model was developed in 2007. The exhibit that the EU took the Tribunal to and I won't take the Tribunal to it again shows that in 2013, the date of that exhibit, there was modelling software called Ecospace, which can be added to EwE modelling, and when that is done, it would allow for spatially defined modelling. What that exhibit does not show is that there is in existence an Ecospace model of the North Sea that has the spatial distribution of sandeel or its predators, and the dynamics between them. At the time that the English scientific report was produced, there was no Ecospace model of the North Sea which had that spatial distribution. The Tribunal will recall that the ICES 2015 key run of the North Sea, published just two years after the exhibit on which the EU relies, does not have this Ecospace component; it doesn't take into account the spatial distribution of sandeel. But if it already

÷			
13:54 1	why wasn't it included in the ICES 2015 key run?	13:57 1	at the second sentence, it refers to:
2	The third point raised by the EU this morning was	2	" the majority of Norwegian operations taking
3	that, according to it, inputting new data into the model	3	place in Norwegian waters"
4	would deprive the model of the key run status. And here	4	There's no percentage breakdown there:
5	it was referring to the updates that were made by the	5	" while the majority of Danish landings come from
6	authors of the English scientific report. The EU seemed	6	within the UK EEZ"
7	to be suggesting that not only should the model have	7	And one can see that specific percentages are then
8	been updated to enable it to run to 2020, it should have	8	listed.
9	been entirely reworked to allow it to be spatially	9	One would have thought, of course, that if the
10	distributed and size-structured.	10	authors of the English scientific report did have the
11	The key point is this: the EU suggests that the	11	same information for Norway as they had about Denmark,
12	updates made by the authors of the English scientific	12	then they would likewise have included that information
13	report to bring the model up to 2020 are somehow	13	in the report.
14	comparable to the changes that would be needed to	14	
15	redress the limitations of the model that were	15	concerned the fact that the outputs of the model in
16	identified transparently as "caveats" in the English	16	
17	scientific report.	17	presentation of the data, in the English scientific
18	I took the Tribunal yesterday to the slides showing	18	
19	how the 2015 Working Group's report on the ICES key run	19	seabirds, for the purposes of presentation in the report
20	sets out the sources of data that can be used to update	20	
21	the model in the manner in which the authors of the	21	benefits for seabirds as a category, and the UK does not
22	English scientific report did. None of those changes	22	understand the EU to be suggesting otherwise.
23	altered the structure, function or foundational	23	(Slide 15) The EU refers to the fact that kittiwake
24	parameters of the model.	24	-
25	It is in that sense that the UK refers to the	25	more than diving seabirds, and the United Kingdom does
	Page 49		Page 51
13:56 1	updated model that was used in the English scientific	13:59 1	not at all disagree with that. Indeed, that's what the
2	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't	2	English scientific report says in a passage that I took
2 3	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run	2 3	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English
2 3 4	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013.	2 3 4	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report.
2 3 4 5	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model	2 3 4 5	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about
2 3 4 5 6	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the	2 3 4 5 6	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has
2 3 4 5 6 7	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure,	2 3 4 5 6 7	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective of the measure, first; secondly, I will deal with best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where Norwegian landings came from, in terms of the ICES	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective of the measure, first; secondly, I will deal with best available scientific advice; thirdly, I will deal with
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where Norwegian landings came from, in terms of the ICES rectangles, but inexplicably chose not to account for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective of the measure, first; secondly, I will deal with best available scientific advice; thirdly, I will deal with the UK basing the measures on that advice; and fourthly,
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where Norwegian landings came from, in terms of the ICES rectangles, but inexplicably chose not to account for that in their calculation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective of the measure, first; secondly, I will deal with the UK basing the measures on that advice; and fourthly, I will end on the precautionary approach.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	report as being aligned with the key run. It isn't actually the key run, because the data for the key run went up to 2013. On the other hand, the changes to the model suggested by the EU are not ones which would bring the model up to date as such, but would alter its structure, its function and its foundational settings. And it follows, of course, that those are not the types of information that one can find in the 2015 report to enable scientists to update the model. The EU's fourth point pertained to the 58% reference point that we've heard so much about. The Tribunal will have noted that the EU this morning mounted no defence at all of the 39% figure that it mooted on Tuesday. We also heard no suggestion today that the authors of the English scientific report should have used the ICES data rather than the European Commission's data. The EU instead seemed to suggest that the authors of the English scientific report did actually know where Norwegian landings came from, in terms of the ICES rectangles, but inexplicably chose not to account for that in their calculation. What the English scientific report (C-45) actually	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 English scientific report says in a passage that I took the Tribunal to yesterday, at page 13 of the English scientific report. The key point, however, is that this criticism about how the data on seabirds was presented in the report has no bearing whatsoever on whether the modelling or the scientific advice itself was sufficiently rigorous to meet the definition of "best available scientific advice", as defined by the EU. The EU has not identified any model that was available at the time the English scientific report was authored that was in fact capable of disaggregating seabirds into specific species of seabirds. Those are my submissions on the modelling, members of the Tribunal. I'll now hand back over to Mr Juratowitch. MR JURATOWITCH: Members of the Tribunal, on the balance of claim 1, I will say something brief about the objective of the measure, first; secondly, I will deal with the UK basing the measures on that advice; and fourthly, I will end on the precautionary approach. Really by way of introduction on the objective,

	1 the UK is entitled to set its own objective, and that	14:05 1	The first point on that is that it is quite a long
	2 this includes pursuing a high level of protection of	2	way from the ordinary meaning of "best available
	3 the ecosystem in the North Sea.	3	scientific advice".
	4 It must follow from that that the EU accepts that	4	The second is that the EU would need to establish
	5 the UK is entitled to pursue benefits for seabirds,	5	the degree of ease or reasonableness to which it refers.
	6 marine mammals and fish that prey on sandeel, as well as	6	And if it was really so easy as they purport to suggest,
	7 sandeel themselves, all being participants in the	7	one might reasonably wonder why they haven't done it.
	8 ecosystem of which sandeel populations form such	8	You've heard from Ms Boileau on it in fact not being
	9 a crucial part. And that crucial part is common ground.	9	easy or fast at all, as a matter of fact.
10		10	The third point and in the end, this is a crucial
1		11	point: the EU would need to show that it would make
12		12	a difference. It can't just parrot the caveats that the
13		13	authors of the English scientific reports had already
14		14	identified and say, on that accepted basis, that more
1:		15	should have been done. It needs to show that it would
10		16	make a difference.
17		17	And for the Norwegian data, about which the EU was
18		18	so excited yesterday, even at the maximum possible
19		19	assumption in favour of the EU's case, which is that
20	10 That's why I begin on the objective: to make good on	20	there's no Norwegian fishing of sandeel in UK waters,
2	that point later about implicit departures from it in	21	even on that maximum possible assumption, the number on
22	the guise of purported application of the test.	22	which they focused, based on that assumption, was within
23	3 That's the first point, on objective.	23	the confidence interval identified in the English
24	4 The second is on best available scientific advice.	24	scientific report on which the English measure was
25	5 The EU this morning said (page 8:19-23) it cannot be	25	based.
	Page 53		Page 55
	1 450 55		1 450 00
14:03 1	1 right that the EU can only prevail if "it adduces	14:07 1	Members of the Tribunal, it's simply not enough just
	 right that the EU can only prevail if "it adduces another model or alternative piece of scientific advice 	14:07 1 2	Members of the Tribunal, it's simply not enough just to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without
2			
2	2 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice	2	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without
22	another model or alternative piece of scientific advice[that] it positively asserts is better".	2 3	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make
2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said 	2 3 4	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice.
2 2 2 5	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has 	2 3 4 5	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is
22	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden 	2 3 4 5 6	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect.
	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the 	2 3 4 5 6 7	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific
	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists
	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science.
	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way.
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 11 11 14	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions
22 33 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish
2 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 11 12 14 14 14 16 10 11	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", that 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of
22 33 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 10 11 12 12 14 12 14 14 15 10 11 18 19 20	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", 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} $	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of prohibiting sandeel fishing only in the UK part of the
22 33 45 60 70 8 8 9 9 10 11 12 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", that being accepted to be a comparative term. 	$ \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 throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of prohibiting sandeel fishing only in the UK part of the North Sea, might have affected the substantial of the
2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", that being accepted to be a comparative term. The EU developed this by saying that if there is an existing model, the question we were told this 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array} $	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of prohibiting sandeel fishing only in the UK part of the North Sea, might have affected the substantial of the overall advice.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ 3 \\ 2 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 14 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 10 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 2 \\ 22 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 \\ 21 $	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", that being accepted to be a comparative term. The EU developed this by saying that if there is an existing model, the question we were told this morning is whether data that could reasonably 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\end{array} $	to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of prohibiting sandeel fishing only in the UK part of the North Sea, might have affected the substantial of the overall advice. To make that good by reference to three examples
2	 another model or alternative piece of scientific advice [that] it positively asserts is better". The only justification given for why that is said not to be capable of being right is that all the EU has to do is to satisfy some sort of prima facie burden creating some sort of doubt about the science that the other party has relied on, and then the EU says that it is for the other party here the UK to justify its own science. Now, you've already heard me on the burden of proof. So I continue on now to say that, subject to the extreme cases discussed yesterday, it is quite difficult to see how a party can establish, to the satisfaction of a tribunal of eminent jurists who are not scientists, that the other party's science is not the best available without proffering science of their own in some form, to allow the tribunal to make some sort of comparison. That's true as a practical matter, and it's true as a matter of the words of the TCA, which say "best", that being accepted to be a comparative term. The EU developed this by saying that if there is an existing model, the question we were told this morning is whether data that could reasonably 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} $	 to throw rocks at somebody else's science, without showing that the criticisms, even if valid, would make a meaningful difference to the substance of the advice. It rather begs the question as to how the Tribunal is supposed to make a judgment in that respect. It's agreed that you are not to resolve scientific controversies for yourself or seek to become scientists so as to make judgments on matters of science. I'll seek to deal with what that means for the Tribunal in practical rather than theoretical terms, and it's in this way. The Tribunal can be assisted by the fact that the scientific papers that the EU is relying on are either the same as, or reach the same or similar conclusions to, the papers analysed in the English and Scottish scientific reports. That militates even further against any suggestion that any changes to the modelling parameters, or to the data used to predict the impact of prohibiting sandeel fishing only in the UK part of the North Sea, might have affected the substantial of the overall advice.

14:09 1	The first one is C-40. It is a 2023 scientific	14:13 1	That's especially useful, in my submission, because
2		2	it shows that even in prevailing conditions of decline
3		3	generally, which one sees from the control group on
4	÷	4	the yellow line, even in those prevailing conditions,
5		5	the fishing prohibition created a positive effect.
6	0 0	6	This, members of the Tribunal, is real-world
7		7	historical data reflecting what actually happened in
8		8	this specific area.
9		9	The other three species studied in this paper all
10		10	continued their decline notwithstanding the closure of
11		11	the fishery. But the authors nonetheless noted, as
12	0	12	you see now on slide 4:
13	1	13	"We are unable to discount the possibility that the
14	• •	14	fishery closure may actually have benefitted breeding
15		15	success of these species ([that is], without it the
16		16	declines would have been even more marked)."
17		17	That is what the scientific literature generally
18	•	18	refers to as a "dampening effect": things may be bad,
19		19	but they may have been worse without the intervention.
20		20	Bearing in mind, of course, that this study was of
21		21	the existing partial closure, and we know from figure 19
22	*	22	that the Tribunal has seen from the Scottish scientific
23		23	report, and also the data with the standard deviation
24	* *	24	added used by NatureScot for wind power projects, that
25	" because their long lifespan, wide-ranging	25	the foraging range of kittiwakes actually extends well
	Page 57		Page 59
14:11 1	habitat use and position at the top of the food chain	14:14 1	beyond the closed area.
14:11 1 2		14:14 1 2	beyond the closed area. Now, there are some other relevant passages from
	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower		-
2	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems"	2	Now, there are some other relevant passages from
2 3	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems"	2 3	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the
2 3 4	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006.	2 3 4	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's
2 3 4 5	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for	2 3 4 5	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that:
2 3 4 5 6	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader	2 3 4 5 6	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between
2 3 4 5 6 7	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at	2 3 4 5 6 7	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9	serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of the proposed measure; that's R-76 at page 2. They said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage inside the closed area. As the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of the proposed measure; that's R-76 at page 2. They said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage inside the closed area. As the Tribunal will appreciate, that shows an improvement in 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of the proposed measure; that's R-76 at page 2. They said that it "aligns with the core advice" of the English
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for kittiwakes at the ribunal sees, the closed area. As the Tribunal will appreciate, that shows an improvement in breeding success after the closure of the fishery when 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of the proposed measure; that's R-76 at page 2. They said that it "aligns with the core advice" of the English scientific report, in particular as to the possibility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 serves as an integrative measure of the health of lower traffic levels in bottom-up controlled systems" Citing another paper, Frederiksen 2006. That, members of the Tribunal, is significant because it regards seabirds as important not just for their inherent value but as an indicator of the broader health of the ecosystem, because of their position at the top of it. On the next slide (3) is a figure from that same article. It's figure 2.B in the article. And it plots breeding success for kittiwake on the Y-axis, and on the X-axis is time, showing the period before the fishery was operational in the area; second is during the operation of the fishery in the area; and then thirdly, after, which is after the fishery was closed in that area, which, as you know, occurred in the year 2000. The yellow line is breeding success for kittiwakes that forage outside the closed area. So that's the control group. As the Tribunal sees, the overall trend was downwards. The blue line is breeding success for kittiwakes at the ribunal sees, the closed area. As the Tribunal will appreciate, that shows an improvement in breeding success after the closure of the fishery when 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	Now, there are some other relevant passages from this recent article, but I'll just go straight to the last paragraph, which is at pages 13 and 14, and it's now on the slide (5). It says that: " our results demonstrate important links between a fishery closure, prey abundance and availability, and seabird diet and breeding success. These findings substantiate previous evidence from marine systems around the world for the potential for forage fisheries to impact upon seabird demography However, they also serve to highlight the difficulties and complexities in teasing apart the contributions of different drivers against a backdrop of environmental change, hindering their practical application to strategic seabird conservation via fisheries management." Members of the Tribunal, that is the Searle paper. Although it was published after the English scientific report, it was referred to by the authors of the English scientific report in their response to the opponents of the proposed measure; that's R-76 at page 2. They said that it "aligns with the core advice" of the English scientific report, in particular as to the possibility of adverse environmental conditions dampening potential

14:16 1	That provides you, members of the Tribunal, with	14:20 1	failed the assessment in all Regions where they could be
2	a helpful coinciding of the Scottish scientific report,	2	assessed."
3	a recent relevant scientific paper relied on and filed	3	This report matters, members of the Tribunal,
4	by the EU in this case, and the views of the authors of	4	because it shows the low abundance of seabirds overall,
5	the English scientific report after they had written	5	indicating that they are species which require
6	that report and then considered the Searle paper.	6	significant conservation efforts.
0 7	I move then to the second example. I said that		
	•	7	The EU is correct that the model does disaggregate
8	there were three; we're now up to the second. And the C_{1} A_{1} X_{2} we may take to be the interval of A_{1} X_{2} where A_{2} A_{2} A_{3}	8	surface- and column-feeders, and that the English
9	that's C-41. You were taken to it this morning by the	9	scientific report doesn't; and Ms Boileau addressed you
10	EU. It's the OSPAR Commission Marine Bird Abundance	10	on that yesterday. My point now is simply to say: if
11	2023 report. It's used by the EU to say that kittiwakes	11	the English scientific report did do so, it seems pretty
12	are "showing a decline in breeding success and not	12	likely, based on what the Tribunal has seen in evidence
13	meeting the OSPAR threshold"; that's the EU's Written	13	before it, that it would show greater impact for
14	Submission, footnote 61.	14	surface-feeders than for column-feeders. It's very hard
15	You were taken to it this morning for the	15	to see how the result would be otherwise.
16	proposition that the report that is the English	16	What is much less obvious is quite how that would
17	scientific report should have disaggregated	17	help the EU's case. Kittiwakes, and a number of other
18	column-feeding and surface-feeding birds. That's	18	birds the UK was seeking to protect, are
19	the purpose for which it was relied on this morning.	19	surface-feeders. So the numbers in the report, had it
20	The significance of the report, fairly viewed, is	20	done what the EU now says it should have done in
21	rather broader than either of those uses of it. On	21	a hypothetical world, would have very likely shown
22	the slide (6) on your screens now, looking at the first	22	greater benefit for surface-feeders than the numbers in
23	highlighting, the report says:	23	the report now show.
24	"In three out of four of the OSPAR Regions assessed,	24	It's hard to see how that would have any impact at
25	less than 75% of all species assessed across the	25	all, in terms of the decision-making or in terms of the
	Page 61		Page 63
			1 4ge 05
14.10 1			
14:18 1		14.00 1	$D_{1} + C_{1} + C_{2} + C_{2$
2	functional groups have achieved threshold values for	14:22 1	overall scientific advice. But if it did, it would have
2	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird	2	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis
3	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy."	2 3	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds.
3 4	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say:	2 3 4	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal.
3 4 5	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders	2 3 4 5	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's
3 4 5 6	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both	2 3 4 5 6	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the
3 4 5 6 7	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season."	2 3 4 5 6 7	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the
3 4 5 6 7 8	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement:
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish."
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does.
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species."	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species." Then running on to the next page, which is on the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column for "Sandeel", it will see that 56% of the diet of minke
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species." Then running on to the next page, which is on the next slide (9):	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column for "Sandeel", it will see that 56% of the diet of minke whales is sandeel; 37% for harbour seal; 41% for grey
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species." Then running on to the next page, which is on the next slide (9): "Within surface-feeders during the breeding season,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column for "Sandeel", it will see that 56% of the diet of minke whales is sandeel; 37% for harbour seal; 41% for grey seal; 55% of puffin diet; 42% for guillemots; 37% for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species." Then running on to the next page, which is on the next slide (9):	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column for "Sandeel", it will see that 56% of the diet of minke whales is sandeel; 37% for harbour seal; 41% for grey
$ \begin{array}{c} 3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	relative breeding abundance, indicating that the bird communities are not healthy." It goes on in the next highlighted passage to say: "In the Greater North Sea, only water-column feeders and grazing feeders achieved the threshold value in both the breeding and non-breeding season." The next slide (7) is table 3 in that same report. It shows the functional groups for the North Sea. Those marked in red are below the threshold for relative abundance. I won't take the Tribunal to it now, but page 17 of the same report specifies which species are in which functional groups, which may assist the Tribunal in due course. I would move now though to the conclusion of that paper, which is at page 23 of the paper and on the next slide (8), where it says: "The availability of small forage fish species at the surface ([for example] sandeel, herring, sprat, and capelin) is probably limiting the breeding success or the annual survival of some surface-feeding species." Then running on to the next page, which is on the next slide (9): "Within surface-feeders during the breeding season,	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	even more strongly justified the measures on the basis of higher predicted effects for surface-feeding birds. That's the second example, members of the Tribunal. (Slide 10) The third example is at C-19. It's an article in the ICES journal from 2014, and the Tribunal has heard it referred to previously as the "Engelhard paper". The abstract is now on the screen, which includes the statement: "Sandeel appears to be the most important prey forage fish." That's borne out by the data on table 2 in the paper, which is now on the next slide (11). It is similar, but not the same as, the data in figure 4 of the English scientific report, and that may be because this article distinguishes between different species. So, for example, it lists minke whales at the top of the table, rather than just baleen whales generally, as the English scientific report does, based on what the EwE model does. If I could ask the Tribunal to look at the column for "Sandeel", it will see that 56% of the diet of minke whales is sandeel; 37% for harbour seal; 41% for grey seal; 55% of puffin diet; 42% for guillemots; 37% for

-		-	
14:24 1	for gannet; and for predatory fish, none of them exceed	14:28 1	It follows that it is for the UK to judge what its
2	18%.	2	objective is, how important to it that objective is in
3	The synthesis on page 100 of this paper, which is on	3	the overall circumstances, and thus whether a degree of
4	your next slide (12), at paragraph 3 says:	4	contribution to that objective that may in the end be
5	"Among the forage fish species, sandeel was most	5	quite limited, all things considered should
6	'universally important' as a prey to predators."	6	nonetheless be pursued.
7	And the Tribunal has seen that borne out in the data	7	Those are all judgments for the UK to make. The
8	in table 2.	8	Tribunal only steps in if, under the TCA, a party is
9	This article is principally used by the EU in this	9	found to have imposed a measure that has no rational or
10	case to support the proposition that sandeel mortality	10	objective connection to the science. That's what you
11	caused by predatory fish is much greater than sandeel	11	get from the word "bases".
12	mortality caused by humans fishing sandeel. That's the	12	The EU is saying that the potential benefit was not
13	EU's Written Submission at paragraph 82.	13	sufficiently great in all categories except
14	That's accurate, but it's not the point of the	14	chick-rearing seabirds, or that the science was not
15	article. The point of the article is to consider the	15	sufficiently certain on the benefits spatially, or in terms of the breadth of species or the size of sandeel
16 17	relationship between forage fish and their predators in the North Sea. And it's not surprising that it reaches	16 17	that would benefit or be needed by predators. But the
17 18	the commonsense conclusion that decreasing fishing	17	EU has not established that there was no rational or
18	mortality for forage fish increases their biomass.	18 19	objective relationship between the science, with the
19 20	Those are the three examples, members of the	19 20	caveats and everything else that it contained which,
20 21	Tribunal, and they matter for four reasons.	20 21	in the UK's respectful submission, was, both for the
21 22	The first is that they explain why no competing	21 22	English report and the Scottish report, gold-standard
22 23	science is being proffered.	22	science they have not established that there was no
23 24	The second is that they demonstrate why the EU is	23 24	rational or objective relationship between that science
24 25	not able to show that any of its criticisms of the model	24 25	and the measures.
25	not able to show that any of its enticisities of the model	23	and the measures.
	Page 65		Page 67
14.26 1		14.20 1	
14:26 1	in the English scientific report would make any	14:30 1	The point to which they returned this morning, to
2	difference to whether the English scientific report was	2	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on"
2 3	difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second	2 3	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of
2 3 4	difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point.	2 3 4	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey
2 3 4 5	difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be	2 3 4 5	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere
2 3 4 5 6	difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point.The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to	2 3 4 5 6	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that
2 3 4 5 6 7	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. 	2 3 4 5 6 7	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the extent of the possible range 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the science. The TCA does not 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations.
$ \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} $	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the science. The TCA does not go further than asking the Tribunal to consider whether 	$ \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} $	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations. Nor does it, or could it, challenge the key role of sandeel in the North Sea ecosystem. And in those circumstances, it has not established any absence of a rational or objective connection between a full
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the science. The TCA does not go further than asking the Tribunal to consider whether the EU has established that there is not a rational or 	$ \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} $	 seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the science. The TCA does not go further than asking the Tribunal to consider whether the EU has established that there is not a rational or objective connection between the measures and the 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations. Nor does it, or could it, challenge the key role of sandeel in the North Sea ecosystem. And in those circumstances, it has not established any absence of a rational or objective connection between a full
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 difference to whether the English scientific report was best available scientific advice. That's the second point. The third point is that the Tribunal can be confident about that because the EU has not been able to make any criticism of the Scottish scientific report. The fourth point is that the EU accepts that so far as the analysis of the scientific literature is concerned, the English scientific report and the Scottish scientific report are equivalent. Members of the Tribunal, that is "best available scientific advice". And subject to any further assistance that I may provide to the Tribunal on that, I'd move now to the UK "basing" the measures on that advice. The TCA does not mandate the Tribunal to conduct its own review of whether it considers the extent of the measures justified by the science. The TCA does not go further than asking the Tribunal to consider whether the EU has established that there is not a rational or objective connection between the measures and the science. That is the test that the EU accepts; indeed, 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	seek to answer what the UK had said about "based on" yesterday, was that if there was localised depletion of sandeel, then predatory fish that is, fish that prey on sandeel can simply forage on sandeel somewhere else. Well, that rather supports the conclusion that it's important to maintain abundance and resilience of sandeel populations generally, not just in specific locations. It also starts from the wrong premise, which is that somehow the UK should be required to tolerate localised depletions. This is a specific example of the broader point that at the stage of application, the EU is in fact in substance seeking to challenge the objective. The UK is seeking to avoid depletion anywhere. It's fundamental, members of the Tribunal, that the EU does not, and cannot, challenge the fundamental premise that prohibiting fishing for sandeel means greater abundance and resilience of sandeel populations. Nor does it, or could it, challenge the key role of sandeel in the North Sea ecosystem. And in those circumstances, it has not established any absence of a rational or objective connection between a full prohibition and the advice on which it was based.

14:32	1	For marine mammals and predatory fish, scientific	14:37 1	scientific literature, and then the parts at the end on
	2	evidence is that they benefit from sandeel abundance.	2	risks, and on it went, but not the modelling exercise in
	3	The scientific evidence is also that reducing fishing	3	the middle? What would the position have been then
	4	increases sandeel abundance; after that, it's only	4	for the scientific advice, for the EU's case and for
	5	a question of degree of benefit. The degree of benefit	5	your considerations?
	6	is not a matter for the EU to criticise or for the	6	So far as I'm addressing the science, the scientific
	7	Tribunal to form a judgment on.	7	advice would have been the same. And we know that
	8	I mention marine mammals and predatory fish because	8	because we have a comparator, which is the Scottish
	9	those are the ones for which I accept the evidential	9	scientific report. And if the Tribunal is looking for
	10	position is less clear. The position on seabirds is	10	further comparators, there's the scientific literature
	11	especially clear.	11	on which the EU's written case relies, three examples of
	12	Of course, the Tribunal will be aware that it's	12	which I've taken you to today.
	13	always necessary to be careful with numbers. And since	13	So with or without the modelling, with or without
	14	the EU is so determined to focus on the modelling,	14	any caveats, and with or without any criticisms that the
	15	I'll say a few words further about it.	15	EU may now make of someone else's science without
	16	The numbers in the modelling were caveated from	16	putting up their own, the science would have remained
	17	the beginning. The table of numbers to which the EU was	13	best available science; and the "basing" for the
	18	keen to draw your attention, it's important to remember	18	purposes of 496(2), insofar as an objective or rational
	19	that those numbers represent the predicted percentage	10	connection is required, would also have been the same.
	20	effect on biomass for the whole of the North Sea, and	20	Members of the Tribunal, those are my submissions on
	20	that is so even where the closure is only of UK waters.	20	"based on". If I can assist the Tribunal further,
	21	What is not known from the application of that	21	I'm of course happy to; otherwise, I will move to
	22	model, and what the English scientific report does not	22	the precautionary approach.
	23 24	opine on, is the percentage effect on UK waters of	23 24	THE CHAIRPERSON: Please go ahead.
	24 25	a closure only of UK waters to sandeel fishing. Well,	24 25	MR JURATOWITCH: On the precautionary approach, what was
	23	a closure only of OK waters to sandeer fishing. Wen,	23	WIK JOKATOWITCH. On the precationary approach, what was
		Page 69		Page 71
14:34	1	that's not the ecosystem. It was the ecosystem that was	14:39 1	said by the EU this morning was that the precautionary
14:34	1 2	that's not the ecosystem. It was the ecosystem that was being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because	14:39 1 2	said by the EU this morning was that the precautionary approach applies if there is an absence of scientific
14:34				
14:34	2	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because	2	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific
14:34	2 3	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done	2 3	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to
14:34	2 3 4	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to	2 3 4	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495.
14:34	2 3 4 5	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only	2 3 4 5	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in
14:34	2 3 4 5 6	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back	2 3 4 5 6	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing
14:34	2 3 4 5 6 7	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced:	2 3 4 5 6 7	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test,
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given.	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given. And it rather raises the hypothetical thought	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given. And it rather raises the hypothetical thought experiment of: what if there was no model? What if the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach. So, much as I hesitate to intervene, that is simply an inaccurate citation of the European Union's position.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given. And it rather raises the hypothetical thought experiment of: what if there was no model? What if the English scientific report just had the 20 pages at the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach.
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given. And it rather raises the hypothetical thought experiment of: what if there was no model? What if the	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach. So, much as I hesitate to intervene, that is simply an inaccurate citation of the European Union's position. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms Norris. So you have heard that, Mr Juratowitch. Please
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 being modelled. And the 58% debate only arises because after the modelling of the entire ecosystem was done that is, of the whole North Sea it was necessary to try to ratchet that back to what impact prohibition only in UK waters might have. What was not ratcheted back was the space in which the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole North Sea. So it's pretty clear, members of the Tribunal, that if one looks at those numbers either before the EU mounted its case, when the caveats were already identified by the authors of the scientific report, or after the EU mounted its case, based on those transparently identified caveats, that caution was always necessary with the numbers. In the end, the EU's case rests on the proposition that the benefit must be quantified; and then it rests on the additional plank that, once quantified, that benefit must be large enough quantitatively to satisfy the EU and the Tribunal. Both of those planks are wrong, for the reasons that I've given. And it rather raises the hypothetical thought experiment of: what if there was no model? What if the English scientific report just had the 20 pages at the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 approach applies if there is an absence of scientific information. The EU is quite stubbornly seeking to erase the word "adequate" from the definition in Article 495. This is again an area where the EU not advancing competing scientific evidence on the same issue is relevant. It's not enough, members of the Tribunal, for the EU to establish that the information on which the UK relied was inadequate measured against some sort of objective standard, because even if that was the test, and even if the EU could make out that it was satisfied, all that would do is engage the precautionary approach. MS NORRIS: Members of the Tribunal, I hesitate to intervene, but on this occasion, counsel for the UK has wrongly represented the European Union's position. And I would like to invite the United Kingdom to re-read the transcript from this morning, where the European Union did explicitly refer to the word "adequate" when referring to the precautionary approach. So, much as I hesitate to intervene, that is simply an inaccurate citation of the European Union's position. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms Norris. So you have heard that, Mr Juratowitch. Please

14:41 1	MR JURATOWITCH: Madam Chairperson, I think it's unlikely	14:44 1	sentence, when you said:
2	to assist the Tribunal if I were to enter into that	2	" I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading
3	debate now. No doubt both parties will look at the	3	under the broader topic of 'precaution', to note that
4	transcript carefully, and may or may not have something	4	this is an objective that is precautionary, as well as
5	further to say on the matter in written submissions to	5	an approach that is precautionary."
6	follow this hearing.	6	What is the "this"?
7	Whether this morning the EU said "adequate" or not		MR JURATOWITCH: Thank you, Madam Chairperson. And
8	is not really the point. The point is that their case	8	I apologise for tucking in a point under the
8 9	requires the creation of some sort of objective	9	precautionary approach which, strictly and logically
	-	9 10	speaking, doesn't belong there.
10	yardstick against which the science is supposed to be		
11	measured. Now, as I was saying, even if the EU made out	11	The "this" is the objective of resilience of not
12	that that was the case, and even if that was the	12	only sandeels, but of the species that prey on sandeel.
13	standard, all it would do would be [to] engage the	13	It's the resilience of those species to which I was
14	precautionary approach.	14	referring.
15	The result would be that the precautionary approach		THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for that clarification.
16	would become relevant to assessing the basing of the	16	So, Mr Westaway, you have the floor.
17	measure on best available science. It would allow the		MR WESTAWAY: Madam Chairperson, members of the Tribunal,
18	state to proceed with the measure, seeking a high level	18	I will continue the response to the reply on claim 2,
19	of environmental protection, on the basis that the	19	and note at the outset that the EU, in its points of
20	advice contained uncertainty as to the likelihood or	20	reply to the UK's case, did not address a number of
21	magnitude of the measure fulfilling the objective.	21	matters.
22	This is consistent, members of the Tribunal, with	22	First of all, they did not address that if the
23	the approach adopted by the International Tribunal for	23	question for the Tribunal is adherence to a standard of
24	the Law of the Sea in the recent Climate Change Advisory	24	proportionality, that the standard of review for
25	Opinion. That's in your record at CLA-[21]. And at	25	assessing that is a standard I think as we put it
	Page 73		Page 75
	1 450 75		r age 75
14:42 1	paragraph 418, it's said that being "informed by the	14:46 1	out of all proportion, or clearly disproportionate. So
14:42 1 2	paragraph 418, it's said that being "informed by the best available science", there in the context of climate	14:46 1 2	out of all proportion, or clearly disproportionate. So we don't understand that to be in dispute.
2	best available science", there in the context of climate	2	we don't understand that to be in dispute.
2 3	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the	2 3	we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any
2 3 4	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach".	2 3 4	we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and
2 3 4 5	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the	2 3 4 5	we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under
2 3 4 5 6	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience	2 3 4 5 6	we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3.
2 3 4 5 6 7	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is,	2 3 4 5 6 7	we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is an objective that is precautionary as well as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precautionary as well as an approach that is precautionary. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is an objective that is precautionary as well as an approach that is precautionary. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is an objective that is precautionary. Members of the Tribunal, those are the UK's submissions on claim 1. I'm of course at your disposal 	$ \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 don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end there.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is an objective that is precautionary. Members of the Tribunal, those are the UK's submissions on claim 1. I'm of course at your disposal to assist you if I can; otherwise, I'd ask you to 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end there.
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precautionary as well as an approach that is precautionary. Members of the Tribunal, those are the UK's submissions on claim 1. I'm of course at your disposal to assist you if I can; otherwise, I'd ask you to recognise Mr Westaway. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end there. So starting with regulatory autonomy, the parties agree that they are each free to set their own level of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precautionary as well as an approach that is precautionary. Members of the Tribunal, those are the UK's submissions on claim 1. I'm of course at your disposal to assist you if I can; otherwise, I'd ask you to recognise Mr Westaway. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end there. So starting with regulatory autonomy, the parties agree that they are each free to set their own level of environmental protection, and that it's not for the
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 best available science", there in the context of climate change, included "the application of [both] the precautionary approach and an ecosystem approach". My last point on precaution, members of the Tribunal, is to emphasise the importance of resilience of populations of species as an objective. That is, of course, harder to measure than biomass, but as important to the ability of a population to endure another avian influenza outbreak, in the case of birds, or the negative effects of climate change, in the case of fish and marine mammals as well as birds. In that respect, although not strictly within the precautionary approach as defined in Article 495, I bring this point to the Tribunal's heading under the broader topic of "precaution", to note that this is an objective that is precautionary as well as an approach that is precautionary. Members of the Tribunal, those are the UK's submissions on claim 1. I'm of course at your disposal to assist you if I can; otherwise, I'd ask you to recognise Mr Westaway. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Juratowitch. I do apologise, I did say that we would reserve 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 we don't understand that to be in dispute. I also note that the EU did not address any arguments on the non-discrimination limb of claim 2, and nor did the EU address any of the UK's arguments under claim 3. So the rebuttal or response that I will present I will confine to the points that were raised this morning, and attempt to pick up some of the outstanding points raised by the Tribunal both in your advance written questions I think there may be one or two of those and also during the hearing itself. Broad structure: start with regulatory autonomy and the objective. Second: deal with proportionality under a number of different headings. Matters of principle: I'll go back to "having regard"; I want to discuss the interpretation of the principle briefly. Role of alternative measures; role of the Tribunal; and then matters of application of proportionality, and I'll end there. So starting with regulatory autonomy, the parties agree that they are each free to set their own level of environmental protection, and that it's not for the Tribunal to review the appropriateness of that level of

<i>,</i>			
14:47 1		14:50 1	Article $494(1)$ to (2). That could be an issue, if one
2		2	of the parties were to pursue certain measures that
3	fisheries management measures, is constrained by the	3	aren't here, but that's not an issue in this case.
4	provisions of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement.	4	And it's not an insignificant point, members of the
5	But thereafter, the European Union, one might say,	5	Tribunal. The EU accepts that the prohibition in this
6	becomes confused, or one enters into territory of	6	case is pursued for those objectives, so is pursued with
7	•	7	the objective of ensuring that fishing activities for
8		8	shared stocks in the UK's waters are environmentally
9		9	sustainable in the long term, and contribute to economic
10		10	and social benefits.
11		11	And fourth, finally, a party must comply with
12		12	the procedural requirement of notification in
13		13	Article 496(3).
14		14	So there are these constraints, and it would be
15		15	wrong we don't submit that there's an unfettered
16		16	discretion or carte blanche, et cetera. As long as the
17	· ·	17	UK complies with the obligations set out in the TCA,
18		18	that's the end of the matter. There's no additional
19	•	10	requirement it needs to satisfy.
20		20	And coming back to the EU's comments this
20		20	morning yet, when the EU reiterated this morning what
21		21 22	it said on Tuesday, that the EU cannot, by setting high
22		22	levels of protection and regulatory ambition, "disregard
23	-	23	the requirement to balance rights and obligations to
24	-	24	which it has agreed when pursuing that objective"
23	access its waters to fish sandeer under the provisions	25	which it has agreed when pursuing that objective
	Page 77		Page 79
14:49 1			
	of Annex 38, and to that extent, the UK grants certain	14:52 1	(page 25:21-23), it again falls into error. And that
2	of Annex 38, and to that extent, the UK grants certain rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation	14:52 1 2	(page 25:21-23), it again falls into error. And that language, "balance rights and obligations" is in the
2	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation	2	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the
3	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent	2 3	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic.
3 4	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38	2 3 4	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by
3 4 5	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take	2 3 4 5	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's
3 4 5 6	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really	2 3 4 5 6	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One
3 4 5 6 7	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case.	2 3 4 5 6 7	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and
3 4 5 6 7 8	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of specific costs and benefits is not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ \end{array} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ \end{array} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ \end{array} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint.	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\end{array} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at in claim 2 there must be good faith, 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} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the Tribunal that it can review the level of protection or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at in claim 2 there must be good faith, meaningful regard to the Article 494(3) principles. Tll come back	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the Tribunal that it can review the level of protection or the regulatory objective that the UK sets; and that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at in claim 2 there must be good faith, meaningful regard to the Article 494(3) principles. I'll come back to 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} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the Tribunal that it can review the level of protection or the regulatory objective that the UK sets; and that must, on the EU's case, reduce that level of protection
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at in claim 2 there must be good faith, meaningful regard to the Article 494(3) principles. Tll come back	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the Tribunal that it can review the level of protection or the regulatory objective that the UK sets; and that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	rights to the EU under the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. But both parties accept and the EU Agent was clear about this this morning that those Annex 38 rights are subject to the right of the parties to take fisheries management measures under 496(1), which really is the critical point for that aspect of the EU's case. So then the next point. The basis for the measure is, as we accept, Article 496(1) of the TCA. And the means by which the UK exercises that right is constrained by the provisions of the TCA; we accept that. It's important, in light in particular of the Tribunal's questions yesterday, just to dwell on that a little bit: the ways in which there are constraints within the Trade and Cooperation Agreement. There are four I want to draw attention to. First and foremost, the measures must be based upon the best available scientific advice. That's clearly a core restraint. Second, there must be and this is where we're at in claim 2 there must be good faith, meaningful regard to the Article 494(3) principles. I'll come back to 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} $	 language, "balance rights and obligations", is, in the UK's submission, problematic. The balance of rights and obligations is struck by the terms of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement; it's not an additional obligation that somehow arises. One finds the balance by looking at Article 496 and Article 494. To the extent that, in that regard, the Trade and Cooperation Agreement goes this far which, on the UK's case, it does not there may be a separate weighing of costs and benefits of a specific measure under consideration in a proportionality assessment. And I'll come back to proportionality. But that weighing of rights and obligations under the TCA, failing which the UK's measures can be held to be a breach of the TCA. In fact, what the EU may be trying to do or may be wrongly achieving with this "balancing of rights and obligations" gloss is to argue indirectly to the Tribunal that it can review the level of protection or the regulatory objective that the UK sets; and that must, on the EU's case, reduce that level of protection

Day 5	I CA Case I	NO. 2024-43	Thursday, 50 January 202.
14:53 1	simply cannot be correct. It's inconsistent with the	14:57 1	principles.
2	EU's pleadings and it's not what the TCA says.	2	So I want to say a bit more on each. And as the
3	So that's the first topic.	3	Tribunal will appreciate, I'm going to spend a lot more
4	I'll move on to proportionate measures. It's common	4	time on the UK's position and try to unpack that
5	ground, I think, that there's points of significant	5	a little bit, which is the "good faith regard" position.
6	divergence here, and it's important conceptually to	6	I'll take them in turn.
7	split them out into points of scope and then points of	7	First, the empty proceduralism or total discretion.
8	application, so points of principle and application.	8	Now, the UK would accept that it's not compliant with
9	There's a danger, I think, in dividing the two.	9	the TCA for a party to cursorily turn one's mind to
10	The scope is key. The EU's Agent this morning	10	a matter and pay no attention to it, without meaningful
11	(page 25:10-12) said:	11	consideration. That would not be compliant with
12	" it is not enough for a decision-maker [simply]	12	the TCA; it requires more; not least, as I'll come to,
13	to consider the need to apply proportionate and	13	because we do accept that it acts as a meaningful
14	non-discriminatory measures, and stop there."	14	constraint on the party's regulatory autonomy in
15	And she said that would "empty [the] provision[] of	15	the decision-making process.
16	any form of meaningful restraint" (page 25:13-14).	16	So coming on to the second option: good faith
17	On that formulation, the UK would agree, to the	17	regard. That is, the United Kingdom says, meaningfully
18	extent that the decision-maker is required to have	18	to consider the relevant factors with an open mind. And
19	regard to applying proportionate and non-discriminatory	19	we say this appropriately reflects the limits of the
20	measures. If a party only considered the need to do so,	20	constraint, at least as regards the need to consider
21	and stopped there, that wouldn't suffice. So that	21	applying proportionate and non-discriminatory measures.
22	observation doesn't assist.	22	So I'll spend a moment on this.
23	Of more concern is the EU's argument that a party	23	Yesterday Justice Unterhalter suggested that there
24	must substantively comply with a test of proportionality	24	was a link, and my note puts the point this way: that
25	or non-discrimination in order to meet the requirement	25	the process of bona fide proceedings in this way has got
	_		
	Page 81		Page 83
14:55 1	in Article 493(3)(f), i.e. that there be, as was put	14:58 1	to make some difference to know how you take the
2	this morning, "adherence", and that that is a matter for	2	decision, and the impact of these reasons on your
3	this Tribunal. And I need to say a little bit more	3	ultimate decision, so some "must make a difference"
4	here, so I'll spend a little bit of time on this.	4	point.
5	As set out yesterday, the ordinary language of the	5	We would accept as a procedural tool that it must
6	provision is an obligation of conduct: to have regard	6	make a difference. Where we would not go so far is to
7	to/take into account principles. The question arises:	7	accept that it necessarily, as a matter really of law,
8	how might that be done? And from the discussion [with	8	must make a difference to the outcome. And that's
9	the] Tribunal, it seems four possible outcomes arise.	9	because fundamentally the "have regard to" obligation is
10	I'm not saying there may not be others, but there seem	10	a procedural rather than substantive obligation.
11	to be four headings that arise for the purposes of	11	Now, I'm not going to repeat points about plain
12	analysis.	12	meaning of language, et cetera, but it may help to stand
13	Firstly, what one might call "total discretion":	13	back a bit and think a bit more broadly about this
14	effectively a discretion to disregard or, as	14	topic.
15	Justice Unterhalter put the point in discussion	15	Yesterday I noted in submissions, and we note in our
16	yesterday, "empty proceduralism". So, first, total	16	written case, analogies with UNCLOS indeed made by
17	discretion.	17	the EU and the Whaling case. There were two other
18	Second, what might be called "good faith regard".	18	potentially helpful analogous situations I wanted just
19	That's the UK's position.	19	to raise before the Tribunal in this context.
20	Thirdly, application, i.e. that a decision-maker	20	The first one is an analogy with other procedural
21	applies and concludes that a measure satisfies	21	obligations in international law, and one that one might

- 21 applies and concludes that a measure satisfies
- the principle.
- 23 And fourthly, substantive compliance, i.e. -- that's
- 24 the EU's position -- that the measure, on some objective
- 25 standard reviewable by the Tribunal, complies with the

Page 82

obligations in international law, and one that one might

negotiate. Clearly it doesn't have a substantive edge,

but it's an obligation to do something procedural. And

think about in this context is the obligation to

the core ideas that arise in the context of that

21

22

23

24

25

Day 3

15:00 1	obligation are similar, and one finds similar language	15:04 1	to repeat myself too much but I wanted to recall to
	obligation are similar, and one finds similar language to those which the United Kingdom says the Tribunal		to repeat myself too much, but I wanted to recall to
2		2	the Tribunal the deliberate language in the Trade and
3	should accept in the context of Article 494(3),	3	Cooperation Agreement twice repeated, of course
4	i.e. meaningful engagement with an open mind.	4	"having regard", and that it is not a stronger
5	The second conceptual point that may be of some	5	obligation.
6	assistance is drawn from the area of environmental law,	6	I wasn't sure whether, digging through the
7	and it's environmental assessment. I mentioned	7	appendices, you would have got this, but we've put on
8	yesterday the strategic environmental assessment process	8	the slide (16) the extracts that we refer to in the UK
9	that was done by the Scottish authorities in this	9	case from the travaux effectively showing this earlier
10	instance, and the Tribunal has, in the legal authorities	10	version that was tabled for the negotiations, and how
11	record at RLA-27, a copy of the underlying Directive on	11	this was as presented by the EU (R-120, page 95).
12	the Assessment of Plans and Programmes in the	12	But the important point is not that. The important
13	Environmental Area, so the environmental impact of plans	13	point is that that formulation, i.e. that "New technical
14	and programmes.	14	measures" and as I explained yesterday, that includes
15	Why this may be of some relevance is because the	15	spatially restrictive measures "shall be
16	core requirement in environmental assessment	16	proportionate, non-discriminatory", was not taken
17	this applies to both the strategic level of plans and	17	forward, is not the one found in the TCA.
18	programmes, and project level, for what it's worth	18	Had that been the measure which either party wanted
19	is to take into account the environmental information	19	to hold themselves to, "shall be proportionate", one
20	that's comprised in the environmental report and	20	would have expected it to be articulated in the TCA, and
21	the consultation exercise on that.	21	it simply was not. In a way, that should be the start
22	If I can just give the Tribunal references, I think	22	and the end of the point. But I wanted to go back to
23	in the SEA Directive the key reference is Article 8 for	23	that.
24	that core obligation, "tak[ing] into account", under	24	So going back to the four options, we've covered
25	the heading "Decision making"; and Article 1 of that	25	total discretion, we've covered good faith regard.
	Page 85		Page 87
15.00 1		15.05 1	
15:02 1	directive explains the objective: "a high level of	15:05 1	Application was the third option for what this might
2	protection of the environment".	2	mean.
2 3	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the	2 3	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon
2 3 4	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment,	2 3 4	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's
2 3 4 5	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account.	2 3 4 5	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the
2 3 4 5 6	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some	2 3 4 5 6	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK
2 3 4 5 6 7	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process,	2 3 4 5 6 7	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "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} $	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy. So I think I'm coming to an end on this part of
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "have regard to" obligation in Article 494(3) serves to ensure	$ \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} $	mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy.
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "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} $	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy. So I think I'm coming to an end on this part of the topic. There were two questions from the Tribunal at 9(a) and (b).
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "have regard to" obligation in Article 494(3) serves to ensure that factors are taken into account, and to improve decision-making, but it does not serve to 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\\22\\23\end{array} $	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy. So I think I'm coming to an end on this part of the topic. There were two questions from the Tribunal at 9(a) and (b). JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry to interrupt. Can I just be
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "have regard to" obligation in Article 494(3) serves to ensure that factors are taken into account, and to improve decision-making, but it does not serve to set up a substantive requirement, as the EU argues.	$ \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} $	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy. So I think I'm coming to an end on this part of the topic. There were two questions from the Tribunal at 9(a) and (b). JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry to interrupt. Can I just be sure that I understand the distinction you're drawing
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	protection of the environment". It is very clear in that context, the decision-making context of environmental assessment, that the duty is one of conduct: to take into account. It does not require, because there may be some particular adverse impact identified in the process, that a decision which would have adverse environmental impacts must not be taken. It's a conduct obligation, not an obligation of result. One reason why it's helpful to think about that conceptually is because the objective, high level of protection, is considered to be materially advanced by taking into account the environmental information. It's not empty; it improves decision-making. It means that the decision-maker is more likely to come to a decision that will not have adverse impacts on the environment; it doesn't preclude that. And that analogy, if one is thinking about the content of the obligation, applies here. The "have regard to" obligation in Article 494(3) serves to ensure that factors are taken into account, and to improve decision-making, but it does not serve to 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\\22\\23\end{array} $	 mean. On the UK's submission, if a party takes it upon themselves to consider and apply the principle, that's sufficient but not necessary to discharge the obligation. And it does reflect, of course, what the UK did in this case. But it cannot be necessary, because one goes back to the clear language, which is "hav[ing] regard to applying"; not, as it could have been, "applying". The final option which is the EU's, as we understand it is substantive compliance, and I can take that very briefly. In the UK's submission, that goes well beyond anything agreed in the Trade and Cooperation Agreement, and effectively sets up obligations of result reviewable by the Tribunal, which would not be a proper reading of the TCA and would be fundamentally inconsistent with the important emphasis on regulatory autonomy. So I think I'm coming to an end on this part of the topic. There were two questions from the Tribunal at 9(a) and (b). JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry to interrupt. Can I just be

Amended by the parties

<i>,</i>			
15:07 1	variant that you are positing. How do you mark the	15:10 1	relevant to the decision that they are exercising.
2	difference between "hav[ing] regard to applying" and	2	On that point of disagreement I did want to touch
3	a mandatory requirement to consider application? I just	3	upon, the UK does dispute a suggestion by the EU in its
4	want to be clear I understand what that third variant	4	Written Submission and that's EU Written Submission,
5	consists of.	5	[paragraphs] 564 to 566 that Article 494(3)(e) and
6	MR WESTAWAY: If we take the third variant, it would be	6	the Tribunal will recall that that's the one that refers
7	inevitable that a party that applied, thought about the	7	to "minimising harmful impacts of fishing on the marine
8	principle take proportionality, to give a concrete	8	ecosystem", et cetera that that ecosystem
9	example thought about proportionality, would also be	9	consideration needs to be subordinated or reconciled
10	"having regard to" it. But as I say, the party doesn't	10	with Article 494(3)(f).
11	need to go that far.	11	We don't accept that. There's not a hierarchy;
12	It's not this case, but it would suffice, in my	12	the EU was right there. And this attempt to diminish
13	submission, for a party to have regard to the	13	the impact of the principle in Article $494(3)(e)$ is, in
14	constituent factors that go to proportionality, and	14	my submission, problematic. I can see why the EU might
15	think about them in its process, without necessarily	15	do it, because clearly they don't suggest the UK didn't
16	applying them. That's not this case. And I submitted	16	have regard to that principle; it was an important
10	yesterday that I think in the vast majority of cases,	17	principle in the UK's consideration.
17	one might expect in those circumstances that a party	18	It wasn't this case, so one is in a world of
10	would itself come to a conclusion on proportionate or	19	hypothetical here. But it would be possible and lawful
20	non-discriminatory.	20	in a conceivable case for one of the parties to give
	•		
21	I draw the distinction because, as a matter of	21	greater weight to a measure that minimised ecosystem
22	(1) language and (2) the required exercise, it doesn't	22	impacts having regard to the principle at (e) than
23	go that far. But I would accept, as a matter of	23	to concerns, for example, about discrimination.
24	practice, that one would expect a party to very often do	24	It would be possible.
25	the exercise of thinking: well, is it proportionate?	25	The next subheading under proportionality I wanted
	Page 89		Page 91
15:08 1	Is it non-discriminatory?	15:11 1	to come to was interpretative principles, and where one
2	So I was going to touch on 9(a) and (b) of the	2	goes to to understand proportionality itself.
3	Tribunal's advance questions. And this 9(a) was on	3	The Agent for the EU said that they are permitted to
4	principles. I don't think I picked this one up	4	have recourse to domestic law and EU law to interpret
5	yesterday in the questions, about what meaning should be	5	the Trade and Cooperation Agreement as regards
6	ascribed to the word "principles".	6	proportionality. She said that the UK had not clearly
7	In the UK's submission, the word "principles"	7	explained why that's not permissible.
8	confirms there's no requirement that the measures must	8	It is set out in the UK's Submission, and it's our
9	conform to the principles. The language is not of	9	case, paragraphs 340 to 343, but I want just to present
10	obligations, but principles applying in the	10	those reasons in summary to the Tribunal. Five points.
11	decision-making context. So no special meaning. In my	11	First, Article 31 of the Vienna Convention requires
12	submission, they are factors to which regard should be	12	the words to be given their ordinary meaning in context
13	1 1 1 1 1	13	
	had in coming to a practical result.		and in light of the object and purpose of the Trade and
14	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the	13	and in light of the object and purpose of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement.
14 15			
	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the	14	Cooperation Agreement.
15	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think	14 15	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law
15 16	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no	14 15 16	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be
15 16 17	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to	14 15 16 17	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but
15 16 17 18	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one	14 15 16 17 18	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in
15 16 17 18 19	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely	14 15 16 17 18 19	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties.
15 16 17 18 19 20	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position. The weight to give to each in the balance is	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in one sense, accepts that EU law between the 27 Member
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position. The weight to give to each in the balance is a matter essentially, in the UK's submission, for the	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in one sense, accepts that EU law between the 27 Member States has an international element, that does not make
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position. The weight to give to each in the balance is a matter essentially, in the UK's submission, for the parties' discretion. And it may be in some cases that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in one sense, accepts that EU law between the 27 Member States has an international element, that does not make it applicable as between the UK and the EU.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position. The weight to give to each in the balance is a matter essentially, in the UK's submission, for the parties' discretion. And it may be in some cases that not all of the principles are relevant. So clearly a party only has to have regard to principles that are	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in one sense, accepts that EU law between the 27 Member States has an international element, that does not make it applicable as between the UK and the EU. Fourth, it makes senses that domestic law would not readily be used to interpret inter-state treaties such
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23 24	Question 9(b) was about the relationship of the different principles with each other. On that, I think it's common ground with the EU that there's no hierarchical order and there's no need for a party to favour one principle over the other. Subject to one point I'm going to come to, that may not be entirely common ground, but that's entirely the UK's position. The weight to give to each in the balance is a matter essentially, in the UK's submission, for the parties' discretion. And it may be in some cases that not all of the principles are relevant. So clearly	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Cooperation Agreement. Second, other relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties may be taken into account under Article 31(3)(c) of Vienna, but they must be rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties. Third, domestic law is neither. And even if one, in one sense, accepts that EU law between the 27 Member States has an international element, that does not make it applicable as between the UK and the EU. Fourth, it makes senses that domestic law would not

Page 94

15:13 1	as the TCA, because the relevant parties might have	15:16 1	warranted, such as prohibition, for decision rather than
2	different domestic law.	2	a range of possible alternatives?"
3	Fifth, moreover, the context in which it appears in	3	The answer to this, in simple terms, is: in
4	EU law and elsewhere and really, with	4	principle, yes; but in doing so, the decision-maker is
5	proportionality, one finds proportionality either in EU	5	constrained by Articles 496 and 494.
6	law or in the human rights context, are the primary	6	So the UK can select a single measure, such as
7	ones are principally vertical relationships between	7	prohibition, as a means of meeting its level of
8	states and individuals, i.e. public law, human rights.	8	protection where that measure is based on best available
9	These are situations where the state is obliged to	9	science, and regard in good faith has been had to the
10	uphold rights unless the restriction is strictly	10	relevant principles. There is no requirement for the UK
11	necessary. The same kind of considerations simply do	11	to pursue that level of protection in any specific way,
12	not apply in an inter-state context, where two states or	12	other than consistently with the terms of the TCA.
13	parties are sovereign equals in a horizontal	13	I'm not going to repeat the points I've made on
14	relationship.	14	alternatives already.
15	So that reason makes it additionally inappropriate	15	So the last point on this is the role of the
16	to take domestic law concepts applicable to individuals	16	Tribunal. And this arises because the EU's Agent,
17	or fundamental rights and to try to import them into	17	towards the end of the Union's reply this morning
18	inter-state relations.	18	(page 34:6-8), said that:
19	So all of that is to say that it's understandable	19	" the United Kingdom considered it sufficient
20	why Article 31 of Vienna does not account for domestic	20	simply to identify various elements that formed part of
21	law playing a role in the interpretation of	21	the decision-making process."
22	an inter-state treaty. The Tribunal is obliged to apply	22	However, the EU's case was that the Tribunal should,
23	the customary rules of treaty interpretation, nothing	23	and is required to, go further, and scrutinise not only
24	more.	24	the elements that the United Kingdom has identified, but
25	Two more points on this principle heading under	25	whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of
	Page 93		Page 95
	C C		
			- 199 7.0
15:15 1	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which	15:18 1	the costs and benefits.
15:15 1 2		15:18 1 2	
	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which		the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the
2	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this	2	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified.
2 3	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application.	2 3	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the
2 3 4	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that	2 3 4	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on
2 3 4 5	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so.	2 3 4 5 6 7	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic, to respond to Tribunal advance question 10. That was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. No
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic, to respond to Tribunal advance question 10. That was the question I assume sort of an all-seeing,	$ \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 costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. No disagreement on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic, to respond to Tribunal advance question 10. That was the question I assume sort of an all-seeing, you remember exactly what the questions were, so	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. No disagreement on that. If the Tribunal takes the view that "have regard"
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ \end{array}$	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic, to respond to Tribunal advance question 10. That was the question I assume sort of an all-seeing, you remember exactly what the questions were, so I'll repeat it. That was the question:	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. No disagreement on that. If the Tribunal takes the view that "have regard" requires compliance with proportionality, there's issues
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proportionality: the role of alternative measures, which I'll take quite briefly, and then the role of the Tribunal, and then I'll briefly come on to application. Alternative measures. We made submissions on this yesterday. The EU argument this morning was that the EU has advanced an alternative proportionate measure that the UK has not grappled with, and the UK should do so. But as explained, the UK does not accept that there's a need for the UK to grapple with an alternative raised by the EU in arbitral proceedings following the measure being decided upon. The requirement is simply that the UK have regard to applying proportionate measures. That does not require a party, in the UK's submission, to look at alternative measures necessarily in considering the factors that are relevant to proportionality, including the weighing of costs and benefits. At most, as I've submitted, it may be a mechanism to assist in undertaking that exercise. If I could take the opportunity, under this topic, to respond to Tribunal advance question 10. That was the question I assume sort of an all-seeing, you remember exactly what the questions were, so	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ \end{array}$	the costs and benefits. That's a mischaracterisation of the UK's position in the first instance. The EU is wrong to say that the UK's case is just that elements have to be identified. And I respond to this under the principle or the approach to proportionality generally, rather than on application, for that reason. The elements need to be considered and weighed: that's key. And a side comment which gets me slightly into application here: if one actually thinks about the documents in this case, it's not clear what the EU wants to see. The documents show a consideration of factors, including, as I showed, for example in the de minimis assessment (C-44), under headings of "Costs" and "Benefits", they make conclusions. Following the mischaracterisation of the UK's position, the Union then went on to say that the Tribunal should go further, and scrutinise not only the elements, but also whether those elements disclose a proper weighing of the costs and benefits. No disagreement on that. If the Tribunal takes the view that "have regard"

Day 3	PCA Case	No. 2024-45	Thursday, 30 January 202
15:19 1	Tribunal to consider the information on the record,	15:23 1	submission so tab 17 (R-77), page 269,
2	including the weighing that was done by the United	2	paragraph 17 pointing out that BirdLife International
3	Kingdom; and we don't shy away from such scrutiny,	3	emphasised the "urgent need to build resilience", and
4	we invite it.	4	then going on to agree with that comment and the need
5	Indeed, if one needed it, it's set out clearly in	5	"to take action", not least because of avian flu.
6	Article 742(a) of the TCA, which says that:	6	The simple point is: there was a need for these
7	"The arbitration tribunal:	7	measures. And really this goes to something the EU
8	"(a) shall make an objective assessment of	8	doesn't purport to challenge anyway, which is the
9	the matter before it"	9	regulatory objective.
10	So I don't think that's really a dispute between	10	If we are talking about balance, this goes to
11	the parties, and it mischaracterises the [UK]'s case.	11	benefits rather than costs in any event. And it's
12	So that leads me on to the last point, which I can	12	a matter where, at the very least, the United Kingdom
13	take relatively swiftly: it's the application and	13	was entitled to take the view that it was important that
14	proportionate measures.	14	action was taken, with a level of urgency, on sandeels.
15	The EU's Agent this morning set out the EU's	15	As I've said, we don't say and I don't argue that
16	concerns under three headings: benefits, costs and	16	this was an emergency measure. Clearly, detailed
17	the weighing exercise. And I've just dealt with that	17	consideration was given to the measure over a number of
18	weighing exercise point, so there's just a little to say	18	years. It wasn't rushed out without consideration,
19	on benefits and costs.	19	partly because there was accepted a need to consider the
20	On benefits, that really goes back to the scientific	20	impact on, among other things, EU vessels and industry.
21	evidence. You've heard from Mr Juratowitch and	21	Finally, on costs, the EU Agent argued
22	Ms Boileau on that; I don't repeat those points. But	22	(page 32:15-24), by reference to passages in the
23	I do want to add, insofar as it's said that uncertainty	23	ministerial submissions that we've seen already, that
24	might make a difference, that uncertainty was expressly	24	the UK concluded that there were no issues with regard
25	recognised by the decision-makers in this case, and	25	to socioeconomic impacts on the EU "because [the]
	Page 97		Page 99
15:21 1	didn't make a difference.	15:24 1	impacts [could] be mitigated". I simply ask the
2	Two references to that from the ministerial	2	Tribunal to read those passages, because that misreads
3	submissions we saw: the United Kingdom Government	3	them and it misreads the submissions.
4	ministerial submission I'll just give the reference,	4	In discussing the potential to mitigate the
5	I think is core bundle tab 17 (R-77), page 271,	5	socioeconomic impacts on EU fishers, the UK was
6	paragraphs 14 to 16; then the Scottish ministerial	6	acknowledging those impacts, but considering that their
7	submission, bundle tab 26 (R-98), page 580, the third	7	significance to some extent could be reduced. It's
8	paragraph on the page.	8	not categorically not to conclude that there is no
9	There was one other point on benefits that was	9	issue; it is to engage with the issue. And the
10	raised by the EU this morning relating to urgency of	10	submission and perhaps this is because the EU has to
11	measures. I'll take this very briefly. The comment was	11	go here to succeed on "have regard to" the submission
12	made by the EU Agent that there is only one reference to	12	misreads entirely the process that was carefully
13	the word "urgent" in the documents. I don't know where	13	undertaken by the United Kingdom.
14	this goes; it's a slightly forensic point, and not	14	The second point that was raised by the EU Agent
15	strictly true.	15	this morning, again referring to those same passages
16	First of all, it's plain when one looks at the	16	the key passage here is paragraphs 25-26 in the
17	record, and the process that was followed, and the	17	14 September submission that you have in the bundle
18	evidence that was inputted into that process, that there	18	(tab 17, R-77). But he said, by reference again to
19	was temporal importance to introducing the management	19	those passages, that the assumptions upon which this
20		20	

- 20 measures that were needed to protect sandeel. It speaks21 for itself, given the importance of sandeels to the
- 22 marine food web and ecosystem.
- 23 In addition, if one wants to look for references to
- the word "urgent" specifically, one can see it
- 25 additionally in the 14 September ministerial

- those passages, that the assumptions upon which thisidea of mitigation was based were unsubstantiated.
- idea of mitigation was based were unsubstantiated.He said they were "unsubstantiated assumptions"
- 22 (page 33:18).
- 23 I don't want to go to the passages now. But again,
- 24 when the Tribunal reminds itself of the analysis in
- 25 those paragraphs, the Tribunal will see that there is

Day 3	PCA Case	No. 2024-4	5 Thursday, 30 January 202
15:26 1	reference to the conclusions being based on evidence	15:49 1	So I hope that that is acceptable. I thought
2	from STECF that's the Science, Technology and	2	I would lay that out first, so that then you are very
3	Ecological Committee for Fisheries, I think and	3	clear about what the Tribunal proposes.
4	the Marine Management Organisation.	4	So in terms of I just have a question initially,
5	So it wasn't unsubstantiated; it was based upon	5	and it's really for both parties.
6	evidence. In any event, the EU doesn't say it's	6	Mr Juratowitch, when you indicated that there was
7	factually incorrect.	7	agreement between the parties that the Arbitration
8	Unless there are any questions at this stage,	8	Tribunal should not resolve science or make scientific
9	those are my submissions.	9	judgments, you then referred us to the Searle paper of
10	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Westaway.	10	2023 and then the Engelhard paper, and in some detail to
11	So, Mr Juratowitch, you also have the floor now.	11	that.
12		12	The European Union, your Agent also referred us to
13	the United Kingdom. Thank you, members of the Tribunal.	13	the additional modular plug-ins that were available, and
14	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. The microphone was	14	you referred us to the various exhibits which
15	still on, so I thought perhaps you might wish to use up	15	demonstrate that.
16	the last five minutes.	16	So my question for both parties is: how should the
17	Thank you very much for those submissions. We will	17	Tribunal take into account these scientific papers, when
18	now take a break until 3.45. So, thank you very much.	18	there is agreement between you that the Tribunal is not
19	We will see you back then.	19	to make judgments on the science? So that's my first
20	(3.27 pm)	20	question, and of course it relates to the standard of
21	(A short break)	21	review.
22	(3.46 pm)	22	So can I ask the European Union to respond to that,
23	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.	23	and of course noting that you can of course respond in
24	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	24	writing as well. But I just thought I would ask that
25	THE CHAIRPERSON: The Tribunal has a number of questions.	25	question first.
	Page 101		Page 103
	1450101		1450 105
15:47 1	We restrained ourselves in the reply and counter-reply.	15:51 1	These year
13.47 1		13.31 1	Thank you. MS NORRIS: Madam Chair, thank you. And indeed this would
3		3	be a preliminary response, and the European Union would
4		4	welcome the opportunity to come back in writing.
5		5	But, put simply, the European Union's position is
6		6	that it is not asking this Tribunal to redo the science
7		7	or form its own scientific assessment. So it's
8		8	a question of evidence, which partly segues into the
9	с .	9	submissions concerning the burden of proof and
10		10	the evidential standard that a party must meet.
11		10	So when a party makes a claim, as the European Union
11		11	does, that a measure is not based on the best available
12		12	scientific advice, then the European Union is required
15	o the parties. It was anticipated at the time of the	15	scientific advice, then the European Onion is required

13 to the parties. It was anticipated at the time of the 14 drafting of the procedural order that those questions

- 15 would be provided at the end of the Respondent's first
- submissions. However, we considered that it was better 16
- 17 to allow the Tribunal a little bit more time to prepare
- 18 questions, and so therefore we are providing those
- 19 written questions at this stage, after the closing of
- 20 the hearing. 21 That does change the date for which the written
- 22 responses are due from 4 February to 5 February. And
- 23 then the replies/responses from the other party to those
- 24 questions will still remain on 10 February, together
- 25 with the final written submissions.

Page 102

Thank you. 25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms Norris.

to redo the modelling itself.

Page 104

to adduce facts and evidence to support that claim. And

met is to, we say, identify flaws in the scientific

model, and to do so by reference to other scientific

In that sense, the Tribunal is asked to look at that

as evidence of the claim that is being advanced. It is

available scientific advice would be in its opinion, or

not being asked itself to determine what the best

one means through which that evidentiary standard can be

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

information.

··· J -			
15:52 1	Mr Juratowitch.	15:56 1	there's nothing of that same packaged nature on the EU
2	MR JURATOWITCH: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.	2	side. So the only thing that the UK can refer to in
3	Could I just begin by saying: the Agent for the	3	order to assess whether or not the EU has met its burden
4	European Union was correct that she did use the word	4	to seek to assist the Tribunal with that is the evidence
5	"adequate" in respect of the precautionary principle.	5	that it has put forward.
6	So I apologise for misquoting her, and retract the	6	If, in the end, you just can't resolve this
7	suggestion that she had not said it. I'd simply taken	7	scientific controversy, the result will be that the EU
8	a handwritten note that I hadn't had time to check	8	has not made out its claim that the UK's measures are
9	against the transcript, and that handwritten note was	9	not based on the best available scientific advice.
10	wrong. It makes no difference at all to the submission.	10	Those are my submissions, Madam Chairperson.
11	With that apology made, on the question that's just	11	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that.
12	been asked, the European Union has claimed that the UK	12	There's one matter which you will find that there
13	has not based its measures on the best available	13	has been quite a lot of discussion about in the oral
14	scientific advice. It needs to satisfy a burden to meet	14	hearing, and it has engaged the Tribunal as well, which
15	that test. It needs to do that by reference to evidence	15	is the whole issue of the modelling.
16	of some kind, and it's natural, where that's the subject	16	I refer back to the transcript at 14.35 (page 70),
17	matter of the claim, that the evidence will be	17	where it talks about the ecosystem model of the EwE and
18	scientific.	18	how it was being modelled. There's part of this that
19	The short answer to your question, Madam Chair,	19	the Tribunal doesn't really understand and would like to
20	is that the Tribunal needs to consider the science so	20	get clarity on, and it's about the 58% debate, and that
21	far as necessary to determine whether it's the "best	21	that 58% debate only arises because the entire ecosystem
22	available". That does not mean resolving scientific	22	was being modelled, so the entire North Sea.
23	controversies as such.	23	The understanding of the Tribunal is that the EwE
24	And to come to the specific part of your question	24	model modelled the entire North Sea. In order to and
25	about the scientific papers, those were elements of	25	please correct me if I'm wrong on this in order to
	Page 105		Page 107
	c		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
15:54 1	······································	15:58 1	examine a scenario of a closure, and I assume it was
2		2	a full closure of the UK waters, you had to, in effect,
3		3	extract out the relevant parts of the UK elements from
4	i ,	4	the whole North Sea. So that meant, for example, when
5		5	you're looking at fishing opportunities, fishing
6	6	6	mortality, you had to look at what the fishing mortality
7	5 5 6	7	for sandeel was in the entire North Sea and then take
8		8	out the part that was in the UK waters.
9		9	So that's my first question, whether that was
10	••	10	correct.
11	• • •	11	And then, Mr Juratowitch, you said (page 70:5-7):
12		12	"What was not ratcheted back was the space in which
13		13	the impact might be experienced: that remained the whole
14		14	North Sea."
15		15	That I don't understand, because I thought the whole
16		16 17	basis was to look at the scenario of the impact on UK
17		17	waters. What you seem to be suggesting is that that
18	•	18 19	scenario also looked at the impact on the whole North Sea.
19 20		19 20	North Sea. So therefore my question is whether the table of
20	form of an armost sonort or an armost witness And if	241	So mererore my question is whether the table of
			the imposts in terms of the persontages of additional
21	that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it	21	the impacts in terms of the percentages of additional biomass for seabirds, for example whether that
21 22	that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it the scientific hinterland behind the positions that the	21 22	biomass for seabirds, for example whether that
21 22 23	that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it the scientific hinterland behind the positions that the parties are relying on.	21 22 23	biomass for seabirds, for example whether that related to the entire North Sea or whether that related
21 22 23 24	 that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it the scientific hinterland behind the positions that the parties are relying on. Here you have that packaged for you on the UK side 	21 22 23 24	biomass for seabirds, for example whether that related to the entire North Sea or whether that related only to the UK waters.
21 22 23	 that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it the scientific hinterland behind the positions that the parties are relying on. Here you have that packaged for you on the UK side 	21 22 23	biomass for seabirds, for example whether that related to the entire North Sea or whether that related
21 22 23 24	 that were done, the Tribunal would have packaged for it the scientific hinterland behind the positions that the parties are relying on. Here you have that packaged for you on the UK side 	21 22 23 24	biomass for seabirds, for example whether that related to the entire North Sea or whether that related only to the UK waters.

-			
		1600 1	
15:59 1	in the EwE model, that would help us from a factual	16:03 1	North Sea, and that is how the 58% figure is reached.
2	perspective.	2	Whereas the correct position, according to the EU, is
3	MR JURATOWITCH: Madam Chairperson, on the first part of	3	that one needs to take as, Madam Chair, your question
4	that, the Tribunal's understanding on the 58% issue is	4	rightly identified the entire North Sea, which
5	correct. I won't repeat back to you what you've just	5	includes UK waters, EU waters, but also waters of
6	said. The answer to the question is: yes, that's	6	Norway.
7	correct.	7	By the 58% figure only comparing EU and UK waters,
8	On the second part, arising from what I said before	8	one is overstating the amount of catches in UK waters.
9	the break, your understanding is also correct. And the	9	And that is the point of disagreement between the
10	reason for it is this: the model modelled the ecosystem.	10	parties.
11	You're absolutely right to say that in order to	11	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Dawes.
12	determine the impact on that ecosystem of removing the	12	The consequence of that is that given the
13	fish caught in EU waters, that's where the 58% debate	13	differential between the 39%, which was the EU's
14	arose.	14	submission was the correct figure, and the 58%, which is
15	Once the percentage is removed and this is not in the model: the model only models the access tem. The 58%	15	the one used in the model, that 19% of sandeel catches
16 17	the model: the model only models the ecosystem. The 58%	16 17	come from Norwegian waters? Is that the consequence of that?
17	debate arises in between the modelling being done and finished, and the report being written to present the	17	
18	finished, and the report being written to present the	18 19	MR DAWES: I'm not sure as a matter of mathematics that is
19 20	information. And the question for the authors of the report is: how do we go from an ecosystem model that	19 20	necessarily correct. I think what we're saying is that if 39% come from
20 21	models the whole North Sea to working out what we can	20 21	UK waters, then the split between EU and Norwegian
21 22	control?	21	waters it's not a figure I necessarily have at hand.
22	What they could control is a reduction of fishing in	22	But what is relevant for the Tribunal's assessment is:
23 24	the part of the North Sea that is UK waters: that's the	23 24	if one replaces the 58% figure by a lower percentage,
24	58% debate. What they then did, in applying that	24	it means that the output of the model or by feeding
		-	
	Page 109		Page 111
16:01 1	percentage, was work out the impact on the ecosystem	16:05 1	into the model an overestimation of what is being
16:01 1 2	percentage, was work out the impact on the ecosystem so still the whole North Sea of a reduction,	16:05 1 2	removed from the North Sea, one is then
			removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation,
2 3 4	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters.	2 3 4	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know,
2 3 4 5	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK	2 3 4 5	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of
2 3 4 5 6	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't	2 3 4 5 6	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose
2 3 4 5 6 7	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently	2 3 4 5 6 7	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea.
$ \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 still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the amount of catches of the North Sea that took place in UK waters. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then sifting out some of the why, in other words, isn't
$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the amount of catches of the North Sea that took place in UK 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the amount of catches of the North Sea that took place in UK waters. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then sifting out some of the why, in other words, isn't the catch that takes place in Norwegian waters then just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the amount of catches of the North Sea that took place in UK waters. The matter of dispute between the parties is: what, in a sense, is it 58% of? The EU's position is that 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then sifting out some of the why, in other words, isn't the catch that takes place in Norwegian waters then just in the figures? Because isn't that what the model is
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 so still the whole North Sea of a reduction, accounting for the proportion of the fish caught in UK waters. Which is why I said there is not a model for the UK waters. That's not an ecosystem, and so you can't ecosystem-model the UK waters on the basis of currently available models. If I can assist you further, I'm at your disposal, but that's the answer to your question. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. That does assist. If I may also now turn to the EU do you have any response to that? MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. On the first part of the question, the EU is in agreement with the UK. On the second part, I think it is important to understand what the 58% figure represents. And it is, I think, common ground that it supposedly represents the amount of catches of the North Sea that took place in UK waters. The matter of dispute between the parties is: what, in a sense, is it 58% of? The EU's position is that they are only comparing the UK and EU waters of the 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	removed from the North Sea, one is then overestimating or there is a risk of overestimation, and it's something that is just not possible to know, but there is a risk of overestimating the benefits of the measure, or the benefits of the measure whose effects the model is trying to evaluate. THE CHAIRPERSON: I understand. We have a question on this in writing, so you will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the whole issue of the Norwegian catch. So thank you for that. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I'm sorry, could I just follow up. We will ask more detailed questions. But I understand the EU's position is that the total catch must be the catch across the North Sea, not simply the total catch of the EU plus the UK. In answer to some of the first questions posed, I'd understood that that was what the model was meant to do, which was to survey the whole of the North Sea. So is there some parameter in the model that is then sifting out some of the why, in other words, isn't the catch that takes place in Norwegian waters then just in the figures? Because isn't that what the model is looking at?

16:07 1	would be more usefully done in writing, please, that's	16:10 1	
2	also fine.	2	
3	MR DAWES: Again, this is a preliminary response and there	3	
4	may need to be a more detailed position.	4	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
5	But simply: indeed that is the purpose of the model.	5	Norwegian sandeels caught in the North Sea are caught
6	But what the EU is saying is: if that is the purpose of	6	outside the UK's waters, the effect of that would be
7	the model, but if being fed into the model is	7	that the solid red line should appear just to the right
8	an overestimation of UK catches, then what comes out of	8	of the current lower end of the confidence interval
9	the model is likely to be an overestimation. It's not	9	marked by the dotted red line. That would be
10	what the model is seeking to test; it's what is being	10) the result.
11	inputted into the model. And then what comes out, in	11	Members of the Tribunal, the only other point
12	a sense, we say could be an overestimation of the impact	12	I would add and this comes back to where this
13	of the measure.	13	question started is that the consequence of having
14	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: That's then predicated on the fact	14	
15	that the figures for the catch in Norwegian waters was	15	
16	not fed into the model?	16	•
17	MR DAWES: Yes. We say that if you take only EU and UK	17	· ·
18	waters, then the figure that is being fed in is not the	18	
19	correct figure to be fed into the model.	19	· ·
20	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.	20	
21	Yes, please, Mr Juratowitch.	21	
22	MR JURATOWITCH: Thank you very much, Madam Chairperson.	22	C I
23	If I could respond on that.	23	
24	It must be very frustrating for the Tribunal to	24	
25	listen to lawyers talking about science, but it's	25	
_		23	-
	Page 113		Page 115
16:08 1	necessary to correct a fundamental misunderstanding that	16:12 1	Thank you very much.
2		2	THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr Dawes.
3		3	MR DAWES: Just one final point, just for the Tribunal's
4		4	understanding when one talks about confidence levels.
5	-	5	If one accepts the EU's position that we are no
6		6	longer in the world of 58%, but in a world of 39%, that
7		7	also necessarily means that there is a shift also in
8		8	terms of the confidence levels. Because the 39% now
9		9	becomes the reference point, and then the confidence
10	· · · · ·	10	levels if one calls them "boundaries", because that's
11		11	what confidence levels are about: they're about setting
12	-	12	a degree of confidence of what is at the lower end and
13		13	what is at the higher end.
14		14	So if the 58% figure, the starting point, is no
15	0	15	longer that but 38%, that then means that new confidence
16		16	levels have to be established. And then when one looks
17		17	at the output of the model and then the simulated
18		18	biomass increases, not only are those figures, we say,
19	• •	19	changed, but the confidence level in those figures is
20	· · ·	20	also changed.
20		21	THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr Juratowitch.
21			
. //	they did what they could with the information that they	Z2.	MR JURATOWITCH: I'm sorry, Madam Chairperson, but that was
		22 23	MR JURATOWITCH: I'm sorry, Madam Chairperson, but that was a new point and it can't be left unresponded to.
23	had and they created a confidence interval. Those are	22 23 24	a new point and it can't be left unresponded to.
23 24	had and they created a confidence interval. Those are the red lines on the graph, if I can put it that way.	23	a new point and it can't be left unresponded to. We are departing very far from science now.
23	had and they created a confidence interval. Those are the red lines on the graph, if I can put it that way.	23 24	a new point and it can't be left unresponded to.
23 24	had and they created a confidence interval. Those are the red lines on the graph, if I can put it that way.	23 24	a new point and it can't be left unresponded to. We are departing very far from science now.

16:13 1	information available at that time, predicted results	16:17 1	the only point that I wish to make at this stage. But
10.15 1	<u>^</u>	2	I won't myself answer that question now on the basis of
		2	that evidence.
3			
4	• •	4	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
5	· · · ·	5	There was one question of clarification that
6	÷	6	we sought. Ms Boileau, when you talked about the
7		7	difference between parametrisation in the model and
8	<u>^</u>	8	recalibration of the model, it would help the Tribunal
9	confidence interval. That was a matter taken into	9	to understand the transcript in particular as to what
10	account in the establishment of that confidence	10	you mean by the distinction between parametrisation and
11	interval. And if, on their maximalist position, they	11	recalibration, just for our own understanding of what
12	are right, it remains within the confidence interval	12	this means.
13	established at that time.	13	Thank you.
14	You cannot, once you've identified a risk coming	14	MS BOILEAU: Madam Chairperson, we might elaborate on this
15	within a confidence interval, say: well, the effect of	15	further in our written response. But in simple terms,
16		16	the parameters, as I understand it, are the inputs into
17		17	the model. Some of these inputs reflect assumptions,
18	· -	18	judgments based on expert evidence, about how, for
19	*	19	example, predators and prey interact.
20	0	20	The parameters in the model are the different
20		21	components, is my understanding, and the way that they
21		21	interact gives rise to the predictions about how things
22		22	would occur in the future. When parameters in the model
23 24		23 24	are altered, the model needs to be recalibrated to make
24 25		24 25	sure that everything still reflects not reality, but
23	5 Thank you, Madam Chairperson.	25	sure that everything still reflects not reality, but
	Page 117		Page 119
16:15 1	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Juratowitch.	16:19 1	a realistic scenario.
16:15 1 2	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Juratowitch. I have another question on the model, and it relates	16:19 1 2	a realistic scenario. So, for example, that can be done by doing what's
	•		
2	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular	2	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's
2 3	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both	2 3	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how
2 3 4 5	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also	2 3 4	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if
2 3 4 5 6	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular	2 3 4 5	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you
2 3 4 5 6 7	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of	2 3 4 5 6 7	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long]	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch? MR JURATOWITCH: I'm not going to have a stab at it,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because I think what the Tribunal might need to understand is:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because I think what the Tribunal might need to understand is: when you speak about the update of the model, there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch? MR JURATOWITCH: I'm not going to have a stab at it, Madam Chairperson. I am only going to say that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because I think what the Tribunal might need to understand is:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch? MR JURATOWITCH: I'm not going to have a stab at it, Madam Chairperson. I am only going to say that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because I think what the Tribunal might need to understand is: when you speak about the update of the model, there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I have another question on the model, and it relates to the EU's suggestion pointing us to additional modular plug-ins that were available and this includes both datasets regarding age and size of sandeel, but also location of predators using Ecospace as a modular plug-in, if I can put it that way and the issue of key run status. So it's a very practical question as to: how [long] does it take to establish key run status if the core elements, can I say, the fundamental parameters of a key run model are changed, and new key run status is being sought? Just how long would that normally take, in light of the fact that the initial model, the 2013 model, took six years to develop? Again, if you don't have an answer to this immediately, that's also fine. MR DAWES: I think this is something which is best addressed in writing on this particular point. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. You're going to have a stab at it, Mr Juratowitch? MR JURATOWITCH: I'm not going to have a stab at it, Madam Chairperson. I am only going to say that that point is for the EU to prove, and they will need to	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	So, for example, that can be done by doing what's called "hindcasting": you run the model looking at how it would hindcast what's happened in the past, and you compare that to the reality of the situation. And if the output looks different, it doesn't align, then you might need to recalibrate the model. It might tell you something about the parameters that need to be adjusted to better reflect real life in the past. Changes to the parameters of the model moving forward mean that the model would need to be recalibrated, or at least its calibration would need to be verified, in order to make sure that it's still essentially a sensible output. And this isn't an easy or a simple thing by any means. That's why, when the model was reviewed by the ICES Working Group, it's initially reviewed by a group of experts, and then the plenary, and then it's further reviewed by the experts. Unless I can assist the Tribunal further on that point. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Yes, you can probably assist, because I think what the Tribunal might need to understand is: when you speak about the update of the model, there are two things. One is you mentioned the update with data

16:21	1	if I misunderstood, that this update involved	16:24 1	The types of things that were updated in the model
	2	re-parametrising the model. And now you explain that	2	are things which are more observational or empirical.
	3	every time you change the parameters in the model,	3	There were things like fishing catch, biomass. They
	4	in fact it has to be recalibrated.	4	didn't require expert judgment: they're not matters of
	5	So if I understand well, the update which was made	5	expert judgment. So in that sense, the updates that
	6	in the model involved a recalibration. It's just the	6	were made to bring the model to 2020 didn't change how
	7	shortcut in the reasoning to make sure that	7	the model predicts that different components of the
	8	we understand.	8	ecosystem would react to changes in sandeel fishing
	9	MS BOILEAU: Thank you, Madam Arbitrator.	9	effort in the North Sea.
	10	One small point of clarification. You referred to	10	THE CHAIRPERSON: European Union, you have a right to reply.
	11	the model being updated by reference to data from 2003	11	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Sorry, just to be clear, before the EU
	12	to 2020. It was updated by reference to data from 2013	12	comes in, the distinction that I understand you to be
	13	to 2020. So the ICES key run essentially used data up	13	drawing is that if there's an existing dataset that has
	14	till 2013, and it was updated with data up to 2020.	14	been used in the model, you can update that dataset?
	15	The key difference essentially is that there are	15	MS BOILEAU: Yes.
	16	certain parameters in the model which are critical	16	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: But one example that we were given
	17	drivers of the model. They're essentially the	17	this afternoon was splitting the size of groups between,
	18	foundational pieces of the model, the engine of	18	for example, adult and juvenile sandeel. Now, that was
	19	the model, which heavily influence the output.	19	said to be a parameter.
	20	So I will mention a couple, but one of them is	20	Could you just tell us why that's a parameter? And
	20	the model's "diet matrix", and the other is called the	21	perhaps give us an example I think you have
	22	"vulnerability multiplier matrix". So these two	21	already of data that you can simply update the
	22	parameters, for example, are driving, in the model,	22	series I think you said biomass or catches but
	23 24	the inter-species interactions. The diet matrix, for	23 24	perhaps to be able to distinguish between data fed
	24 25	example, is constructed by experts using stomach records	24	routinely into the model which can be updated, and why,
	23	example, is constructed by experts using stomach records	23	fournery into the model which can be updated, and why,
		Page 121		Page 123
16:23		and literature, and the vulnerability multiplier looks	16:26 1	for example, the splitting of size groups would be
16:23	2	at the shape of predator-prey interactions.	2	a parameter rather than a data improvement or
16:23	2 3	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the	2 3	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.
16:23	2 3 4	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but	2 3 4	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more
16:23	2 3 4 5	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption,	2 3 4 5	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new
16:23	2 3 4 5 6	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert	2 3 4 5 6	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right
16:23	2 3 4 5	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review.	2 3 4 5 6 7	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be
16:23	2 3 4 5 6	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model.	2 3 4 5 6	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression.MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much mature sandeels are
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example.
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example.
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission,
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used in the English scientific report would align with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new functional group, with the new assumptions built within
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used in the English scientific report would align with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new functional group, with the new assumptions built within
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used in the English scientific report would align with the ICES key run. Because it is those parameters that are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much mature sandeels are consumed by whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new functional group, with the new assumptions built within that about how juvenile sandeels predate on their prey
16:23	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	at the shape of predator-prey interactions. So these are two parameters that are drivers of the model, they're heavily influential in the model, but they require a degree of not necessarily assumption, but they require a degree of expert input and expert review. I said before that they're the engine of the model. So if we think of the model like a car, changing those parameters, or adding something on or breaking something off, would be adding different components to the motor or the car itself. Updating the model to 2020 from 2013 is more like adding road to enable the existing car to predict further. It's essentially updating data that already exists in the model to reflect more recent accurate data, and it enables it to run into the future. But importantly, the updates that were made to bring it to the future didn't change those core foundational parameters, let's put it that way. They were intentionally kept the same so that the EwE model used in the English scientific report would align with the ICES key run. Because it is those parameters that are so significant that need to be reviewed by experts,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 a parameter rather than a data improvement or progression. MS BOILEAU: So splitting the group of sandeels, to be more technically accurate, I think would be creating a new functional group in the model. Whereas there is right now one functional group for sandeel, it would be splitting those into two. And that's not a matter of assuming, for example, that you could just halve the information that's fed into the model about how much whales feed on sandeel: you would need information about how much whales eat juvenile sandeels, and you would need information about how much whales, for example. So this is really a universe of new data that would need to be brought into the model. And then after that is done, the model would need to be, in my submission, recalibrated; or in order to align with the best available scientific advice, one would ideally have an ICES Working Group review of that model, with its new functional group, with the new assumptions built within that about how juvenile sandeels predate on their prey and are predated on by other predators.

Page 122

Amended by the parties

-		I	
16:28 1	MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.	16:31 1	against the English measure, does the Scottish measure
2	The European Union's position is a simple one. When	2	also fail, because it's one measure? Or if claim 1
3	you feed in such new data like this and I think that	3	prevails against the English measure, is there
4	was in essence the position, as the European Union has	4	a differentiation between the Scottish measure and
5	understood, of the United Kingdom there is a need to	5	the English measure in terms of claim 1, in terms of
6	check whether the model needs to be recalibrated. So,	6	the challenge and where it lies?
7	yes, when you insert additional data for a new period of	7	MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And it's been indicated
8	time, this does require to verify whether or not this	8	to me that you may not have been able to hear me as
9	leads to a need to recalibrate the model.	9	clearly as possible before, so I have endeavoured to
10	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.	10	raise the microphone.
11	You'll be pleased to know that we are moving on from	11	I think it is important to remember what it is that
12	the issue of the model. But we have been doing oral	12	this Ecosim modelling was seeking to ascertain. It was
13	questions; we have a different written question on	13	seeking to ascertain, or to simulate or evaluate, what
14	the model.	14	would be the impact on biomass in the entirety of UK
15	But I just want to pick up on what the United	15	waters of the North Sea.
15	Kingdom Mr Westaway made a comment regarding the EU,	16	So the EU's submission is that to that extent, when
10	in its reply, not saying anything about claim 2 or	10	one looks at that piece of evidence and when one
17	claim 3. I just wanted to clarify with the EU that its	18	evaluates whether it can be considered part of the "best
			-
19	written submissions and its oral submissions on Tuesday	19	available scientific advice", it is relevant both to
20	stand. So I just thought I would seek that	20	assessing the English and the Scottish measure, because
21	clarification, to be absolutely certain.	21	it is seeking to evaluate an impact across UK waters of
22	MS NORRIS: Madam Chair, I'm grateful for the question	22	the North Sea.
23	because had that question not been asked, this would	23	On, more generally, your question about well,
24	have been a point that we would have raised with	24	let's say if one can call it the "remainder" of the
25	the Tribunal.	25	English scientific report and the Scottish scientific
	Page 125		Page 127
	1 450 125		1450127
16:30 1	The European Union maintains its written submissions	16:33 1	report, I think as the EU has endeavoured to explain
16:30 1 2	The European Union maintains its written submissions and its submissions from earlier this week. We	16:33 1 2	report, I think as the EU has endeavoured to explain throughout this hearing, what those and the EU
	-		• • •
2	and its submissions from earlier this week. We	2	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU
2 3	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points	2 3	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the
2 3 4	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was	2 3 4	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of
2 3 4 5	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have	2 3 4 5	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice.
2 3 4 5 6 7	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should	2 3 4 5 6	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors 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\end{array} $	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors in the modelling, and that challenge is directed to the English 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question. It does appear that the premise of the EU's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors in the modelling, and that challenge is directed to the English 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question. It does appear that the premise of the EU's challenge is that the modelling does constitute "best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors in the modelling, and that challenge is directed to the English measure. So what remains the basis on which the Scottish measure is still impugned?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question. It does appear that the premise of the EU's challenge is that the modelling does constitute "best available science". Would you agree with that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors in the modelling, and that challenge is directed to the English measure. So what remains the basis on which the Scottish measure is still impugned? 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question. It does appear that the premise of the EU's challenge is that the modelling does constitute "best
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 and its submissions from earlier this week. We endeavoured to assist the Tribunal by identifying points where we can agree with the United Kingdom throughout these proceedings. But given that our rebuttal was comparatively short, the fact that we may not have addressed all points raised by the United Kingdom should certainly not be construed as a concession or waiving of those points. That being said, given that there are further rounds of questions and submissions, the European Union will continue in its endeavour to really focus on matters where there is a disagreement between the parties. Thank you. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for that clarification. The Tribunal would now like to turn to the issue of "best available scientific advice". And we have first one question for the EU and then one for the UK. To the EU: the challenge on the "best available scientific advice" rests primarily on the errors in the modelling, and that challenge is directed to the English measure. So what remains the basis on which the Scottish measure is still impugned?	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\\24\end{array} $	 throughout this hearing, what those and the EU has not contested the scientific nature, or the methodological rigour, I should say, of those pieces of advice. The EU's position is that that scientific advice indicates that to the extent there is this phenomenon of local depletion of sandeel or there may be, I should say, a phenomenon of local depletion this may raise an issue for predators who are dependent upon sandeel and who are unable to attain that sandeel within the locally depleted area. And to the extent that there either is not this phenomenon of local depletion, or that the predators are either not dependent upon sandeel in the first place or they are able to obtain sandeel from outside the locally depleted area, then that is what the EU would submit is what that evidence shows. So, yes, it is relevant for both measures in that sense. JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Mr Dawes, if I could just ask you a follow-up question. It does appear that the premise of the EU's challenge is that the modelling does constitute "best available science". Would you agree with that

16:35 1	MR DAWES: I think the EU	16:39 1	parameter of the model? It's because of the underlying
2	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: There may be deficiencies in it,	2	scientific literature and evidence which are summarised
3	but the idea of modelling along the lines that was	3	in the English and Scottish scientific reports, and
4	undertaken for the purposes of the English measure	4	these are elements which are then included in the model.
5	constitutes part of the body of "best science"?	5	So we say there is a link between the scientific
6	MR DAWES: I think the EU would agree that it can constitute	6	literature and the model. So when a model depending
7	advice of a scientific nature when it has the necessary	7	on what the model is trying to test and depending on
8	methodological rigour. So there is no obligation to	8	what is the outcome of that model, we say that this can
9	conduct such modelling; but when it is conducted, it can	9	be taken into account in assessing whether or not
10	constitute a piece of scientific advice, and it must	10	a measure is based on the best available scientific
11	meet the constraints in order to be considered reputable	11	advice.
12	science.	12	So it's not because the decision-maker says, "I am
13	But in a sense, the EU's position is twofold. Our	13	not basing my measure on it", that that piece of advice
14	first position is that results generated based on the	14	cannot be taken into account in assessing whether
15	model cannot be considered as forming part of the best	15	the measure is based on the best available scientific
16	available scientific advice. But even to the extent	16	advice.
17	that they do, then the body of best available scientific	17	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Just a last question.
18	advice is not sufficient the measure is not based on	18	So your reading of the provision of the treaty is to
19	that body.	19	say that there are choices that you can make as to the
20	So to come back to your question, it is not	20	extent to which certain features of "best science" are
21	a necessary premise of the EU's claim.	21	used? Because that would cast a slightly different
22	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: You see, the reason I'm asking	22	light on how we think about Article 496(2), which is to
23	the question is that there seems to be a potential	23	say: either you have an objective question, and a party
24	I won't say "contradiction", but tension in the	24	must simply do the best science, or rather must get
25	challenge that the EU is making, which is that the	25	the best available scientific advice, as an objective
	Page 129		Page 131
			1 age 151
16:37 1	Scottish measure, that didn't do any of the modelling.	16:40 1	matter. But I understand you to be saying. "But there
16:37 1 2	Scottish measure, that didn't do any of the modelling, is not criticised.	16:40 1 2	matter. But I understand you to be saying, "But there are choices that you can make: and to some degree, if
16:37 1 2 3	is not criticised.	16:40 1 2 3	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if
2 3	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken	2	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge",
2	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body	2 3	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if
2 3 4	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken	2 3 4	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at
2 3 4 5	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such	2 3 4 5	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after
2 3 4 5 6 7	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling	2 3 4 5 6 7	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, ifyou do more, you may be more exposed to challenge",which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking atthis.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, afterthe modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated
2 3 4 5 6	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to	2 3 4 5 6	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this.MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist the fact that modelling exists, then it should be taken 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist the fact that modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into account when one looks at what constitutes the "best
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array}$	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist the fact that modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. And I think it's important it was a submission 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into account when one looks at what constitutes the "best available scientific advice".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist the fact that modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. And I think it's important it was a submission that the EU already made that the aim of the model 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} $	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into account when one looks at what constitutes the "best available scientific advice". THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling, the fact that modelling may exist the fact that modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. And I think it's important it was a submission that the EU already made that the aim of the model is to it is based also on the underlying scientific 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into account when one looks at what constitutes the "best available scientific advice". THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I have a question for both of the parties, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. And I think it's important it was a submission that the EU already made that the aim of the model is to it is based also on the underlying scientific literature. So when one looks at the model, for 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific rigour, must be taken into account when one looks at what constitutes the "best available scientific advice". THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I have a question for both of the parties, and it relates to the identified flaws by the EU in the EwE
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 is not criticised. So if modelling along the lines that was undertaken for the English measure does constitute part of the body of "best science", assuming it's done well you say it wasn't then how can the entire absence of such modelling go without challenge; but when the modelling is done, with its deficiency, it gives rise to challenge? That would seem to be somewhat structurally in tension with itself. MR DAWES: I think the EU's position would be that from the moment that modelling is done, then it becomes a piece of scientific advice which is, in a sense, then out there in the world and needs to be taken into account in assessing the notion of "best available scientific advice". So while there is no requirement in the first place to do modelling exists, then it should be taken into account. And I think it's important it was a submission that the EU already made that the aim of the model is to it is based also on the underlying scientific literature. So when one looks at the model, for 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 are choices that you can make; and to some degree, if you do more, you may be more exposed to challenge", which would seem to be a slightly odd way of looking at this. MR DAWES: I think as a matter of factual record, after the modelling had been done, it was explicitly stated that the results, or the simulations generated based on the model, were taken into account by the decision-maker when it decided to approve the English measure; and that the Tribunal has in Exhibit R-77. And then more generally, as I said, the EU is not suggesting that there is any requirement on a party to undertake any modelling. The EU's simple position is that when modelling has been undertaken, it must be undertaken with the necessary scientific rigour; and then the results of that modelling, or whether it has the necessary scientific advice". THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. I have a question for both of the parties, and it relates to the identified flaws by the EU in the EwE ecosystem model.

16:43

16:45

	PCA Case	INO. 2024-45	5 Thursday, 50 January 2025
	1 available scientific advice" in relation to these	16:47 1	Those are the two ways in which a flaw could affect
	2 errors, if they are to be established, subject to	2	whether scientific advice was "best available scientific
	3 a requirement of materiality? If so, do the errors	3	advice".
	4 identified by the EU meet any requirement of	4	The answer is: yes, there would need to be
	5 materiality?	5	materiality, and it would need to be materiality to that
	6 Perhaps the EU, since I invite the EU initially.	6	very significant extent. Of course, as you know and
	7 But since you've just been on the floor, are you ready	7	I won't go into application in response to this
	8 to answer now? This is a written question, by the way.	8	question but as the Tribunal is aware, the UK's
	9 MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair. This may indeed be	9	position is that all of the scientific advice relied on
1	0 an issue that the EU will come back to in writing.	10	does not approach either of those levels of materiality.
1	1 There are certain elements which I think the EU	11	There's a third possibility. I say that this
1	2 when one looks at the English scientific report and the	12	possibility does not arise on a correct interpretation,
1	3 Scottish scientific report, there are two elements which	13	but I will nonetheless, to seek to assist the Tribunal
1	4 seem to be materially important when it comes to looking	14	as fully as I can, articulate it.
1	5 at sandeel and its role in the ecosystem. We will not	15	And it would be this: that the flaw is so material
	6 rehearse these elements, but they are the element of age	16	that it could be said to affect whether or not the
	7 and the element of space. The aim of a model should be	17	measure was truly based on the best available scientific
	8 to reflect these elements should be included and	18	advice. I say you don't get there because you'd have to
	9 properly taken into account in a model, based on	10	cross one of those first two thresholds; and if you
	information that's reasonably available.	20	crossed one of those first two thresholds, then it
	Now, in the present case, when one applies this to	20	wouldn't be best available scientific advice. If you
	the particular model in question, the EU's position is	21 22	don't cross that threshold, then the question is just:
	that these two elements have not been taken into	22	did the decision-maker base itself on that advice, which
	account, and there are also additional elements that		
	the EU has identified.	24 25	has already passed the hurdle of "best available scientific advice"?
4	the EO has identified.	25	scientific advice ?
	Page 133		Page 135
5	Now, whether each and every element meets	16:48 1	And if it did base itself on it, factually and in
	2 a threshold of materiality I would say is a question	2	terms of a rational or objective relationship, then
	3 that the Tribunal may not when one looks at each and	3	that's enough. You don't, in my principal submission,
	4 every element, the Tribunal may not need to break them	4	get at that stage to be able to say there's a flaw
	5 down individually. But the EU's position is that when	5	that's big enough that we should undo the basing
	6 one adds together the various elements here, including	6	exercise.
	7 elements which the other scientific advice suggests are	7	Because all science will be capable of being
:	8 important elements, that this meets any threshold of	8	improved in one way or another. Once it's "best
	9 materiality, so when one puts together the various	9	available scientific advice", that's the end of the
1		10	enquiry for those purposes. And then the "based on"
1		10	analysis is just: was it based on it, including rational
1		11	or objective relationship?
1		12	So I say the issue of a flaw being material doesn't
1		13	arise at that third stage; but I accept that, at least
1		15	as it was put by the Tribunal at one point during this
1		15	hearing, it might credibly be thought to do so. I say
1		10	not, for the reasons I've given.
1		17	Thank you very much.
1		18	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr Juratowitch.
2		20	Ms Norris you have the floor.
2		20 21	MS NORRIS: As I said a few moments ago, we wanted to
2	-	21 22	endeavour to assist this Tribunal in understanding
	2 second sechario is that it may unminish the quality of		endeavour to assist this ritounal in understanding

- second scenario is that it may diminish the quality of the advice to such an extent that there would then be
- 23 24 some other scientific information or advice that would
- 25 be better than the advice that contained the flaw.

Page 134

- endeavour to assist this Tribunal in understanding 22
- 23 what's really in dispute. And so with that in mind,
- 24 much in terms of the test of what has just been said,
- 25 we would agree with. It does have to be a material

16:50 1	difference. When we're talking about "Does a measure	16:53 1	The UK, Mr Westaway, argues that the phrase
2	lack methodological and scientific rigour?", yes, the	2	"hav[ing] regard to" in the treaty implies a deferential
3	flaws pointed to, assessed holistically, must in some	3	review by the Tribunal, which can be limited to
4	sense make a difference. We wouldn't suggest otherwise.	4	monitoring of the decision-making process. But to what
5	Of course, then we come to the factual question of	5	extent does the wording of Article 494(3)(f), stating
6	whether we're across the thresholds in the different	6	that parties must "have regard to applying
7	scenarios that counsel for the United Kingdom has	7	proportionate measures" impact on this standard of
8	identified, and there we would respond to you further in	8	review?
9	writing.	9	So in other words, it's the measure as applied, and
10	THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, thank you.	10	not only the measure as being developed? So that is the
11	Just following up on what Mr Dawes said regarding	11	question.
12	the two major flaws in the model used in the English	12	So I invite the United Kingdom to respond first to
13	scientific report, which was the age/size of sandeel,	13	that question.
14	and also the spatial distribution.	14	MR WESTAWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
15	Just taking the age/size of sandeel, so that was not	15	The word "applying" is one of a number of verbs
16	in the 2013 key run ecosystem model; correct?	16	that's found behind the content: we have "minimising"
17	MR DAWES: (Nods head)	17	and "ensuring" next to the various principles in
18	THE CHAIRPERSON: Correct. So surely, if that flaw exists	18	Article 494(3).
19	in the original model, according to your submissions	19	In effect, it's an indication and in my
20	that this flaw was in the English scientific report	20	submission, another indication of the decision-making
21	model, it's like comparing apples and oranges? And if	21	nature of the principles, a point I made earlier: that
22	the flaw was in the English scientific report, surely	22	these are factors going to decision-making.
23	that same flaw was also in the ecosystem model from	23	That one applies the precautionary principle,
24	2013?	24	absent if we step back from this context, it's simply
25	MR DAWES: Thank you, Madam Chair.	25	how one can use the precautionary principle in
	Page 137		Page 139
	rage 157		rage 139
16:52 1	Again, while the EU may come back in writing on this	16:55 1	decision-making. It doesn't have, in the United
16:52 1 2	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to	16:55 1 2	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that.
	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in		Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which
2	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to	2	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that.
2 3	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the	2 3	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which
2 3 4	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters	2 3 4	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard
2 3 4 5	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the	2 3 4 5	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead
2 3 4 5 6	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any	2 3 4 5 6	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate
2 3 4 5 6 7	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ \end{array} $	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ \end{array}$	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but 	$ \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} $	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\end{array}$	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but I knew that this was going to be my last opportunity 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} $	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional omission at all. We fully accept that it's articulated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but I knew that this was going to be my last opportunity to ask any follow-up questions. So thank you. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional omission at all. We fully accept that it's articulated as "principles".
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but I knew that this was going to be my last opportunity to ask any follow-up questions. So thank you. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional omission at all. We fully accept that it's articulated as "principles".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but I knew that this was going to be my last opportunity to ask any follow-up questions. So thank you. 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\\21\\22\\23\end{array} $	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional omission at all. We fully accept that it's articulated as "principles".
$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 point, the 2013 model was not set up or designed to evaluate whether or not a particular measure which in this case is the prohibition of sandeel in all UK waters of the North Sea so to that extent, that is the reason why the underlying 2013 model did not take into account, for example, age: because, in a sense, the model's purpose was not to ascertain or to evaluate any particular measure. It is here that, in the English scientific report, the model is being used to evaluate as the name of the English scientific report says to assess "the ecosystem risks and benefits" of a full closure. And it's to the extent that the model is then being used to ascertain this point that the European Union submits that age becomes something that must be taken into account in the model. When one looks at what the model is being used to ascertain, that's when the age component becomes relevant. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. That's a helpful clarification. And my apologies for asking that, but I knew that this was going to be my last opportunity to ask any follow-up questions. So thank you. 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\end{array}$	 Kingdom's submission, any special meaning beyond that. And one cannot ignore "hav[ing] regard to", which governs all of those provisions. So "hav[ing] regard to" sits there and was deliberately put there to govern all of them. Would it make a difference if the wording, instead of being "hav[ing] regard to applying proportionate measures", were "hav[ing] regard to proportionality"? Not a significant difference, in the United Kingdom's submission. THE CHAIRPERSON: May I ask a follow-up question, because in your statement just now, you have omitted the word "principles". So "having regard to the principles of proportionality and non-discrimination", and "having regard to applying the principles". So what is the relevance of the word "principles" here? MR WESTAWAY: Well, I touched on that earlier. I wasn't attempting to set out a quote, or at least there were some ellipses. But no, it wasn't an intentional omission at all. We fully accept that it's articulated as "principles".

Day 3	PCA Case 1	No. 2024-4	5 Thursday, 30 January 2023
16:57 1	principles, the factors that go into decision-making.	17:01 1	be to engage with the application of proportionality in
2	It may be we can add a little more in writing, but	2	looking at the measures, and that's what happened in
3	I don't have more to add on that at this juncture.	3	this case.
4	THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please, that would be helpful, to	4	I think where the line in the sand needs to be
5	explain that a bit more in writing.	5	drawn, because one is looking at a treaty for the first
6	So, European Union.	6	time, is that the wording deliberately doesn't go that
7	MS NORRIS: Madam Chairperson, we have made a number of	7	far. But I do appreciate what may be a fine distinction
8	submissions going precisely to what we say is the	8	between those two.
9	significance of that term "applying", and we say indeed	9	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: What it seems to contemplate is that
10	that it does indicate that the output has some	10	one has to have regard to how a measure that is being
11	relevance. But that is also because of what has to be	11	contemplated will be applied in a proportionate manner
12	read into the term "shall decide on" in Article 496(1).	12	in order to secure conservation of marine living
13	And the "decide on", we could also reformulate that,	13	resources. In other words, it's concerned to know how
14	as counsel for the United Kingdom offered a different	14	the measure under contemplation will comport with
15	potential wording: perhaps the parties could have said,	15	the principle as to how in application in other
16	"Each Party, when deciding on, shall have regard to".	16	words, in the real world, as it were what it will do
17	But that's not what they said. They said "shall decide	17	for conservation that comports with the idea of
18	on", and it is that which has to be read together with	18	proportionality.
19	494(3). And the principle and it is a principle	19	Is that a fair way of reading this or not?
20	to which regard should be had is one that goes to the	20	MR WESTAWAY: I wouldn't fundamentally disagree with that
21	application of proportionality and non-discrimination.	21	characterisation. It's to have regard to the factors
22	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for your submissions.	22	that go to proportionality as a matter of application.
23	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: I wonder if I could have a follow-up	23	JUSTICE UNTERHALTER: Yes, thank you.
24	question to the UK.	24	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
25	You gave us a menu of interpretations, four in all,	25	Just a final couple of questions. I know the time
	Page 141		Page 143
16:58	and you opted for the second of your four items on the	17:02 1	is marching on. So if you don't mind, we will just
2	2 menu.	2	continue on with a couple of questions.
3	I'm wondering whether that interpretation isn't	3	The Tribunal's first question is for the
4	actually taking out the word "applying". In other	4	United Kingdom.
4	words, read the provision as if the word "applying"	5	In the oral submissions today, we were referred to
6	wasn't there. Because yours is, as it were,	6	a number of different passages, particularly in the
7	a procedural account of this provision, whereas there	7	ministerial submissions and the de minimis assessment,
8	*	8	in which you referred us to the conclusions that were
ç	you apply the measure to achieve certain ends.	9	reached regarding the benefits of the measure

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conclusions.

quite colloquially.

- you apply the measure to achieve certain ends. 10 So perhaps you could help us to see what work
- 11 "applying" is doing, and whether that comes closer to
- 12 the third item on your menu, rather than the second.
- 13 MR WESTAWAY: The short answer to the point is that
- 14 "applying" is not doing that work, because one has to
- 15 read it after "have regard to". And one cannot for this
- 16 purpose -- it's very important -- ignore "have regard
- 17 to". Were it the case that the provision required the
- 18 application of, that could and would have been said. 19
- In terms of what "having regard to ... applying" 20 means, I've just made submissions on that. It means,
- 21 going back to the options, having regard to those
- 22 constituent factors that go to the application of
- 23 proportionality. That's how one, I think, makes some
- 24 sense of this. And as I've submitted, in many cases,
- 25 the practical approach that the parties will adopt will

Page 142

Page 144

outweighing its costs. Perhaps also this could be later

very little reasoning to be found in those passages as

answered in writing. But it seemed to us that there was

to how the weighing exercise was done to arrive at these

So in other words, we had the factors that were had

regard to, and we had the outcome, the conclusion, but

there was nothing in between, if I can put it that way,

MR WESTAWAY: I think part of that is the limitations of

submissions themselves need to be read as a whole and

submissions made in the course of a process where there

understood in the context of what they are, which is

referring the Tribunal to passages, partly the need to

get through submissions relatively swiftly.

It goes without saying that the ministerial

17:04	I.	17:08 1	part of the measure, or the English measure. For the
	2 record there are others not, perhaps mercifully, all	2	Scottish measure, we have an act, a law with a preamble.
	3 of them and there are a number of documents and	3	For the English measure, what we have are variations
	4 assessments that would have been appended at various	4	from the MMO, or else
	5 points to those submissions.	5	Where is to be found exactly the full scope of
	6 So I think, Madam Chair, the best way of dealing	6	the English measure?
	7 with the question is to attempt to point the Tribunal to	7	MS NORRIS: On a general level, to the extent that that's
	8 a little more than just those key passages, so the	8	a question for the European Union, we wouldn't say that
	9 Tribunal can have a sense of where they fit into	9	that would fall exclusively in the scientific evidence.
	10 the bigger picture. What those key passages	10	It's the decision-maker. And the scientific evidence is
	demonstrate, and why I impressed those upon the	11	part of what a decision-maker may take into account when
	12 Tribunal, is they demonstrate that the	12	deciding on a fisheries management measure. But
	13 weighing/balancing exercise with the factors in mind	13	certainly we would expect to see other documentation
	14 was done.	14	showing how, on the basis of not only that scientific
	15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Yes, I appreciated this was	15	evidence but other factors, a conclusion was reached.
	likely to be something that you would need to answer in	16	So to the extent that I referred to an impact
	17 writing. But that would be very helpful, because that	17	assessment, I was referring more to the type of
	gives that would be helpful to our assessment.	18	regulatory impact assessment that regulators may apply
	In a similar vein, to the European Union, you have	19	or prepare before adopting a legislative measure.
	suggested that in undertaking the proper weighing of the	20	Now, I don't want to stray into the intricacies of
	21 benefits and impacts of a measure, the Tribunal has to	21	UK law, but certainly the ministerial statements may be
	analyse the "what" that is to be weighed and the "how"	22	precisely the type of document in which one would expect
	that weighing is undertaken.	23	to see how the decision-maker applied their mind to
	24 So does this mean that the Tribunal has to look for	24	those different factors, rather than simply
	evidence of how a party weighed and balanced the	25	an enumeration of them.
	D 145		D 147
	Page 145		Page 147
17:06	1 benefits and detrimental impacts of a measure, and not	17:09 1	So we certainly wouldn't be so restrictive as to say
17:06	1	17:09 1	So we certainly wouldn't be so restrictive as to say it can only be in the scientific evidence itself.
17:06	2 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you	2	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself.
17:06	2 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you	2 3	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful.
17:06	 2 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you 3 envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be 4 shown? 	2 3 4	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
17:06	2 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you3 envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be4 shown?	2 3 4 5	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both
17:06	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. 	2 3 4 5 6	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom.
17:06	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some 	2 3 4 5 6 7	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this
17:06	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important.
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide that
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be 	$ \begin{array}{c} 2\\3\\4\\5\\6\\7\\8\\9\\10\\11\\12\\13\\14\\15\\16\\17\\18\\19\\20\end{array} $	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how 	$ \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} $	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how the measure related to those factors. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Just to follow a bit on that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate receiving from you your final written submissions.
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how the measure related to those factors. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Just to follow a bit on that. You referred there the weighing exercise should 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate receiving from you your final written submissions.
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how the measure related to those factors. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Just to follow a bit on that. You referred there the weighing exercise should be, in your view, in the scientific report? Because one 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate receiving from you your final written submissions. The deadlines are as set out in PO1, just to note those, which is, I think, quite late at night: midnight,
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how the measure related to those factors. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Just to follow a bit on that. You referred there the weighing exercise should be, in your view, in the scientific report? Because one 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\end{array}$	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate receiving from you your final written submissions.
	 simply what, and the outcome? And if so, how do you envisage that such a demonstration of the "how" can be shown? MS NORRIS: This is also a question which we would come back to in more detail. But we do say that there should be some demonstration of the "what", and that is where you see that a factor has been identified. When it comes to looking at the "how" that weighing has been done, a measure itself may provide some evidence of how that weighing has been done. In this case, we rely on the measure itself as showing that there was no real weighing and balancing between the interests. Now, on a more general level, there are impact assessments prepared prior to regulatory measures being adopted, and one might expect to see more than a simple identification of a factor, but some form of reasoning to explain why a factor was considered not to be particularly significant or significant, and how the measure related to those factors. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Just to follow a bit on that. You referred there the weighing exercise should be, in your view, in the scientific report? Because one 	$\begin{array}{c} 2\\ 3\\ 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ \end{array}$	 it can only be in the scientific evidence itself. PROFESSOR RUIZ FABRI: Thank you. That's helpful. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So thank you to the Agents and counsel of both delegations, the European Union and the United Kingdom. As I mentioned right at the beginning of this session, we have a number of questions which we will provide tonight in writing for you. They range across a number of different areas. But in the interests of time, we felt it was important to give you a sense of our main issues and our main questions that we had for you. But that doesn't mean to say that any of the other questions or the other claims that we have not mentioned in this session are not also important. So I have already indicated that we will provide those questions in writing tonight, with a request that you provide answers on 5 February; and that then by 10 February you will have an opportunity to provide your responses to the respective party's answers to those questions, and on 10 February we will anticipate receiving from you your final written submissions. The deadlines are as set out in PO1, just to note those, which is, I think, quite late at night: midnight,

Page 150

Day 3

$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 17:11 & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 4 \\ & 5 \\ & 6 \\ & 7 \\ & 8 \\ & 9 \\ & 10 \\ & 11 \\ & 12 \\ & 13 \\ & 14 \\ & 15 \\ & 16 \\ & 17 \\ & 18 \\ & 19 \\ & 20 \\ & 21 \\ & 22 \\ & 23 \\ & 24 \\ & 25 \end{array}$	 corrections to the transcripts. So are you ready to agree now on a date for [transcript corrections], noting the fact that I'm sure you will wish to have those corrected transcriptions prior to your final written submissions on the 10th? So we will need to perhaps work back from 10 February as to when you could provide those. MR JURATOWITCH: Madam Chairperson, from the United Kingdom's perspective, given the quite tight deadlines for the answers of questions and written submissions, it may, in the scheme of things, be a more practical albeit less pure alternative to leave the correction of transcripts until after the written 	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	 a difference to the Tribunal, the United Kingdom would tends towards Friday the 14th, rather than the 12th. If it does make a difference to the Tribunal, we of course wish to assist the Tribunal. But could I take this opportunity to, with respect, echo the Chairperson's gratitude towards Mr McGowan for the transcripts. Thank you. MS NORRIS: The European Union would also be delighted to have until 14 February to review the transcripts. THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. So 14 February it is. With that, that concludes all our business for the oral hearing. I want to finally express my sincere thanks to my fellow arbitrators, Honourable Justice David Unterhalter and Professor Hélène Ruiz Fabri, for their assistance; and of course to the PCA Secretariat and Registry, who have been of invaluable assistance to the Tribunal. I would also like to formally thank the Agents and counsel for the European Union and the United Kingdom. You have presented your respective positions very eloquently, and you have assisted the Tribunal considerably in undertaking the very difficult task that we have before us. With that, I would like to now close the oral
23	Page 149	25	Page 151
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	 that something in the written submissions would need correction based on the transcripts. But it might, in all of the circumstances taken together, be a more proportionate approach. I haven't consulted with my colleagues at the European Union on that; I don't know their view. THE CHAIRPERSON: European Union? MS NORRIS: The European Union is open to that relatively pragmatic solution, not least because we have been reading the transcripts, which we have helpfully been provided with on a rolling basis, and we have not identified any major problem that we think would lead to a significant risk. So we would be open to that. THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you very much for that. And it is due to our very excellent court reporter, Mr McGowan, who does such excellent transcripts, that the parties can agree to that. So in that respect, if the submissions are due on 10 February, then you will need at least perhaps on 12 February; would that be appropriate? I'm looking to the PCA Registrar here for guidance. 12 February? DR SABANOGULLARI: Madam Chair, I am entirely in the hands of the parties. Perhaps they can state their positions on whether that would be an appropriate deadline. MR JURATOWITCH: Madam Chair, if it wouldn't make 	17:16 17:16 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 12 13 14 15 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 16 17 17 16 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	2 (5.16 pm) 3 (The hearing concluded) 4 5 6 7 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

г — т					
A	accurate 65:14 122:16	advanced 28:4 41:4	136:25 149:12	analysis 2:9 66:9	139:23
ability 30:15 74:9	124:5	86:13 94:6 104:20	150:17	70:25 82:12 100:24	apply 25:11 27:8 40:5
able 9:7 30:14 33:25	accurately 114:20	advancing 38:14 72:6	agreed 3:5,15 4:4 5:5	136:11	81:13 88:4 93:12,22
65:25 66:6 102:5	achieve 27:13 142:9	adverse 60:24 86:7,8	25:16,22 56:7 77:24	ANNA 2:12	142:9 147:18
114:16 115:18	achieved 62:1,6	86:17	79:25 88:14	Annex 2:21,24 3:7,10	applying 7:10 24:19
123:24 127:8	achieving 80:20	adversely 80:25	agreement 1:1 2:25	3:23 4:3 5:1 8:2	41:2 42:10 81:19
128:15 136:4	acknowledged 28:8	advice 7:10 8:16,17,22	6:22 77:4,13,15	31:24 33:7,23 77:12	83:21 88:9,10,25
about 2:5 5:9,9 12:20	acknowledgement	8:23 9:5,7,23 10:1,8	78:3,16 80:5,10	78:1,4	89:2,16 90:10 94:12
13:14 16:8 17:13	5:20	10:15 11:2,12 24:4	87:3 88:15 92:5,14	annexed 14:17	109:25 139:6,15
20:10,14,20 40:17	acknowledging 100:6	24:7 29:22 40:16,18	103:7,18 110:16	annual 62:21	140:8,16 141:9
43:22,25 44:9 46:8	across 61:25 112:15	40:20,21 43:18 52:8	agreements 6:2	another 2:10 8:21	142:4,5,11,14,19
50:13 51:11 52:5,19	127:21 137:6 148:9	52:10,21,22 53:13	ahead 24:11 71:24	9:22 15:3 22:13	appreciate 58:23 83:3
53:21 54:7 55:17	act 37:10 147:2	53:24 54:2 55:3	aim 130:22 133:17	28:3 37:13 43:11	143:7
66:6 68:2 69:15	acting 33:5	56:4,22 60:22 64:1	albeit 149:22	54:2 58:4 74:10	appreciated 145:15
77:8 78:4 84:11,13	action 31:13,19 99:5	66:3,13,16 68:24	ALEX 2:17	106:17 118:2 136:8	approach 11:9,13,14
84:22 86:11,19 89:7	99:14	71:4,7 73:20 78:19	align 120:6 122:21	139:20	18:14 36:11 39:20
89:9,15 90:5,14	activities 79:7	104:13,22 105:14	124:18	answer 8:12 11:3 15:2	40:5 52:23 71:23,25
91:23 96:10 99:10	activity 17:21	106:18 107:9	aligned 19:3 50:2	19:10 24:13 68:2	72:2,13,20 73:14,15
103:3 105:25	acts 83:13	114:10 124:19	alignment 19:8 43:1	95:3 105:19 106:12	73:23 74:4,4,14,18
107:13,17,20	actually 43:15 50:3,20	126:18,21 127:19	aligns 60:22 122:25	109:6 110:10	75:5,9 96:6 135:10
113:25 115:1 116:4	50:24 59:7,14,25	128:5,6 129:7,10,16	alive 3:13 30:17	112:16 118:16	142:25 150:4
116:11,11 119:6,18	96:10 142:4	129:18 130:13,16	ALLAN 3:2	119:2 133:8 134:14	approaches 39:18
119:22 120:8,23	add 10:25 27:7 34:18	131:11,13,16,25	allegation 37:15	134:15 135:4	appropriate 41:15
124:10,11,13,22	37:18 44:5 97:23	132:20 133:1 134:7	alleged 8:7 37:25	142:13 145:16	150:20,24
125:17 127:23	115:12 141:2,3	134:20,23,24,25	alleging 37:12	answered 144:11	appropriately 83:19
131:22 137:1	added 48:10 59:24	135:2,3,9,18,21,23	alleviation 39:12	answers 8:5 148:18,20	appropriateness
above 22:11	adding 44:9 45:15	135:25 136:9	allow 1:7,8 35:13	149:20	76:24
absence 11:17 68:22	122:10,11,13	Advisory 73:24	48:11 49:9 54:18	ANTHONY 2:4	approve 32:17 132:10
72:2 130:6	addition 98:23	affect 80:25 135:1,16	73:17 102:17	anticipate 148:21	approved 18:22 19:4
absent 139:24	additional 34:19	affected 56:21	allows 11:16 15:6	anticipated 102:13	ARAGÓN 3:7
absolutely 109:11	45:17 70:18 79:18	affirmative 40:22	all-seeing 94:21	anything 88:14 114:7	arbitral 94:10
125:21	80:6 103:13 108:21	affirmatively 40:2	alone 8:16	125:17	arbitration 1:1,5,20
abstract 64:8	118:3 125:7 133:24	affirmed 43:9	along 129:3 130:3	anyway 99:8	3:5 37:1 97:7 103:7
abundance 60:7 61:10	additionally 93:15	AFFIRMING 3:11	already 7:6 17:12 18:6	anywhere 68:15	Arbitrator 121:9
62:2,11 63:4 68:7	98:25	after 32:10 48:21	27:24 34:15 44:5	an]other 32:10	arbitrators 151:14
68:19 69:2,4	address 12:12,18,25	57:11 58:16,16,24	47:22 48:24 54:11	apart 60:13	Arctic 62:25
accept 9:20 33:14 69:9	13:11 20:4 21:16	60:18 61:5 69:4	55:13 70:11 95:14	apex 6:10	area 30:15,16 57:19
78:3,9,11 83:8,13	28:23 36:2 42:19	70:3,13 102:7,19	99:23 122:15	apologies 138:21	58:14,15,17,19,22
84:5,7 85:3 89:23	75:20,22 76:3,5	124:16 132:6	123:22 130:22	apologise 74:24 75:8	59:8 60:1 72:6 85:6
91:11 94:8 106:9	102:4	142:15 149:23	135:24 148:16	105:6	85:13 128:12,16
136:14 140:22	addressed 7:6 27:24	afternoon 2:23 9:12	already-existing 10:15	apology 105:11	areas 1:21 148:10
acceptable 103:1	47:17 63:9 118:18	35:21 36:2 123:17	alter 44:11 50:7	appear 115:7 128:22	argue 12:5,13,18,25
acceptance 42:7 53:19	126:7	again 3:19 10:24	altered 49:23 119:24	APPEARANCES 2:1	13:5 80:21 99:15
accepted 54:21 55:14	addressing 13:4 71:6	16:11 18:24 21:20	altering 47:9	appeared 10:12	argued 2:5 4:11 5:17
99:19	adds 134:6	24:25 26:21 48:8	alternative 8:22 27:15	appears 10:25 26:19	11:9 99:21
accepts 4:13 10:3 14:4	adduce 104:14	72:6 80:1 100:15,18	28:6,11,16,18,21	42:24 47:22 64:10	argues 5:8 6:25 86:24
52:25 53:4,15 66:8	adduces 8:21 54:1	100:23 112:25	41:5,9,14 54:2	93:3	139:1
66:24 79:5 92:21	adequate 11:17 27:12	113:3 118:16 138:1	76:18 94:1,4,6,9,14	Appellate 28:9	argument 16:8 21:17
116:5	72:4,19 73:7 105:5	against 56:17 60:14	149:22	appended 145:4	28:5 38:2 41:6
access 2:20 3:21 4:6	adherence 25:25	72:10 73:10 105:9	alternatively 19:22	appendices 87:7	81:23 94:5
6:23 25:15 32:22	75:23 82:2	127:1,3	alternatives 95:2,14	apples 137:21	arguments 76:4,5
77:11,25	adjourn 35:9,16	age 12:6 13:7,14 14:3	although 53:15 60:18	applicable 41:10	arise 82:9,11 84:25
accessibility 15:25	adjourned 35:8,19	14:5,7 15:19 16:4	74:13	92:16,18,23 93:16	134:18 135:12
accorded 6:6	adjudicate 1:25	23:18 44:22 57:5	always 7:20 33:8	applicant 37:21 38:4	136:14
according 8:11 24:12	adjust 16:6	118:5 130:25	69:13 70:15	application 28:24 29:5	arisen 2:13
49:3 111:2 137:19	adjusted 120:8	133:16 138:7,16,18	ambition 25:21 79:23	53:17,22 60:15	arises 70:2 80:6 82:7
account 12:6,10 13:6	adjustment 14:11	Agent 2:4,5,6,7,8,17	among 65:5 99:20	68:13 69:22 74:3	95:16 107:21
16:6,9,19,24 18:11	31:24	2:18 1:11 44:2 77:7	117:19	76:19 81:8,8 82:20	109:17 114:4,9,13
47:19 48:23 50:22	administrative 3:1,2	78:3 81:10 92:3	amount 4:15 30:8	88:1 89:3 94:3 96:7	arising 109:8
82:7 85:19,24 86:5	4:2	95:16 97:15 98:12	33:20,21 110:20	96:10 97:13 135:7	arose 48:4 109:14
86:14,22 92:17	adopt 11:16 142:25	99:21 100:14	111:8	141:21 142:18,22	around 60:10
93:20 103:17	adopted 4:14,21 23:24	103:12 105:3 114:3	ANABEL 3:7	143:1,15,22	arrangement 3:1 4:2
114:20 117:10	31:23 73:23 146:17	Agents 148:5 151:19	analogies 84:16	applied 6:11 89:7	arrive 144:13
	adopting 147:19	age/size 137:13,15	analogous 84:18	139:9 143:11	article 1:1 3:19 4:15
130:15,20 131:9,14		ago 136:21	analogue 6:9	147:23	4:24,24 5:1,4,4 6:4
130:15,20 131:9,14 132:9,19 133:19,24	adult 46:1 123:18		04 00 0C 10	Re- 26 01 40 11	C.1E 00 7 0 0 10 01
	adults 45:22	agree 26:19 76:22,25	analogy 84:20 86:19	applies 36:21 40:11	6:15,20 7:8 8:18,21
132:9,19 133:19,24 138:7,17 142:7 147:11	adults 45:22 advance 42:23 76:10	agree 26:19 76:22,25 81:17 99:4 126:4	analyse 145:22	72:2 82:21 85:17	24:7,8,16,17 25:3,3
132:9,19 133:19,24 138:7,17 142:7	adults 45:22	agree 26:19 76:22,25			

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

Day 5		r CA Case I	NO. 2024-43	1 1101	suay, 50 January 2025
32:20 39:25 43:13 57:20 58:11,11 60:3 64:6,16 65:9,15,15 72:5 74:14 77:18 78:9,23 79:1,13 80:7,8 82:1 85:3,23 85:25 86:21 91:5,10 91:13 92:11,17 93:20 97:6 131:22	145:7 attempting 140:20 attention 34:6 69:18 78:17 83:10 authored 52:12 authorities 85:9,10 authority 36:13 authors 16:25 17:10 20:22,25 22:6 44:18 49:6,12,21 50:16,19	80:7 90:21 99:10 balanced 26:4 145:25 balancing 8:10 26:5 26:20 80:16,20 146:14 baleen 64:18 bar 9:3 base 9:25 11:19 53:12 135:23 136:1 based 9:5 11:11 12:3	136:7,13 138:11,14 138:18 139:10 140:8 143:10 146:16 BELL 3:1 belong 75:10 below 22:9 62:10 BEN 2:16 benefit 26:3 51:24 57:16 63:22 67:12	69:20 74:8 108:22 115:15 116:18 123:3,23 127:14 bird 61:10 62:2 BirdLife 99:2 birds 61:18 63:18 64:3 74:10,12 bit 78:15 82:3,4 83:2,5 84:13,13 86:25 102:17 141:5	build 99:3 Buildings 2:18 built 124:21 bullets 18:2 bundle 3:8 13:21,22 14:16 98:5,7 100:17 burden 8:24,25 10:4 36:3,9,14,16,16,21 36:23 37:3,3,5,15 27:17 29:5 0 10 16
139:5,18 141:12 Articles 5:24 95:5 articulate 135:14 articulated 87:20 140:22 ascertain 127:12,13 138:8,15,18 ascribed 90:6 aside 41:8	51:10 55:13 59:11 60:19 61:4 70:12 109:19 114:14 autonomy 2:18 3:14 3:16 4:18 5:6 6:12 6:18,24 7:1,21 25:13 76:13,21 77:2 77:9,17,21 83:14	33:17 40:17,21 41:20,22 45:11 55:22,25 63:12 64:19 68:2,24 70:13 71:21 78:18 95:8 100:20 101:1,5 104:12 105:13 107:9 115:16	67:17 69:2,5,5 70:17,19 benefits 4:8 22:1,4 23:23 27:16 29:8,14 29:15,23,25 30:21 30:25 31:2 32:1 34:5,14,21 51:21 53:5 60:25 66:20	146:22 black 114:25 115:2 black-legged 22:7 62:25 blanche 79:16 BLANCO 3:7 blue 58:21 body 28:9 117:23	37:17 38:5,9,10,16 38:18 39:1,4,11 40:6,9,12,16 41:1 41:11 42:7,7,9,12 42:15 54:6,11 104:9 105:14 107:3 burden-shifting 41:12 BURROWS 2:20 business 151:12
asked 26:10 104:19,21 105:12 125:23 asking 43:18 66:21 104:6 115:23 129:22 138:21 aspect 5:11 78:7 aspects 11:23 36:4 assert 19:7 36:12 assertion 44:16	88:19 availability 60:7 62:18 available 7:9 9:17 10:1,11,22 11:2,12 15:22,23 16:1,4 18:15 19:24 20:23 21:14 23:25 24:3,6 28:17 29:21 33:20 40:15,20 43:12,13	119:18 129:14,18 130:23 131:10,15 132:8 133:19 135:17 136:10,11 150:2 bases 30:12 67:11 basing 7:9 52:22 66:15 71:17 73:16 131:13 136:5	67:15 79:10 80:12 80:15 94:17 96:1,15 96:20 97:16,19,20 98:9 99:11 112:5,6 138:13 144:9 145:21 146:1 benefitted 59:14 BENTLEY 3:2 BENTLEY 3:2	129:5,17,19 130:4 Boileau 2:16 4:10 36:3 42:16,18,19 55:8 63:9 97:22 119:6,14 121:9 123:15 124:4 bona 83:25 borne 64:12 65:7 both 6:2 7:5,9 16:18 25:6 26:4 32:17	C calculation 50:23 calibration 120:12 call 26:17 31:10 82:13 127:24 called 14:24 17:6 48:10 82:18 120:3 121:21
asserts 8:23 54:3 assess 7:25 9:24 23:7 28:19 107:3 138:12 assessed 61:24,25 63:2 137:3 assessing 30:25 73:16 75:25 127:20 130:15 131:9,14 assessment 11:6 15:11	44:5,7,17 47:1,3 52:9,11,21 53:12,24 54:16 55:2 57:5 66:3,12 71:17 73:17 74:2 78:19 95:8 103:13 104:12,22 105:13,22 106:6,17 107:9 110:8 117:1 118:4 124:19	basis 8:21 10:2 24:5 27:17 33:14 40:1 55:14 64:2 73:19 78:8 108:16 110:7 116:25 117:3 119:2 126:23 147:14 150:11 battle 6:1 bear 30:24	BERNHARD 2:6 best 7:9 10:1 11:11 24:6 29:21 40:15,20 52:9,20 53:12,24 54:16,20 55:2 66:3 66:12 71:17 73:17 74:2 78:19 95:8 104:12,21 105:13 105:21 106:6,17	47:20 62:6 67:21 70:20 73:3 74:3 76:10 78:3 85:17 103:5,16 118:4 127:19 128:18 132:22 148:5 bottom 15:14,15,24 17:23 18:1,2 21:6 bottom-up 58:3	calls 116:10 came 21:23 50:21 57:10 117:4 CAMILLE 2:9,16 capabilities 18:11 capable 52:13 54:5 136:7 capelin 62:20 capture 115:22
27:2,6 29:23 63:1 80:13 85:7,8,12,16 86:4 96:14 97:8 104:7 111:23 144:7 145:18 147:17,18 assessments 145:4 146:16 assimilate 10:12 assist 42:16 62:13	126:18,20 127:19 128:24 129:16,17 130:15 131:10,15 131:25 132:20 133:1,20 135:2,17 135:21,24 136:9 avian 74:10 99:5 avian 74:10 99:5 avia 68:15 aware 17:10 18:21	bearing 6:25 43:6 52:7 59:20 become 56:8 73:16 becomes 19:23 77:6 116:9 130:12 138:16,19 befit 6:21 before 1:10 1:9 15:9 19:12 29:6 42:22	107:9 118:18 122:24 124:18 126:18,20 127:18 128:23 129:5,15,17 130:5,15 131:10,15 131:20,24,25 132:19,25 135:2,17 135:21,24 136:8 145:6	boundaries 116:10 breach 4:10,24,25 9:8 36:15 37:20,22,25 38:1,5,15 40:7 80:18 breached 37:11,13 breadth 67:16 break 35:12 45:14,18 101:18,21 109:9	car 122:9,12,13 CARBALLEIRA 2:11 CARDIEL 3:7 careful 69:13 carefully 73:4 100:12 carried 21:8 carte 79:16 case 1:4 3:9 2:5 4:21
71:21 73:2 74:21 81:22 94:18 107:4 110:9,11 120:19,21 126:3 135:13 136:22 151:4 assistance 66:14 85:6 134:16 151:16,17 assistant 3:8,8,10	20:2 21:2 69:12 135:8 away 97:3 B b 88:22 90:2 back 21:4 23:8 25:24 52:16 70:5,6 76:16	48:6 58:13 63:13 70:10 84:19 97:9 109:8 122:8 123:11 127:9 147:19 151:24 beforehand 102:9 begin 53:14,20 105:3 beginning 69:17 70:25	better 8:16,23 54:3 102:16 120:9 134:25 between 1:2 6:1 25:6 26:12,13 48:16 60:6 64:16 65:16 66:23 67:19,24 68:23 88:25 89:2 92:16,19	134:4 breakdown 51:4 breaking 122:10 breath 42:24 43:2 breeding 22:9,12 23:5 58:12,18,21,24 59:14 60:8 61:12 62:2,7,20,24	4:23 9:10 28:13 36:22 37:14 38:13 38:15 39:3,9 40:11 41:18 55:19 61:4 63:17 65:10 70:11 70:13,16 71:4,11 73:8,12 74:10,11 75:20 77:8 78:7
assisted 56:13 151:22 associated 4:7 assume 94:21 108:1 assumes 33:19 assumption 33:24 34:3 55:19,21,22 117:5,7 122:5 assumptions 33:18 100:19,21 119:17	78:23 79:20 80:14 84:13 87:22,24 88:8 97:20 101:19 104:4 107:16 108:12 109:5 115:12 129:20 133:10 138:1 139:24 142:21 146:5 149:16 backdrop 60:14	148:7 begins 13:25 begs 56:5 behalf 4:1,7 1:13 35:24 behind 106:22 139:16 being 44:10 50:2 53:7 54:5,21 55:8 57:16 65:23 70:2 74:1 94:11 101:1 104:20	92:21,23 93:7 97:10 103:7,18 109:17 110:22 111:9,13,21 114:3,16 119:7,10 120:25 123:17,24 126:13 127:4 131:5 143:8 144:17 146:14 beyond 60:1 88:14 140:2	brief 52:19 briefly 10:10 26:7 76:17 88:13 94:2,3 98:11 bring 9:11 49:13 50:6 74:15 75:2 122:17 123:6 bringing 106:16 Britain 1:3,17 Broad 76:13	79:3,6 80:11,24 84:16,17 87:9 88:7 89:12,16 91:18,20 92:9 95:22 96:4,11 97:11,25 102:10 106:16 115:4 133:21 138:4 142:17 143:3 146:12 cases 54:13 89:17
124:21 Atomic 1:2 attack 117:23 attain 128:11 attempt 76:9 91:12	bad 22:22 59:18 Baker 2:19,19,20 balance 4:10 5:13 25:22 26:24 36:7 52:18 79:24 80:2,4	104:21 107:18,22 109:17,18 112:1 113:7,10,18 115:21 117:21 118:12 121:11 126:10	big 136:5 bigger 145:10 binding 2:25 4:2 6:22 biomass 12:2 13:2 21:18 29:19 65:19	broader 58:7 61:21 68:12 74:16 75:3 broadly 84:13 broken 14:7 brought 38:20 124:16	90:23 142:24 cast 131:21 CASTRO-SPOKES 2:25 catch 112:11,15,15,16

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

Duy 5		1 011 0450		1101	study, 50 Junuary 202
112:22 113:15	132:3	96:25 97:5 99:16	compared 22:1,4 46:2	116:4,8,9,11,12,15	consultation 31:11
114:5,8,13,20 123:3	challenging 8:20	127:9	58:25 115:18	116:19 117:2,9,10	85:21
catches 20:16 21:3,15	Chambers 2:16,16,17	climate 73:24 74:2,11	comparing 110:24	117:12,15,17	consulted 150:5
110:20 111:8,15	3:3	close 151:25	111:7 137:21	confident 66:6	consume 46:1
113:8 123:23	change 19:11,22 45:21	closed 58:16,19,22	comparison 54:18	confidential 149:9	consumed 12:7 13:7
catching 2:6	60:14 73:24 74:3,11	60:1 152:1	competing 65:22 72:7	confine 76:8	23:18 124:14
categorically 100:8	102:21 121:3	closely 26:2	compiled 16:25 17:9	confined 10:6	Contact 17:7,8
categories 51:18 67:13	122:18 123:6	closer 142:11	Complainant 1:15	confirmed 1:22 31:3	contained 67:20 73:20
category 51:21	changed 116:19,20	closes 102:8	36:13,16 37:16	confirms 25:4 90:8	77:12 134:25
CATHERINE 2:18	118:12	closes 102.8 closing 102:19	complains 40:17	conform 90:9	contemplate 143:9
2:23	changes 17:20 43:5	closure 42:4 57:19	complete 3:3 20:24	conformity 4:14,22	contemplated 143:11
caught 109:13 110:3	44:8,10 49:14,22	58:24 59:10,14,21	completed 114:17	confused 77:6	contemplated 143.11 contemplation 143:14
114:15 115:5,5	50:5 56:18 120:10	60:7 68:25 69:21,25	completeness 39:14	connection 66:23	contemplation 143.14 contended 9:13
114.15 115.5,5	123:8	108:1,2 138:13	complexities 60:12	67:10 68:23 71:19	contends 43:14
cause 20:2	changing 122:9	closures 41:20,22	compliance 82:23	CONNIE 2:21	content 86:20 106:8
caused 65:11,12	chapter 5:19	coastal 1:18 3:12	88:12 96:23	conscious 24:25	139:16
caused 05.11,12 caution 70:14	characterisation 3:3	cod 14:2 44:21 45:10	compliant 83:8,11	consequence 111:12	contested 128:3
caveated 69:16	143:21	coinciding 61:2	complies 79:17 82:25	111:16 115:13	context 2:13 3:14 5:21
caveated 09.10 caveats 13:12,16	characterise 114:6	colleague 11:22	comply 79:11 81:24	consequential 4:25	6:7 28:9 31:22
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0		-	
49:16 55:12 67:20	CHASE 2:19 check 105:8 125:6	colleagues 150:5	component 14:4,5	conservation 5:15	39:19,21 40:12 53:10 74:2 84:10 22
70:11,14 71:14 CBE 3:2		colloquially 144:18 column 64:21	48:23 130:25 138:19	25:18 60:16 63:6 143:12.17	53:10 74:2 84:19,22 84:25 85:2 86:2 4
CBE 3:2 cease 134:20	checking 7:3 chicks 46:6	column 64:21 column-feeders 63:8	components 10:20		84:25 85:3 86:3,4
			-	consider 6:2 11:10	90:11 92:12 93:3,6
Cefas 17:9	chick-rearing 41:20	63:14	44:22 119:21	25:11 28:11,16	93:12 139:24
certain 6:20 11:23	42:3 57:4 67:14	column-feeding 61:18	122:11 123:7	65:15 66:21 81:13	144:24
28:23 30:22 38:23	choices 131:19 132:2	combined 51:16	comport 143:14	83:18,20 88:4 89:3	contextual 27:17
41:9 46:6,21 67:15	chose 23:22 50:22	Combining 51:18	comports 143:17	97:1 99:19 105:20	continue 54:12 72:25
78:1 79:2 121:16	circumstances 10:6	come 10:22 25:24	comprehensive 23:12	considerably 151:23	75:18 126:12 144:2
125:21 131:20	25:15 28:10 37:21	44:12 45:13 46:15	comprised 85:20	consideration 23:5	continued 59:10
133:11 142:9	38:4,24 39:2,13	51:5 78:23 80:14	COMPSTON 2:22	80:13 83:11 91:9,17	contradicted 13:18
certainly 40:19 126:8	67:3 68:22 89:18	83:12 86:16 89:19	conceded 9:10	96:12 99:17,18	contradiction 129:24
147:13,21 148:1	150:3	90:19 92:1 94:3	conceivable 91:20	considerations 71:5	contrary 4:12 6:4 37:7
CESSFORD 3:1	citation 72:22	104:4 105:24	concept 18:4 27:7	93:11	contrasted 31:21
cetera 79:16 84:12	cited 57:2,13,24	111:16,20 129:20	conception 8:8	considered 5:11 24:6	contribute 79:9
91:8	Citing 58:4	133:10 137:5 138:1	concepts 93:16	24:21 28:12 29:21	contribution 27:14
chain 58:1	CLA 73:25	146:5	conceptual 85:5	34:6 57:12 61:6	67:4
Chair 1:14 5:7 11:24	claim 8:18 9:8,11,21	comes 113:8,11	conceptually 81:6	67:5 81:20 86:13	contributions 60:13
29:2 104:2 105:19	18:18 20:13 28:14	115:12 123:12	86:12	95:19 96:8 102:16	control 58:20 59:3
110:14 111:3 125:1	28:16 29:10 36:7,8	133:14 142:11	concern 22:6 81:23	127:18 129:11,15	109:22,23 114:11
125:22 127:7 133:9	36:24 37:16 38:16	146:9	142:8	146:19	controlled 58:3
137:25 139:14	39:4,6 40:11,12,23	coming 79:20 83:16	concerned 21:25	considering 94:15	controversies 56:8
145:6 150:22,25	40:24,25 52:19	88:20 90:13 114:17	51:15 66:10 143:13	96:24 100:6	105:23 106:14
Chairperson 1:3	74:20 75:18 76:4,6	117:14	concerning 8:17 24:17	considers 7:14 26:25	controversy 107:7
24:11 28:25 35:2,21	78:22 104:11,14,20	commence 1:4	42:17 104:9	32:19 40:4 66:18	Convention 92:11
35:25 42:18 48:5	105:17 107:8	commensurate 3:24	concerns 21:17 91:23	94:25	COOKE 2:17
71:24 72:23 73:1	125:17,18 126:25	27:16	97:16	consistency 7:16 8:20	cooperation 1:1 5:9
74:23 75:7,15,17	126:25 127:2,5	comment 96:9 98:11	concession 5:23 10:5	9:24	5:11 77:4,13,15
101:10,14,23,25	129:21	99:4 125:16	30:21 126:8	consistent 8:1 73:22	78:2,16 80:5,10
104:25 105:2	claimant 40:6	comments 79:20	conclude 100:8	102:8	87:3 88:15 92:5,14
107:10,11 109:3	claimed 105:12	commercial 46:25	concluded 24:22	consistently 7:21	copy 85:11
110:11 111:11	claims 6:14 8:5 24:14	Commission 2:4,5,6,7	99:24 152:3	95:12	core 3:8 13:20,22
112:8 113:20,22	36:14 37:17 38:21	2:8,9,9,10,10,11,12	concludes 82:21	consists 89:5	14:16 60:22 78:20
116:2,21,22 117:25	43:1 148:14	61:10	151:12	constituent 89:14	84:25 85:16,24 98:5
118:1,20,23 119:4	clarification 75:15	Commission's 50:18	conclusion 22:19 33:3	142:22	118:10 122:18
119:14 123:10	119:5 121:10	commitments 3:4	62:15 65:18 68:6	constitute 128:23	correct 11:5 29:7,12
124:25 125:10	125:21 126:16	Committee 101:3	89:19 144:16	129:6,10 130:4	36:25 37:7 39:21
126:15 132:21	138:21	common 53:9 81:4	147:15 149:6	constitutes 129:5	63:7 81:1 105:4
134:11,13 136:19	clarify 125:18	90:16,20 110:19	conclusions 56:15	132:19	107:25 108:10
137:10,18 138:20	clarity 107:20	commonsense 65:18	96:15 101:1 106:7	constrained 77:3	109:5,7,9 111:2,14
140:12 141:4,7,22	CLAUDE 2:19	communities 62:3	144:8,14	78:11 95:5	111:19 113:19
143:24 145:15	clear 5:12 45:1 69:10	Community 1:2	concrete 89:8	constraint 83:14,20	114:1 135:12
148:4 149:18 150:7	69:11 70:9 78:4	comparable 49:14	conditions 4:17 17:20	constraints 78:15	137:16,18
150:14 151:10	86:3 88:8 89:4	comparative 54:21	59:2,4 60:24	79:14 129:11	corrected 149:14
Chairperson's 151:6	96:11 103:3 117:20	comparatively 64:25	conduct 38:3 66:17	constructed 121:25	correction 149:6,23
challenge 68:14,17,20	123:11	126:6	82:6 86:5,9 129:9	construction 8:24	150:2
99:8 126:20,22	clearly 6:9 41:18 76:1	comparator 71:8	conducted 129:9	construed 6:11 126:8	corrections 149:2,11
127:6 128:23	77:21 78:19 84:23	comparators 71:10	confidence 55:23	construing 27:17	149:13
129:25 130:7,9	90:24 91:15 92:6	compare 120:5	114:23 115:8,24	consult 149:4	costs 26:3 27:15 29:11
	1	-		1	1

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

29:13 32:3 34:4,14	
29:15 52:5 54:4,14	
34:21 80:12,15	
94:16 96:1,14,20	
97:16,19 99:11,21	
144:10	
COTA 2:9	
counsel 3:6,7,7,8,8	
1:25 2:7 6:8 8:11	
9:9,13 10:23,25	
11:9 13:8 16:12	
18:24 20:17 21:20	
24:15 26:10 30:2,20	
32:5 34:20 35:22	
72:15 137:7 141:14 148:5 151:20	
12.15 151.1 141.14	
148:5 151:20	
counter-reply 1:10	
counter-reply 1.10	
102:1	
countries 21:9	
counts 7:5	
	L
couple 121:20 143:25	1
144:2	L
	L
coupled 24:2	L
20110	L
course 25:7 31:8	L
36:10,25 39:14	L
10 15 50 0 51 0	L
42:15 50:9 51:9	L
57:11,16 59:20	L
	1
62:14 69:12 71:22	
74:8,20 87:3 88:6	
103:20,23,23 135:6	
137:5 144:25	
149:25 151:3,16	
court 1:5 2:16,16 3:5	
6:10 150:15	
courts 38:24	
covered 15:1 87:24,25	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
covers 47:14,16	
co-Agent 24:10 28:23	
CO-Agent 24.10 20.25	
8	
31:23	
31:23 CR 1:24	
31:23 CR 1:24	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21	
31:23 CR 1:24	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticisem 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticisem 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 create 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:99 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 crosse 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticism 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticism 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 create 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticism 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1 C-41 22:14,17 61:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticism 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1 C-41 22:14,17 61:9 C-43 31:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 create 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 41:25 69:6 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1 C-41 22:14,17 61:9 C-43 31:9 C-44 96:14	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 created 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticised 130:2 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1 C-41 22:14,17 61:9 C-43 31:9	
31:23 CR 1:24 CRAMP 2:21 create 117:17 create 59:5 114:23 creates 117:18 149:25 creating 54:7 124:5 creating 54:7 124:5 creation 73:9 credibly 136:16 critical 78:7 121:16 criticise 42:25 69:6 criticise 41:25 69:6 criticism 8:14 16:14 52:5 66:7 criticisms 10:2 36:4 44:13 56:3 65:25 71:14 117:21 cross 135:19,22 crossed 135:20 crucial 53:9,9 55:10 current 23:13 115:8 currently 110:7 cursorily 83:9 customary 93:23 C-19 64:5 C-40 57:1 C-41 22:14,17 61:9 C-43 31:9 C-44 96:14	

D dampening 59:18 60.24danger 30:17 81:9 DANIELA 2:5 Danish 51:5 data 10:18 12:15 14:6 14:8.9 16:23.25 17:24 18:3,20 19:11 19:23,25 20:23 44:5 44:6,7,9 46:3 49:3 49:20 50:3,17,18 51:17,18 52:6 54:24 55:17 56:19 59:7,23 64:12,14 65:7 120:24 121:11,12 121:13,14 122:14 122:16 123:22,24 124:2,15 125:3,7 database 15:6,16 17:9 46:14,14,18 dataset 14:24 15:2,10 46:13,18 123:13,14 datasets 14:21 15:22 16:1,4 118:5 date 48:9 50:7 102:21 149.12David 1:12 151:15 Dawes 2:4 4:4,6 11:24 29:1,2 35:2 110:14 111:11,18 113:3,17 116:2,3 118:18 125:1 127:7 128:20 129:1,6 130:11 132:6 133:9 137:11 137:17,25 day 1:9 2:7,8 3:1,2 8:5 8:12 9:13 10:14 11:4 26:15 32:6 35:7,11,14 de 96:13 144:7 deadline 150:24 deadlines 148:23 149.20deal 36:3.6.7 52:20.21 56:10 76:14 dealing 145:6 149:10 dealt 97:17 debate 20:9 43:17 70:2 73:3 107:20.21 109:13.17.25 decide 6:18 94:24 141:12,13,17 decided 94:11 132:10 decides 11:2 deciding 4:19 77:2 141:16 147:12 decision 32:17 84:2,3 85:25 86:8,16 91:1 95.1 decisions 114:9 decision-maker 7:4 25:10 81:12,18 82:20 86:16 95:4 131.12 132.9 135:23 147:10.11 147:23 decision-makers

97:25 decision-making 7:24 32:13 34:8 63:25 83:15 86:4,15,23 90:11 95:21 139:4 139:20,22 140:1,25 141:1 decline 59:2,10 61:12 declines 59:16 decreasing 65:18 defence 36:24 37:20 37:25 38:8,11,14 40:22 50:14 deferential 139:2 deficiencies 129:2 deficiency 130:8 defined 13:12 26:3 48:12 52:10 74:14 definition 52:9 72:4 degree 55:5 67:3 69:5 69:5 116:12 122:5,6 132:2 Delegation 2:13 delegations 148:6 deliberate 87:2 deliberately 140:5 143:6 delighted 151:8 demanding 27:18 demersal 14:2 demography 60:11 demonstrate 60:6 65:24 103:15 145:11,12 demonstrated 42:2 demonstration 146:3 146.8denial 38:1 40:23 denied 46:19 Denmark 21:9 51:11 departing 116:24 departures 53:19.21 dependent 128:10,14 depending 131:6,7 depleted 30:14 128:12 128:16 depletion 30:13 68:3 68:15 128:8,9,13 depletions 68:12 deployed 47:4 deprive 12:15 18:20 49:4 describing 2:24 design 5:4 designed 138:2 despite 23:24 detail 17:7,8 103:10 146:6 detailed 99:16 112:13 112:25 113:4 determination 23:10 determine 2:17 104:21 105:21 109:12 determined 27:25 69:14 detrimental 146:1 develop 13:17 16:18

43:23 44:3 118:15 developed 48:6 54:22 139.10 deviation 59:23 DG 2:9,9,10,10,11,11 diagonal 115:2 dictate 10:4 diet 60:8 64:22,24 121:21,24 dietary 30:6 diets 46:1 difference 55:12,16 56:4 66:2 84:1,3,6,8 89:2 97:24 98:1 105:10 119:7 121:15 137:1,4 140:7,10 151:1,3 different 8:7 21:19 39:19,24 44:22 45:11,14 47:24 60:13 64:16 76:15 90:15 93:2 119:20 120:6 122:11 123:7 125:13 131:21 137:6 141:14 144:6 147:24 148:10 differential 111:13 differentiation 127:4 difficult 54:13 106:9 151:23 difficulties 39:1 60:12 difficulty 41:17 146:25 digging 87:6 diluted 115:17 dilution 115:25 diminish 91:12 134:22 direct 6:24 directed 126:22 directive 85:11,23 86:1 disaggregate 63:7 disaggregated 61:17 disaggregating 52:13 disagree 10:24 52:1 143:20 disagreement 77:7 91:2 96:21 111:9 126:13 disagrees 7:5 8:6 10:9 discernible 36:12 discharge 88:5 discharged 38:19 discharging 38:5 39:1 disclose 30:19 34:13 34:17 95:25 96:19 disclosed 34:21 discount 59:13 discretion 7:2 79:16 82:13,14,17 83:7 87:25 90:23 discrimination 91:23 discuss 76:16 discussed 54:13 discussing 100:4 discussion 82:8.15 107:13 disposal 10:13 42:15

74:20 110:9 dispositive 8:18 9:21 disproportionate 76:1 disprove 41:25 dispute 1:24 2:13 5:12 6:14 8:12 23:10,15 28:9 76:2 91:3 97:10 110:22 136:23 disregard 3:4 25:21 79:23 82:14 distinct 13:2 distinction 88:24 89:21 119:10 123:12 143:7 distinguish 123:24 distinguishes 64:16 distributed 16:15 49:10 distribution 16:24 17:21 47:20 48:15 48:19,24 137:14 distributions 17:25 divergence 25:5 81:6 divided 44:21 dividing 81:9 diving 22:1,4,10 51:25 document 13:20 14:19 15:5,9 17:3 19:14 19:16,18 22:13,16 22:20 31:9,11,12 44:25 147:22 documentation 147:13 documents 14:14,15 16:22 31:17 96:11 96:12 98:13 106:25 145:3 doing 19:8 39:17 44:1 95:4 120:2 125:12 142:11,14 domestic 6:6 92:4,20 92:24 93:2,16,20 domino 45:21 done 14:10 48:11 55:7 55:15 63:20,20 70:3 82:8 85:9 97:2 106:21 108:25 109:17 113:1 120:2 124:17 130:5,8,12 132:7 144:13 145:14 146:10,12 dotted 115:9 doubt 54:7 73:3 106:10 DOWELL 2:25 down 2:20,25 6:15,22 14:7 15:12 28:2 37:3 45:14,18 134:5 downwards 58:21 DR 1:11 2:6,8,12,20 3:1,2,6,8 150:22 drafting 102:14 draw 69:18 78:17 89:21 drawing 88:24 123:13 drawn 85:6 143:5 drivers 60:13 121:17

122:3 driving 121:23 DRUMMOND 2:18 **DTU** 2:12 due 62:14 102:22 150:15,18 during 30:2 31:8,23 58:14,25 62:24 76:12 136:15 149:9 duty 86:5 dwell 78:14 dynamics 18:12 48:16 Е e 91:22 each 3:17,20 6:10,13 25:16 33:23 36:23 40:11 42:19 76:22 83.2 90.15 21 106.8 134:1,3 141:16 earlier 87:9 126:2 139:21 140:19,25 ease 55:5 easily 46:4 easy 55:6,9 120:14 eat 46:5,7 124:12 echo 151:6 Ecological 101:3 economic 1:19 4:7 5:13,20 32:20 33:16 79:9 Ecopath 17:6,13 47:25 Ecosim 17:6,13 18:8 18:11 47:25 127:12 Ecospace 17:7,14,15 17:19,24 18:2,4,8 18.11 47.23 48.10 48:14,18,23 118:6 ecosystem 2:3 9:16 23:14,20,23 36:6 46:9 47:7 48:3 53:3 53:8 58:8 60:25 68:21 70:1,1,3 74:4 91:8,8,21 98:22 107:17,21 109:10 109:12.16.20 110:1 110:6 115:18 123:8 132:24 133:15 137:16,23 138:13 ecosystem-model 110:7 edge 84:23 EDOARDO 3:12 EEZ 51:6 effect 45:21 59:5,18 69:20,24 108:2 114:18 115:6,17 117:15 139:19 effectively 9:1 82:14 87:9 88:15 effects 36:6 47:8 57:18 64:3 74:11 112:7 efficient 35:3 effort 123:9 efforts 63:6 either 2:4 32:24 39:15 56:14 61:21 70:10

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

, -					
87:18 93:5 128:13	66:2,10 67:22 69:23	et 79:16 84:12 91:8	119:19 120:2	explains 15:5,11 18:4	fall 9:1 147:9
128:14 131:23	70:24 114:14,19	EU's 16:14 28:16 32:8	121:23,25 123:16	18:7 30:12 86:1	fallback 11:14
135:10	116:25 122:21	32:21 33:17 36:11	-	explicit 5:23	falls 80:1
			123:18,21 124:1,9		
elaborate 119:14	126:22 127:1,3,5,20	36:21 38:16 40:23	124:14 130:25	explicitly 24:21 72:19	familiar 106:25
element 11:1 92:22	127:25 129:4 130:4	41:6 50:12 55:19	138:7	132:7	far 7:17 66:8 71:6
133:16,17 134:1,4	131:3 132:10	57:7 61:13 63:17	examples 14:22 56:23	explore 47:8	80:10 84:6 89:11,23
elements 23:19,21,25	133:12 137:12,20	65:13 70:16 71:4,11	65:20 71:11	export 39:17	105:21 106:11
24:2 30:24 34:7,12	137:22 138:10,12	78:7 79:20 80:24	exceed 65:1	exposed 132:3	116:24 143:7
34:13,16,17 95:20	146:25 147:1,3,6	81:2,10,23 82:24	excellent 150:15,16	express 151:13	fared 23:1
95:24,25 96:4,7,19	enjoys 7:2	88:11 95:16,22	except 67:13 120:25	expression 114:4	fast 55:9
96:19 105:25 108:3	enough 25:10 41:25	97:15,15 110:23	exception 37:20,23,24	expressly 43:9 97:24	favour 55:19 90:18
118:11 131:4	42:3 56:1 70:19	111:13 112:14	exceptions 40:1	extend 10:20 35:14	features 131:20
133:11,13,16,18,23	72:8 81:12 106:11	115:4 116:5 117:5	exchange 114:2	54:25	February 102:22,22
133:24 134:6,7,8	136:3,5	117:22 118:3	excited 55:18	extended 22:20	102:24 148:18,19
ellipses 140:21	enquiry 136:10	127:16 128:6,22	exclusive 1:19	extended 22.20 extends 18:8,11 59:25	148:21 149:16
-	ensemble 47:1				
eloquently 151:22		129:13,21 130:11	exclusively 147:9	extension 17:14	150:19,20,21 151:9
elsewhere 93:4	ensure 86:21	132:14 133:22	excused 38:3	extensive 23:12 43:5	151:10
else's 56:2 71:15	ensuring 79:7 139:17	134:5	exercise 1:7 3:16 4:18	extent 2:17 23:3 25:7	fed 113:7,16,18,19
emergency 31:4 99:16	enter 73:2	EVA 2:11	5:5,21 9:12 20:24	47:2 66:18,19 77:9	114:4,7 123:24
eminent 54:15	entering 3:6	evaluate 112:7 127:13	41:12 42:21 71:2	78:1 80:9 81:18	124:10
EMMA 3:3	enters 77:6	127:21 138:3,8,11	77:2 85:21 89:22,25	100:7 115:21	feed 124:11 125:3
emphasis 88:18	entire 45:19 47:7,16	evaluates 127:18	94:18 97:17,18	127:16 128:7,12	feeders 22:10 23:1
emphasise 74:6	70:3 107:21,22,24	evaluating 106:5	136:6 144:13	129:16 131:20	62:5,6
emphasised 41:21	108:7,23 111:4	evaluation 17:19	145:13 146:23	134:23 135:6 138:5	feeding 57:6 111:25
99:3	114:20 130:6	19:11	exercised 3:12	134:23 133:0 138:3	fellow 151:14
empirical 123:2	entirely 39:16 49:9	even 6:19 9:4 20:22	exercises 78:10	147:16	felt 148:11
•	e e				
empowered 7:23,25	90:19,20 100:12	27:18 44:7 46:3	exercising 91:1	extract 108:3	FERNANDEZ 2:11
empty 25:13 81:15	150:22	55:18,21 56:3,17	exhibit 13:21 14:20	extracts 87:8	few 69:15 136:21
82:16 83:7 86:15	entirety 127:14	59:2,4,16 64:2	15:3,4,7 17:3,5,16	extreme 9:10 54:12	fide 83:25
enable 19:1 49:8	entitled 39:10 53:1,5	69:21 72:11,12	18:3 19:15 22:14,17		fifth 12:24 15:13
50:11 122:13	99:13	73:11,12 92:20	31:9 45:5 48:7,9,13	F	51:14 93:3
enables 122:16	enumeration 147:25	117:7 129:16	48:22 132:11	Fabri 1:12 3:10 34:9	figure 12:20 50:15
encounter 38:25	environment 1:21	event 30:12 99:11	exhibits 14:17 103:14	120:21 146:22	58:10,11 59:21
end 27:11 35:7,11,13	25:19 86:2,17	101:6	exist 46:20 47:22	148:3 151:15	64:14 110:18 111:1
52:23 55:10 67:4	environmental 1:15	every 19:21 25:16	130:18		111:7,14,22,24
70:16 71:1 76:19	17:20 60:14,24	117:5 121:3 134:1,4	existed 48:25	facie 4:21 10:3 36:14	113:18,19 116:14
79:18 87:22 88:20	73:19 76:23 85:6,7	everything 67:20	existence 26:23 28:3	36:16,20 37:4 38:9	figures 112:23 113:15
				38:19 54:6	0
95:17 102:15 107:6	85:8,13,13,16,19,20	117:17 119:25	48:6,14	fact 23:24 39:2,4,11	115:24 116:18,19
115:8 116:12,13	86:4,8,14	evidence 30:11 31:10	existing 10:17,20	40:8,9 42:12 43:4	file 16:23
136:9	environmentally 79:8	39:5,16 43:21,25	12:15 14:10 15:17	44:8,21 45:6 47:3	filed 61:3
endeavour 126:12	envisage 102:12 146:3	60:9 63:12 69:2,3	15:22 16:2 44:10	51:15,23 52:12	final 16:14 21:16
134:15 136:22	equally 40:16	72:7 97:21 98:18	54:23 59:21 70:25	54:25 55:8,9 56:13	46:23 88:11 102:25
endeavoured 126:3	equals 93:13	101:1,6 104:8,14,20	122:13 123:13	68:14 80:19 113:14	116:3 143:25
127:9 128:1	equivalent 39:24	105:15,17 106:4,13	exists 14:9 122:15	118:14 121:4 126:6	148:22 149:1,15
ends 26:12,14 38:17	66:11	107:4 118:25 119:3	130:19 137:18	130:18,19 149:13	finally 34:4 79:11
142:9	erase 72:4	119:18 127:17	expanded 27:1		99:21 151:13
endure 74:9	error 80:1	128:17 131:2	expect 41:24 89:18,24	factor 29:22 146:9,18	find 31:5 50:10 107:12
Energy 1:2	errors 10:7 126:21	145:25 146:11	106:16 146:17	146:19	findings 60:8
engage 72:13 73:13	133:2,3 134:10	147:9,10,15 148:2	147:13,22	factors 15:18 83:18	finds 80:7 85:1 93:5
100:9 143:1	,		· ·	86:22 89:14 90:12	
	escaped 34:5	evident 9:4	expected 87:20	94:15 96:12 139:22	fine 113:2 118:17
engaged 107:14	especially 59:1 69:11	evidential 28:23 69:9	expense 5:25	141:1 142:22	143:7
engagement 85:4	essence 125:4	104:10	experienced 70:7	143:21 144:15	finished 109:18
Engelhard 64:8	essentially 26:1 90:22	evidentiary 104:15	108:13	145:13 146:21	first 3:9 6:14 8:12
103:10	120:14 121:13,15	evidently 57:14	experiment 70:23	147:15,24	12:4 14:19 17:7
engine 121:18 122:8	121:17 122:14	EwE 17:6 45:2,7 47:5	expert 46:10 106:20	facts 29:5 36:24 41:18	29:6,17 30:18 31:11
English 9:18 13:18	Essex 2:16,16	47:6,14,25 48:5,10	106:20 119:18	53:18 104:14	31:16 32:5 33:12
14:4,12 17:1,11	establish 36:14 37:24	64:19 107:17,23	122:6,6 123:4,5	factual 30:19 33:14	36:2 37:19 38:6,22
19:2 20:22 21:1,4	38:7,21 40:8,16	109:1 122:20	expertise 13:17	109:1 132:6 137:5	39:9 42:24 44:15
23:11 36:5 40:13	47:18 54:14 55:4	132:23	experts 120:17,18		45:23 52:20 53:23
42:22 43:3,24 44:18	72:9 118:10	EWEN 3:1	121:25 122:23	factually 101:7 136:1	55:1 57:1,19 61:22
-				fail 127:2	
44:20 47:4 48:17	established 4:20 37:22	exactly 94:22 147:5	explain 12:4,8 30:3	failed 63:1	65:22 75:22 77:16
49:6,12,16,22 50:1	53:11 66:22 67:18	examine 7:15 108:1	65:22 121:2 128:1	failing 43:3 80:17	78:18 81:3 82:16
50:17,20,24 51:10	67:23 68:22 116:16	example 15:21 33:19	141:5 146:19	failures 24:2	83:7 84:20 92:11
51:17 52:2,3,12	117:7,13 133:2	39:3 46:5 47:13	explained 6:9 17:15	fair 143:19	96:3 98:16 102:15
55:13,23,24 56:16	establishing 37:16,17	61:7 62:19 64:4,5	23:16 29:18 30:10	fairly 61:20	103:2,19,25 108:9
57:11,12 60:18,19	38:5,16 40:7 42:9	64:17 68:12 89:9	34:10,16 87:14 92:7	faith 37:10 78:22	109:3 110:15
60:22 61:5,16 63:8	42:12	91:23 96:13 108:4	94:8	82:18 83:5,16 87:25	112:17 126:18
	establishment 117:10	108:22 117:20	explaining 25:1	95:9	128:15 129:14
63:11 64:15,19 66:1					
63:11 64:15,19 66:1	estublishment 117.10	100122 117120		95.9	

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

130:17 135:19,20	42:3 59:25	14:6 45:6,8,11,16	99:4 118:21,22,23	harder 74:8	hours 1:5,8,9
139:12 143:5 144:3	foremost 78:18	45:18 47:13,15 62:1	138:22 139:22	harmful 91:7	human 93:6,8
Firstly 82:13	forensic 98:14	62:9,13 124:6,7,21	141:8 142:21	having 48:1,2 76:16	humans 65:12
e e				5	
fish 2:6,16,20 3:21 4:7	foreseen 31:24	fundamental 68:16,17	gold-standard 67:22	77:20 87:4 89:10	hurdle 135:24
6:23 14:2 25:16	form 2:3 25:14 43:20	93:17 114:1 118:11	good 1:3 35:21 37:10	91:22 106:3 114:17	hypothetical 33:15,17
30:1,20 32:22 33:22	53:8 54:17 69:7	fundamentally 44:11	53:20 56:23 78:22	115:13 140:14,15	63:21 70:22 91:19
45:10 46:14,21,25	81:16 104:7 106:20	84:9 88:18 143:20	82:18 83:5,16 87:25	142:19,21	HÉLÈNE 1:12
47:14 53:6 62:18	146:18	further 11:22 18:5,5	95:9	hav[ing 88:8,25 89:2	Hélène 151:15
64:11 65:1,5,11,16	formally 151:19	24:21 34:11,23 35:1	govern 140:5	139:2 140:3,4,8,9	
65:19 68:4,4 69:1,8	formed 34:8 95:20	35:13 56:17 66:13	governing 37:1	Hazen 57:24	I
74:12 77:12,25	forming 129:15	66:21 69:15 71:10	Government 2:17,18	head 137:17	ICES 18:22,23 19:4,4
109:13 110:3	formulation 81:17	71:21 73:5 95:23	2:20,21,21,22,22,23	heading 2:21 5:23	19:12 20:20 40:14
114:16 117:6	87:13	96:18 110:9 119:15	2:23,24,24,25,25	7:17 8:1 15:13	43:2 44:24 48:20
fisheries 4:13 5:10,18	forward 8:15 34:25	120:18,19 122:14	3:1,1,2,2,3 98:3	22:19 74:15 75:2	49:1,19 50:17,21
6:19 60:10,16 77:3	87:17 107:5 120:11	126:10 137:8	governs 140:4	85:25 93:25	· · · ·
78:6 101:3 147:12	found 67:9 87:17	future 119:23 122:16	GRAHAM 2:10	headings 76:15 82:11	64:6 120:16 121:13
fishers 100:5	139:16 144:12	122:18	grant 3:17,20 19:12	96:14 97:16	122:22,25 124:20
	147:5	122.18	0		ICES's 43:7
fishery 21:8 58:13,15			granted 2:11,12,14	health 58:2,8	idea 100:20 129:3
58:16,24,25 59:11	foundational 49:23	G	grants 18:22 78:1	healthy 62:3	143:17
59:14 60:7	50:8 121:18 122:18	GALLOUZE 2:9	graph 114:24 115:1	hear 127:8	ideally 124:19
fishing 3:25 4:4 7:16	four 61:24 65:21	gannet 65:1	grapple 94:9	heard 12:20 17:13	ideas 84:25
9:25 11:11 12:21,23	78:17 82:9,11 87:24	GATT 27:19 39:25	grappled 7:4 28:20	22:8 36:11 50:13,16	identification 146:18
17:21 18:12 20:6	141:25 142:1	GAUCI 2:5	94:7	54:11 55:8 64:7	identified 9:15 24:5
24:5 28:19 32:9,24	fourth 12:17 20:4	gave 141:25	grateful 125:22	72:24 97:21	34:13 43:15 49:16
32:25 34:1 47:9	50:12 66:8 79:11	general 18:7 39:25	gratitude 151:6	hearing 34:24 35:14	52:11 55:14,23
55:20 56:20 59:5	92:24	52:25 53:16 146:15	grazing 62:6	37:5 73:6 76:12	66:20 70:12,14 86:7
65:12,18 68:18 69:3	fourthly 52:22 82:23	147:7	great 1:3,17 67:13	102:8,20 107:14	95:24 96:4 111:4
69:25 79:7 91:7	framework 27:1	generality 41:24	134:19	128:2 136:16 149:7	117:2,14,16 132:23
108:5,5,6 109:23	frameworks 39:23		greater 7:18 22:24	149:9 151:13 152:1	
114:19 115:3,16,19	FRANCO 2:9	generally 22:22 33:13	23:1 30:8 62:5	152:3	133:4,25 137:8
123:3,8	Frederiksen 58:4	57:10 59:3,17 64:18	63:13,22 65:11	heavily 121:19 122:4	146:9 150:12
fit 145:9	free 43:23 76:22	68:8 96:6 127:23	68:19 91:21	held 80:17	identify 9:22 23:17
		132:12	grey 64:23		34:7 43:11 95:20
five 2:21 7:17 8:1	Friday 151:2	generated 12:2 29:19	8	help 63:17 84:12	104:16
11:25 18:2 92:10	from 4:15 8:20 9:2,9	129:14 132:8	grossly 117:22	108:25 109:1 119:8	identifying 126:3
101:16	13:2 15:13,24 18:7	gentlemen 1:3 35:21	ground 53:9 81:5	142:10	ignore 140:3 142:16
flaw 134:18,25 135:1	21:19 24:14 26:17	101:23	90:16,20 110:19	helpful 61:2 84:18	illustrate 8:7
135:15 136:4,13	26:21 32:15 33:22	Georgina 1:23	group 13:25 14:1,2	86:11 138:20 141:4	immediately 118:17
137:18,20,22,23	43:9,21,22,23 45:9	gets 53:17 96:9	18:23 19:5 29:6,9	145:17,18 148:3	immense 16:20
flaws 9:4,23 12:1	48:5 50:21 51:5	GIBB 3:2	29:11 45:16,18	helpfully 150:10	IMOGEN 3:1
104:16 132:23	52.4 10 21 55.2 9	give 4:9,25 33:19 36:1	58:20 59:3 120:16	hence 4:9,13	impact 56:19 60:11
10 1110 102120	53:4,19,21 55:2,8				
137:3,12	56:24 57:19 58:10		120:17 124:4,6,7,20	her 105:6	-
		45:2 85:22 89:8	120:17 124:4,6,7,20 124:21	her 105:6 herring 62:19	63:13,24 70:5,7
137:3,12 fleets 18:12	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4	124:21	herring 62:19	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7		63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u>	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u>	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighted 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlight 60:12 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighted 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 following 37:12 50:9 67:1	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guilemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlight 60:12 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcasti 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 following 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21 implied 44:2
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusig 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairent 2:19 4:16 77:10 impach 2:2 implied 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22 handwritten 105:8,9	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairent 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 impling 11:1
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 92:2 97:20	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 $\boxed{ H } \\ habitat 58:1 \\ Hague 1:6 \\ half 1:9 \\ halve 124:9 \\ hand 5:14 43:14,16 \\ 47:15 50:5 52:16 \\ 111:22 \\ hands 150:22 \\ handwritten 105:8,9 \\ happened 37:5 59:7 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlight 60:12 highlight 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implying 11:1 import 93:17
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7 61:14	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18 fully 135:14 140:22	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 92:2 97:20 98:14 99:7,10 115:3	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 $\boxed{ H } \\ habitat 58:1 \\ Hague 1:6 \\ half 1:9 \\ halve 124:9 \\ hand 5:14 43:14,16 \\ 47:15 50:5 52:16 \\ 111:22 \\ hands 150:22 \\ handwritten 105:8,9 \\ happened 37:5 59:7 \\ 120:4 143:2 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlight 60:12 highlight 62:4 highlighting 61:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindcast 120:4 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3 HON 1:12	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implying 11:1 import 93:17 importance 74:6
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7 61:14 forage 30:15 58:19,22	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18 fully 135:14 140:22 fulmar 62:25	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 92:2 97:20 98:14 99:7,10 115:3 141:20 144:22	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guilemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22 handwritten 105:8,9 happened 37:5 59:7 120:4 143:2 happens 42:2	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlight 60:12 highlighting 61:23 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindcast 120:4 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3 HON 1:12 honourable 11:24	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implied 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implient 93:17 importance 74:6 98:19,21
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7 61:14 forage 30:15 58:19,22 60:10 62:18 64:11	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18 fully 135:14 140:22 fulmar 62:25 function 6:14 7:3	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 99:7,10 115:3 141:20 144:22 148:25	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22 handwritten 105:8,9 happened 37:5 59:7 120:4 143:2 happy 71:22	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 hindeasting 120:3 hindeasting 120:3 hindeasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3 HON 1:12 honourable 11:24 151:14	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implied 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implying 11:1 import 93:17 importance 74:6 98:19,21 important 1:15 14:6
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7 61:14 forage 30:15 58:19,22 60:10 62:18 64:11 65:5,16,19 68:5	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18 fully 135:14 140:22 function 6:14 7:3 49:23 50:8	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 92:2 97:20 98:14 99:7,10 115:3 141:20 144:22 148:25 going 83:3 84:11	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guilemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22 handwritten 105:8,9 happened 37:5 59:7 120:4 143:2 happens 42:2 happon 42:2 hapbour 64:23	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 high-level 117:23 hindcasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3 HON 1:12 honourable 11:24 151:14 hope 103:1	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implicit 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implying 11:1 import 43:17 importance 74:6 98:19,21 important 1:15 14:6 15:20 16:4 23:19
137:3,12 fleets 18:12 floor 1:12 11:22 24:10 28:22 35:23 42:18 75:16 101:11 133:7 136:20 flu 99:5 focus 69:14 126:12 focused 55:22 focusing 41:10 follow 39:22 53:4 73:6 112:12 146:22 followed 98:17 following 94:10 96:16 137:11 follows 37:12 50:9 67:1 follow-up 128:21 138:23 140:12 141:23 food 47:14,16 58:1 98:22 footnote 46:23,24 57:7 61:14 forage 30:15 58:19,22 60:10 62:18 64:11	56:24 57:19 58:10 59:3,21,22 60:2,9 64:6 67:11 68:10 69:2,16,22 72:4,18 82:8 85:6 87:9 88:21 97:3,21 98:2 101:2,24 102:12,22 102:23 108:3 109:1 109:8,20 111:16,20 112:2 114:4 116:24 117:4 121:11,12 122:12 125:11 126:2 128:16 130:11 137:23 139:24 147:4 148:22 149:16,18 frustrating 113:24 FTB 2:17 3:3 fulfilling 73:21 full 3:21 30:19 32:21 42:4 68:23,25 108:2 138:13 147:5 FULLER 2:18 fully 135:14 140:22 fulmar 62:25 function 6:14 7:3	45:2 85:22 89:8 90:21 91:20 98:4 123:21 134:15 148:11 given 5:23 16:22 30:6 54:4 70:21 92:12 98:21 99:17 111:12 123:16 126:5,10 136:17 149:19 gives 119:22 130:8 145:18 gloss 80:21 go 2:10,15 24:11 26:24 34:11 60:3 66:21 71:24 76:16 84:6 87:22 89:11,14,23 95:23 96:18 100:11 100:23 102:9 106:11 109:20 130:7 135:7 141:1 142:22 143:6,22 goes 42:6 62:4 80:10 88:8,14 99:7,10 115:3 141:20 144:22 148:25	124:21 groups 13:2 14:7 21:19 45:6,8,11 47:13,15 62:1,9,13 123:17 124:1 Group's 44:25 49:19 guidance 150:21 guillemots 64:24 guise 53:22 Gulland 1:23 <u>H</u> habitat 58:1 Hague 1:6 half 1:9 halve 124:9 hand 5:14 43:14,16 47:15 50:5 52:16 111:22 hands 150:22 handwritten 105:8,9 happened 37:5 59:7 120:4 143:2 happy 71:22	herring 62:19 hesitate 72:14,21 heuristic 28:14 hierarchical 90:17 hierarchy 91:11 high 2:2 9:3 25:20 53:2 73:18 79:22 86:1,12 115:23 higher 30:8 64:3 116:13 highlight 60:12 highlighted 62:4 highlighting 61:23 hindeasting 120:3 hindeasting 120:3 hindeasting 120:3 hindering 60:14 hinterland 106:22 historical 59:7 HOFSTÖTTER 2:6 hold 87:19 holistically 137:3 HON 1:12 honourable 11:24 151:14	63:13,24 70:5,7 84:2 85:13 86:7 91:13 99:20 108:13 108:16,18 109:12 110:1 113:12 114:12 115:17,19 115:25 127:14,21 139:7 146:15 147:16,18 impacts 32:21,23 33:16 86:9,17 91:7 91:22 99:25 100:1,5 100:6 108:21 145:21 146:1 impaired 4:8 impairment 2:19 4:16 77:10 impeach 2:2 implied 53:18,21 implied 44:2 implies 25:4 139:2 implying 11:1 import 93:17 importance 74:6 98:19,21 important 1:15 14:6

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

Day 5		r CA Case	10.2024 43	1 Hui	suay, 50 January 2022
64:10 65:6 67:2	115:22 117:1	97:4 133:6 139:12	124:9 125:15,18,20	18:19 20:6,15 46:10	147:7
68:7 69:18 74:9	124:10,11,13	inviting 2:4	128:20 131:17	69:22	levels 58:3 79:23
78:13 81:6 87:12,12	133:20 134:24	involve 38:9	133:7 135:22	KOOPMAN 2:24	116:4,8,10,11,16
88:18 91:16 99:13	149:9	involved 13:11 37:4	136:11,24 137:11	KYRIAKOU 2:10	135:10
110:17 127:11	informed 74:1	44:1 45:13 121:1,6	137:15 140:13		LEVENT 3:6
130:21 133:14	informs 6:14	Ireland 1:3,17	142:20 143:25	L	liberal 39:10
134:8 142:16	inherent 58:7 114:2	ISABELLA 3:8	144:1 145:8 146:22	lack 29:20 31:21 137:2	lies 127:6
148:11,15	initial 118:14	issue 8:17 9:7 10:16	148:23 149:10	ladies 1:3 35:21	life 120:9
importantly 25:24	initially 103:4 120:17	16:4 27:3 32:19,23	Justice 1:12 26:10	101:23	lifespan 57:25
122:17	133:6	72:7 79:1,3 100:9,9	82:15 83:23 88:23	landings 20:21 50:21	light 78:13 92:13
imposed 67:9	input 19:11 122:6	107:15 109:4	112:12 113:14	51:5 117:4	118:14 131:22
imposes 27:15	inputs 119:16,17	112:11 114:5,9,10	114:3 123:11,16	language 4:2 80:2	like 20:4,12 26:7
impressed 145:11	inputted 98:18 113:11	114:12 115:3 118:7	124:24 128:20	82:5 84:12 85:1	34:24 72:17 107:19
improve 86:22	inputting 12:14 18:19	125:12 126:17	129:2,22 131:17	87:2 88:8 89:22	114:6 122:9,13
improved 136:8	19:25 49:3	128:10 133:10	141:23 143:9,23	90:9	123:3 125:3 126:17
improvement 58:23	insert 125:7	136:13 138:24	151:14		137:21 151:19,25
124:2	inside 58:22	149:1	justifiable 4:16	large 70:19	likelihood 73:20
improves 86:15	insignificant 79:4	issues 1:25 23:7 96:23	justification 41:11	last 18:1 21:6 22:16	likely 51:24 63:12,21
impugned 126:24	insofar 10:5 40:7	99:24 148:12	54:4 77:16,18,23	60:4 74:5 95:15	
		item 142:12		97:12 101:16	86:16 113:9 115:17 145:16
inaccurate 19:7 72:22	71:18 97:23		justified 4:9 27:20 31:4 36:18 38:3	131:17 138:22	likewise 40:25 51:12
inadequate 72:10	instance 2:19 9:14	items 142:1	51:4 36:18 38:3 64:2 66:19	late 35:15 148:24	
117:22	28:12 77:11 85:10	i.e 77:1 82:1,20,23		later 9:12 53:21	limb 76:4
inappropriate 93:15	96:3	85:4 87:13 93:8	justifies 68:25	117:16 144:10	limit 3:16
included 13:15 49:1	instead 5:24 50:19		justify 2:18 40:2 42:4	LAURA 2:8	limitations 5:5 43:24
51:12 74:3 131:4	140:7	J	54:9 77:10	LAUREN 3:3	44:4 49:15 144:19
133:18	integrative 58:2	JACOB 3:2	juvenile 44:22 45:18	law 1:16,22 3:3 5:17	limited 14:10 38:23
includes 15:6 16:25	intensity 7:15	JANE 1:11	45:23 46:2 123:18	5:20,25 6:6 37:9	67:5 139:3
22:24 53:2 64:9	intentional 140:21	January 1:9 1:1	124:12,22	73:24 84:7,21 85:6	limiting 4:18 62:20
87:14 111:5 118:4	intentionally 122:20	JOANNA 3:9		92:4,4,15,18,20,21	limits 83:19
including 94:16 96:13	interact 119:19,22	JOSEPHINE 2:7	<u> </u>	92:24 93:2,4,6,8,16	line 13:10 15:11 16:13
97:2 134:6 136:11	interaction 48:4	JOSÉ 3:7	KC 2:16	93:21 147:2,21	18:13,25 20:10,19
inconsistent 6:20 81:1	interactions 121:24	journal 64:6	keen 69:18	lawful 91:19	21:22 22:21 43:10
88:18	122:2	judge 67:1	KEITH 3:8	lawfully 32:8	58:18,21 59:4
incorrect 101:7	interests 45:3 102:4	judgment 56:6 69:7	kept 122:20	lawyers 113:25	114:25 115:2,4,7,9
increases 12:2 13:2	146:14 148:10	123:4,5	key 12:16 14:25 18:21	lay 103:2	143:4
21:19 29:19 65:19	internal 19:18,19	judgments 56:9 67:7	18:21 19:3,4,9,12	lead 51:20 150:12	lines 19:19 21:7 26:22
69:4 115:15 116:18	22:18	103:9,19 119:18	19:20,21 20:3 43:2	leads 10:10 97:12	30:5,23 114:24
incumbent 37:23	international 1:16,22	juncture 11:21 24:10	43:7 44:24 48:20	125:9	129:3 130:3
indeed 28:15 33:6	2:25 5:20,25 6:21	34:23 141:3	49:1,4,11,19 50:2,3	least 39:23 45:17	link 11:8 28:1 83:24
45:16 46:21 52:1	37:9,11,13 38:24	Juratowitch 2:16 4:9	50:3 52:5 68:20	53:18 83:12,20 99:5	131:5
66:24 84:16 97:5	73:23 84:21 92:15	4:11 35:23,25 52:17	81:10 85:23 96:8	99:12 120:12	linked 10:14
104:2 113:5 133:9	92:18,22 99:2	52:18 71:25 72:24	100:16 118:8,10,11	136:14 140:20	links 60:6
141:9	interpret 92:4,25	73:1 74:23 75:7	118:12 121:13,15	149:25 150:9,19	Lisa 1:23
independent 3:12	106:19	97:21 101:11,12	122:22,25 137:16	leave 149:22	list 14:21
indicate 141:10	interpretation 6:21	103:6 105:1,2	145:8,10	leaving 35:10 41:8	listed 3:23 4:3 45:8
indicated 21:2 103:6	7:8 10:16 25:5	108:11 109:3	kick 11:18	left 33:7,21 116:23	51:8
127:7 148:16	76:17 93:21,23	113:21,22 116:21	kind 38:11 39:9 40:22	legal 2:4,5,6,7,8 3:6,7	listen 113:25
indicates 21:13 128:7	135:12 142:3	116:22 118:1,21,22	46:9 48:1 93:11	3:7,8,8 2:13 29:5	lists 64:17
indicating 62:2 63:5	interpretations	134:13 136:19	105:16	41:10 85:10 117:22	literature 59:17 66:9
indication 139:19,20	141:25	149:18 150:25	kinds 41:23	legislative 147:19	68:25 71:1,10 122:1
indicator 58:7	interpretative 92:1	jurisdiction 1:20	Kingdom's 5:19 16:8	legitimate 1:15 5:14	130:24 131:2,6
indirectly 80:21	interpreted 27:19	jurisprudence 39:19	21:17 26:9 29:10	length 29:18	little 78:15 82:3,4 83:5
individually 134:5	interpreting 5:18,22	jurists 54:15	33:4,10 36:18 37:6	lengthy 19:16	86:25 97:18 102:17
individuals 93:8,16	6:7	just 7:19 14:22 18:4	96:24 106:6 140:2	lenient 27:20	141:2 144:12 145:8
industry 99:20	interrupt 88:23	21:23 25:10 29:17	140:11 149:19	less 27:14,18 30:22	living 2:11 143:12
inescapable 33:3	interval 55:23 114:23	38:1,10 41:10,18,23	kittiwake 51:23 58:12	61:25 63:16 69:10	lob 41:23
inevitable 89:7	115:8 117:2,9,11,12	46:3,17 48:21 55:12	62:25 64:25	149:22	local 128:8,9,13
inexplicably 50:22	117:15,17	56:1 58:6 60:3	kittiwakes 22:8 58:18	lesser 30:22	localised 30:13 68:3
inferences 39:10	intervene 72:15,21	64:18 68:8 70:24	58:22 59:25 61:11	let 1:6 8:16	68:11 Jacolly: 20:14 128:12
influence 121:19	intervention 59:19	78:14 84:18 85:22	63:17	let's 3:7 5:12 122:19	locally 30:14 128:12
influential 122:4	inter-species 121:24	88:23 89:3 92:9	knew 138:22	127:24	128:16
influenza 74:10	inter-state 92:25	96:4 97:17,18 98:4	know 1:6 11:3 46:5,7	level 2:2 3:23 25:20	located 39:6
information 11:18,20	93:12,18,22	102:2,9 103:4,24	50:20 58:17 59:21	27:13 53:2 73:18	location 12:10 16:10
20:20 21:13 46:8,9	intricacies 147:20	105:3,11 107:6	71:7 84:1 98:13	76:22,24 77:1 80:22	16:16 23:17 118:6
50:10 51:11,12 72:3	introducing 98:19	109:5 112:4,12,22	102:11 112:4	80:24 85:17,18 86:1	locations 68:9
72:9 85:19 86:14	introduction 52:24	114:2 115:7 116:3,3	125:11 135:6	86:12 94:24 95:7,11	logic 9:4
97:1 104:18 109:19	invaluable 151:17	118:13 119:11	143:13,25 150:6	99:14 115:24	logically 75:9
114:15,21,22	invite 35:22 72:17	121:6 123:11,20	known 12:14,19,22	116:19 146:15	long 43:22 55:1 57:25

Trevor McGowan

Page 7

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
Jonger 10:6,15 majority 21:11 51:25 14:32 12:32 12:32:15 13:10,13:15 31:16	79.9.16 118.9.13	major 137.12 150.12	117.9 124.8 132:1.6	127.3 4 5 20 129.4	39.20 55.7 56.21	39.10 41.19 44.9 17
iFail:5 imates: 26:12 26:18 iFail:0:13:17 imates: 26:12 26:18 iFail:0:13:17 iFail:13:17 iFail:13:16:12 iFail:13:		0				-
Jook 57: 194525 male 291.63:11 524 392.569.63.3 152.10 13517 89:18 91:14 93.1 823.852.3.12 982.31 01:19 1064 432.17 454 5320 123.41 26:12 139.91.01 42.9 106:16 108:13 932.42 51 02.17 1056.16 1452.32 56.49.27 66.17 137.11 38.352.32 972.44 101:15 932.42 51 02.17 1056.16 1452.32 56.49.27 66.17 mature 44.22 4519 143.51.14 44.49 114.21 101:14 1122.11.31 122.2 11224 133.14 142.13 123.58.05 22.2 mature 44.22 4519 143.51.14 14.23 123.51.13 12.22 1224 133.14 14.21 103.85.07.22 144.51.14 12.31 122.13.13 12.22 145.81 146.02 136.20 121.71 131.91 132.2 59.44.18.16 62.13 361.80.3.17.21 145.83 146.66.13 192.23.22 20.25 145.81 149.23 136.21 122.17 104.31 105.30 59.24.45.14 361.80.3.17.21 145.31 147.23 107.31 118.31 147.23 107.31 118.31.12 118.31.14 12.23 114.42.20 114.42.20 114.41.42.20 114.41.42.21 114.41.42.21 114.41.42.21 114.41.42.21 114.41.42.21 114.41.42.22 114.41.42.22 <	0					
9825 104:19 1064 42:17.34:452.0 1234 126:12 1399.10 142:9 106:16 108:13 9324.25 102:17 1086.16 1452 55:18 55:31.16 56:3 MATTHEW 224 519 145:21 146:11.11 122:12.12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:1	look 3:7,19 45:25	make 29:16 31:1 32:4	39:2 56:9 63:3		89:18 91:14 93:1	
108.0cd 108:24 54:18 55:11,16.63 MATTHEW 2:24 143:10,14144/9 144:21 19:41 112:12.23 13:13,1 108.0cd 108:24 56:67,23:66:17 maximus 73:18:14 145:21 14:61:11,13 136:16 14:61:17 12:12.33 13:14 108.0cd 108:24 89:61:57:82:39:81 maximus 75:18:21 143:01:14:14:19:91 136:16 14:61:17 12:44:13:12:31:24:13:14 132:41 33:14 14:22 109:12:19:11:19 92:42:52:02:17:11 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:16 14:61:17 136:17 137:17 14:92:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18 14:14:17 136:18	64:21 73:3 94:14	33:2 36:19 38:11	75:21 76:15,19	137:1 138:3,9,25	97:24 101:15	84:13 86:16,25
looked 108:18 566.9.23 661.7 mature 442 45:19 14521 1461.11.13 1207.72.2138.18 1221.151.223 71.9 807 108:5 941.35,68.92.22 maximum 551.821 14521 1461.11.13 12621 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12624 1451.123 12623 1441.123 12623 1441.123 12623 1441.123 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423 1263.1462.141.1423	98:23 104:19 106:4	42:17 43:4 53:20	123:4 126:12	139:9,10 142:9	106:16 108:13	93:24,25 102:17
Joshing 289 (i):2 677 71:15 72:12 124:13 H4621 147:1,12,3 136:16 14671 124:41 223 1223 112:34 1331 1420 396:15 978,32 498 maximus 17:17 143:21 129.21 115:22 112:21 129.22 112:21 129.22 112:129 15:22 112:21 129.22 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:22 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:22 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:22 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:22 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 12:21 129.12 12:21 129.12 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:21 12:2	108:6,16 145:24	54:18 55:11,16 56:3	MATTHEW 2:24	143:10,14 144:9	114:12 119:14	112:13,25 113:1,4
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		56:6,9,23 66:1,7	mature 44:22 45:19	145:21 146:1,11,13	120:7,7,22 134:18	122:13,15 123:2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						124:4 127:23 132:3
1324 13314 1432 1038,19 1149 may 48 520 62.715 measures 419 79.11 mind 282 20252 147.17 149.21 1355 14610 119.124 12013 551 382.5 39.91 361 840.317.21 1352 389.18 85.4 150.3 3425 5025 70.10 151.3 6415 6614 67.4 413.942.11 52.2 ninimised 91.21 ninimised 91.21 30.24 132.19 142.23 841.28 55.16 6614 67.4 413.942.11 52.2 ninimised 91.21 31.02 1132.19 142.23 80.11 10.19.19 82.10 662.3 67.25 761.8 ninimised 91.21 130.24 132.19 142.23 841.28 55.16 86.7 77.31.79 78.61.8 139.16 42.3 52.16 92.2 130.24 132.19 142.23 1154 11.52.3 12.66 87.14.15 50.8 94.1 1447.22 145.1 77.37.69 78.4 100 53 41 mamades 30.1.13 53.6 69.18 74.12 130.18 132.3 13.9 98.11.20 99.7 ninke 36.46 47.22 98.46.25 99.23 101 22.0 83.1 07.13 64.9 17.19 60.16 149.2.12 44.2 149.2.14 44.72 98.12 20.9.10 98.12 20.9.10 98.12 20.9.10 119.12 119.12 101 22.0 83.1 07.13 64.9 17.19 60.16 149.12 42.7 149.12 42.1						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-			
			5	,		
		·	-			
3425 5025 70:10 151:3 64:15 66:14 67:4 41:3,9 42:11 23:22 minimised 91:3,14:7 morting 13:4 35:4 98:16 116:10:20 notex 92:24 93:15 71:15 73:44,76:11 53:12 64:26 65:15,76:18 minimised 91:21 35:11 41:42:52.0 130:24 13:21 134:31 makefs 8:14 90:19,23 92:16 78:25 79:28 00:17 minimised 91:21 47:23 14:14:14:26:20 138:17 makefs 71:5 45:21 139:16 47:22 34:51 77:76:78:4 47:77:76:78:4 138:17 makefs 8:14 90:19:23 92:16 87:41:41 90:08 94:1 147:12 77:76:78:68 67:17 17:76:78:4 77:76:78:78:78:179:715 10s 53:41 mamamas 30:1.33 127:81 128:89 129:22 94:1.20 97:7 minic 90:16 0 98:10 10:12 77:17 77:17 77:17 77:17 77:17 77:17 77:17 77:11 77:11 77:11 77:11 77:11 77:13 77:14 77:14 19:14:12 19:14:12:15 10:14:12:12:11 10:14:17:11 14:21:16:29 minimised 91:14:15 10:14:12:11 10:14:12:11 10:14:17:11 14:11:16:12 10:14:17:11 14:11:16:12				<i>'</i>		
$\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 $				-		
			-	-		-
$\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 $			-			
lose 20:2 lose 3:1: mammals 30:1:13 + 115:2:126:6 lose 3:1: lose 3:4: mammals 30:1:13 + 115:2:126:6 lose 3:3:1 lose 3:4: lose 3:3:1 lose 3:4:12 + 12:13:3:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:13:1			-			-
		0	-			-
Iosses 33:11 53:6 69:1,8 74:12 130:18 132:133:9 98:11 20:09:7 minute 30:6 64:17.22 94:5 95:17 97:15 Iot 12:20 83:3 107:13 6:19 77:19 60:16 140:12 141:21 43:7 128:18 1397 140:9 minutes 10:16 6 minutes 10:16				-	· ·	
			-			-
Int 12:20 83:3 107:13 6:19 17:19 60:16 140:12 141:21 143:7 128:18 139:7 14:09 mischaracterisation mortality 12:21:23 10w 634 17:37 376:69:81:0 14:61:25 147:11 143:21 44:16 96:16 32:07:67:101.219 115:81 16:12 manager 3:9 McGowan 1:23:24 94:18 mischaracterises mischaracterises 97:11 motor 12:21:1 motor 12:21:1 motor 12:21:1 motor 12:21:1 motor 12:21:1 motor 40:10 65:5 94:17 motor 40:10 65:5 94:17 motor 40:10 65:5 94:17 motor 40:10 65:7 94:17 motor 40:10 61:7 6:21 Madam: 1:4 5:7 49:21 143:11 119:10 12:0:11 meeting 42:6 61:13 mischarestood 12:11 motor 40:10 61:7 6:21 10:42 10:52,19 MARE 2:9,91:01:01.11 marching 16:41:12 meaningful 25:14 meeting 42:6 61:13 mitigated 32:24 10:01 moving 120:10 12:51 11:12 41:12:13 margin 7:2 56:47 75:28:16 73:31:21,24:24:12 member 2:45.67.8 mitigated 32:24 10:01 moving 120:10 12:51 11:12 41:13:13 margin 7:2 margin 7:2 56:47 72:28:16 73:31:21,24:24:12 moting 120:10 12:51 moving 120:10 12:51 moving 120:10:15:1						
$ low 634 \\ low 634 \\ low 753 ?8.6 98:19 \\ low 753 ?8.6 98:19 \\ low 1:4 147:12 \\ low 1:4 123:14 92:14 \\ mandate 5:18 \\ mandate 5:11 \\ mandate 5:11 \\ mandate 5:11 \\ mandate 5:11 \\ man 1:14 5:7 \\ man 1:14 5:7 \\ low 1:14 14:11 \\ man 1:19:10 120:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ man 1:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low 2:11 \\ low $						
lower Sk: 2111:24 101:4147:12 147:18,21149:21 mechanism 28:18 mischaracterises 108:6.6 LUS 3:7 mandate 66:17 150:16 151:6 met 39:12 41:16 52:9 misquoting 105:6 most 64:10 65:5 94:17 M mandate 66:17 150:16 151:6 met 39:12 41:16 52:9 misquoting 105:6 most 64:10 65:5 94:17 MACENTEE 2:21 manner 48:6:10 28:14 88:2 105:22 133:4 move 40:10 61:7 62:1 move 40:10 61:7 62:1 Madam 1:14 5:7 marp 19:16 41:22 145:52 84:12 meeting 42:6 61:13 mitigate 33:10.15:25 100:4 moving 120:10 125:1 10:14 11:3 21:1 margin 7:2 56:47 8:22 81:16 meeting 42:6 61:13 mitigate 32:24 100:1 moving 120:10 125:1 11:24 29:2 35:25 100:4 mitigate 31:0.15:25 moving 120:10 125:1 moving 120:10 126:1						
LUIS 3:7 mandiate 66:17 150:16 151:6 meet 39:12 41:16 52:9 misguoting 105:6 mount ef 50:14 70:11 M manifestation 11:15 manifestation 11:15 mean 10:13 24:4 27:5 105:14 129:11 misguoting 105:6 mount ef 50:14 70:11 MACENTEE 2:21 manifestation 11:15 manifestation 11:15 mean 10:13 24:4 27:5 105:14 129:11 misguoting 105:6 mount ef 50:14 70:11 Madam 1:14 57: many 19:16 41:22 14:52:24 148:13 95:7 95:7 100:4 100:4 mount ef 50:14 70:11 10:42 10:52,19 marching 6:4 10:11 meaningful 2:14 meets 1:14:14 mets 39:12 1:42:18 mitigate 33:10.15:25 mount e2:8 35:28.25 10:16 111:13 111:13 111:13 111:14 margin 7:2 56:47 8:22 81:16 7:23 11:21,24 24:12 mitigate 33:10.15:25 mount e2:8 35:28.25 100:14:14:18,23 119:14 12:19 125:1 margin 7:2 56:47 8:22 81:16 7:23 18:21:14:42:15:7 motheller 4:32:2 101:14:17:22 8:7:15 105:10:14:11 101:14:17:22 8:7:11 101:14:17:22 8:7:11 101:14:17:22 8:7:11 101:14:17:22 8:7:11 101:14:20:14:14:12 101:22:10:17:16	lower 58:2 111:24	101:4 147:12	147:18,21 149:21	mechanism 28:18		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	115:8 116:12	manager 3:9	McGowan 1:23,24	94:18	97:11	most 64:10 65:5 94:17
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	LUIS 3:7	mandate 66:17	150:16 151:6	meet 39:12 41:16 52:9	misquoting 105:6	motor 122:11
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		mandatory 89:3	McKenzie 2:19,19,20	81:25 104:10	misreads 100:2,3,12	mounted 50:14 70:11
Markam 49:21 119:10 119:10 meeting 42:6 61:13 misunderstood 61:57:122 81:4 11:24 29:23 35:25 many 19:16 41:22 145:24 145:24 145:24 148:57 10:11 meeting 42:6 10:12 11:12 10:12 10:12 11:12 10:12 </td <td>M</td> <td>manifestation 11:15</td> <td>mean 10:13 24:4 27:5</td> <td>105:14 129:11</td> <td>misunderstanding</td> <td>70:13</td>	M	manifestation 11:15	mean 10:13 24:4 27:5	105:14 129:11	misunderstanding	70:13
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	MACENTEE 2:21					move 40:10 61:7 62:15
11:22:12:12:12:13 46:4 142:24 meaning 6:6 10:11 meets 134:1.8 100:4 moving 120:10 125:1 107:10 109:3 MARE 2:9,010,01,1 24:7 55:2 84:12 92:21 mitigation 100:20 46:2 23:23 20:13 63:16 110:14 111:3 2:11 24:7 55:2 84:12 92:21 mitigation 100:20 46:2 23:25:01:3 63:16 110:14 11:3 2:11 meaningful 25:14 meaningful 25:14 meaningful 25:14 meaningful 25:14 meaningful 25:14 mitigation 100:20 46:22 20:13 63:16 117:25 118:23 MARL 2:9,11 53:56 57:22 60:9 61:10 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15,18 53:14 56:1 modeller 43:22 102:107:11 113:20,22 11:61 139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1.8 74:12 91:7 43:12,13 47:2 56:10 58:25 59:6 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:1 132:21 13:42:1 140:15 150:22,29:4 30:21 marked 15:25 59:16 111:25 11 67:15 65:10 69:14 (11:21 81:67:15 103:14 (41:17 142:62 143:24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 astria 13:42:1 marked 15:25 59:16 111:25 11:67:15 130:12,18:18,19 112:21 16:22 122:10 123:14 (15:10 143:24 148:4 130:12,18:18,16 112:21 14:22:12<	Madam 1:14 5:7					
Instant marching 144:1 24:7 55:2 84:12 member 2:4,5,6,7,8 mitigate 3:2:4 100:1 much 2:2:8 3:2:8,25 107:10 109:3 MARE 2:9,9,10,10,11 90:5:11 9:12:14:12 92:21 members 1:14 4:1 5:7 MMO 147:4 64:22 50:13 63:16 110:14 11:3 2:11 meaningful 25:14 723 11:21,24 24:12 MNZM 1:11 101:14 17.18,23 117:25 118:23 MARIA 2:11 marine 1:21 5:15 meaningfully 83:17 73:18 38:13 40:4,10 107:22,24 109:10 101:14 17.18,23 134:13 137:25 57:22 60:9 61:10 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15.18 35:44 56:1 modelling 36:5 42:17 125:10 126:15 139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1,8 74:12 91:7 43:12,13 47:2 56:10 52:15.18 53:44 56:1 modelling 36:5 42:17 125:10 126:15 18:17 19:22 21:1 mark 61 15:25 59:16 111:25 116:7,15 70:9 71:20 72:8,14 71:2,13 104:23 136:18,24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 MARU 02:10 mark 61:13 134:21 meant 108:4 112:18 117:20 127:12 128:23 136:18,24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 13:15 13:61:13.25 mark 81:10 121:20 127:12 128:23 150:14 151:10	11:24 29:2 35:25				5	
Instant MARE 2:9,9,10,10,11 90:5,11 92:12 140:2 92:21 mitigation 100:20 46:22 50:13 63:16 110:14 111:3 2:11 margin 7:2 56:47 82:28 1:16 members 1:14 4:15:7 MMO 147:4 65:11 72:21 87:1 113:22 116:22 margin 7:2 56:47 82:28 1:16 7:23 11:2.12 44:21:12 MXZM 1:11 105:2 107:18 119:14 121:9 125:1 margin 7:2 56:47 82:28 1:16 28:19 34:22 35:5 modeller 43:22 105:2 107:18 105:2 107:11 125:22 127:7 133:9 57:32 60:9 61:10 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15,18 53:14 56:1 modeller 43:22 124:10,12,13 13:20,22 116:1 113:20,22 116:1 139:14 141:7 145:6 98:22 10:14 43:12 68:15 95:7 104:15 65:20 66:12 68:16 56:18 69:14,16 70:3 143:24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 mark 89:1 86:15 95:7 104:15 65:20 66:12 68:16 56:18 69:14,16 70:3 143:24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 material 6:13 13:4:21 mark 10:21 17:23 19:12 73:22 74:51 9 75:17 17:21 10:13 104:23 150:14 14:15:10 18:14 19:12 17:31 18:4:14 12:16 117:28 119:12 73:22 74:51 9 75:17 122:52 79	48:5 73:1 75:7,17					
10:10:107:8 2:11 meaningful 25:14 members 1:14 4:1 5:7 MNO 147:4 65:11 72:21 87:1 110:14 111:3 margin 7:2 56:4 78:22 81:16 72:23 11:21,24 24:12 MNZM 1:11 101:14,17,18;23 117:25 118:23 marine 1:21 5:15 meaningfully 83:17 73:18 38:13 40:4,10 107:22,24 109:10 105:21 07:11 125:22 127:7 133:9 25:18 30:1,13 53:6 meaningfully 83:17 37:18 38:13 40:4,10 107:22,24 109:10 113:20.22 116:1 139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1,8 74:12 91:7 43:12,13 47:2 56:10 58:5 59:6 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:1 136:22 27:15 136:18 4:41 48:20 149:18 150:22,25 98:22 101:4 143:12 68:18 76:25 78:10 61:1 63:3 64:4 48:9;11,12 52:7,15 136:18,24 138:20 18:17 19:22 21:1 marked 15:25 59:16 111:25 116:7,15 70:27 12:0 72:8,14 71:23 10:4:25 136:14 14:16:10 136:14 48:4 19:51 27 33:11 84:16 material 6:13 134:21 meant 108:4 112:18 117:20 129:30 91:01.3,7,7 77:82:38:55 34 10:51 107:28 135:10 27:10,12,22 28:41,21 10:12,12 12:8:23 71:12,12 12:8:23 71:12 12:12 12:8:23 71:12,12 12:22,114:51:10 71:12,12 12:22,114:51:10 71:12:21 12:23 11:51	-				0	
113:22 116:22 margin 7:2 56:4 78:22 81:16 7:23 11:21,24 24:12 MNZM 1:11 101:14,17,18,23 117:25 118:23 MARIA 2:11 marine 1:21 5:15 modeller 43:22 107:22,221 10:11 105:2 0:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.22 116:11 113:20.21 13:41:3 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:22.11 34:13 13:21:13 13:21:13:11 11:11:11 11:11:11:11:11:11 11:11:12:11:11 14:12:12.21 13:11 14:11:11:12:11:11:11 13:11:11:11 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td></td<>			-		0	
117:22 118:23 MARIA 2:11 83:10,13 85:4 28:19 34:22 35:5 modelled 70:2 107:18 105:2 107:11 119:14 121:9 125:11 marine 1:21 5:15 meaningfully 83:17 meaningfully 83:17 meaningfully 83:17 modeller 43:22 modeller 43:22 113:20,22 116:11 134:13 137:25 57:22 60:9 61:10 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15,18 53:14 56:1 modelling 36:5 42:17 125:10 126:15 139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1,8 74:12 91:7 43:12,13 47:2 56:10 58:5 59:6 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:1 132:21 134:13 149:18 150:22,25 98:22 101:4 143:12 86:15 95:7 104:15 65:20 66:12 68:16 56:18 69:14,16 70:3 143:24 148:4 18:17 19:22 21:1 marked 15:25 59:16 111:25 116:7,15 70:9 71:20 72:8,14 71:2,13 104:23 145:14 109:17 38:15 42:20 47:21 MAROUSO 2:10 120:15 142:20,20 79:4 101:13 115:11 114:17 126:22 must 2:17 4:23 11:5 139:14 107:8 135:15 136:13,25 material 6:13 134:21 meant 108:4 112:18 117:20 121:20 130:12,18,18,19 70:17,19 78:18,21 117:21 121:5 134:24 18:32 material 8:13 03:13 28:17,18,21 29:51:11:6 130:12,18,18,19 70:17,19 78:18,21 117:22			8			
119:14 121:9 marine 1:21 5:15 meaningfully 83:17 37:18 38:13 40:4,10 107:22,24 109:10 113:20,22 116:1 125:22 127: 7 133:9 25:18 30:1,13 53:6 means 16:16 20:21 37:18 38:13 40:4,10 107:22,24 109:10 113:20,22 116:1 139:14 141:7 145:6 57:22 60:9 61:10 26:11,23 57:22 6:10 58:5 59:6 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:1 132:21 134:13 149:18 150:22,25 98:22 101:4 143:12 68:18 76:25 78:10 61:1 63:3 64:4 48:9,11,12 52:7,15 136:18,24 138:20 18:17 19:22 21:1 marke 91:1 86:15 95:71 04:15 65:20 66:12 68:16 65:18 69:14,16 70:3 143:24 148:4 25:25 29:4 30:21 62:10 115:9 117:8 119:12 73:22 74:5,19 75:17 107:15 109:17 multiplier 121:22 38:15 42:20 47:21 MAROUSO 2:10 120:15 142:20,20 79:4 101:13 115:11 114:17 126:22 112:11 94:4 95:13 98:12 135:15 136:13,25 measure 4:14,21 6:19 mention 39:14 69:8 129:3,9 130:1,3,7,7 27:8,23 28:5 5:4 105:11 107:8 materially 133:3,5 82:09 51:16 121:20 130:12,18,18,19 70:17,19 78:18,21 117:21 712:5		0		-		
1125:12 125:18 30:1,13 53:6 means 16:16 20:21 42:14,19 46:6 47:24 modeller 43:22 124:10,12,13 134:13 137:25 57:22 60:9 61:10 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15,18 53:14 56:10 42:21 47:12,25 modeller 33:21 125:10 126:15 139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1,8 74:12 98:12 10:14 143:12 86:15 95:7 106:11 55:16 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:13 136:18,24 136:18,24 138:12 136:18,24 138:12 136:18,25 136:18,24 143:12 137:12 136:18,14 141:25 117:20 130:12,18,19 100:11 101:13 115:11 114:17 142:21 122:12 1			-			
134:13 137:25 57:22 60:9 110 26:12,14 40:12,25 52:15,18 modelling 36:5 42:17 125:10 125:11 125:10 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11 125:11				,	,	
139:14 141:7 145:6 69:1,8 74:12 91:7 43:12,13 47:2 56:10 58:5 59:6 60:17 42:21 47:1,25 48:1 132:21 134:13 149:18 150:22,25 mark 89:1 68:18 76:25 78:10 61:1 63:3 64:4 48:9,11,12 52:7,15 136:18,24 138:20 149:18 150:22,25 mark 89:1 mark 89:1 86:15 95:7 104:15 65:20 66:12 68:16 56:18 69:14,16 70:3 143:24 148:4 25:25 29:4 30:21 62:10 115:9 111:25 116:7,15 70:9 71:20 72:8,14 71:2,13 104:23 130:12,18 4:14 94:4 95:13 98:12 material 61:3 134:21 measure 4:14,21 6:19 117:70 127:12 128:23 129:3,9 130:1,3,7,7 27:8,23 28:5 53:4 105:11 107:8 134:29,18 135:5,5 23:23 26:11,23 measure 4:14,21 6:19 mention 39:14 69:8 129:3,9 130:1,3,7,7 27:8,23 28:5 53:4 105:11 107:8 materiality 133:3,5 8:20 9:5 11:16 120:24,25 148:7,14 models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:34 125:16 130:22 materially 86:13 28:17,18,21 29:9,11 mentioned 46:28 85:7 132:7,14,15,17 78:22,25 79:11 139:21 140:24 133:14 29:14,24,25 30:12 ment 141:25 142:2,12 models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:34 144:25 materially 86:13				<i>'</i>		
149:18191:298:22101:4143:1268:1876:2578:1061:163:364:448:9,11,1252:7,15136:18,24138:20made 10:511:25marke 4155:2559:16111:25117:8119:1273:2274:51970:971:2072:81471:2,13107:15109:17109:14143:12143:24148:4418:1719:2212:15136:1559:16111:25117:8119:1273:2274:51975:17107:15109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:115109:17100:12:12122:11134:2,9133:1315136:13,2315:31136:13,23115:31134:2,9133:13135:1023:2326:11,2312:12136:14131:15131:15136:18,24136:1412:12137:17136:18,24136:16136:1812:12136:14131:12136:16136:16136:18136:11136:18136:16136:16136:16131:15136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:16136:1613				-		
Indet 10:5 11:25 made 10:5 11:25mark 89:1 marked 15:25 59:1686:15 95:7 104:15 111:25 116:7,1565:20 66:12 68:16 70:9 71:20 72:8,1456:18 69:14,16 70:3 71:2,13 104:23143:24 148:4 150:14 151:1025:25 29:4 30:21 38:15 42:20 47:21 49:5,12 73:11 84:16 94:4 95:13 98:12MAROUSO 2:10 material 6:13 134:21 material 6:13 134:21 material 6:13 134:25117:8 119:12 120:15 142:20,20 79:4 101:13 115:11 117:2073:22 74:5,19 75:17 79:4 101:13 115:11 117:17 126:22 122:17 123:6 135:10107:15 109:17 120:15 142:20,20 79:4 101:13 115:11 117:20114:17 126:22 122:12 122:17 123:3multiplier 121:22 122:17 123:3105:11 107:8 117:21 121:5materiality 133:3,5 135:108:20 9:5 11:16 27:10,12,22 28:4,12 27:10,12,22 28:4,12 27:10,12,22 28:4,12 120:24,25 148:7,14 133:14mentiona 39:14 69:8 121:20 120:24,25 148:7,14 models 46:20,25 47:3 models 46:20,25 47:3 models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:3,5 80:24 81:24 84:3,5141:7 142:20 141:7 142:20 144:25mathematics 111:18 matrix 121:21,2,2,24 MATT 2:2229:14,24,25 30:12 32:1,24,21 41:15 52:20 55:24 82:20 16 7:9metiological 128:4 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 113:10:13112:15 113:24 107:3MAGGIE 2:23 magnitude 30:22 73:21matrix 11:123:9,11 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:2173:17,18,21 74:8 73:21,74:15 52:20 55:24 73:17,18,21 74:8model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 112:15 113:24maintain 7:11 29:8,13 32:1 68:7 32:1 68:799:12 99:1273:17,18,21 74:8 99:22 97:99:12 99:12MICHAEL			-		,	
market 10.5marked 15:25 59:16111:25 116:7,1570:9 71:20 72:8,1471:2,13 104:23150:14 151:1025:25 29:4 30:2162:10 115:9117:8 119:1273:22 74:5,19 75:17107:15 109:171107:15 109:1738:15 42:20 47:21MAROUSO 2:10120:15 142:20,2079:4 101:13 115:11114:17 126:22122:149:5,12 73:11 84:16material 6:13 134:21meant 108:4 112:18117:20127:12 128:23must 2:17 4:23 11:594:4 95:13 98:12135:15 136:13.25measure 4:14,21 6:19meant 039:14 69:8129:3,9 130:1,3,7,777:8,23 28:5 53:4105:11 107:8135:1027:10,12,22 28:41,12120:24,25 148:7,14130:12,18,18,1970:17,19 78:18,21117:21 121:5134:2,9,18 135:5,523:23 26:11,23mentioned 46:22 85:7132:7,14,15,1778:22,25 79:11122:17 123:6133:1429:14,24,25 30:12mentioned 46:22 85:7132:7,14,15,1778:22,25 79:11139:21 140:24133:1429:14,24,25 30:12metrilly 145:2110:884:8 86:9 90:8144:25matrix 121:21,22,2432:2,17 41:5,7,14107:3model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matrix 121:21,22,2432:2,17 41:5,7,14107:3model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matrix 121:21,22,2432:2,17 41:5,7,14107:3model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matrix 121:22,2473:17,18,21 74:8118:3,66138:16 139:6138:16 139:6148:12,1273:5 79:18 82:273:17,18,21 74:8112:7:10118:3,66138:16 13:62:	-					-
10:11 10:2262:10 115:9117:8 119:1273:22 74:5,19 75:17107:15 109:17multiplier 121:2238:15 42:20 47:21MAROUSO 2:10120:15 142:20,2079:4 101:13 115:11114:17 126:22122:149:5,12 73:11 84:16material 6:13 134:21meant 108:4 112:18117:20129:3,9 130:1,3,7,727:8,23 28:5 53:494:4 95:13 98:12135:15 136:13,25measure 4:14,21 6:19mention 39:14 69:8129:3,9 130:1,3,7,727:8,23 28:5 53:4105:11 107:8134:2,9,18 135:5,523:23 26:11,23mentioned 46:22 85:7132:7,14,15,1778:22,27 79:11117:21 121:5135:1027:10,12,22 28:4,12120:24,25 148:7,14models 46:20,25 47:380:24 81:24 84:3,5125:16 130:22materially 86:1328:17,18,21 29:9,11mencifully 145:2men u141:25 142:2,1247:10 109:16,2184:8 86:9 90:8139:21 140:24133:1429:14,24,25 30:12mercifully 145:2models 46:22,5584:8 86:9 90:892:18 104:10141:7 142:20mathematics 111:1830:25 31:2,4,22met 10:5 36:15 104:16models 64:25129:10 131:24,24144:25materi 1:1 23:9,1158:2 60:21 67:9129:8 137:2118:3,6129:10 131:24,24148:12,1273:5 79:18 82:287:18 91:21 94:6,11127:10moment 33:3 46:15138:16 139:6148:12,1273:5 79:18 82:287:18 91:21 94:6,11127:10moment 33:3 46:15138:16 139:6132:1 68:790:22 97:9 99:1299:12 99:17 104:12 112:6midle 71:3momitoring 139:4mater 138:11121:10 105:16		marked 15:25 59:16			-	
Jack Difference MAROUSO 2:10 120:15 142:20,20 79:4 101:13 115:11 114:17 126:22 122:1 49:5,12 73:11 84:16 material 6:13 134:21 meant 108:4 112:18 meant 108:4 112:18 117:20 127:12 128:23 must 2:17 4:23 11:5 105:11 107:8 i134:2,9,18 135:5,5 23:23 26:11,23 mentioned 46:22 85:7 130:12,18,18,19 70:17,19 78:18,21 121:10:2 materially 86:13 28:17,18,21 29:9,11 ment 105:26:15 104:16 models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:3,5 139:21 140:24 133:14 29:14,24,25 30:12 metriols 53:15 104:16 models 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:13 144:25 matter 1:1 23:9,11 58:2 60:21 67:9 metriological 128:4 107:3 models 121:21 138:8 112:15 13:13:13 129:10 131:24,24 73:5 79:18 82:2 87:18 91:21 94:6,11 127:10 meant 33:3 46:15 msite 13:3:13:13 138:16 139:6 129:10 131:24,24 73:5 79:18 82:2 87:18 91:21 94:6,11 127:10 models 64:25 models 64:25 138:16 139:6 129:11 20:22,19 99:12 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 micophone 101:14 183:22 130:12		62:10 115:9				
49:5,12 73:11 84:16 94:4 95:13 98:12 105:11 107:8material 6:13 134:21 135:15 136:13,25 materiality 133:3,5meant 108:4 112:18 measure 4:14,21 6:19 8:20 9:5 11:16117:20 mention 39:14 69:8 121:20127:12 128:23 129:3,9 130:1,3,7,7 130:12,18,18,19must 2:17 4:23 11:5 27:8,23 28:5 53:4105:11 107:8 117:21 121:5135:15 136:13,25 materiality 133:3,58:20 9:5 11:16 23:23 26:11,23121:20130:12,18,18,19 121:2070:17,19 78:18,21 78:22,25 79:11122:17 123:6 125:16 130:22135:10 materially 86:13 23:1429:14,24,25 30:12 29:14,24,25 30:12mentioned 46:22 85:7 120:24,25 148:7,14 menu 141:25 142:2,12 47:10 109:16,21models 46:20,25 47:3 47:10 109:16,2184:8 86:9 90:8 84:8 86:9 90:8139:21 140:24 144:25133:14 mathematics 111:18 29:14,24,25 30:1228:17,18,21 29:9,11 29:14,24,25 30:12 met 141:25 142:2,12 met 10:5 36:15 104:16 model's 121:21 138:8 model's 121:21 138:8 modular 18:13 103:1384:8 86:9 90:8 84:8 86:9 90:8MAGGIE 2:23 magnitude 30:22 73:21matter 1:1 23:9,11 27:5 59:6 15:16 54:19,20 73:21 main 17:17 77:16 15:9 65:21 69:6 13:10 84:7 89:21,2394:25 95:6,8 99:16 99:17 104:12 112:6mitophone 101:14 127:10 midde 71:3 middle 71:3 models 50:15 motoring 139:4 motoring 139:4 motoring 139:4mater 138:11 matural 105:16 motoring 139:4 motor 37: 26:13,14		MAROUSO 2:10		79:4 101:13 115:11		
94:4 95:13 98:12135:15 136:13,25measure 4:14,21 6:19mention 39:14 69:8129:3,9 130:1,3,7,727:8,23 28:5 53:4105:11 107:8134:2,9,18 135:5,523:23 26:11,23121:20130:12,18,18,1970:17,19 78:18,21122:17 123:6135:1027:10,12,22 28:4,12120:24,25 148:7,14models 46:20,25 47:380:24 81:24 84:3,5125:16 130:22materially 86:1328:17,18,21 29:9,11120:24,25 148:7,14models 46:20,25 47:380:24 81:24 84:3,5139:21 140:24133:1429:14,24,25 30:12mercifully 145:2110:892:18 109:16,21141:7 142:20mathematics 111:1830:25 31:2,4,22met 10:5 36:15 104:16model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matter 1:1 23:9,1158:2 60:21 67:9129:8 137:2118:3,6138:16 139:673:2127:5 53:16 54:19,2073:17,18,21 74:8microphone 101:1418:3,3 46:15138:16 139:673:2127:5 53:16 54:19,2073:7,17,18 91:21 94:6,11127:10moment 33:3 46:15myself 87:1 119:2main 17:17 77:1655:9 65:21 69:678:8 80:12 82:2,24microphone 101:1483:22 130:12moment 33:3 46:1513:10 83:10 84:7 89:21,2394:25 95:6,8 99:16middle 71:3monitoring 139:4monitoring 139:4maintain 7:11 29:8,1383:10 84:7 89:21,2394:25 95:6,8 99:16midnight 148:24mooted 50:15maintain 6:4,17105:17 107:12112:6 113:13midnight 148:24mooted 50:15more 3:7 26:13,14						
105:11 107:8 117:21 121:5materiality 133:3,5 134:2,9,18 135:5,58:20 9:5 11:16 23:23 26:11,23121:20 mentioned 46:22 85:7130:12,18,18,19 132:7,14,15,1770:17,19 78:18,21 78:22,25 79:11122:17 123:6 122:17 123:6135:10 materially 86:1327:10,12,22 28:4,12 28:17,18,21 29:9,11120:24,25 148:7,14 mentioned 46:22 85:7models 46:20,25 47:3 120:24,25 148:7,14models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:3,5139:21 140:24 141:7 142:20133:14 mathematics 111:18 144:2529:14,24,25 30:12 30:25 31:2,4,22mer 10:5 36:15 104:16 met 10:5 36:15 104:16model's 121:21 138:8 model's 121:21 138:8MAGGIE 2:23 magnitude 30:22 73:21 73:21 173:21matter 1:1 23:9,11 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 73:17,18,21 74:873:17,18,21 74:8 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 127:10model's 13:13 103:13 118:3,6138:16 139:6 myself 87:1 119:2maintain 7:11 29:8,13 32:1 68:7 maintain 5:4,1783:10 84:7 89:21,23 90:22 97:9 99:1299:17 104:12 112:6 99:17 104:12 112:6midnght 148:24 midnght 148:24 migh 9:11 26:24more 3:7 26:13,14	-	,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
117:21 121:5134:2,9,18 135:5,523:23 26:11,23mentioned 46:22 85:7132:7,14,15,1778:22,25 79:11122:17 123:6135:1027:10,12,22 28:4,12120:24,25 148:7,14models 46:20,25 47:380:24 81:24 84:3,5125:16 130:22materially 86:1328:17,18,21 29:9,11meru 141:25 142:2,1247:10 109:16,2180:24 81:24 84:3,5139:21 140:24133:1429:14,24,25 30:12meru 141:25 142:2,12110:892:18 104:10141:7 142:20mathematics 111:1830:25 31:2,4,22met 10:5 36:15 104:16model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matrix 121:21,22,2432:2,17 41:5,7,14107:3model's 121:21 138:8112:15 113:24144:25matter 1:1 23:9,1158:2 60:21 67:9129:8 137:2118:3,6138:16 139:673:2127:5 53:16 54:19,2073:17,18,21 74:8MICHAEL 2:25moment 33:3 46:15mself 87:1 119:2main 17:17 77:1655:9 65:21 69:678:8 80:12 82:21,24microphone 101:1483:22 130:12moment 136:21148:12,1273:5 79:18 82:287:18 91:21 94:6,11127:10moment 136:21mater 136:21148:12,1273:5 79:19 82:299:17 104:12 112:6midnght 148:24mooted 50:15mater 136:21132:1 68:790:22 97:9 99:1299:17 104:12 112:6midnght 9:11 26:24more 3:7 26:13,14mature 105:16105:17 107:12112:6 113:13112:6 12:4more 3:7 26:13,14mature 107:1 128:3						
122:17 123:6 135:10 27:10,12,22 28:4,12 120:24,25 148:7,14 models 46:20,25 47:3 80:24 81:24 84:3,5 125:16 130:22 materially 86:13 28:17,18,21 29:9,11 menu 141:25 142:2,12 47:10 109:16,21 84:8 86:9 90:8 139:21 140:24 133:14 29:14,24,25 30:12 menu 141:25 142:2,12 47:10 109:16,21 92:18 104:10 144:25 matrix 121:21,22,24 30:25 31:2,4,22 met 10:5 36:15 104:16 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 MAGGIE 2:23 MATT 2:22 41:15 52:10 55:24 methodological 128:4 modular 18:13 103:13 132:15,18 137:3 magnitude 30:22 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 138:16 139:6 73:21 27:5 59:16 52:1 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 moment 33:3 46:15 mself 87:1 119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 momintoring 139:4 mame 138:11 maintain 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 mooted 50:15 mater 105:16 materialins 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 midnight 9:11 26:24			-			-
125:16 130:22 materially 86:13 28:17,18,21 29:9,11 menu 141:25 142:2,12 47:10 109:16,21 84:8 86:9 90:8 139:21 140:24 133:14 29:14,24,25 30:12 mercifully 145:2 110:8 92:18 104:10 141:7 142:20 mathematics 111:18 30:25 31:2,4,22 met 10:5 36:15 104:16 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 144:25 matrix 121:21,22,24 32:2,17 41:5,7,14 107:3 model's 121:21 138:8 129:10 131:24,24 MAGGIE 2:23 MATT 2:22 41:15 52:20 55:24 methodological 128:4 modular 18:13 103:13 132:15,18 137:3 magnitude 30:22 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 138:16 139:6 main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 mater 138:11 maintain 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 mooted 50:15 mater 105:16 maintain 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14<						-
141:7 mathematics 111:18 30:25 31:2,4,22 met 10:5 36:15 104:16 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 144:25 matrix 121:21,22,24 32:2,17 41:5,7,14 107:3 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 MAGGIE 2:23 MATT 2:22 41:15 52:20 55:24 met 10:5 36:15 104:16 model's 121:21 138:8 112:15 113:24 magnitude 30:22 matter 1:1 23:9,11 58:2 60:21 67:9 129:8 137:2 modular 18:13 103:13 138:16 139:6 73:21 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 moments 136:21 moments 136:21 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 mointoring 139:4 mater 138:11 maintain 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 mature 107:1 128:3			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
144:25 matrix 121:21,22,24 32:2,17 41:5,7,14 107:3 modest 64:25 129:10 131:24,24 MAGGIE 2:23 MATT 2:22 matter 1:1 23:9,11 58:2 60:21 67:9 methodological 128:4 modular 18:13 103:13 132:15,18 137:3 73:21 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 127:10 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 mooted 50:15 mate 138:11 maintain 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 matural 105:16	139:21 140:24			5		
MAGGIE 2:23 MATT 2:22 41:15 52:20 55:24 methodological 128:4 modular 18:13 103:13 132:15,18 137:3 magnitude 30:22 matter 1:1 23:9,11 58:2 60:21 67:9 129:8 137:2 moment 33:3 46:15 138:16 139:6 73:21 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 maself 87:1 119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 mame 138:11 maintains 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 midgle 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 mature 107:1 128:3						
magnitude 30:22 matter 1:1 23:9,11 58:2 60:21 67:9 129:8 137:2 118:3,6 138:16 139:6 73:21 27:5 53:16 54:19,20 73:17,18,21 74:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:3 46:15 myself 87:1 119:2 main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 moment 316:21 myself 87:1 119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 name 138:11 32:1 68:7 90:22 97:9 99:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 107:1 128:3						
Imagination 27:553:1654:19,20 73:17,18,2174:8 MICHAEL 2:25 moment 33:346:15 myself 87:1119:2 73:21 55:965:2169:6 78:880:1282:21,24 microphone 101:14 83:22130:12 moment 33:346:15 myself 87:1119:2 148:12,12 73:579:1882:2 87:18 91:21 94:6,11 127:10 moment 33:346:15 myself 87:1119:2 maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 name 138:11 32:1 68:7 90:22 97:9 99:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 mooted 50:15 natural 105:16 maintains 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 107:1 128:3						-
Main 17:17 77:16 55:9 65:21 69:6 78:8 80:12 82:22 microphone 101:14 83:22 130:12 148:12,12 73:5 79:18 82:2 87:18 91:21 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 name 138:11 32:1 68:7 90:22 97:9 99:17 104:12 112:6 midly 91:12 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 107:11 128:33	0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-	
Image: Number of the second						myself 87:1 119:2
maintain 7:11 29:8,13 83:10 84:7 89:21,23 94:25 95:6,8 99:16 middle 71:3 monitoring 139:4 name 138:11 32:1 68:7 90:22 97:9 99:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 mooted 50:15 natural 105:16 maintains 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 107:1 128:3			-	-		
minimum in 125.0,15 90:22 97:9 99:12 99:17 104:12 112:6 midnight 148:24 mooted 50:15 natural 105:16 maintains 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 105:16	-		-			
maintains 6:4,17 105:17 107:12 112:6 113:13 might 9:11 26:24 more 3:7 26:13,14 nature 107:1 128:3	-		-		0	
				0		
	-			5		
126:1 110:22 111:18 126:23,24 127:1,1,2 28:11 38:12 39:12 27:7 30:7 33:13 129:7 139:21	176.1	110.22 111:18	120.23,24 127:1,1,2	20.11 30:12 39:12	21.1 30.1 33:13	129:7 139:21

Trevor McGowan

Page 8

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

, 					<i>sauj</i> , <i>so vanauj</i> 2020
NatureScot 59:24	90:1	0	69:25 70:2,5 75:12	121:21 124:23	PABLO 2:19
NEAT 2:24	normally 37:22	object 27:21 92:13	81:20 90:25 95:23	134:7,24 139:9	packaged 106:21,24
necessarily 26:16 84:7	118:13		96:18 98:12 107:2	142:4 143:13,15	107:1
89:15 94:14 111:19	NORMAN 2:10	objective 1:16 5:15	107:21 108:24	144:15 147:13,15	page 3:8,18 13:9,21,24
111:22 116:7 122:5	norms 6:1	11:5 25:23 27:13,22 28:1 41:16 42:1	109:16 110:24	148:13,14	14:20 15:4,8,12,15
necessary 5:22 16:23	Norris 2:7 4:3,5 1:11	52:19,24 53:1,10,15	111:7 113:17 115:3	others 15:21 57:2	16:12 17:4,16,23
27:19 29:20 30:21	1:14 24:11,12 35:3	53:19,20,23 66:23	115:11,14 116:18	82:10 145:2	18:1,3,6,25 19:17
39:6 69:13 70:4,15	72:14,23 104:2,25	67:2,2,4,10,19,24	118:23 119:1	otherwise 26:23 28:3	19:19 20:18 21:6,21
88:5,7 93:11 105:21	125:22 136:20,21	68:14,23 71:18	139:10 147:14	33:8 38:3 42:16	22:14,17 24:14
114:1 129:7,21	141:7 146:5 147:7	72:11 73:9,21 74:7	148:2	51:22 63:15 71:22	26:18,22 30:5,23
132:16,18	150:8 151:8	74:17 75:4,11 76:14	open 15:23,25 16:1	74:21 137:4	31:5 43:10 45:5,7
necessity 28:10	North 4:3,5,6 9:16	79:7,25 80:23,25	83:18 85:4 150:8,13	ought 43:19	46:16 52:3 53:25
NED 2:17	16:18 21:8 22:24	82:24 86:1,12 97:8	opened 8:3	ourselves 102:1	57:19 60:21 62:12
need 14:11 15:14	23:2 30:8 32:22	99:9 131:23,25	open-source 14:9 15:6	out 11:10 21:9 38:11	62:16,22 65:3 77:7
25:11 31:13,18	45:7 47:5,6,8,9,11	136:2,12	operation 58:15	38:15 43:1 45:8	80:1 81:11,16 87:11
34:18 46:10,11 55:4	48:6,14,18,21 53:3	objectively 11:17	operational 58:14	49:20 57:10 61:24	95:18 98:5,7,8 99:1
55:11 57:4 81:13,20	56:21 62:5,9 65:17	objectives 77:20 78:25	operations 21:11 51:2	64:12 65:7 72:12	99:22 100:22
82:3 83:20 89:11	68:21 69:20 70:4,8	79:6	opine 69:24	73:11 76:1 79:17	107:16 108:11
90:17 94:9 96:7	107:22,24 108:4,7	obligation 9:25 24:24	opinion 46:10 73:25	81:7 82:5 92:8 97:5	pages 17:16 45:4 60:4
99:3,4,6,19 106:11	108:14,19,23	25:2,7 28:2 37:14	104:22	97:15 99:2,18 103:2	70:24
106:13 113:4	109:21,24 110:2,20	37:14 80:6 82:6	opponents 60:20	107:8 108:3,8	Palace 1:6
118:24 120:7,8,11	110:25 111:1,4	84:9,10,22,24 85:1	opportunities 3:25 4:4	109:21 110:1	paper 57:2,9,10,24
120:12,22 122:23	112:2,15,19 114:8	85:24 86:9,10,20,21	108:5	112:21 113:8,11	58:4 59:9 60:17
124:11,13,16,17	114:11,18 115:5,14	87:5 88:6 129:8	opportunity 94:19	130:14 140:20	61:3,6 62:16,16
125:5,9 134:4 135:4	115:15 123:9	obligations 3:11 4:10	104:4 112:10	142:4 148:23	64:8,13 65:3 103:9
135:5 144:20,23	127:15,22 138:5	6:22 7:8 8:8,10	138:22 148:19	outbreak 74:10	103:10
145:16 149:5,16	northern 1:3,17 62:25	25:22 37:12 40:1	151:5	outcome 84:8 131:8	papers 56:14,16,24
150:1,19	Norway 21:9 51:11	79:17,24 80:2,4,16	opted 142:1	144:16 146:2	103:17 105:25
needed 9:14 49:14	111:6	80:21 84:21 88:16	option 83:16 88:1,11	outcomes 82:9	paragraph 13:23,24
67:17 97:5 98:20	Norwegian 20:15,21 21:3,11,12 50:21	90:10	options 87:24 142:21 oral 25:1,4 30:2	outline 40:10 outlined 40:5	13:24 18:9 60:4
needs 26:19 55:15 79:19 91:9 105:14	51:2,3 55:17,20	obliged 93:9,22	107:13 125:12,19	output 7:25 15:16	65:4,13 74:1 98:8 99:2 102:12 149:3
105:15,20 111:3	111:16,21 112:11	observation 81:22	144:5 149:9 151:13	111:25 116:17	paragraphs 34:19
119:24 125:6	112:22 113:15	observational 123:2	151:25	120:6,14 121:19	36:22 91:5 92:9
130:14 143:4	114:5,8,13,15 115:3	obtain 128:15	orally 102:2	141:10	98:6 100:16,25
negative 74:11	115:5 117:4	obtainable 11:19	oranges 137:21	outputs 15:13,15,19	parameter 112:20
negotiate 84:23	note 31:14 74:16 75:3	43:20 44:18 46:4	Orbit 2:12	21:24 51:15	123:19,20 124:2
negotiated 3:5	75:19 76:3 83:24	48:25	order 13:11 16:6 23:7	outset 75:19	131:1
negotiations 87:10	84:15 105:8,9	obtained 10:19 11:7	29:21 37:1 46:11	outside 30:14 58:19	parameters 19:23
neither 92:20	148:23	46:11 obvious 39:3 63:16	81:25 90:17 102:9	115:6 117:6 128:16	23:22 45:24 49:24
net 41:24	noted 50:14 59:11	117:18	102:11,14 107:3,24	outstanding 76:9	56:19 118:11
Netherlands 1:7	84:15	obviously 24:23 38:18	107:25 109:11	outweighing 144:10	119:16,20,23 120:8
never 4:11 5:17 46:19	nothing 34:18 93:23	occasion 72:15	120:13 124:18	over 25:14 30:15	120:10 121:3,16,23
new 12:14 18:19 19:11	107:1 144:17	occasions 31:8	129:11 134:15	41:24 51:20 52:16	122:3,10,19,22
19:23,25 45:16 49:3	noticeably 42:5	occur 119:23	143:12 149:3	90:18 99:17 102:9	parametrisation
87:13 116:15,23	notification 79:12	occurred 58:17	Ordinarily 106:16	114:18 117:17	119:7,10
117:17 118:12	noting 103:23 149:13	ocean 57:23	ordinary 55:2 82:5	overall 27:6 56:22	parametrise 10:19
124:5,15,20,21	notion 130:15	October 31:10	92:12	58:20 63:4 64:1	parametrised 12:6
125:3,7	notwithstanding	odd 132:4	Organisation 101:4	67:3	paraphrase 1:25
next 18:13 22:25 43:2	59:10	off 122:11	Organization 39:18	overarching 42:23	parrot 55:12
58:10 62:4,8,16,22	NOURA 2:13	offered 141:14	original 137:19	overestimating 112:3	part 2:3 6:7 15:20
62:23 64:13 65:4	nuance 38:22,23	often 57:22 89:24	orthodox 40:5	112:5	27:6 34:8 39:5
78:8 91:25 139:17	nuances 37:18	Okay 150:14	OSPAR 22:9 23:4	overestimation 12:22	47:14 53:9,9 56:20
NG 2:23	nullification 2:19	OLIVER 2:20	61:10,13,24	20:8 112:1,3 113:8	88:20 95:20 105:24
NIALL 2:21	32:21 33:16 77:11	omission 140:22	other 3:17,20 5:16,25	113:9,12	106:4 107:18 108:8
night 148:24 Nods 127:17	nullified 25:17	omits 11:19	8:15 10:19 11:6	overstated 29:8 32:1 overstatement 29:15	109:3,8,24 110:15
Nods 137:17 none 49:22 65:1	nullify 32:8 33:8 number 15:18 33:18	omitted 140:13	13:12 14:13 24:2 26:4 30:1 32:25	overstatement 29:15 overstates 7:20	110:17 114:10 127:18 129:5,15
none 49:22 65:1 nonetheless 59:11	55:21 63:17 75:20	once 4:20 18:22 24:25	26:4 30:1 32:25 33:6,8,9,22 34:1	overstates 7:20 overstating 111:8	127:18 129:5,15 130:4 144:19 147:1
67:6 135:13	76:15 99:17 101:25	36:15 41:13 53:16	38:2 39:7 45:25	overview 23:12	130:4 144:19 147:1
non-breeding 62:7	139:15 141:7 144:6	70:18 109:15	46:20 47:10,15 50:5	overview 23:12 own 9:6 25:1,20 33:4	partial 41:19 57:19
non-discrimination	145:3 148:8,10	117:14,16 136:8	54:8,9,16 59:9 60:2	33:10 37:16,17	59:21
24:18 76:4 81:25	numbering 17:4 19:18	ones 50:6 69:9 93:7	63:17 84:17,20	39:21 53:1 54:10,17	participants 53:7
140:15 141:21	19:19 22:18	one's 83:9	90:15,18 92:15	66:18 71:16 76:22	particular 22:6,16
non-discriminatory	numbers 63:19,22	only 2:12 4:24 5:10	95:12 98:9 99:20	104:7 106:18	25:6 35:6 38:11,25
7:11 24:20,23 25:12	69:13,16,17,19	8:8 11:1 33:3 34:12	102:23 104:17	119:11	39:2,24 48:2 60:23
41:3 42:11 81:14,19	70:10,15	34:18 47:7,13,13	106:8 112:21		78:13 86:7 118:19
83:21 87:16 89:20	, -	49:7 54:1,4 56:20 62:5 67:8 69:4,21	115:11 117:19	Р	119:9 133:22 138:3
		02.3 07.0 07.4,21			
L	1		1		

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

138:9	Permanent 1:5 3:5	120:20 121:10	141:8 147:22	91:22 93:25 95:4	133:19
particularly 21:25	permissible 92:7	125:24 136:15	precision 27:8	96:5 105:5 139:23	proportion 76:1 110:3
41:17 144:6 146:20	permitted 38:2 92:3	138:2,15 139:21	preclude 86:18	139:25 141:19,19	proportionality 6:3
parties 2:16 3:12,13	person 17:9	142:13 145:7	precluded 8:20	143:15	24:17 27:2,25 28:2
3:15,24 6:10 9:2	perspective 109:2	pointed 9:23 137:3	predate 124:22	principles 6:15,20 7:4	28:24 33:5 75:24
10:24 25:6 32:17	149:19	pointing 99:2 118:3	predated 124:23	7:7 26:1 77:20	76:14,19 80:13,14
73:3 76:21,25 78:3	pertained 44:15 50:12	points 11:25 23:9,10	predators 12:7,10	78:23 82:7 83:1	81:24 89:8,9,14
78:5 79:2 90:23	phenomenon 128:7,9	28:23 29:4,6,9,11	13:7 16:10,16,20	90:4,6,7,9,10,15,24	91:25 92:2,6 93:5,5
91:20 92:16,19 93:1	128:13	29:16 30:17 32:4	23:17,19 45:25 46:5	90:25 92:1 95:10	94:1,16 96:6,23
93:13 97:11 102:13	phrase 139:1	42:23 75:19 76:8,10	46:8 47:21 48:15	139:17,21 140:14	138:25 140:10,15
103:5,7,16 106:23	pick 76:9 125:15	-	57:22 65:6,16 67:17	-	141:21 142:23
	-	81:5,7,7,8 84:11	,	140:14,16,17,23	
110:22 111:10	picked 90:4	92:10 93:25 95:13	118:6 119:19	141:1	143:1,18,22
126:13 132:22	picking 57:20	97:22 126:3,7,9	124:23 128:10,14	prior 145:1 146:16	proportionate 7:10
139:6 141:15	picture 145:10	145:5	predatory 65:1,11	149:15	24:19,22 25:11
142:25 149:5	piece 8:22 48:1 54:2	population 74:9	68:4 69:1,8	probably 62:20	26:11 27:9,10,12,18
150:17,23	127:17 129:10	populations 53:8 68:8	predator-prey 122:2	120:21	28:6,17 41:2,7
partly 99:19 104:8	130:13 131:13	68:19 74:7	predicated 113:14	problem 117:18	42:11 81:4,13,19
144:20	pieces 121:18 128:4	pose 102:2	predict 56:19 122:14	150:12	83:21 87:16,19
parts 5:8,9 71:1 108:3	place 20:10,16,21 21:3	posed 112:17	predicted 64:3 69:19	problematic 80:3	89:19,25 94:6,12
party 3:20,21 6:18	21:12,15 51:3	poses 106:12	114:18 115:15	91:14	97:14 139:7 140:8
8:19 9:6 11:16,18	110:20 112:22	positing 89:1	117:1	procedural 37:1 79:12	143:11 150:4
25:20 36:3,13,23	114:21 128:15	position 10:11 23:3	predictions 119:22	84:5,10,20,24 102:8	proportions 46:1
38:25 39:7 40:8,8	130:17	25:2 29:7 37:6,8	predicts 123:7	102:11,14 142:7	propose 102:6
54:8,9,14 67:8	plain 84:11 98:16	38:20 40:19 58:1,8	prefer 46:7	149:2	proposed 41:12 60:21
79:11 81:20,23 83:9	plank 70:18	69:10,10 71:3 72:16	preliminary 104:3	proceduralism 82:16	proposes 66:25 103:3
87:18 88:3 89:7,10	planks 70:20	72:22 82:19,24 83:4	113:3	83:7	proposition 30:4,9
89:13,18,24 90:17	plans 85:12,13,17	83:5 90:20 96:2,17	premise 68:10,18	proceed 73:18	57:3 61:16 65:10
90:25 94:13,24	play 10:22 41:9	104:5 106:2 110:23	128:22 129:21	proceedings 83:25	70:16 128:25
102:23 104:10,11	playing 93:21	111:2 112:14 113:4	preparation 1:9	94:10 126:5	protect 63:18 98:20
106:16,17 131:23	plays 77:21	116:5 117:8,11	prepare 102:17	process 7:24,25 32:13	protection 1:15,20 2:3
132:13 141:16	pleadings 7:19 81:2	125:2,4 128:6	147:19	34:8 77:22 83:15,25	53:2 73:19 76:23,25
145:25	please 24:11 42:18	129:13,14 130:11	prepared 102:3	85:8 86:7 89:15	77:1 79:23 80:22,24
party's 37:25 54:16	71:24 72:24 107:25	132:14 133:22	146:16	95:21 98:17,18	86:2,13 94:24 95:8
83:14 148:20	113:1,21 141:4	134:5 135:9	present 14:23 22:17	100:12 139:4	95:11
pass 11:22 24:10	pleased 125:11	positions 106:22	43:17 76:7 92:9	144:25	protocol 2:24
28:22	-	-			-
40.44	plenary 120:18	150:23 151:21	109:18 133:21	produce 9:6.22 13:12	prove 34:2 40:13
	plenary 120:18 plots 58:11	150:23 151:21 positive 59:5	109:18 133:21 presentation 51:17.19	produce 9:6,22 13:12 39:8 43:11	prove 34:2 40:13 118:24 25
passage 52:2 62:4	plots 58:11	positive 59:5	presentation 51:17,19	39:8 43:11	118:24,25
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18	118:24,25 proven 44:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevous 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevouls 126:25 127:3 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 producet 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16148,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 provideg 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 prety 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,1618,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoils 54:7 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 product 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:7 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoils 42:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisions 2:24 3:2
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:7 plug-ins 10:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 06:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:57,17 provisional 43:9 provisions 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plug 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisions 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,161 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 proving 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 perfectly 115:22 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 prety 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 projection 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 projected 46:23 50:25	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,1618,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4 public 93:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,161 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 proving 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:23	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 prety 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 projection 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 projected 46:23 50:25	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4 public 93:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 prety 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoils 126:25 127:3 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 projected 46:23 50:25 projects 59:24	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 43:9 provisional 43:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4 public 93:8 published 48:21 60:18
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10 101:15 123:21,24	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:23	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevous 60:9 74:25 previous 9 74:25 previous 9 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21 primary 93:6 principal 136:3	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18 project 59:24 prompted 34:9	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisions 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4 published 48:21 60:18 PUCCIO 2:8
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10 101:15 123:21,24 133:6 141:15	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5 87:12,13,22 90:19	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:23 71:23,25 72:1,13,20	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoils 42:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21 primary 93:6 principal 136:3 principally 65:9 93:7	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18 project 46:23 50:25 project 59:24 prompted 34:9 proof 8:24,25 39:1	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,1614 146:11 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 proving 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 43:9
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10 101:15 123:21,24 133:6 141:15 142:10 144:10	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5 87:12,13,22 90:19 91:2 95:15 97:12,18	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:23 71:23,25 72:1,13,20 73:14,15 74:4,14,17	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoils 42:1 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21 primary 93:6 principal 136:3 principally 65:9 93:7 principle 6:6 11:15	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18 project 85:24 project 46:23 50:25 project 59:24 prom 8:24,25 39:1 54:11 104:9	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,1614 146:11 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 proving 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 43:9
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10 101:15 123:21,24 133:6 141:15 142:10 144:10 145:2 149:16	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5 87:12,13,22 90:19 91:2 95:15 97:12,18 98:9,14 99:6 100:14	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precation 74:5,16 75:3 precationary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:23 71:23,25 72:1,13,20 73:14,15 74:4,14,17 74:18 75:4,5,9	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevailing 59:2,4 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevent 33:5 previous 60:9 74:25 previously 64:7 prey 30:14 53:6 60:7 64:10 65:6 68:4 75:12 119:19 124:22 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21 primary 93:6 principal 136:3 principal 6:6 11:15 37:7 41:2 52:25	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 producing 115:14 product 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18 project 46:23 50:25 projects 59:24 prompted 34:9 proof 8:24,25 39:1 54:11 104:9 proper 34:14,17,21	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,16,18,19 149:17 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 providing 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisions 2:24 3:2 4:17,22 5:10,22 6:8 25:14 77:4,25 78:11 140:4 public 93:8 published 48:21 60:18 PUCCIO 2:8 puffin 64:24 pure 149:22
passage 52:2 62:4 100:16 passages 60:2 99:22 100:2,15,19,23 144:6,12,20 145:8 145:10 passed 135:24 past 120:4,9 PAUL 2:11 Pause 15:8 22:20 35:9 pay 83:10 PCA 1:4 150:21 151:16 Peace 1:6 PENELOPE 1:11 people 114:9 per 77:22 percentage 51:4 69:19 69:24 109:15 110:1 111:24 percentages 51:7 108:21 perfectly 115:22 performed 24:23 25:8 perhaps 100:10 101:15 123:21,24 133:6 141:15 142:10 144:10 145:2 149:16 150:19,23	plots 58:11 plugged 14:9 15:17 16:1 18:15 plugging 21:24 plug-in 18:13 118:7 plug-ins 103:13 118:4 plus 110:25 112:16 pm 1:10 35:9,18,19,20 101:20,22 152:2 point 2:9 5:2,3 12:8,12 12:17,24 13:14 14:6 16:3,7,14 18:17 19:25 20:4,11,25 21:16 22:3 25:5,24 26:8 29:17,25 31:1 31:14,20 32:5 33:2 33:12,13 37:9 42:5 42:24 43:8 47:17 49:2,11 50:12,13 51:14 52:5 53:21,23 55:1,10,11 63:10 65:14,15 66:4,5,8 68:1,13 73:8,8 74:5 74:15 75:2,8 77:16 78:7,8 79:4 82:15 83:24 84:4 85:5 87:12,13,22 90:19 91:2 95:15 97:12,18 98:9,14 99:6 100:14 111:9 115:11 116:3	positive 59:5 positively 8:23 54:3 possession 39:7 possibility 33:15,17 41:8,13 59:13 60:23 135:11,12 possible 9:11 55:18,21 66:19 82:9 91:19,24 95:2 112:4 127:9 potential 60:10,24 67:12 100:4 129:23 141:15 potentially 84:18 power 59:24 powers 7:13 PO1 148:23 practical 54:19 56:11 60:15 90:13 118:9 142:25 149:22 practice 89:24 pragmatic 150:9 preamble 3:15 147:2 precaution 74:5,16 75:3 precautionary 11:8,13 11:14,15 52:3 71:23,25 72:1,13,20 73:14,15 74:4,14,17 74:18 75:4,59 105:5 139:23,25	presentation 51:17,19 presented 13:1 21:18 23:6 52:6 87:11 151:21 presents 1:10 preservation 1:21 presumed 37:10,11 pretty 63:11 70:9 prevail 54:1 prevails 126:25 127:3 prevoails 126:25 127:3 previous 60:9 74:25 prima 4:21 10:3 36:14 36:16,20 37:4 38:9 38:19 54:6 primacy 7:1 primarily 21:8 27:10 28:1 47:14 126:21 primary 93:6 principal 136:3 principal 136:3 principal 6:9 93:7 principal 6:6 11:15 37:7 41:2 52:25 53:16 76:15,17 81:8	39:8 43:11 produced 1:23 9:18 43:19 48:17 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 produces 114:25 produces 115:14 produce 115:2 Professor 1:12 2:12 3:10,12 34:9 120:21 146:22 148:3 151:15 proffered 65:23 106:3 proffering 54:17 programmes 85:12,14 85:18 progression 124:3 prohibiting 32:9 56:20 68:18 115:19 prohibition 7:16 9:25 11:11 24:6 28:19 59:5 68:24 70:5 79:5 95:1,7 114:19 115:16 138:4 project 85:18 project 46:23 50:25 projects 59:24 prompted 34:9 proopt 34:14,17,21 88:17 95:25 96:20	118:24,25 proven 44:8 provide 5:21 15:16 23:12 66:14 146:11 148:9,161 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provided 15:2 102:7 102:15 115:21 150:11 provides 28:18 38:8 61:1 proving 39:25 102:18 proving 36:23 39:4 40:9 provision 6:16 27:24 81:15 82:6 131:18 142:5,7,17 provisional 43:9 provisional 43:9

Trevor McGowan

Page 10

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

					-
27:21 42:13 47:12	148:17.21 149:20	109:10 129:22	99:22 100:18 101:1	108:23 146:21	14:13 17:1,11 19:2
61:19 92:13 106:5	quite 30:4 38:20 39:13	138:6	104:17 105:15	relates 103:20 118:2	20:22 21:1,2,5,24
113:5,6 138:8	54:13 55:1 63:16	reasonableness 26:15	116:9 118:25	132:23	22:6 36:5 40:13,14
142:16	67:5 72:3 74:25	27:1,7 55:5	121:11,12	relating 45:24 98:10	42:22 43:4,25 44:19
purposes 14:23 17:17	94:2 107:13 144:18	reasonably 3:24 10:18	references 15:18	relation 4:5 7:7 46:10	
					44:21,25 47:4 48:17
22:17 51:16,19	148:24 149:19	11:7,19 12:5,9,14	85:22 98:2,23	133:1	49:6,13,17,19,22
71:18 82:11 129:4	quota 33:20,21	12:19 13:1,6 16:9	referred 3:14 15:10	relations 92:16,19	50:2,10,17,20,24
136:10	quotas 33:24 34:1	18:15,19 20:1,6	17:14 30:3 44:21	93:18	51:10,13,18,19 52:2
pursuant 1:1	quote 18:24 26:17,21	21:14,18 23:25 24:3	46:13,16 47:10,22	relationship 26:12,13	52:4,6,12 55:24
pursue 2:2 53:5 77:19	140:20	28:17 54:24 55:7	60:19 64:7 103:9,12	27:5,11,22 65:16	57:11,12,13 59:23
78:25 79:2 95:11	quoting 24:14	133:20	103:14 121:10	67:19,24 90:14	60:19,20,23 61:2,5
pursued 67:6 77:1		reasoning 121:7	144:5,8 146:23	93:14 136:2,12	61:6,11,16,17,20,23
79:6,6	R	144:12 146:18	147:16	relationships 93:7	62:8,12 63:3,9,11
pursues 27:11	raise 84:19 127:10	reasons 65:21 70:21	referring 49:5 72:20	relative 62:2,10	63:19,23 64:15,19
pursuing 25:23 53:2	128:9 149:1	84:2 92:10 136:17	75:14 100:15	relatively 97:13	66:1,2,7,10,11
79:25	raised 26:8 49:2 51:14	rebut 4:23 28:5 41:6	144:20 147:17	144:21 150:8	67:22,22 69:23
pursuit 5:14	76:8,10 94:10 98:10	rebuttal 4:1,7 1:13	refers 13:9 45:5 49:25	released 31:11	70:12,24 71:9 85:20
put 8:15 10:23 75:25	100:14 125:24	7:12 35:24 44:15	51:1,23 55:5 59:18	relevance 11:4 85:15	106:20 109:18,20
82:1,15 87:7 104:5	126:7	76:7 126:5	91:6 149:8	140:17 141:11	114:14 116:25
107:5 114:24 118:7	raises 41:13 70:22	rebutted 44:14	reflect 5:5 23:21 88:6	relevant 5:1,3,21 6:7	122:21 127:25
122:19 134:19	range 41:20,23 42:3	recalibrate 120:7	119:17 120:9	17:2,12 18:23 22:11	128:1 133:12,13
136:15 140:5	57:6 59:25 66:19	125:9	122:15 133:18	23:5,9 26:5 29:23	137:13,20,22
144:17	95:2 148:9	recalibrated 45:20	reflected 36:25	31:22 42:4 60:2	138:10,12 146:24
puts 83:24 134:9	ratchet 70:5	119:24 120:12	reflecting 59:7	61:3 72:8 73:16	reporter 150:15
putting 71:16	ratcheted 70:6 108:12	121:4 124:18 125:6	reflects 83:19 119:25	77:19 83:18 90:24	reports 23:12,17
	rather 50:18 53:18	recalibration 119:8,11	reformulate 141:13	91:1 92:15 93:1	55:13 56:17 131:3
0	56:5,11 61:21 64:18	121:6	refusing 39:8	94:15 95:10 108:3	represent 69:19
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	recall 48:20 87:1 91:6	regard 1:20 6:5 24:19	111:23 127:19	115:24
quality 10:7 134:22	68:6 70:22 84:10	recalled 31:23	41:1 42:10 76:16	128:18 130:25	represented 72:16
quantified 70:17,18	95:1 96:6 99:11	receiving 34:25	77:20 78:23 80:9	134:20,21 138:19	represents 110:18,19
quantify 23:22 quantitatively 70:19	124:2 131:24 142:12 147:24	148:22	81:19 82:6,18 83:5	relied 2:18 9:23 36:24	reputable 129:11
	142:12 147:24	recent 44:9 57:17 60:3	83:17 84:9 86:21	54:8 61:3,19 72:10	request 148:17
quarter 15:19		61:3 73:24 122:15	87:4,25 88:9,25	77:10 106:1,17	require 1:24 45:19
question 7:13 10:17	rational 66:22 67:9,18	recital 3:9,13	89:2,10,13 90:12,25	135:9	63:5 86:6 94:13
15:1,2 26:8 28:7	67:24 68:23 71:18	recognise 38:25 74:22	91:16,22 94:12 95:9	relies 37:19 38:7 48:22	122:5,6 123:4 125:8
34:9 36:2,10 41:11	136:2,11	recognised 1:16,22	96:22,25 99:24	56:24 71:11	required 9:6 13:16
48:4 53:10 54:23	rationality 26:14,17	23:4 25:19 28:8	100:11 139:2,6	rely 38:12 42:13	29:21 34:11 39:12
56:5 69:5 75:23	26:25 27:4,5	97:25	140:3,4,8,9,14,16	106:18 146:12	45:17 68:11 71:19
82:7 90:14 94:20,21	razorbill 64:25	recollection 148:25	141:16,20 142:15	relying 37:23 56:14	81:18 89:22 94:25
94:23 103:4,16,20	reach 56:15	reconciled 91:9	142:16,19,21	57:15 106:23	95:23 104:13
103:25 104:8	reached 111:1 144:9	record 14:14 15:3	143:10,21 144:16	remain 102:24	142:17
105:11,19,24 106:9	147:15	19:14,16 22:14	146:25	remainder 127:24	requirement 25:21
106:12 108:9,20	reaches 65:17	30:19 31:18 73:25	regarding 12:1 18:18	remained 70:8 71:16	79:12,19,24 81:25
109:6,19 110:10,15	react 123:8	85:11 97:1 98:17	21:14 23:13 29:4	108:13	85:16 86:24 89:3
111:3 112:9 115:13	read 2:21 3:22 4:15,24	118:25 132:6 145:2	118:5 125:16	remains 38:17 117:12	90:8 94:11 95:10
118:2,9 119:2,5	5:4 24:8,16 25:3	records 121:25	137:11 144:9	126:23	130:17 132:13
125:13,22,23	32:19 100:2 141:12	recourse 11:13 39:10	regardless 27:13	remarkable 47:21	133:3,4 134:17
126:19 127:23	141:18 142:5,15	92:4	regards 6:3,22 7:9	remarkable 47:21 remember 69:18	requirements 7:17 8:1
128:21 129:20,23	144:23	92:4 rectangles 20:20	29:25 57:14 58:6	94:22 127:11	30:6
131:17,23 132:22	readily 43:20 44:17	50:22	29:25 57:14 58:6 83:20 92:5	94:22 127:11 reminds 100:24	requires 5:12 19:11
132:25 133:8,22	48:25 92:25			140:24	
134:2,14 135:8,22	reading 27:20,24	red 20:10 62:10	Regions 61:24 63:1 Registrar 3:6 150:21		24:18 73:9 83:12
137:5 139:11,13	88:17 131:18	114:24 115:4,7,9		removed 109:15 112:2	92:11 96:23,25
140:12 141:24	143:19 150:10	redactions 149:8,10	Registry 151:17 regulators 147:18	removing 109:12	reserve 74:24 resilience 68:7,19 74:6
142:8 144:3 145:7	reads 3:10,19 13:23	redo 104:6,23	8	repeat 84:11 87:1 94:23 95:13 97:22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
146:5 147:8	ready 133:7 149:12	redress 49:15	regulatory 1:16 2:18		75:11,13 99:3
questioning 9:9	real 53:19 120:9	reduce 80:24	3:14 4:18 5:6,15	109:5	resilient 30:7
questions 4:12,14,15	143:16 146:13	reduced 7:3 100:7	6:12,18,24 7:1,20	repeated 87:3	resolution 6:13
1:7 20:14 24:9	realistic 120:1	reducing 69:3	25:13,20 76:13,21	repeatedly 52:25	resolve 56:7 103:8
34:23 35:1,6,10	reality 30:19 119:25	reduction 12:20 20:6	77:2,9,17,21 79:23	replaces 111:24	106:14 107:6
74:25 76:11 78:14	120:5	109:23 110:2	80:23,25 83:14	replied 26:16	resolving 105:22
88:21 90:3,5 94:22	really 52:24 55:6 73:8	refer 10:14 16:11 31:7	88:19 99:9 146:16	replies 42:20	resort 38:19
101:8,24,25 102:2,3	78:6 84:7 93:4	72:19 87:8 107:2,16	147:18	replies/responses	resources 2:11 13:17
102:6,7,10,12,14,18	97:10,20 99:7 103:5	reference 14:3,13,24	rehearse 133:16	102:23	43:25 143:13
102:19,24 112:13	107:19 124:15	17:22 18:6 19:13	REID 3:3	reply 1:5,5 35:11	respect 16:19 37:6
112:17 115:22	126:12 136:23	27:10 28:1 31:12,16	reiterated 79:21	75:18,20 95:17	40:11 42:21 44:25
125:13 126:11	real-world 59:6	31:18 36:12 43:12	relate 29:7,9,12 106:8	102:1 123:10	46:21 47:20 51:16
138:23 143:25	reason 32:7 53:14	44:20 45:2 50:12	114:6	125:17	56:6 74:13 105:5
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 0 1 1 1	86:11 93:15 96:7	56:23 85:23 98:4,12	related 36:4,5 108:23	report 9:18 13:19 14:4	114:10 150:18
144:2 148:8,12,14	00.11 /0.10 /0.1				

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

-					
151:5	79:24 80:2,4,16,20	137:23	129:5,12 130:5	41:17 45:9 51:7	setting 2:25 6:22
respectful 57:9 67:21	93:6,8,10,17	sand 143:4	131:20,24 136:7	54:13 59:12 63:15	79:22 116:11
respective 148:20	rigorous 52:8	sandeel 2:3,16 4:3,5,7	scientist 43:22	63:24 64:22 91:14	settings 50:8
151:21	rigour 29:20 128:4	7:16 9:25 11:11	scientists 50:11 54:15	96:12 98:24 100:25	seventh 36:10
respond 10:10 11:22	129:8 132:16,18	12:7,11 13:7,14	56:8 117:24	101:19 129:22	several 14:22
11:25 29:3 94:20	137:2	16:10,17,19 21:8	scope 81:7,10 147:5	142:10 146:8,17	shape 122:2
96:5 103:22,23	RINDORF 2:12	23:14,18,20 24:5	149:5	147:13,23	share 4:4
112:10 113:23	rise 4:9,25 119:22	28:19 30:8,13,14	Scottish 3:2,3 23:11	seeing 106:7	shared 79:8
137:8 139:12	130:8	32:23,24 44:17 45:1	40:14 56:16 57:13	seek 39:17 56:8,10	shares 3:24
respondent 1:18 36:17	risk 112:3,5 117:14,16	45:12,14,18,19,22	59:22 61:2 66:7,11	68:2 107:4 125:20	shield 9:1
37:19,23 38:6,7,10	149:25 150:13	45:24,25 46:2,2,5,7	67:22 71:8 85:9	134:16 135:13	shift 37:3 38:18 116:7
38:12 106:2	risks 23:23 71:2	46:8 47:6,9,20	98:6 126:24 127:1,4	seeking 2:1,2 37:3	shifting 36:20 37:4
Respondent's 102:15	138:13	48:15,24 53:6,7,8	127:20,25 130:1	40:2 63:18 68:14,15	39:11
response 26:9 28:7	RLA-27 85:11	55:20 56:20 57:5,18	131:3 133:13 147:2	72:3 73:18 113:10	shifts 36:17
40:15 60:20 75:18	road 122:13	62:19 64:10,22,23	screen 64:8	127:12,13,21	short 7:14,19 8:4,12
76:7 104:3 110:13	ROBSON 2:22	65:5,10,11,12 67:16	screens 61:22	seeks 42:13	24:13 101:21
113:3 119:15 135:7	rocks 56:2	68:4,5,5,8,18,19,21	scrolls 15:12	seem 27:20 28:2 30:18	105:19 126:6
responses 102:22	role 6:12,24 7:7,20,21	69:2,4,25 75:12	scrutinise 7:24 34:12	82:10 108:17 130:9	134:14 142:13
148:20	23:14,20 26:2 41:9	77:25 98:20 108:7	95:23 96:18	132:4 133:14	shortcut 25:9,9 121:7
rest 126:25	68:20 76:17,18	111:15 115:19	scrutinising 26:2	seemed 49:6 50:19	shortcuts 8:7
restrained 102:1	77:21 93:21 94:1,2	118:5 123:8,18	scrutiny 9:2 97:3	144:11	shortly 44:12 102:7
restraint 1:7 25:14	95:15 133:15	124:7,11 128:8,10	se 77:22	seemingly 44:3	show 36:17 41:15
78:20 81:16	rolling 150:11	128:11,14,15	sea 1:19 4:3,5,6 9:16	seems 39:17 63:11	48:13 55:11,15
restriction 28:13	ROUISSI 2:13	133:15 137:13,15	16:18 21:8 22:24	82:9 129:23 142:8	63:13,23 65:25
93:10	rounds 126:10	138:4	23:2 30:8 32:22	143:9	96:12 115:17
restrictive 27:14	routinely 123:25	sandeels 75:12 98:21	45:7 47:5,6,8,9,11	seen 32:15 43:21	showed 96:13
87:15 148:1	row 14:23 15:24 17:7	99:14 115:5 124:4	48:6,14,18,21 53:3	46:24 59:22 63:12	showing 41:1 49:18
rests 70:16,17 126:21	17:17	124:12,13,22	56:21 62:5,9 65:17	65:7 99:23	56:3 58:13 61:12
result 63:15 73:15	ROWLAND 3:3	satisfaction 54:14	68:21 69:20 70:4,8	sees 53:18 58:20 59:3	87:9 146:13 147:14
86:10 88:16 90:13	RUBY 2:24	satisfied 72:12	73:24 85:23 107:22	segues 104:8	shown 14:13 45:12
107:7 115:10	Ruiz 1:12 3:10 34:9	satisfies 82:21	107:24 108:4,7,14	select 94:25 95:6	46:15 63:21 146:4
results 23:7 60:6	120:21 146:22	satisfy 32:13 41:25	108:19,23 109:21	self-judging 26:1	shows 3:3,13 46:16
117:1 129:14 132:8	148:3 151:15	54:6 70:19 79:19	109:24 110:2,20,25	senior 3:6,7	48:8 58:23 59:2
132:17	rule 37:20,21,22,25	105:14	111:1,4 112:2,15,19	sense 36:1 49:25 92:21	62:9 63:4 128:17
retains 42:9,12	38:1,2,6,7	saw 20:10 98:3	114:8,11,18 115:5	104:19 110:23	shrink 37:3
retract 105:6	rules 92:15,18 93:23	saying 38:15 54:22	115:14,15 123:9	113:12 123:5	shy 97:3
return 7:12 20:9,12	run 6:4 12:16 14:25	67:12 73:11 82:10	127:15,22 138:5	128:19 129:13	side 96:9 106:24 107:2
26:7 35:12 36:6	18:21,21 19:3,4,9	105:3 111:20 113:6	seabird 13:3 46:6 60:8	130:13 134:21	sifting 112:21
returned 68:1	19:12,21 20:3 43:2	125:17 132:1	60:11,15	137:4 138:7 142:24	sight 30:18
returns 17:23	43:7 44:24 48:20	144:22	seabirds 21:19 22:1,2	145:9 148:11	significance 61:20
review 7:13 26:6	49:1,4,8,19 50:2,3,3	says 13:25 17:7,8,17	22:4,5,11 41:21,23	senses 92:24	100:7 141:9
66:18 75:24 76:24	118:8,10,12,12	17:23 18:2,9,10,13	42:3 51:16,19,21,25	sensible 120:14	significant 4:19 13:17
80:22 103:21	120:3 121:13	19:20 22:21 36:15	52:6,13,14 53:5	sentence 22:25 46:24	25:5 57:14 58:5
106:13 122:7	122:16,22,24,25	41:13,18 50:25 52:2	57:4,18,22 58:6	51:1 57:21 75:1	63:6 81:5 122:23
124:20 138:25	137:16	54:8 57:21 60:5	63:4 67:14 69:10	sentinels 57:23	135:6 140:10
139:3,8 151:9	running 62:22	61:23 62:17 63:20	108:22	separate 31:7 80:11	146:20,20 150:13
reviewable 82:25	runs 19:20,21	65:4 81:2 83:17	seal 64:23,24 115:1	separately 13:1 21:18	silent 42:5
88:16	rushed 99:18	85:2 97:6 131:12	seals 30:6	23:7	similar 17:22 56:15
reviewed 120:16,17	R-0161 15:4,7 B 108 14:20 10:15	138:12 149:3	Searle 57:2 60:17 61:6	separates 2:16	64:14 85:1,1 145:19
120:18 122:23 reworked 49:9	R-108 14:20 19:15	scenario 108:1,16,18	103:9	September 98:25	simple 19:10,25 20:25
	45:5 46:12,16 P 120 87:11	120:1 134:22	season 62:7,24	100:17 SEDUAN 2:0	22:3 44:3 45:15
re-estimate 45:23 re-parametrising	R-120 87:11 R-161 17:4	scenarios 134:17 137:7	second 6:24 12:8 14:21,23 15:24 16:7	SERHAN 3:9 series 29:3 33:23	95:3 99:6 119:15 120:15 125:2
121:2	R-161 17:4 R-76 60:21	schedule 35:9 149:5	22:21 24:13 29:9,25	123:23	120:15 125:2 132:14 146:17
re-read 72:17	R-70 60:21 R-77 98:5 99:1 100:18	scheme 149:21	22:21 24:13 29:9,25 31:20 33:13 38:23	serious 117:24	simply 9:7 11:18
RIDINGS 1:11	132:11	SCHÄFERLING 3:8	43:8 47:17 51:1	serve 60:12 86:23	13:18 19:7 21:6
right 2:10,20 4:6,8	R-98 98:7	science 8:15 10:8 11:6	53:24 55:4 57:21	serve 60:12 80:25 served 6:15	31:14 34:1,7 38:14
8:19 25:15 32:22	N-70 70.7	54:7,10,16,17 56:2	58:14 61:7,8 64:4	serves 58:2 86:21	38:20 44:5 56:1
54:1,5 57:5 77:11	<u> </u>	56:9 57:15 65:23	65:24 66:3 76:14	Service 2:4,5,6,7,8	63:10 68:5 72:21
77:18 78:5,10 91:12		66:20,24 67:10,14	78:21 82:18 83:16	40:15	81:1,12 87:21 93:11
109:11 115:7 117:5	s 97:11 SAPANOCUL LADI	67:19,23,24 71:6,15	85:5 92:15 100:14	session 148:8,15	94:11 95:20 100:1
117:12 123:10	SABANOGULLARI	71:16,17 73:10,17	109:8 110:17	set 2:20 6:15 25:20	104:5 105:7 112:15
124:6 148:7	3:6 150:22 same 9:7,19 17:3	74:2 95:9 101:2	134:22 142:1,12	53:1 76:22 79:17	113:5 123:22
rightly 111:4	-	103:8,19 104:6	secondly 52:20	82:5 86:23 92:8	131:24 139:24
rights 1:18 2:14 3:11	32:15 48:2 51:11 56:15,15 58:10 62:8	105:20 106:1,6,11	Secretariat 151:16	97:5,15 138:2	146:2 147:24
3:17 4:10,16 5:13	62:12 64:14 71:7,19	106:18,19 113:25	secure 143:12	140:20 148:23	simulate 127:13
8:8,10 25:22 32:9	72:7 93:11 100:15	116:24 117:21,23	see 14:21 15:22,23	sets 9:2 49:20 80:23	simulated 12:2 13:2
33:7,17 78:2,5	107:1 122:20	122:24 128:24	19:13 22:13 33:22	88:15	21:18 29:19 116:17
	107.1 122.20				
		1			

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

	1				
simulations 132:8	sorry 88:23 112:12	68:10	14:18 25:4 37:2	suggests 43:3,19 44:4	96:22 112:22
since 69:13 133:6,7	116:22 123:11	state 1:18 10:13 11:2	44:19 46:22 56:25	45:15 48:25 49:11	taking 16:19 21:23
149:8	sort 26:14 54:6,7,18	37:12,13,15 39:3,9	57:9 59:1 61:14	134:7	51:2 86:14 137:15
sincere 151:13	72:10 73:9 94:21	73:18 93:9 150:23	65:13 67:21 80:3	suitable 47:12	142:4
single 14:1 95:6 117:5	sought 30:3 47:18	stated 14:12 15:18	88:3,13 89:13 90:7	summarised 131:2	tak[ing 85:24
singular 94:25	118:13 119:6	26:21 47:2 132:7	90:12,22 91:4,4,14	summary 92:10	talked 119:6
sits 140:5	sound 57:15	statement 4:1,7 1:13	92:8 94:14 98:4,7	superior 9:16,22	talking 99:10 113:25
situate 43:17	source 15:23,25 16:1	16:11,21 35:24 64:9	99:1 100:10,11,17	43:11,15,20	137:1
situation 39:15 120:5	sources 5:25 49:20	140:13	105:10 111:14	support 36:24 39:4,6	talks 107:17 116:4
situations 84:18 93:9	sovereign 1:18 3:11	statements 21:1	124:17 127:16	44:19 65:10 104:14	task 6:25 8:9 151:23
six 5:23 118:15	93:13	147:21	130:21 136:3	supports 68:6	TCA 1:17,23 2:21,22
size 14:7 41:22 45:11	space 70:7 108:12	states 3:12 36:22	139:20 140:2,11	supposed 56:6 73:10	2:24 3:6 4:11 5:8
67:16 118:5 123:17	133:17	37:10,10 92:22 93:8	submissions 7:12 8:3	supposedly 110:19	6:5,12,15 7:17 8:2,9
124:1	spatial 16:24 17:19,24	93:12	10:12 25:1 30:2	sure 87:6 88:24	8:19 10:4 24:8
sizes 45:14	18:12 47:19 48:15	state's 2:10	31:8 32:16 33:4,10	111:18 119:25	31:24 36:15,21
size-structured 13:13	48:18,24 137:14	stating 139:5	34:25 36:19 42:14	120:13 121:7	39:22,25 40:6,7
44:16 45:1 46:14,20	spatially 13:12 16:15	status 5:18 12:16	42:17 52:15 57:8,16	149:13	41:11 43:13 53:17
46:25 47:3,6 49:10	48:12 49:9 67:15	18:21 19:12 20:3	71:20 73:5 74:20	surely 137:18,22	54:20 66:17,20 67:8
skua 62:25	87:15	22:23 49:4 118:8,10	84:15 94:4 98:3	surface 62:19 63:8	78:9,11 79:17 80:16
slide 46:15,23 50:25	speak 120:23	118:12	99:23 100:3 101:9	surface-feeders 22:7	80:18 81:2 83:9,12
51:23 57:20 58:10	speaking 75:10	STECF 101:2	101:12,17 102:16	22:22 51:24 62:24	87:17,20 88:17 93:1
59:12 60:5 61:22	speaks 98:20	STEFAN 3:8	102:25 104:9 106:2	63:14,19,22	95:12 97:6
62:8,17,23 64:5,13	special 5:18 90:11	step 23:8 44:3 139:24	107:10 125:19,19	surface-feeding 22:1,5	team 117:22
65:4 87:8	140:2	steps 67:8	126:1,2,11 134:11	61:18 62:21 64:3	teasing 60:13
slides 20:11 49:18	species 13:3 14:1,2	STEVEN 2:18	137:19 140:24	surprised 16:21	technical 40:14 87:13
slightly 96:9 98:14	15:19 17:21 18:12	still 19:3,3 26:19	141:8,22 142:20	surprising 65:17	technically 124:5
131:21 132:4	45:10 47:11 52:13	86:25 101:15	144:5,7,21,23,25	survey 112:19	Technology 101:2
134:15	59:9,15 61:25 62:12	102:24 110:2	145:1,5 148:22	survival 62:21	tell 120:7 123:20
small 46:7 62:18	62:18,21 63:5 64:16	119:25 120:13	149:15,21,24 150:1	SUSMAN 2:11	telling 8:4
121:10	65:5 67:16 74:7	126:24	150:18	sustainable 79:9	temporal 98:19
SMS 14:24 15:10	75:12,13	stock 15:11 16:11	submit 79:15 128:17	swiftly 53:18 97:13	tends 151:2
46:13,17 47:10,12	specific 3:17 21:25	25:16 32:10	submits 56:25 138:15	144:21	tension 129:24 130:10
social 4:7 5:13 32:21	22:4 36:4 39:13	stocks 3:23 12:11	submitted 89:16 94:17	synthesis 65:3	term 10:11,14,22 11:4
33:16 79:10	42:20 44:13 51:7	32:25 33:9,22,23	106:13 142:24	systems 58:3 60:9	14:8 27:3,9,17,18
socioeconomic 99:25	52:13 59:8 68:8,12	79:8	subordinated 91:9	systems 50.5 00.7	54:21 79:9 141:9,12
100:5	80:12,15 95:11	stomach 121:25	subparagraph 3:22	T	terms 2:12 3:19 5:23
SOFIA 2:9	105:24	stop 25:12 81:14	subjaction 24:16		6:11 50:21 53:16,17
software 47:25 48:1,1	specifically 26:13 30:1	stopped 81:21	subsequent 26:5	tab 13:20 21:5 98:5,7	56:11 63:25,25
48:3,5,10	98:24	STOPPIONI 3:12	31:17	99:1 100:18	67:16 80:5 95:3,12
solid 115:7	specification 17:24	straight 60:3	substance 56:4 68:14	table 14:23 45:8,9,12	103:4 108:21 116:8
solution 150:9	specified 27:23	straightforward 30:4	substantial 39:5 56:21	62:8 64:12,18 65:8	119:15 127:5,5
some 5:8,9 11:5 25:1	specifies 62:12	30:9,18 40:23	substantiate 60:9	69:17 108:20	136:2,24 142:19
38:2 39:18 45:10	spend 82:4 83:3,22	strategic 60:15 85:8	substantive 19:22	tabled 87:10	territorial 1:19
54:6,7,17,18 60:2	spent 25:1	85:17	82:23 84:10,23	TAC 25:16	territory 39:7 77:6
62:21 72:10 73:9	split 45:10,22,25 81:7	strategies 17:20	86:24 88:12	take 2:11 12:6 14:15	test 26:15 27:8 41:10
76:9 82:24 84:1,3	111:21	stray 147:20	substantively 81:24	14:22 16:22,24 17:2	42:5 53:22 66:24
85:5,15 86:6 90:23	splitting 123:17 124:1	stress 31:21	succeed 100:11	18:5 21:4 34:3	72:11 81:24 96:25
100:7 102:2,3,3	124:4,8	strictly 74:13 75:9	succeeds 38:4	35:12 43:23 44:23	105:15 113:10
103:10 105:16	sprat 62:19	93:10 98:15	success 22:10,12 23:5	45:3 48:8,23 62:11	131:7 136:24
106:18 112:17,20	stab 118:21,22	stronger 87:4	58:12,18,21,24	77:19 78:5 83:6	textual 27:17
112:21 119:17	stage 37:2 68:13 101:8	strongly 64:2	59:15 60:8 61:12	84:1 85:19 86:5	thank 28:25 29:2
132:2 134:24 137:3	102:19 114:16	struck 80:4	62:20	88:13 89:6,8 93:16	34:24 35:2,8,16,17
140:21 141:10	119:1 136:4,14	structural 43:5	suffice 81:21 89:12	94:2,19 97:13 98:11	35:25 72:23 74:23
142:23 146:7,11,18	stand 84:12 125:20	structurally 130:9	sufficient 19:23 33:20	99:5,13 101:18 103:17 108:7 111:3	75:7,15 101:10,13
somebody 56:2	standard 29:5 38:19	structure 14:8 36:1	33:21 34:7 57:4	103:17 108:7 111:3	101:14,17,18,23
somehow 19:8 33:25	59:23 72:11 73:13	44:11 49:23 50:7	88:5 95:19 129:18	113:17 118:10,13 138:6 147:11 149:9	104:1,2,24,25 105:2
40:2 41:14 49:13	75:23,24,25 82:25	76:13	sufficiently 52:8 67:13		107:11 110:11,14
68:11 80:6	103:20 104:10,15	stubbornly 72:3	67:15	151:5 taken 12:9 13:6 16:5,9	111:11 112:11
someone 71:15	132:25 138:24	studied 59:9	suggest 50:19 55:6	18:14 32:18 34:20	113:20,22 116:1
something 18:14	139:7	study 18:6 57:18	91:15 137:4	39:18,20 44:24	117:25 118:1,20
26:24 27:25 34:1	start 13:4 36:9 46:3	59:20	suggested 7:18 44:10	47:19 61:9,15 71:12	119:4,13 121:9
39:21 41:24 52:19	76:13 87:21	subheading 91:25	50:6 83:23 145:20		124:24 125:1,10
73:4 84:24 99:7	started 3:9 106:10	subject 20:13 26:6	suggesting 44:9 49:7	86:9,22 87:16 92:17	126:14,15 127:7
112:4 118:18 120:8	115:13	33:24 54:12 66:13	51:22 108:17	99:14 105:7 117:9	132:21 133:9
122:10,10 138:16	starting 2:9 5:1,3	78:5 90:18 105:16	132:13	130:14,19 131:9,14	134:11,13 136:18
122.10.10 1.30.10				132:9,18 133:19,23	136:19 137:10,25
-	29:15 37:9 43:10	133:2	Suggestion 50:20	138.16 150.2	130.17 1.97.10.2.9
145:16 150:1	29:15 37:9 43:10 45:7 76:21 116:14	133:2 subjective 11:1	suggestion 36:20 47:21 50:16 56:18	138:16 150:3 takes 10:15 23:8 27:3	
-	45:7 76:21 116:14	133:2 subjective 11:1 submission 13:16	47:21 50:16 56:18	takes 10:15 23:8 27:3	138:20,23 139:14
145:16 150:1 somewhat 130:9		subjective 11:1	22		

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

145:15 148:3,4,5	thresholds 135:19,20	40:1 93:22,23	8:18,19 15:12,15	22:3 23:3 28:5,21	valuable 57:9
150:14 151:7,10,19	137:6	106:12 131:18	17:17 22:19 25:2	35:11 72:16,22	value 58:7 62:6
152:1	through 3:16 32:18	139:2 143:5	27:19 32:19 33:7	95:17 104:5 125:2	values 62:1
thanks 151:14	34:15 87:6 104:15	trend 58:20	36:21 39:22 40:5	universally 65:6	variant 89:1,4,6
their 3:14 9:2 10:7	144:21	Trevor 1:23,24	41:9 67:8 74:15	universe 43:18 124:15	variations 147:3
21:2 30:15 33:25	throughout 126:4	tribunals 38:24	75:3,8 76:5,14	unlawful 38:3	various 14:21 34:7
37:11 45:11 46:1	128:2	Tribunal's 6:13 7:13	77:18,25 78:2,6	unless 2:11 8:21 24:9	95:20 103:14 134:6
50:23 54:17 57:5,25	throw 56:2	19:16 23:10 27:6	80:13,16 85:24	34:22 93:10 101:8	134:9 139:17 145:4
58:7,8 59:10 60:15	Thursday 1:9 1:1	29:23 34:5 36:10	91:25 92:17 93:25	120:19	vast 89:17
60:20 65:16,19	tight 149:19	42:15 74:15 75:2	94:19 96:5,14 97:16	unlikely 46:4 73:1	Vaughn 1:23
71:16 73:8 76:22	till 121:14	78:14 90:3 109:4	143:14	102:5	vein 145:19
92:12 100:6 114:15	time 3:7 9:17 13:17	111:23 116:3 144:3	underestimate 29:10	unpack 83:4	verbs 139:15
117:11 124:22	25:1 26:21 32:15	true 25:13 54:19,19	underestimation	unreasonable 8:24	verified 120:13
		77:24 98:15 115:25	51:20		verify 125:8
147:23 150:6,23	35:4,6,13,14 45:3			unresponded 116:23	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
151:16	48:16 52:11 58:13	117:8	underlying 85:11	unsubstantiated	version 87:10
themselves 21:1 53:7	82:4 83:4 102:4,13	truly 135:17	130:23 131:1 138:6	33:18 34:2 100:20	vertical 93:7
87:19 88:4 144:23	102:17 105:8 117:1	try 70:5 83:4 93:17	undermine 10:7	100:21 101:5	Verulam 2:18
theoretical 56:11	117:13 121:3 125:8	trying 80:19 112:7	understand 27:4	unsupported 8:25	very 5:12 7:2 19:10
149:25	143:6,25 148:11	114:9 131:7	51:22 74:25 76:2	Unsurprisingly 8:6	35:2,3,8,25 63:14
thin 26:14,17 27:3,4	time-travel 117:18	tucking 75:8	88:12,24 89:4 92:2	Unterhalter 1:12	63:21 86:3 88:13
thing 107:2 115:3	today 50:16 71:12	Tuesday 34:16 36:12	107:19 108:15,25	26:10 82:15 83:23	89:24 98:11 99:12
120:15	140:25 144:5	50:15 79:22 125:19	110:18 112:8,14	88:23 112:12	101:14,17,18,23
things 31:15 59:18	together 2:21 4:15 5:4	turn 3:8,18 13:20 15:5	114:11 119:9,16	113:14 114:3	103:2 105:2 107:11
67:5 99:20 117:19	24:8 25:3 32:20	16:7 18:17 19:15,17	120:22 121:5,8	123:11,16 124:24	113:20,22,24
119:22 120:24	102:24 134:6,9	22:15 34:4 37:7	120:22 121:5,8	-	
				128:20 129:2,22	115:17 116:1,24
123:1,2,3 149:21	141:18 150:3	83:6,9 110:12	134:11	131:17 141:23	117:23 118:9
think 32:7 73:1 75:25	told 2:8 20:17 21:20	126:17 138:24	understandable 93:19	143:9,23 151:15	125:10 126:15
76:11 81:5,9 84:13	54:23	Turning 32:3 44:13	understanding 23:13	until 35:7,9,11,12,16	132:21 134:13
84:22 85:22 86:11	tolerate 68:11	47:17	23:19 77:22 107:23	35:19 101:18	135:6 136:18
88:20 89:15,17 90:4	tolerated 41:19	turns 11:10 17:16	109:4,9 116:4	149:23 151:9	138:20 142:16
90:15 97:10 98:5	tonight 148:9,17	twice 87:3	119:11,21 136:22	update 46:11 49:20	143:24 144:12
101:3 110:17,19	tool 84:5	two 1:5,8,9 8:4 13:2	understatement 32:3	50:11 120:23,24	145:17 148:4
111:20 114:25	top 19:19 58:1,9 64:17	14:15 17:16 31:7,15	understates 7:21	121:1,5 123:14,22	150:14,15 151:10
118:18 120:22	topic 42:16 74:16 75:3	32:4 37:18 42:23	understood 9:1	updated 15:7 19:1	151:21,23
122:9 123:21,23	81:3 84:14 86:25	48:21 51:18 76:11	112:17 125:5	29:18 49:8 50:1	vessels 3:20 32:24,25
124:5 125:3 127:11	88:21 94:19	81:9 84:17 88:21	144:24	121:11,12,14 123:1	33:15,21,25 99:20
128:1 129:1,6	total 82:13,16 83:7	93:12,25 98:2	undertake 132:14	123:25	114:15
130:11,21 131:22	87:25 112:14,16	120:24 121:22	undertaken 42:21	updates 49:5,12	via 60:16
132:6 133:11	touch 90:2 91:2	122:3 124:8 133:13	100:13 129:4 130:3	122:17 123:5	VICKI 2:25
142:23 143:4	touched 140:19	133:23 134:17	132:15,16 145:23	updating 42:25	Vienna 92:11,17
144:19 145:6	towards 17:23 35:13	135:1,19,20 137:12	undertaking 9:12	122:12,14	93:20
148:24 150:12	95:17 151:2,6	143:8	16:20 45:15 94:18	uphold 93:10	view 10:7 39:20 96:22
thinking 86:19 89:25	to/take 82:7	twofold 129:13	145:20 151:23	urgency 31:16,21	99:13 146:24 150:6
thinks 96:10	trade 1:1 5:9 28:13	type 14:5 18:10	undo 136:5	98:10 99:14	viewed 61:20
third 12:12 13:23	39:18 77:4,12,14	147:17,22	unfettered 79:15	urgent 31:13,19 98:13	views 61:4
	, ,	types 47:24 50:9 123:1		98:24 99:3	
15:11 18:9,17 29:11	78:2,16 80:5,9 87:2		Union 1:2,15 2:2 4:2		vulnerability 121:22
31:1 49:2 55:10	88:14 92:5,13	typically 19:21	1:5,11,13 2:1,15 3:5	use 7:12 23:22 35:3	122:1
64:5 66:5 78:25	traffic 58:3		4:11,13,20 5:17 6:3	58:1 101:15 105:4	
88:1,25 89:4,6	transcript 1:23 13:10	U	7:5,6,14 8:6 9:14,20	139:25	W
92:20 98:7 135:11	16:13 18:25 20:18	UK's 2:15 10:10 25:4	9:21 10:3,8,15	used 9:19 10:19,20	wait 35:6
136:14 142:12	21:21 24:15 26:18	29:7 32:9 41:16	11:25 12:4,12,17,24	12:21 16:6 19:1	waiving 126:8
thirdly 52:21 58:15	26:22 30:5 31:6	42:1 67:21 74:19	13:4,9 16:21 20:9	20:7,23 43:24 47:1	want 11:3 26:16 76:16
		72.1 07.21 74.19	20:12 22:15 23:16	47:8 49:20 50:1,17	
82:20	43:10 72:18 73:4	75.20 76.5 70.0			78:17 83:2 86:25
82:20 though 62:15	43:10 72:18 73:4 105:9 107:16 119:9	75:20 76:5 79:8	24.25 26.7 25 27.3	54.25 25 56.19	00.4.01.0.00.0
though 62:15	105:9 107:16 119:9	80:3,11,17 82:19	24:25 26:7,25 27:3 28:4 7 29:3 16 17	54:25,25 56:19 57:22 59:24 61:11	89:4 91:2 92:9
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7	28:4,7 29:3,16,17	57:22 59:24 61:11	97:23 100:23
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20	97:23 100:23
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17 103:12,22 104:3,11	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17 103:12,22 104:3,11	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17 103:12,22 104:3,11 104:13 105:4,12 106:1,3 123:10	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 59:1 usefully 113:1	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17 103:12,22 104:3,11 104:13 105:4,12 106:1,3 123:10 124:25 125:4 126:1	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 59:1 usefully 113:1 uses 61:21	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11 97:16 106:25	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14 transpired 114:2	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimatel 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3 uncertainty 73:20	28:4,7 29:3,16,17 30:10 31:1,14,20 32:4 33:2,9,14 34:10,15,18,23 72:18 77:5 96:17 103:12,22 104:3,11 104:13 105:4,12 106:1,3 123:10 124:25 125:4 126:1 126:11 138:15	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 59:1 usefully 113:1	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1 wasn't 37:2 49:1 87:6
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11 97:16 106:25 three-hour 35:12	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14 transpired 114:2 travaux 87:9	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3 uncertainty 73:20 97:23,24	$\begin{array}{c} 28:4,7 \ 29:3,16,17\\ 30:10 \ 31:1,14,20\\ 32:4 \ 33:2,9,14\\ 34:10,15,18,23\\ 72:18 \ 77:5 \ 96:17\\ 103:12,22 \ 104:3,11\\ 104:13 \ 105:4,12\\ 106:1,3 \ 123:10\\ 124:25 \ 125:4 \ 126:1\\ 126:11 \ 138:15\\ 141:6 \ 145:19 \ 147:8 \end{array}$	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 59:1 usefully 113:1 uses 61:21 using 118:6 121:25	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1 wasn't 37:2 49:1 87:6 91:18 99:18 101:5
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11 97:16 106:25 three-hour 35:12 threshold 22:9,9,11	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14 transpired 114:2 travaux 87:9 treaties 92:25	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3 uncertainty 73:20 97:23,24 UNCLOS 6:1 84:16	$\begin{array}{c} 28:4,7 \ 29:3,16,17\\ 30:10 \ 31:1,14,20\\ 32:4 \ 33:2,9,14\\ 34:10,15,18,23\\ 72:18 \ 77:5 \ 96:17\\ 103:12,22 \ 104:3,11\\ 104:13 \ 105:4,12\\ 106:1,3 \ 123:10\\ 124:25 \ 125:4 \ 126:1\\ 126:11 \ 138:15\\ 141:6 \ 145:19 \ 147:8\\ 148:6 \ 150:6,7,8 \end{array}$	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 5 9:1 usefully 113:1 uses 61:21 using 118:6 121:25 V	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1 wasn't 37:2 49:1 87:6 91:18 99:18 101:5 130:6 140:19,21
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11 97:16 106:25 three-hour 35:12 threshold 22:9,9,11 61:13 62:1,6,10	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14 transpired 114:2 travaux 87:9 treaties 92:25 treatment 112:25	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3 uncertainty 73:20 97:23,24 UNCLOS 6:1 84:16 under 1:16,22 3:22	$\begin{array}{c} 28:4,7 \ 29:3,16,17\\ 30:10 \ 31:1,14,20\\ 32:4 \ 33:2,9,14\\ 34:10,15,18,23\\ 72:18 \ 77:5 \ 96:17\\ 103:12,22 \ 104:3,11\\ 104:13 \ 105:4,12\\ 106:1,3 \ 123:10\\ 124:25 \ 125:4 \ 126:11\\ 126:11 \ 138:15\\ 141:6 \ 145:19 \ 147:8\\ 148:6 \ 150:6,7,8\\ 151:8,20\\ \end{array}$	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 59:1 usefully 113:1 uses 61:21 using 118:6 121:25 v v 1:16	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1 wasn't 37:2 49:1 87:6 91:18 99:18 101:5 130:6 140:19,21 142:6
though 62:15 thought 51:9 70:22 89:7,9 101:15 103:1 103:24 108:15 122:24 125:20 136:16 three 13:15 16:25 17:10 19:18,21 21:7 29:3,16 56:23 59:9 61:8,24 65:20 71:11 97:16 106:25 three-hour 35:12 threshold 22:9,9,11	105:9 107:16 119:9 149:13 transcriptions 149:14 transcripts 149:2,6,11 149:23 150:2,10,16 151:7,9 transformed 43:6 transparent 39:16 transparently 49:16 70:14 transpired 114:2 travaux 87:9 treaties 92:25	80:3,11,17 82:19 83:4 88:3,13 90:7 90:20,22 91:17 92:8 94:13 96:2,4,16 107:8 115:6 135:8 UK-SANDEEL 1:20 ultimate 84:3 ultimately 6:18 unable 59:13 128:11 uncertainties 117:3 uncertainty 73:20 97:23,24 UNCLOS 6:1 84:16	$\begin{array}{c} 28:4,7 \ 29:3,16,17\\ 30:10 \ 31:1,14,20\\ 32:4 \ 33:2,9,14\\ 34:10,15,18,23\\ 72:18 \ 77:5 \ 96:17\\ 103:12,22 \ 104:3,11\\ 104:13 \ 105:4,12\\ 106:1,3 \ 123:10\\ 124:25 \ 125:4 \ 126:1\\ 126:11 \ 138:15\\ 141:6 \ 145:19 \ 147:8\\ 148:6 \ 150:6,7,8 \end{array}$	57:22 59:24 61:11 65:9 92:25 111:15 121:13 122:20 123:14 131:21 137:12 138:11,14 138:18 useful 5 9:1 usefully 113:1 uses 61:21 using 118:6 121:25 V	97:23 100:23 125:15 147:20 151:13 wanted 1:6 32:12 84:18 87:1,18,22 91:25 125:18 136:21 149:1 wants 96:11 98:23 warranted 95:1 wasn't 37:2 49:1 87:6 91:18 99:18 101:5 130:6 140:19,21

Trevor McGowan

UK-SANDEEL (European Union v United Kingdom) PCA Case No. 2024-45

Thursday, 30 January 2025

Duy 5		i en cuse	10.2024 45	1101	souy, 50 Junuary 2025
waters 2:6,10,16,20	122:17,19 123:1,3,6	112:9,10 113:1	102 45:5	2020 49:8,13 120:25	91:10 139:5
3:21 4:6 6:23 21:12	123:16 132:9 140:9	118:19 133:10	102 45:5 106 45:7	121:12,13,14	495 72:5 74:14
24:20 25:15 32:9,22	140:20 142:6,17	137:9 138:1 141:2,5	11 4:4 64:13	122:12 123:6	496 4:15,24 5:4 7:8
32:25 33:1,9 51:3	143:16 144:5,8,15	144:11 145:17	114 14:20 18:25	2021 31:10	24:7 25:3 27:23
55:20 69:21,24,25	weren't 21:25	148:9,17	12 65:4 150:20,21	2023 57:1 61:11	32:14,19 80:7 95:5
70:6 77:11,25 79:8	Westaway 2:17 4:13	written 36:19,21 37:2	12th 151:2	103:10	496(1) 24:16 77:18
108:2,8,17,24	2:23 36:7 74:22	46:22 56:25 57:8,15	125 20:18	2024-45 1:4	78:6,9 141:12
109:13,24 110:4,6,7	75:16,17 89:6	61:5,13 65:13 71:11	13 46:23 52:3 60:4	2025 1:9 1:1	496(2) 8:18,21 43:13
110:21,24,25 111:5	101:10 125:16	73:5 76:11 84:16	133 16:12	206 21:6	71:18 131:22
111:5,5,7,8,16,21	139:1,14 140:19	91:4,4 102:3,5,6,19	139 13:9	21 73:25	496(3) 79:13
111:22 112:22	142:13 143:20	102:21,25 106:1	14 16:13 20:19 30:5	220 13:21	
113:15,18 114:19	144:19	109:18 117:23	50:25 60:4 98:6,25	23 22:14,17 62:16	5
115:6,16,19,20,25	we'll 14:22	119:15 125:13,19	100:17 151:9,10	24 4:5	5 60:5 102:22 148:18
117:6 127:15,21	we're 61:8 78:21	126:1 133:8 148:22	14th 151:2	25-26 100:16	5.16 152:2
138:4	102:5 111:20 137:1	149:15,20,23 150:1	14.35 107:16	25:10-12 81:11	513 5:24 46:23
water-column 22:10	137:6 149:10	wrong 3:3 11:10 12:5	141 21:21	25:13-14 81:16	515 5:24
23:1 62:5	we've 50:13 87:7,24	12:9,13,18,25 13:5	15 13:20 21:5 51:23	25:21-23 80:1	516 5:24
way 27:16 33:6 52:24	87:25 99:23	31:25 68:10 70:21	151 31:5	26 98:7	52 4:11
55:2 56:12 83:24,25	whales 30:7 64:17,18	79:15 96:3 105:10	16 18:25 87:8 98:6	269 99:1	55% 64:24
87:21 95:11 106:7	64:23 124:11,12,14	107:25	167 26:18	27 92:21	56% 64:22
114:24 117:22	Whaling 84:17	wrongly 43:1 72:16	168 26:22	271 98:5	564 91:5
118:7 119:21	whatsoever 52:7	80:20 WTO 5:17 6:1 28:9	17 62:12 98:5 99:1,2	28% 64:25	566 91:5
122:19 132:4 133:8 134:21 136:8	while 22:7 51:5	WIO 5:17 6:1 28:9 39:21	100:18 18 30:5	29 4:6	58 57:7
143:19 144:17	130:17 138:1 WHITE 2:23	39:21	18 50:5 18% 64:25 65:2	3	58% 12:19 20:6 50:12
145:6	whole 33:23 69:20	X	1876 04.23 05.2 18-19 26:22		70:2 107:20,21
ways 78:15 135:1	70:4,8 107:15 108:4	X-axis 58:13	19 59:21	3 1:9 2:18 58:10 62:8	109:4,13,16,25
web 47:14,16 98:22	108:13,15,18	A-axis 56:15	19% 111:15	65:4 76:6 125:18 3.27 101:20	110:18,23,25 111:1 111:7,14,24 114:5
week 126:2	109:21 110:2	Y	1994 27:20	3.45 101:18	116:6,14
weighed 26:4 29:13	112:10,19 114:8,18	vardstick 73:10	1999 18:7	3.46 101:22	580 98:7
96:8 145:22,25	115:14,15 144:23	year 15:19 58:17		3.6 102:12	59 3:8
weighing 8:9 26:5,20	wide 7:2	years 19:21 48:21	2	30 1:9 1:1	
34:4,14,17,21 80:12	wider 30:15	99:18 118:15	2 21:9 24:14 36:8	31 92:11 93:20	6
80:15 94:16 95:25	wide-ranging 57:25	yellow 58:18 59:4	40:25 57:20 60:21	31(3)(c) 92:17	6 61:22
96:20 97:2,17,18	wind 59:24	yesterday 2:5,23 7:19	64:12 65:8 75:18	32:15-24 99:22	60 3:18
144:13 145:20,23	wish 101:15 119:1	8:3 12:1 13:8 18:18	76:4 78:22 79:1	33:18 100:22	61 61:14
146:10,12,14,23 weighing/balancing	149:14 151:4 wishes 40:8	20:18 25:25 28:24	89:22 102:11	34:6-8 95:18	69 45:6 47:15
145:13	witness 106:20	29:4 30:2 31:3 32:6	125:17 149:3	340 92:9	
weight 90:21 91:21	wonder 55:7 141:23	34:7,20 41:21 42:2	2(1) 3:19 5:1 2 3 20:22	343 92:9 35 4:7,9 3:23 4:3	7
WEIWEI 2:20	wondering 142:3	48:4 49:18 52:3	2-3 30:23 2.B 58:11	33:23	7 62:8
welcome 104:4	word 43:12 67:11 72:4	54:13 55:18 63:10	2.00 1:10 35:9	37% 64:23,24	70 107:16
welcomes 5:19	72:19 90:6,7 98:13	68:3 78:14 82:5,16 83:23 84:15 85:8	2/1:23-34 8:5	38 2:21,24 3:7,10 5:1	70:5-7 108:11
well 23:1 53:6 59:25	98:24 105:4 139:15	87:14 89:17 90:5	2/1:25-2:5 8:12	8:2 31:24 33:7	739 1:1
68:6 69:25 74:12,17	140:13,17 142:4,5	94:5	2/107:23-108:2 9:13	77:12 78:1,4	74 4:12
75:4 88:14 89:25	wording 139:5 140:7	yesterday's 24:14	2/147:15 3:2	38% 116:15	742(a) 97:6
103:24 107:14	141:15 143:6	31:5	2/152:19-24 32:6	39% 50:15 111:13,20	75 4:13 75% 61:25
117:15 121:5	words 26:4 54:20	Y-axis 58:12	2/167:3-9 26:15	116:6,8	, 5 / 6 01.23
127:23 130:5	69:15 92:12 112:21		2/190:20-21 3:1	392 36:22	8
140:19 went 19:6 24:21 50:4	139:9 142:5 143:13 143:16 144:15	Z	2/23:16-17 2:7	393 36:22	8 21:22 62:17 85:23
71:2 96:17	work 10:24 13:11	ZHANG 2:20	2/23:19-22 2:8 2/73:3 11:4		8:19-23 53:25
were 2:14 3:13 9:4	45:13 110:1 142:10	ZOE 2:22	2/73:3 11:4 2/80:16-17 10:14	4	81 17:4,4,23 18:1,3,6
16:4 17:3 21:2	142:14 149:16	zone 1:19	2/80:16-17 10:14 2:17-22 77:7	4 6:4 57:19 59:12	82 65:13
22:22 23:25 24:3,22	worked 117:2		2:17-22 77:7 20 39:25 43:10 47:13	64:14 102:22	83 17:16
25:13 26:3,3 30:22	working 18:23 19:5	1	70:24	41 19:17,19 41% 64:23	88 4:14
32:12 35:3 36:18	44:25 49:19 109:21	1 4:1,3 13:10 36:7	2000 57:19 58:17	41% 64:23 418 74:1	
40:17,21 42:4 44:7	120:16 124:20	40:12,24 52:19	2003 120:25 121:11	42 4:10	9
44:21 46:25 47:1,3	world 39:18 60:10	74:20 85:25 89:22	2006 58:4	42% 64:24	9 43:10 62:23
47:3,12 49:5,15	63:21 91:18 116:6,6	126:25,25 127:2,5	2007 48:7	493(3)(f) 82:1	9(a) 88:22 90:2,3
51:16 54:23 61:8,9	130:14 143:16	1.30 35:12,12,16,19,20 10 64:5 94:20 102:24	2013 14:25 48:9 50:4	494 4:15,24 24:8,17	9(b) 90:14
61:15 69:16 70:11 73:2 76:8 79:2	worse 59:19	10 64:5 94:20 102:24 148:19,21 149:16	118:14 121:12,14	32:20 80:8 95:5	9.2 149:3
84:17 88:21 94:22	worth 85:18 wouldn't 81:21	150:19	122:12 137:16,24	494(1) 79:1	9.31 1:2
98:20 99:24 100:20	135:21 137:4	10th 149:15	138:2,6 2014 64:6	494(3) 5:4 6:15,20	90 30:5 91 30:23
100:21 103:13	143:20 147:8 148:1	10.32 35:18	2014 64:6 2015 44:23 48:20 49:1	78:23 85:3 86:21	91 50:25 94 15:4,8
105:25 106:21	150:25	100 65:3	49:19 50:10	139:18 141:19 404(3)(a) 01:5 13	95 87:11
115:1 117:3 118:4	writing 103:24 104:4	101 4:15	2019 57:24	494(3)(e) 91:5,13 494(3)(f) 25:3 27:21	
				T/T(J)(1) 2J.J 21.21	

Trevor McGowan