In the matter of an arbitration under the Rules of Arbitration of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes

Case No. ARB/18/21

Video conference via Zoom

Wednesday, 30th June 2021

Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits

Before:

RT HON LORD PHILLIPS KG PC

MR J TRUMAN BIDWELL JR

MS BARBARA DOHMANN QC

BAY VIEW GROUP LLC and THE SPALENA COMPANY LLC

Claimants

 $-\Delta$

GOVERNMENT OF RWANDA

Respondent

Cogretary to the Tribunal: ALEY P KADIAN

Secretary to the Tribunal: ALEX B KAPLAN

Transcript produced by Anne-Marie Stallard and Georgina Vaughn on behalf of Trevor McGowan

APPEARANCES FOR CLAIMANTS

STEVEN COWLEY, Duane Morris LLP
BRYAN HARRISON, Duane Morris LLP
RODERICK MARSHALL, Bay View Group LLC
FOR RESPONDENT

RICHARD HILL QC, 4 Stone Buildings
ALASTAIR TOMSON, 4 Stone Buildings
MICHELLE DUNCAN, Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP
DANIEL McCARTHY, Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP
DANIELLE DUFFIELD, Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP
LUCY NEEDLE, Joseph Hage Aaronson LLP
NARCISSE DUSHIMIMANA, Rwanda Mining Board
SPECIOZA KABIBI, MINIJUST, Government of Rwanda

THIRD PARTY OBSERVERS

LISA GROSH, United States Office of International Claims and Investment Disputes

JOHN DALEY, United States Office of International Claims and Investment Dispute

NICOLE THORNTON, United States Office of International Claims and Investment Dispute

CATHERINE GIBSON, Office of the United States Trade Representative

MICHAEL COFFEE, United States Department of Justice DONNA CHAPIN, United States Department of Justice INTERPRETERS

SARAH ROSSI, French-English interpreter

ELIZA BURNHAM, French-English interpreter

ROBERT WOLFENSTEIN, French-English interpreter

JEAN CLAUDE MUGENZI, Kinyarwandan-English interpreter

ROSE-MARIE MUKARUTABANA, Kinyarwandan-English interpreter

SUPPORT STAFF

JAMES WATKINS, FTI Consulting
DAVID BRODSKY, FTI Consulting
ANNA LOUTFI, assistant to the Tribunal
COLLEEN FERGUSON, ICSID paralegal
IZABELA CHABINSKA, ICSID intern

12:00 1	Wednesday, 30th June 2021	12:03 1	questions.
2	(Transcript times are British Summer Time)	2	MR GATARE: Thank you.
3	(12.00 noon)	3	(12.03 pm)
4	THE PRESIDENT: Good morning all. Is there any housekeeping	4	Cross-examination by MR COWLEY
5	to deal with before we take Mr Gatare?	5	Q. Good afternoon, Mr Gatare.
6	MR HILL: Nothing contentious, Mr President. We've agreed	6	A. Good afternoon, Mr Cowley.
7	on the timing. If it becomes necessary to use all of	7	Q. If I could ask that document C-015 be brought up. I'll
8	it, the Claimants have 2 hours and 54 and we have	8	give you an opportunity to see what this is. If we
9	3 hours and 6 if necessary. We've also agreed on the	9	could open it up to the first page.
10		10	1
11	words, which was our proposal. So I think peace has	11	referenced in one of your witness statements?
12	broken out on all those fronts.	12	
13	THE PRESIDENT: Right. Thank you very much.	13	Q. If I could ask that we go to [PDF] page 8 of the
14	MR COWLEY: I have one question. The Tribunal has raised	14	
15	a couple of times as housekeeping the user-friendly	15	, 1
16	access to exhibits. We've discussed this with	16	1 0 1
17	Mr Kaplan. I just want to make sure that the loop is	17	
18	closed: have the panel been instructed how to find the	18	1 0
19	right versions of the exhibits where they're broken out?	19	ē:
20	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr Cowley. Yes, we have.	20	• •
21	MR COWLEY: Thank you.	21	* '
22	THE PRESIDENT: It's a little bit complicated, but we seem	22	1 1 1 2
23	to have mastered it, I think. So no further problems on	23	• •
24	that front.	24	1
25	Right, let's invite Mr Gatare to join us.	25	A. Can you give me a chance to read this text on the
	Page 1		Page 3
12:01 1	MR WATKINS: Okay, we're bringing the witness in.	12:05 1	screen, please?
2	(12.02 pm)	2	Q. Yes. (Pause)
3	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called)	2 3	Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it.
2 3 4	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare.	2 3 4	Q. Yes. (Pause)A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it.Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the
2 3 4 5	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon.	2 3 4 5	Q. Yes. (Pause)A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it.Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green
2 3 4 5 6	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it?	2 3 4 5 6	Q. Yes. (Pause)A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it.Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy
2 3 4 5 6 7	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(12.02 pm) MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this arbitration, haven't you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that: "They have to determine potential mineral deposits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this arbitration, haven't you? A. That's correct, yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that: "They have to determine potential mineral deposits in their large scale concessions in order to be given
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this arbitration, haven't you? A. That's correct, yes. MR HILL: If you wait there, Mr Cowley, who represents the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that: "They have to determine potential mineral deposits in their large scale concessions in order to be given a 30 year permit to develop industrial mining."
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this arbitration, haven't you? A. That's correct, yes. MR HILL: If you wait there, Mr Cowley, who represents the Claimants in this arbitration, is going to ask you some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that: "They have to determine potential mineral deposits in their large scale concessions in order to be given a 30 year permit to develop industrial mining." Do you see that? A. I see it, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR FRANCIS GATARE (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Gatare. MR GATARE: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: It's afternoon with you, is it? MR GATARE: That's correct. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. It is here now too, come to think of it. Do you see in front of you on the screen a witness declaration? MR GATARE: Yes, sir, I see it. THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you like to read it aloud, please? THE WITNESS: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. (12.03 pm) Direct examination by MR HILL Q. Mr Gatare, you have made two witness statements in this arbitration, haven't you? A. That's correct, yes. MR HILL: If you wait there, Mr Cowley, who represents the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Yes. (Pause) A. I can read it now. Yes, I have read it. Q. Okay. And just taking a step back, I referenced the term "Green Paper" in my prior question. By "Green Paper", that means that this was a draft of a policy that was under discussion by members of the ministry, but it was never adopted as a formal implemented policy at any time; is that correct? A. That's incorrect, sir. Although we don't use the colour-coding of our policy documentation, but I understand what you are saying. Nonetheless, this policy document was discussed among various stakeholders in the mining sector and it was accepted as a consensus document, even though it was never published in the Official Gazette. Q. In this paragraph the policy document talks about "the government's decision to privatize mineral concessions" led to "a number of large players enter[ing] the market", and it goes on to say that: "They have to determine potential mineral deposits in their large scale concessions in order to be given a 30 year permit to develop industrial mining." Do you see that?

12 context of the government p 13 government assets, which in 14 sector, in agriculture, in tour 15 so this was a broader policy 16 government out of the produ 17 companies to do that.	onal mining companies to incessions, the progress of that was primarily done of industrialisation of the eta a long-term, 30-year of it, sir. How I understand the se government-owned in implemented in the larger olicy to privatise existing cluded in the manufacturing rism and other areas. And to privatise, to get active sectors and get private in great there was a requirement articipating in this ertake sufficient mineral and then allow them to evelop industrial mining.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And I was explaining that because of the presence of small-scale artisanal operators in our country, we have an industry that is capable of responding to global market changes very quickly because they tend to be nimble. This was not in any way in reference to the existing mining policy in the country, but rather to the practical realities of how companies respond to global market changes. Q. Thank you. And what I was focusing on is the aspect of the then current recognition at the time of this statement that the Rwandan mining industry still remains largely artisanal at this time, despite adopting a policy some years ago to industrialise it; correct? A. There is indeed a coexistence of small-scale mining operators as well as large-scale industrial operators, and this is recognised not only in our policy but also in our legislations, which issue space for licensing large-scale operators. So this goes without saying, because it's a consistent policy of our country. Q. If I could draw your attention to the last sentence in this paragraph, you confirm there that: " Rwanda's mining industry was, and still is, dominated by artisanal mining" Correct? Page 7
12:09 1 start of the privatisation word 2 over the life of the long-term 3 A. Industrialisation cannot be 4 to have what begins and who 5 another. If that's what you a 6 that's correct. 7 Q. If I could ask you to bring 8 statement of Mr Gatare and 9 In this paragraph of your 10 statement, you acknowledge 11 " the Rwandan mining i 12 artisanal, and part of the goa 13 and industrialisation means 14 has historically been substart 15 to changing demand in the recognition in the pol 18 industrialisation would be o 19 a period of time, not immed 19 A. This is out of context, sir. 10 statement was given in the contrast between small-separatices and large-scale incompage 6	achieved overnight. It has at comes sequentially after are asking about, yes, up the supplemental witness go to paragraph 20. supplemental witness in the first line that: industry remains largely all of professionalisation that this will change, there intial ability to be flexible innerals market." what you just described acy that the progress to be step at a time over late; correct? Paragraph 20 in my witness ontext of explaining how we ck production increases and I was mentioning here acale artisanal mining	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. By their nature, sir, the artisanal, small-scale operators tend to be many; the large-scale operators, industrial operators, tend to be fewer. Even though, if you look at the capital invested, if you look at the production done, even fewer industrial operators can have a scale much larger than several small-scale. So, yes, I was referring here to the number of operators in our country. Certainly the small-scale operators outnumber the large-scale ones. Q. And the timing of this statement, where you're talking about the present time as of the statement, that was signed last year; correct? A. That's correct, yes. Q. If I could ask that the initial witness statement be brought back up I'm sorry, brought up for the first time. If we go to the original statement of Mr Gatare, paragraph 24. I would ask you to read that paragraph, sir, and let me know when you're able to answer a question about it. A. Can someone zoom it up for me, please? (Pause) I've read it, yes. Q. So to focus on the term "artisanal mining" for a moment, I wanted to reference your description in this paragraph of the context of the mining that is taking place. The first sentence refers to:

12:15	1	" mining in Rwanda takes place in	12:19 1	everything you said in the paragraph. I just used it at
	2	communities"	2	the beginning of the question to draw your attention to
	3	By "communities", in fact you're talking about the	3	what you were referring to as "communities" so we could
	4	concessions themselves in large part; correct? Miners	4	explain the relationship between artisanal mining and
	5	live on the land that makes up the concessions; correct?	5	the communities in which the miners live. That was the
	6	A. No, sir, it's not always the case. For example, in the	6	only purpose of referencing this paragraph.
	7	case of the large-scale concessions, particularly those	7	So without questioning the rest of your points in
	8	that have been previously in government hands that were	8	the paragraph, I would like to just continue to focus on
	9	privatised, they were exclusively mining areas, not	9	the miners themselves who are doing the work that we've
	10	inhabited areas. But there are some cases where mining	10	been referring to as "artisanal mining", just focusing
	11	operations are close to settled areas of the	11	on them.
	12	communities, yes.	12	Those miners walk out of their house with hand tools
	13	Q. So in some instances, miners live on the land that makes	13	and conduct the mining for minerals that we've been
	14	up some of the concessions that private companies now	14	referring to as "artisanal mining"; correct?
	15	own; correct?	15	A. Sir, artisanal mining is not about people and
	16	A. Correct.	16	communities. Artisanal mining is about methods used,
	17	Q. And in others, the mining area is separate, but right	17	regardless of whether these are employees who are in
	18	next to where people live; correct?	18	mining camp or whether they are people coming from their
	19	A. That's correct. Except that also even when mining	19	homes. We refer to artisanal mining as a way of doing
	20	operation is far from settled area, in the broader sense	20	things: the kind of tools they use, the practices that
	21	of the community, there is that coexistence of the	21	they use to extract the minerals, which tend to be using
	22	ecosystem, whether it's with water, with the	22	very simple, rudimentary tools, often in very unsafe
	23	environment, with forestry and others, because of the	23	mining environments, very unproductive and wasteful,
	24	specific terrain of Rwanda. So even when it's far, the	24	that harms the environment.
	25	impact can be felt by the communities, yes.	25	So I wouldn't use people and where they live, but
		Page 9		Page 11
		I age /		rage 11
12:17	1	Q. And the miners who are doing the work that's been	12:21 1	rather on the methods used in extracting the minerals.
12.17	2	described as "artisanal mining", these are individuals	2	That's what we mean by "artisanal mining": as a method
	3	that live in these communities, either on or adjacent	3	rather than people.
	4	to, in some instances, the concessions, who walk out of	4	Q. Thank you. I'd like to focus on the miners that were
	5			
		their house with hand tools to do their mining; correct?		
	6	their house with hand tools to do their mining; correct? A. This is not the case that I was referring to here.	5 6	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD
		A. This is not the case that I was referring to here.	5	
	6 7	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend	5	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences.
	6	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred	5 6 7	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those
	6 7 8	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend	5 6 7 8	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and,
	6 7 8 9	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector.	5 6 7 8 9	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as
	6 7 8 9 10	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for	5 6 7 8 9 10	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain
	6 7 8 9 10 11	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that	5 6 7 8 9 10	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct?
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are — let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far.
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here. Q. Thank you for that explanation. And I should say, as	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far. But with respect to artisanal mining, we refer to
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here. Q. Thank you for that explanation. And I should say, as clarification, while I appreciate your explaining this	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far. But with respect to artisanal mining, we refer to the methods that they are using, not exclusively to
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here. Q. Thank you for that explanation. And I should say, as	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far. But with respect to artisanal mining, we refer to
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here. Q. Thank you for that explanation. And I should say, as clarification, while I appreciate your explaining this	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far. But with respect to artisanal mining, we refer to the methods that they are using, not exclusively to
	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. This is not the case that I was referring to here. Mr Cowley, you may be familiar with the global trend over the last couple of decades that is often referred to as the social licence to operate in mining sector. I was referring here to that requirement by society for mining operators to obtain the social consensus that this mining is acceptable in our community, because of the direct impact that mining operations have on the environment, on the communities that live there. And so my reference here was particularly to mean that a sensible mining operator must obtain the not only the government licence, but also the community's acceptance for them to operate. And there are many cases around the world, including here in Rwanda, where communities have complained and it has led to changes in the licensing rights of the mine operators. That's what I was referring to here. Q. Thank you for that explanation. And I should say, as clarification, while I appreciate your explaining this paragraph, I was not attempting to challenge or question	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	conducting mining activity on and around the NRD concessions while they operated those under those licences. These were people that were going out every day and, by hand, conducting mining activities described as "artisanal mining" because they needed to obtain minerals so they could sell them and earn money for their family to live on; correct? A. Sir, artisanal mining as a practice is only recognised in the context of licensed people. When they are let me put it differently. They are licensed companies that have formal rights to operate mines that use artisanal methods, and these companies sometimes use labour that comes from far, and they live on the mine. Sometimes they may use labour that is coming from the community around where the mine is. So it's not always exclusive that the miners will be from around that community; many times they are brought in from far. But with respect to artisanal mining, we refer to the methods that they are using, not exclusively to those who are living near the mine.

12:22	1	Q. Okay, so I'm just going to refer to "miners". What	12:26 1	mining sector tends to be seasonal: increases in the dry
	2	you've just described as some of the miners are made up	2 3	season, when agricultural activities are low, and
	3	of people coming from a distance, some of the people who are the miners live either on the concession or the		reduces during the rainy season, when they have to work on their agricultural fields.
	4	communities right next to it, that was true of NRD when	5	So it would not be unusual that whoever was no
	5 6	it operated under its licences; correct?	6	longer working at the NRD mines would have their farms
	7	A. I can't comment on that. I actually have I was not	7	to work on and do agricultural work on their fields.
	8	actively following on NRD activities on the ground. But	8	Q. Because a portion of the miners were made up by
	9	given the reports that I have read and statements that	9	individuals who also had agricultural fields that they
	10	I have seen from various individuals, NRD had a mix as	10	operated and had invested their time in, you knew they
	11	well of miners: some that lived near to the mines and	11	weren't going to leave just because tags stopped being
	12	some that came in from far.	12	delivered to NRD; they were going to stay, right?
	13	Q. Okay. You're familiar with the period beginning in	13	A. Sir, these are questions that perhaps would be best
	14	2014, when then Minister Evode barred Pact from issuing	14	asked to Mr Evode. But I can tell you in general terms,
	15	mineral tags to NRD to use in selling minerals; correct?	15	as a government official, knowing how people live, that
	16	A. I have seen some correspondences to that effect, yes.	16	if there were people laid off from mining and they were
	17	Q. Do you recall how long that lasted?	17	living on their land, they would have opportunities to
	18	A. No, sir, I have no recollection. I don't have a memory	18	continue to work on their field for agriculture. And if
	19	of that.	19	there were any individuals that would have any ideas to
	20	Q. Do you recall NRD being given back the opportunity to	20	carry out illegal mining activities, I can assure you
	21	obtain tags and continue selling minerals at any point?	21	that they would not be tolerated because the local
	22	A. I'm not aware of that. I have no recollection.	22	administration would have a responsibility to stop that.
	23	I wasn't following it.	23	Q. Well, just as a matter of common sense, the government
	24	Q. For the period of time that Minister Evode did prevent	24	understood that even though NRD could no longer buy
	25	tags from being issued to NRD, the government understood	25	their minerals and sell them using the tag system, these
		Dage 12		Page 15
		Page 13		Page 15
12.24				
12:24	1	that at least as to those miners who had been doing	12:28 1	miners needed to mine and sell minerals, so it was
12:24	1 2	that at least as to those miners who had been doing their daily activities at the NRD concessions because	12:28 1	miners needed to mine and sell minerals, so it was taking place. Wasn't that understood?
12:24	1 2 3	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because	12:28 1 2 3	taking place. Wasn't that understood?
12:24	2	_	2	
12:24	2	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those	2 3	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat
12:24	2 3 4	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type	2 3 4	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite
12:24	2 3 4 5	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they	2 3 4 5	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it.
12:24	2 3 4 5 6	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on;	2 3 4 5 6	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the	2 3 4 5 6 7	taking place. Wasn't that understood?A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it.Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system.
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right?
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities.
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not.
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have
12.24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are not concentration camps. Often those who live in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have a job at the mine: it means they must do alternative
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are not concentration camps. Often those who live in the communities also have other economic activities, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have a job at the mine: it means they must do alternative economic activities to get their income. And I'm saying
12:24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are not concentration camps. Often those who live in the communities also have other economic activities, because they live on their land, they have agriculture. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have a job at the mine: it means they must do alternative economic activities to get their income. And I'm saying if there are people who were working there and live in
12.24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are not concentration camps. Often those who live in the communities also have other economic activities, because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have a job at the mine: it means they must do alternative economic activities to get their income. And I'm saying
12.24	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their daily activities at the NRD concessions because they lived very close to those concessions, that those people still had to go out each day and do the same type of mining to obtain the same types of minerals if they were going to obtain cash for their families to live on; correct? A. I'm not aware of that. In any case, if the formerly licensed company was no longer operating in the concession, then there is no one allowed to operate that concession until it's fully licensed. If anybody was going to go on that concession to mine any minerals, it would be illegal and they would have to be punished by the law. Q. Where did the government think the people went when the tags weren't delivered to NRD to use to sell minerals? Where did the miners go? A. Mr Cowley, I that's a question I am not able to answer. But I can tell you that mining communities, from whom labour comes from to go and work on the mines, are not concentration camps. Often those who live in the communities also have other economic activities, because they live on their land, they have agriculture. In	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	taking place. Wasn't that understood? A. I don't understand the question, sir. Could you repeat it? Maybe you can ask it differently. I didn't quite pick it. Q. You just told us that if it happened, it would have been against the law for these miners to go out and continue to mine and obtain minerals once NRD lost its rights to the concessions. I'm actually focusing on the period where it was on the concessions but lost the ability to have lawful tags applied. So the same point: that there was no lawful way to sell the minerals under the tag system. Despite your statement that you knew it would be illegal, just as a matter of common sense, you knew these people had to keep doing it, right? A. That's incorrect, sir. There's no such thing as common sense that leads people to do illegal activities. Absolutely not. If people had lost their job at NRD and they are no longer employed at the mine, it means they don't have a job at the mine: it means they must do alternative economic activities to get their income. And I'm saying if there are people who were working there and live in

12:29 1 would be the alternative for them to do it. 2 So it's not common sense to say that the next thing 3 to do is to go and do illegal activities. And I've said 4 if anybody went to do that, or considered to do that, 5 they would immediately understand that it's illegal and 6 the local administration would have to stop that. 7 Q. Did the Government of Rwanda ever look into whether the 8 miners who had been mining on NRD's concessions while 9 NRD was given tags continued to mine on those 10 concessions when the tags were taken away from NRD, and 11 just found some other way to sell their minerals for 12 money for their families? 13 A. So, sir, let me explain. 14 Minerals are not eaten. They can only be used in 15 industries. And so, yes, if anybody was going to carry 16 out mining, it would be for selling them. 17 But for minerals to have access to the market, there 18 is a requirement in Rwanda to have them tagged. And 19 there are not individuals that have access to tags; tags	12:33 1 Q. May I ask that the supplemental witness statement be 2 brought up at paragraph 18, and the third sentence 3 highlighted well, sir, I'll let you read this 4 paragraph before we do anything else, and tell me when 5 you're ready to answer the question. (Pause) 6 A. I have read it. 7 Q. Now, if the third sentence could be highlighted, I would 8 appreciate it. 9 So focusing just on that sentence of that paragraph, 10 talking about the iTSCi tagging system and comments that 11 were made by the Claimants about how production numbers, 12 as the Claimants count them, suggest more minerals are 13 going out of Rwanda than are actually mined in Rwanda, 14 you explain that in fact the system is tracked closely, 15 and you describe here, at least in part here I think 16 there's other paragraphs as well but you describe 17 what you mean by how the system works. And here you say 18 that: 19 "Production figures are reported on a mine by mine
for minerals are only issued to fully licensed companies that are in operation. So if NRD was no longer operating their concession and they don't have access to tags, the minerals would not have any tags, and that goes without saying they have no access to the market. Q. Well, that's why I'm asking these questions. And what Page 17	basis" 20 basis" 21 So by that you mean within something like NRD's 22 licences, when it was operating under them, there were 23 five concessions: you could actually track concession by 24 concession how much of a particular mineral was mined in 25 a given time period, compared to other minerals mined at Page 19
12:31 1 I'm asking right now is: didn't the government ask these 2 very questions? Because if it was taking place, that 3 would suggest everything you just said about how the 4 tagging system is supposed to work may not in fact be 5 how it's working on the ground, if miners can go out, 6 mine minerals, just like they did every day under the 7 NRD concessions when NRD had tags, and find ways to sell 8 them to people who could get them into the stream of 9 commerce anyway. Didn't the government ask this 10 question and look into it? 11 A. Sir, the Government of Rwanda cares about its people and 12 we always care to make sure that they have gainful 13 employment and income. So I am aware that when NRD was 14 no longer operating their mining concessions, it was 15 important for the government to quickly find alternative 16 companies that could take up the concessions so they can 17 provide employment to those who had lost their jobs. 18 Q. How quickly did that happen? After NRD lost the ability 19 to apply lawful tags to the miners' minerals, how 20 quickly did the government get another operator in who 21 had such right and could pay those miners? 22 A. Sir, I need to check. I don't know how long it took, 23 but I can check that and come back to you. 24 Q. I'll come back to that question. 25 A. Sure.	12:35 1 that concession in same time period, and compare that to minerals mined at the other NRD concessions by mine; correct? 4 A. That's correct, yes. 5 Q. If I could ask that R-118 be brought up. Just to orient you, are you familiar with this document, sir? And we can give you a chance to look at it. I don't have specific questions about anything other than one section, and I'll bring it to you and highlight it. But I want to make sure you're comfortable, you know what document you're looking at, in case you recognise it. 12 A. Can I have a look at the title and who wrote it, perhaps? Maybe it would help me. 14 Q. Yes, my memory isn't the sharpest, at least right now I'm a little bit tired so I can't say that the name is on there, but I believe it's not contested that 17 Dr Mike has explained that he wrote this. 18 A. Sir, I'm not familiar with this document. But you can ask the question you want. 20 Q. Okay. That's all I right, and I just wanted to make sure. 21 So I'm going to ask now that we turn to page 3, and there's a chart on that page, and highlight the chart and the language under it. There we go. I'm going to ask you a question about this. Page 20

in this chart form, and that's a few different types of minerals that were being mined on the NRD concessions over different years; correct? A. I can see the figures, yes. Q. That's what it says. And it specifically cites the source, and I want to break that apart to see that you might be familiar with what he's referring to, even if you didn't view the document and aren't familiar with these numbers. I'm focusing more on the sources. So he says for some of the years, the data is sourced from the data itself, it's provided by NRD. Are you familiar with how the concession licensees reported data about the production on their mines to the government? A. I am not familiar with how they reported prior to 2011, and I will explain. The year 2011 is when the iTSCi traceability system started to operate in Rwanda, and since that time we established a very accurate network of data collection where each volume of minerals that is produced at the mine site is bagged and tagged with a unique tag, which is identifiable with the volume in the bag. Since that time, data has been collected, simultaneously kept at the government offices, as well as at the iTSCi offices. Page 21	itself. So in addition to NRD having this information, MINIRENA should have had its own set of this data, if NRD complied with its obligations to report? A. That's correct, yes. If NRD or any other companies had provided the data, then it would be reasonable to expect that the institutions who received it would have it. Q. Then from 2011, whenever in the year it started following it at least this says, "2011 & 2012 data provided by RNRA". So let me focus on that first. RNRA is the Rwanda Natural Resources Administration; is that correct? A. Authority, sir. Natural Resources Authority. Q. I apologise. Thank you. And is the iTSCi bagging and tagging reporting system operated under RNRA? A. Now, RNRA has evolved. It used to have a department called the Department for Geology and Mining: that's the one that followed on the minerals. And it had other departments: land, forestry, water, all natural resources. It has since evolved to become what I lead today: the Rwanda Mining, Petroleum and Gas Board. Q. Okay. This says those two years' data was provided by RNRA. Do you know whether RNRA in those years collected the data that the iTSCi system was producing from its
12:39 1 Prior to that time, I'm not familiar with how data 2 was collected from the mining companies and shared. 3 Q. Now, we just looked at your witness statement and the 4 language about production being identified mine by mine. 5 You're talking about the 2011 to today current system 6 that you refer to as taking place under iTSCi; correct? 7 A. That's correct, yes. 8 Q. So for a portion of this time period that didn't apply, 9 and there's two years where it does; correct? 10 A. Yes, again depending I would have to check which 11 year sorry, which month in 2011 when the iTSCi system 12 started operating. So I am not confident that it 13 started in January 2011. 14 But anyhow, from whenever iTSCi system started, 15 I can comfortably say that the bag-and-tag system has 16 been able to also accurately reflect on the mineral 17 production figures. 18 Q. Yes. So focusing again I started the question about 19 the data provided by NRD itself. Even though you said 20 you didn't know the details of how it reported, were you 21 at least familiar with the concept that the licensees of 22 mining concessions had an obligation to report their 23 production on a regular basis from their mines to 24 MINIRENA? 25 A. Yes, that would be a reasonable expectation, yes.	12:42 1 bagging and tagging system about production at each mine? 3 A. That's correct, yes. In fact, iTSCi keeps a duplicate copy that the government also receives. 5 Q. And who receives it today? You said it progressed to a different department. But who today holds all that data reported by the iTSCi bag-and-tag system? 8 A. The institution that I lead. 9 Q. And that institution, RDB, has data from that system on a mine-by-mine basis; correct? 11 A. That's correct, yes. 12 Q. You do know that the Claimants have made a point in this case about the fact that the Government of Rwanda chooses on an annual basis not to report that data on a mine-by-mine basis, but collectively for the whole country. So no one could go back and test no one with just the publicly reported data could go back and test to say, "Well, that's not actually what they've produced, it's a lot more", because you can't attribute any portion of the total to one mine on your own; correct? 22 A. It's incorrect, sir. The fact that there is no publication of the mine-by-mine production data does not mean that it does not exist, and neither does it mean that there is anything to hide. It's just that there

to do it that way would requi company confidential data th for their consent. However, find out, obviously every con if you complied with their re to it.	and would require you to ask if anybody wanted to go and impany would be happy to, or quirements to have access in ave never found a necessity	3 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	holder can voluntarily decide they no longer wish to continue operating a mining licence, or it could be because they have not met compliance-related regulations, and there would have been due process to arrive to the conclusion that this is this has got to end. And how that ends is that it starts by unofficial notification, which we would include in the circumstances that are explained in the end of this
10 statistics and on the other has	nd we have got import	10	licence, and then it would go ahead to give the official
11 statistics, and it's very easy a		11	period of the company to actually conclude their
the difference to local produc		12	presence at the mining concession, which at the end
have a system that traces from	-	13	of which there is no additional relationship between the
14 aggregating each mine with t	-	14	company and the government. Yes.
15 export, that gives us confident	ould question our numbers,	15	Q. In fact, after the description of those same events in the information, in the language that was used in the
So only a cynical mind wo but they are verifiable, they a	-	16 17	supplemental witness statement, you get down to
18 Q. Thank you for that explanat		18	paragraph 26, which I believe is the last paragraph in
19 If I could ask to return to t		19	that section, and you start by saying:
20 statement, and section IV that	~ ~	20	"As a practical matter, there are no formal
21 I don't know if it could be en		21	procedures required other than [the] notification."
22 page.		22	So, as you described, it could be notification in
23 But, Mr Gatare, are you al	ole to read this?	23	some instances from the licence holder, it might have to
24 I'm going to draw your attent	tion to two paragraphs, but	24	formally notify the government that it was giving up the
25 I want to make sure you know	w what you're looking at.	25	licence and leaving; or it could be that the government
Page 25			Page 27
12:46 1 A. Which paragraph, sir?	12:49) 1	had to give notice to the licence holder that it lost
2 Q. I'm going to ask you question		2	its rights under the licence and had to leave.
3 26. But do you recall giving		3	But other than that, you say there's no formal
4 statement about the process l		4	procedure; correct?
5 if it's asked to return concess	ions to the government,		
6 actually doesn't have a forma		5	A. What I mean by "formal procedures" is the kind of
detain decin that a form	al process? You said: this	5 6	A. What I mean by "formal procedures" is the kind of protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you
7 is how it works, and you des	cribed in these paragraphs	6 7	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal	cribed in these paragraphs	6 7 8	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recall 9 A. Correct, yes.	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony?	6 7 8 9	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship.
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to	recribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony?	6 7 8 9 10	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you	o 25 and 26. understood were the formal	6 7 8 9 10 11	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you 12 rules of it, you then say, "In	o 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations,
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recall 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you 12 rules of it, you then say, "In 13 works. You say really it's no	o 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process of officiation, and then the	6 7 8 9 10 11	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recall 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you 12 rules of it, you then say, "In 13 works. You say really it's no	o 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations,
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you 12 rules of it, you then say, "In 13 works. You say really it's no 14 government gives the license	o 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the eye the former licensee ose ends and final	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license 15 90 days to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occupy	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license government gives the license business, and then after that take possession itself, occupy down to the possession itself, occupy what is how to the possession itself, occupy down to the possession itself, occupy whether the poss	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives esscribe, as a courtesy, but	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this
7 is how it works, and you des 8 what happens. Do you recal 9 A. Correct, yes. 10 Q. If we could bring it down to 11 After describing what you 12 rules of it, you then say, "In 13 works. You say really it's no 14 government gives the license 15 90 days to take care of its loc 16 business, and then after that 17 take possession itself, occup 18 90 days, more or less, you de 19 then it's free to go in and occ	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out those
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license 50 days to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occup 90 days, more or less, you de then it's free to go in and occ A. That's an incorrect characte	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out those concluding those obligations, there are no formal events
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license 90 days to take care of its lor business, and then after that take possession itself, occup 90 days, more or less, you de then it's free to go in and occ A. That's an incorrect characte	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct? risation of the process,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out those concluding those obligations, there are no formal events associated with this exercise.
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license for hospital days to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occupy when it's free to go in and occ A. That's an incorrect characte sir. What I was describing her	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct? risation of the process, e is the wrapping-up	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out those concluding those obligations, there are no formal events associated with this exercise. Q. In your testimony you say that means you wouldn't even
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license for how to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occup describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In describing what you for her say, "In describing the say, "In describi	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the ee the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct? risation of the process, e is the wrapping-up the exit process from	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out thoseconcluding those obligations, there are no formal events associated with this exercise. Q. In your testimony you say that means you wouldn't even expect much dialogue if it got to the endpoint where the
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license for how to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occupy he you do you do then it's free to go in and occ A. That's an incorrect characte sir. What I was describing her process, the closure process, a licence holder, regardless of	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the e the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct? risation of the process, e is the wrapping-up the exit process from of what has caused the end	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out thoseconcluding those obligations, there are no formal events associated with this exercise. Q. In your testimony you say that means you wouldn't even expect much dialogue if it got to the endpoint where the government was asking the licensee to leave, and within
is how it works, and you des what happens. Do you recall A. Correct, yes. Q. If we could bring it down to After describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In works. You say really it's no government gives the license for how to take care of its loc business, and then after that take possession itself, occup describing what you rules of it, you then say, "In describing what you for her say, "In describing the say, "In describi	cribed in these paragraphs I giving that testimony? 25 and 26. understood were the formal essence", how the process offication, and then the e the former licensee ose ends and final the government is free to y itself. It gives escribe, as a courtesy, but upy itself; correct? risation of the process, e is the wrapping-up the exit process from of what has caused the end	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	protocol procedures of handover of this or that: you know, people coming together to receive a concession back or whatever. There is no formal event that concludes that relationship. The notification requires the company and it gives the company an opportunity to wrap up their operations properly, to meet some of the outstanding obligations, whether it's with their employees or whether it's with their suppliers or whether it's with other institutions and companies they may have had a relationship with. Of course the company has got also a right to request an additional period, if they feel they have not concluded what they needed to do. But other than this notification, and the company carrying out thoseconcluding those obligations, there are no formal events associated with this exercise. Q. In your testimony you say that means you wouldn't even expect much dialogue if it got to the endpoint where the

- 12:51 1 happening other than that formal notification; correct?
 - 2 A. Indeed, if the company has not requested any additional
 - 3 time for them to conclude any outstanding obligations,
 - 4 then indeed it would be expected at the end of that
 - 5 notification period that the concession is back in the
 - 6 hands of the government.
 - 7 Q. Yes.
 - 8 If I could ask that C-038 be brought up.
 - 9 This is a May 19th 2015 letter from then
 - 10 Minister Evode Imena to NRD. Have you seen this before?
 - A. Can you zoom it up, please, for me to see? My sight is 11
 - 12 not as good as it used to be.
 - 13 Q. I can relate very well to that.
 - 14 A. What's the date of this document, please?
 - 15 Q. May 19th 2015.
 - 16 A. Yes, I can see it. Thank you.
 - 17 Q. Are you familiar with this letter?
 - 18 A. I can't recall it. But I can see that we were copied,
 - 19 at the Rwanda Development Board.
 - 20 Q. Yes. And as you just read it, you saw the last
 - 21 paragraph in the letter, in which Minister Imena stated
 - 22 that NRD is asked to hand back over the concessions;
 - 23 correct?
 - 24 A. Can I see that? I did not read through the document;
 - I was scanning through the beginning and end.

- 12:55 1 and interest in a lot of industries; correct? Do you
 - 2
 - A. Sorry, I'm not sure I understand the question --
 - Q. Yes, it was a poor question. I'm trying to race here,
 - 5 and I shouldn't.
 - 6 Do you recall that in your first witness statement
 - you described the background of your department working
 - 8 to get foreign investors in a number of industries
 - within Rwanda?
 - 10 A. Correct, yes.
 - Q. Including the mining industry; correct?
 - A. Correct, yes.
 - Q. And because you wanted foreign investors to come in and
 - 14 be successful, you did not -- the Government of Rwanda
 - 15 did not place any prohibition on investors from selling
 - their shares to other investors over time; correct?
 - 17 A. Prohibition? I'm not sure I understood. Can you repeat
 - 18 that last part, please?
 - 19 Q. Yes. When your group was working with investors to come
 - 20 in and invest in companies in Rwanda, to do business in
 - 21 various sectors, you didn't put any restrictions on
 - 22 those investors from then selling those shares to others
 - 23 who might want to pay them more for it, or pay them
 - 24 whatever for it; correct?
 - 25 A. No, no restrictions.

Page 31

- 12:53 1 Q. Please highlight the last paragraph of the letter, on
 - the second page. 2
 - 3 A. I can see that, yes.
 - 4 Q. Based on the description we just read in your witness
 - 5 statement, it's accurate to say, is it not, that after
 - 6 sending this notice, Minister Imena shouldn't have
 - 7 expected any further dialogue with NRD, but after
 - 8 waiting -- whether it's the 60 days that he says or the 9 90 days that you say, after waiting that notice period,
 - 10 he understood that the ministry was then free to occupy
 - the concessions itself, with nothing further from NRD;
 - 11
 - 12 correct?
 - 13 A. This seems consistent with what I was describing.
 - 14 Q. I'd like to touch on one point. In your first witness
 - 15 statement you give a bit of a description of the
 - 16 background of, first, as it started, RIEPA, and then 17 what then went into your department, your group in RDB.
 - 18 You gave some testimony about the interest in
 - 19 obtaining foreign investment in Rwanda throughout
 - 20 a number of industries over a long period of time, and
 - 21 that you were looking for people willing to assist,
 - 22 people willing to invest -- broadly, not specifically to
 - 23 Mr Marshall, for example, who you challenged his
 - 24 statement about his specific solicitation -- and you
 - 25 described how there was broad solicitation of investment

- 12:57 1 Q. Because you understood if you placed restrictions on
 - investors' ability to sell their shares to others, it
 - 3 would make it a much less attractive investment for them
 - 4 to ever put any money in in the first place, right?
 - 5 A. That is reasonable, yes.
 - Q. How many mining concessions were privatised in the 6
 - 7 2005-2010 period? And I use the term "concessions";
 - 8 I didn't ask how many licences were issued. How many
 - 9 mining concessions were privatised?
 - 10 A. I can't recall. So I wasn't even actively involved.
 - I can't give you a number, but there are quite a number 11
 - 12 of them.
 - 13 Q. One last document, if I could ask to bring it up: C-132.
 - 14 Take a look at this document, sir, to refresh your
 - 15 recollection about it. (Pause)
 - 16 A. Can you go to the bottom of the document, please.
 - 17 Further down, please. I'm trying to see if it's the one
 - 18 I'm thinking about. Yes, okay.
 - 19 Q. Do you recall in your supplemental witness statement
 - 20 discussing your impression of this document? You
 - 21 conclude that you say you don't think it was actually
 - 22 signed by RIEPA and Mr Marshall.
 - 23 A. I recall seeing this document and Mr Marshall's
 - 24 allegations that this was indeed signed by my
 - 25 predecessor, Mr Williams Nkurunziza, and I have

Page 32

12:59 1	questioned it on a number of grounds.	13:04 1	of his evidence relates to law.
2	One, when I succeeded Mr Williams Nkurunziza as	2	MR HILL: Yes. Mr President, the examination of this
3	general director of RIEPA, I never received this as	3	witness is going to be conducted by Mr McCarthy on
4	a handover relationship, which	4	behalf of the Respondent, rather than by me. So he will
5	Q. Mr Gatare, can I ask you about one ground only.	5	appear on camera in a moment.
6	I wanted to focus on the document because I have	6	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
7	a question about one of the grounds that you gave. As	7	MR COWLEY: Before we start, can I just ask what time
8	opposed to I'm not asking you about all your	8	I should pay attention to or the questioning is going
9	testimony; it's in the witness statement.	9	to be done by someone else, but what time should we be
10	-	10	paying attention to for the break?
11	said the date of January 12th 2004, as referenced by	11	THE PRESIDENT: We'll proceed for about three-quarters of
12	•	12	an hour and then we'll break for half an hour.
13		13	MR WATKINS: Would you like me to bring the witness in,
13	came into existence in September 2004; correct?	14	Mr President?
		15	THE PRESIDENT: I would, please. (Pause)
15			
16		16	Is there some problem?
17	that you noticed, instead of Mr Marshall lying about	17	MR KAPLAN: It shows his video is connected but we're seeing
18	• • •	18	a black screen.
19	Mr Marshall, an American lawyer who had been living in	19	MR WATKINS: It's still coming in. His internet
20		20	connectivity is very, very weak. We may have to turn
21	the American month/day/year reference, instead of what	21	off his 360-degree camera to save bandwidth.
22	is familiar from our documents as the Rwandan accepted	22	MR KAPLAN: Counsel, members of the Tribunal, may we do so,
23	day/month/year system, so when he looked back at it all	23	so that his bandwidth is
24	these months later, he said January 12th instead of	24	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
25	December 1st 2004? Isn't that equally plausible to	25	MR WATKINS: Was that a "Yes"? I apologise, I didn't hear.
	Page 33		Page 35
13:01 1	making up the whole document?	13:07 1	THE PRESIDENT: Sorry. It was a "Yes".
13:01 1 2	making up the whole document? A. I can if I do not know the American official	13:07 1 2	THE PRESIDENT: Sorry. It was a "Yes". MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available.
	A. I can if I do not know the American official way		-
2	A. I can if I do not know the American official	2	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available.
2 3	A. I can if I do not know the American official way	2 3	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm)
2 3 4	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right	2 3 4	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called)
2 3 4 5	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the	2 3 4 5	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo.
2 3 4 5 6	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal.	2 3 4 5 6	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in the waiting room, so we should be able to bring him in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes. THE PRESIDENT: I was explaining: that is a witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in the waiting room, so we should be able to bring him in. THE PRESIDENT: Well, I suggest we give him the ordinary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes. THE PRESIDENT: I was explaining: that is a witness declaration that is designed for witnesses of fact.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in the waiting room, so we should be able to bring him in.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes. THE PRESIDENT: I was explaining: that is a witness
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in the waiting room, so we should be able to bring him in. THE PRESIDENT: Well, I suggest we give him the ordinary witness declaration, notwithstanding the fact that some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes. THE PRESIDENT: I was explaining: that is a witness declaration that is designed for witnesses of fact. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. I can if I do not know the American official way THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure that the witness is the right person to answer that question, as opposed to the Tribunal. MR COWLEY: Thank you. No further questions. MR HILL: I have no re-examination. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Gatare. You're now free to go. MR GATARE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr President. (The witness withdrew) (Pause) THE PRESIDENT: Is Mr Rwamasirabo ready to give evidence? MR COWLEY: That's my understanding. I didn't hear Mr Kaplan specify whether he's in the room and he's connected with FTI, but that's our expectation: he was to be available MR KAPLAN: Yes, that's my understanding. Please go ahead, FTI. MR WATKINS: I apologise. Yes, he is sitting in front of his system, I can see him on the 360 camera and he is in the waiting room, so we should be able to bring him in. THE PRESIDENT: Well, I suggest we give him the ordinary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, the witness is available. (1.07 pm) MR OLIVIER RWAMASIRABO (called) THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo. MR RWAMASIRABO: Good afternoon. THE PRESIDENT: If you would please look at your screen, and there is a witness declaration that's normally designed for a witness of fact, although it seems to the Tribunal that some of your evidence relates to matters of law. But we've decided that we would invite you to repeat this declaration, if you are happy to do so, aloud. MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Please will you then repeat the witness declaration. MR RWAMASIRABO: Sorry, I didn't get you. THE PRESIDENT: Could you look at your screen. MR RWAMASIRABO: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: Do you see a witness declaration? MR RWAMASIRABO: I cannot see it. MR WATKINS: One moment. MR RWAMASIRABO: Okay, yes. Sorry, yes. THE PRESIDENT: I was explaining: that is a witness declaration that is designed for witnesses of fact.

- 13:09 1 THE PRESIDENT: Some of your witness statement is dealing
 - with law. But we have thought it appropriate to invite
 - 3 you to make this declaration, if you are happy to do so.
 - 4 MR RWAMASIRABO: I'm happy to do so.
 - 5 THE PRESIDENT: Well, then would you please repeat it aloud.
 - 6 MR RWAMASIRABO: I solemnly declare upon my honour and
 - 7 conscience that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth
 - 8 and nothing but the truth.
 - 9 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 - 10 (1.09 pm)
 - 11 Cross-examination by MR McCARTHY
 - 12 Q. Good afternoon, Mr Rwamasirabo.
 - 13 A. Good afternoon.
 - 14 Q. I'd like to start by asking you some questions about the
 - 15 contract. Operator, if we could have up Exhibit C-017.
 - This is the contract made between NRD and Rwanda for
 - 17 acquiring the mining concessions; yes?
 - 18 A. Yes.
 - 19 MR McCARTHY: Sorry, I can't hear Mr Rwamasirabo.
 - 20 A. I said: yes, I can see it on the screen.
 - 21 THE PRESIDENT: Did you hear anything?
 - 22 MR RWAMASIRABO: Hello?
 - 23 THE PRESIDENT: Mr McCarthy, did you hear the answer?
 - 24 MR McCARTHY: I didn't hear the answer, sorry, no. We had
 - a little problem here. Sorry.

- 13:12 1 MR McCARTHY: If we could have a look at Mr Rwamasirabo's
 - 2 first witness statement at paragraph 5, please,
 - 3 operator: if we could look at that side by side with the
 - 4 contract.
 - 5 You say in paragraph 5 that:
 - 6 "... once one party to a contract performs, that
 - 7 party is entitled to all benefits owed to that party
 - 8 under the contract."
 - 9 A. Can you repeat that, please?
 - 10 Q. You say that:
 - "... once one party to a contract performs, that
 - 12 party is entitled to all benefits owed to that party
 - 13 under the contract."
 - 14 That is your first sentence, yes?
 - 15 A. True.
 - 16 Q. And you say in the next sentence that NRD was:
 - "... obligated ... to '[p]roceed immediately to the
 - industrial exploitation' and to perform other research
 - 19 and planning activities."
 - 20 A. True.
 - 21 Q. You're referring there to the obligations under
 - 22 Article 2 of the contract which we've just looked at,
 - and you can see on the slide?
 - 24 A. True.
 - 25 Q. You accept that NRD had to perform the obligations under

Page 39

- 13:10 1 THE PRESIDENT: Right.
 - 2 MR McCARTHY: I think we're okay now.
 - 3 Mr Rwamasirabo, Article 2 of the contract sets out
 - 4 certain obligations on NRD?
 - 5 A. Sure, yes. Can you just scroll down, so that the
 - 6 article -- Article 2 can be visible. Scroll up. Yes,
 - 7 thank you.
 - 8 Q. Article 2.2 required NRD to provide the action plan, the
 - 9 environmental protection plan and the investment plan?
 - 10 A. Sure.
 - 11 Q. Article 2.3 required NRD to:
 - 12 "Proceed immediately to the industrial exploitation
 - in all given sites."
 - 14 A. Sure.
 - 15 Q. And Article 2.5 required NRD to:
 - 16 "Provide ... reports of reserves and the feasibility
 - 17 study after 4 years."
 - 18 A. Sure.
 - 19 MR WATKINS: Excuse me, Mr McCarthy. We're getting a lot of
 - 20 feedback. Is there another system in your room that the
 - 21 speaker is on?
 - $22\,$ $\,$ MR McCARTHY: Yes, sorry. If we can just take 30 seconds to
 - 23 sort that out, sorry. (Pause)
 - 24 Is that better?
 - 25 MR WATKINS: Yes, it appears to be better. Thank you.

Page 38

- 13:13 1 Article 2 before it would be entitled to grant the
 - 2 mining concessions?
 - 3 A. True.
 - 4 Q. It follows that if NRD didn't perform its obligations
 - 5 under Article 2 of the contract, it would not be
 - 6 entitled to the grant of the mining concessions?
 - 7 A. True.
 - 8 Q. And therefore there was no guarantee under the contract
 - 9 that NRD would receive the grant of the mining
 - 10 concessions, regardless of its own contractual
 - 11 performance?
 - 12 A. No, what I meant -- what I meant in this -- on that
 - paragraph is that as long as NRD performed their
 - 14 contractual obligations under Article 2, they would be
 - entitled, they would have a right to a long-term
 - 16 contract.
 - 17 Q. Yes, Mr Rwamasirabo. I think you agree with me that
 - under the contract, there was no guarantee that NRD
 - 19 would receive the mining concessions regardless of its
 - 20 contractual performance?
 - 21 A. There will be a guarantee as long as they have performed
 - their contractual obligations. And the other party will
 - also have to fulfil its contractual obligations, since
 - NRD had performed them.
 - 25 Q. You accept that NRD had to perform its obligations under

Day 8 -- Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case No. ARB/18/21

13:15 1 the contract?

- 2 A. Of course, and which they did.
- 3 Q. Well, Mr Rwamasirabo, that's a factual assertion and
- we'll come to that a bit later on. For now I'd like to
- 5 move to Articles 3 and 4 of the contract, and if we
- 6 could focus on that again, operator.
- 7 Now, the French and English versions of the contract
- 8 have slightly different meanings. But under both
- 9 versions of the contract, NRD was first required under
- 10 Article 2.5 to submit a feasibility study?
- 11 A. Sure.
- 12 Q. And both versions required a "positive evaluation of the
- submitted feasibility study"? 13
- 14 A. Sure.
- 15 Q. So that required the government to consider the
- feasibility report submitted under Article 2.5? 16
- 17 A. Sure.
- 18 Q. And it was for the government to deem the submitted
- 19 feasibility study was satisfactory?
- 20 A. Sure.
- 21 Q. Now, operator, if we could look back at paragraph 5 of
- 22 Mr Rwamasirabo's witness statement.
- 23 In paragraph 5 you make no reference to NRD's
- 24 obligations under Article 4 of the contract?
- 25 A. Sure.

Page 41

- 13:18 1 assertion as to what was common knowledge in the mining

 - 3 A. It is -- I've given that statement based on my knowledge

Wednesday, 30 June 2021

- 4 of the Rwandan mining industry and what the practice has
- 5
- 6 Q. And you're not properly in a position to make that
- 7 assertion?
- 8 A. I believe I have the knowledge, I have the skills, and
- I've worked in the mining industry and I've followed
- 10 closely the mining sector in Rwanda.
- Q. We'll come to your background a bit later on. For now, 11
- 12 I want to have a look at Exhibit RM-001. (Pause)
- 13 Sorry, we still don't have the right document.
- 14 Exhibit RM-001, please. It should be the 2011 Law
- 15 Governing Contracts. Thank you.
 - If we could go to page 50 of the PDF, operator. If
- 17 we could focus on Article 77.
- 18 This is Article 77 of the Rwandan 2011 Law Governing
- 19 Contracts; yes?
- A. Yes.

16

- Q. And it defines a "suspensive condition"?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 O. This is:
- 24 "... an event ... which must occur before the
- performance of the contract becomes due."

Page 43

- 13:16 1 Q. The government obligations under Article 4 were also
 - 2 conditional on the positive evaluation of the
 - 3 feasibility study?
 - 4 A. It was one of the obligations that NRD had to fulfil.
 - 5 Q. If we could have a look at paragraph 6 of your witness
 - 6 statement, operator, please. You say there:
 - 7 "... it was common knowledge in the mining industry
 - 8 that once a mining company obtained a contract for ...
 - mining licenses, it was guaranteed long-term concessions
 - 10 at the end of the original four-year term."
 - 11 A. Sure, yes.
 - Q. But you yourself are not a member of the mining 12
 - 13 industry, are you?
 - 14 A. I'm not a member of the mining industry. But I have
 - 15 experience in the mining sector, I have other clients in
 - 16 the mining sector, and I have that knowledge.
 - 17 Q. Yes, you're not a member of the mining industry and
 - you've taken this point on instructions from Claimants' 18
 - 19 counsel, haven't you?
 - 20 A. I beg your pardon, Daniel?
 - Q. You are not a member of the mining industry and you've 2.1
 - 22 taken this point on instructions from Claimants'
 - 23 counsel?
 - 24 A. No.
 - 25 Q. You have put forward no evidence to support your

Page 42

- 13:20 1 A. Yes.
 - 2 Q. And:
 - 3 "An event may be a suspensive condition either by
 - 4 agreement between the parties or by an order of the
 - 5 court."
 - A. Yes.
 - 7 Q. If we could also look at the same time, operator, at
 - 8 C-017 again, at Articles 3 and 4, if that's possible,
 - please. (Pause) Thank you, operator.
 - 10 The positive evaluation of the feasibility study was
 - 11 an event which had to occur before the government would
 - 12 be required to perform its obligations in respect of the
 - 13 mining concessions?
 - 14 A. Yes.
 - 15 Q. The positive evaluation of the feasibility study under
 - 16 Article 4 was therefore a suspensive condition under
 - 17 Article 77?
 - 18 A. I don't agree with that.
 - 19 Q. Well, Mr Rwamasirabo, you agree that it's an event which
 - must occur before the performance of the contract
 - 21 becomes due. It's plain from the language --
 - 22 A. I don't --
 - 23 Q. Sorry, can I just finish the question.
 - 24 A. Yes.
 - 25 Q. It's plain from the language of the contract that this

13:21 1 is a s	uspensive condition.	1sn't 1t'/

- 2 A. It's not mentioned anywhere that it's a suspensive
- 3 condition of the contract. If you look at Article 77,
- 4 paragraph 2, this event -- which is the feasibility
- 5 study, positive evaluation of the feasibility study --
- 6 should have been an event that was agreed upon between
- the two parties before that, or by a court order. And
- 8 we do not see anywhere in the contract where it was
- 9 agreed between the parties, okay? And neither do we
- 10 even have any court order in that regard.
- 11 So that is why I cannot -- I don't consider this to
- 12 be a suspensive condition; rather executory.
- 13 Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, the parties have agreed the terms of
- 14 Article 4, didn't they?
- 15 A. Yes, but they did not agree that it should be
- a suspensive condition. It should be explicitly 16
- 17 mentioned in the contract, like many other contracts
- 18 where you find suspensive conditions.
- Q. And Article 77 says nothing which requires a suspensive 19
- 20 condition to be expressly labelled as such in the
- 21 contract?
- 22 A. But it wasn't agreed between the parties at the
- 23 beginning, yes.
- 24 Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, if you could just focus on my question.
- 25 Article 77 does not require that a suspensive

- 13:24 1 A. Yes, if it was a suspensive condition.
 - O. If we could go to Mr Rwamasirabo's first witness
 - 3 statement at paragraph 7, please.
 - 4 I don't think we've got the right witness statement,
 - 5 sorry. Mr Rwamasirabo's first witness statement,
 - 6 please. Thank you.
 - 7 You say that there's a Rwandan administrative
 - 8 practice that if one party fails to contest the other
 - party's performance, it is "deemed to be
 - 10 an acknowledgment of performance"?
 - 11 A. Yes.
 - 12 Q. And you say that:
 - "Rwanda did not object to NRD's performance under
 - 14 the terms of Article 4 ..."
 - 15 A. Yes.

13

- 16 Q. And you say:
- 17 "As a result ... NRD's performance is deemed to be
- 18 acknowledged."
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. In paragraph 7 you've cited no provisions of Rwandan law
- 21 in support of the propositions you make there?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Operator, if we could get Exhibit C-062, please.
- 24 This is a letter dated 2nd August 2011 from
- Minister Kamanzi to NRD?

Page 47

- 13:23 1 condition be explicitly labelled in the contract,
 - 2 does it, as such?
 - A. But -- I get you. But it requires that that suspensive 3
 - 4 condition should be agreed between the parties before
 - 5
 - 6 Q. Yes, but just focus on the particular requirement which
 - 7 you've asserted: that it must be expressly labelled.
 - 8 There is nothing in Article 77 which requires
 - 9 a suspensive condition to be expressly labelled as such
 - 10 in the contract; yes?
 - 11 A. There is nothing. But, sir, Article 77, paragraph 2,
 - 12 requires that this should be agreed between the parties,
 - 13 and this was not -- it wasn't done before then.
 - 14 Q. Operator, if we could go down to Article 78, please.
 - 15 This sets out the effect of the non-occurrence of
 - 16 a suspensive condition?
 - 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. And pursuant to Article 78 of the law, non-occurrence of 18
 - 19 the suspensive condition extinguishes the obligation
 - 20 under the contract?
 - 21 A. Yes.
 - 22 Q. So if the requirement for the positive evaluation of the
 - 23 feasibility study was a suspensive condition, if it was
 - 24 not positively evaluated, the government's obligation to
 - 25 create long-term concessions was extinguished?

Page 46

- 13:26 1 A. Yes.
 - 2 Q. The letter expressly states that Rwanda considered that
 - 3 the contract "had not been fully executed"?
 - 4
 - 5 Q. "... more especially [as to] article 2 as regards the
 - presentation of the final report ... and [the] mining
 - 7 feasibility studies ..."

 - Q. So Rwanda did object to NRD's performance under the 9
 - 10 contract?
 - 11 A. In that letter, yes.
 - Q. You've also ignored other examples in the evidence which
 - 13 record Rwanda's dissatisfaction with NRD's performance
 - 14 of the contract, haven't you?
 - 15 A. No, I have not. I did not see -- even prior to that
 - letter, I did not see anywhere where the government had 16
 - 17 objected to the performance of NRD. And this letter
 - 18 came almost a year -- almost one year after NRD made the
 - 19 right application, in time and in full.
 - 20 Q. You've also failed to mention that Rwanda proposed to
 - 21 NRD that it would be prepared to negotiate on only two
 - 22 of the five concessions because its performance under the contract fell below what was expected?
 - 24 A. No.

23

25 Q. Well, if we can go back to paragraph 7. Operator, if we

12.20 1		12.22 1	manfarmance of the contractive chlications?
13:28 1	could have paragraph 7 and Exhibit R-018 up at the same	13:33 1	performance of the contractual obligations?
3	time, please, of Mr Rwamasirabo's first witness statement.	2 3	A. Yes, I can see that.Q. Looking back at paragraph 7, your statement is wrong
4		4	when it suggests that Rwanda did not object to NRD's
5	-	5	performance?
6		6	A. I don't believe it's wrong, because even after 2009, NRD
7	Q. Again, he is making clear that Rwanda's contractual	7	continued to get several extensions of the mining
8		8	concession. And I don't think I don't think any
9		9	regulator can extend mining the mining licences
10	·	10	several times if the company is not performing.
11		11	Q. You've made an unqualified, an unequivocal statement in
12		12	paragraph 7 that Rwanda did not object, and that's
13	•	13	wrong?
14		14	A. It did not object within the prescribed time, okay,
15		15	especially with regard to when they were examining the
16	. ^ ~	16	applications for the long-term contract.
		17	Q. And it's wrong to suggest that NRD's performance under
17		18	the contract was deemed to be acknowledged?
18			_
19		19	A. It's not wrong.Q. If we could have a look at Mr Rwamasirabo's third
20		20 21	witness statement, please. Paragraph 6, please.
21	Q. And your first witness statement at paragraph 7 is wrong		
22	3	22	You say here that:
23	•	23	"[You] disagree with Mr Mugisha's conclusions
24	, ,	24	that the contract was not extended"
25	this partly came almost one or two years in silence,	25	You say that:
	Page 49		Page 51
12.20 1	I I NED I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	12.26 1	
13:30 1	two years keeping NRD in total silence, two years of	13:36 1	" each time Rwanda extended the licenses,
2	inaction, and I consider that as having not having	2	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended
2 3	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant	2 3	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract."
2 3 4	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the	2 3 4	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes.
2 3 4 5	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was	2 3 4 5	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to
2 3 4 5 6	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural	2 3 4 5 6	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences
2 3 4 5 6 7	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants.	2 3 4 5 6 7	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister, and paragraph 4 is requesting a report on why NRD cannot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each extension of the Licenses, or [you say] the Licenses
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister, and paragraph 4 is requesting a report on why NRD cannot meet the obligations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each extension of the Licenses, or [you say] the Licenses independently grant the right to conduct mining
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister, and paragraph 4 is requesting a report on why NRD cannot meet the obligations? A. Yes, I can see.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each extension of the Licenses, or [you say] the Licenses independently grant the right to conduct mining operations at the Concessions covered by the licenses."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister, and paragraph 4 is requesting a report on why NRD cannot meet the obligations?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each extension of the Licenses, or [you say] the Licenses independently grant the right to conduct mining operations at the Concessions covered by the licenses."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	inaction, and I consider that as having not having exercised due process in terms of making the applicant know within the time, within the time provided by the law. If you look at the 2008 law, there was a prescribed time which the Ministry of Natural Resources had to reply to the applicants. So in my assessing this application, and the response that came more than a year after the application, I considered it that they had not objected to NRD's performance within the due time, within the normal time, the normal practice within that sector. Q. If we could have, operator, instead of R-018, if we could have R-106, please. Sorry, it would be helpful to keep the witness statement and have R-106 instead of R-018, please. (Pause) Sorry, I think we have the wrong exhibit, operator. It should be R-106, please. We'll come back to the contract if that's too complicated. Sorry. Thank you. Sorry, operator, R-106 is the document we want. This is a letter in 2009 to NRD from the minister, and paragraph 4 is requesting a report on why NRD cannot meet the obligations? A. Yes, I can see.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	explicitly or implicitly, it also implicitly extended the Contract." A. Yes. Q. And again, you've cited no provision of Rwandan law to support the assertion that extensions to the licences implicitly extended the contract? A. This was on the basis of Mugisha's assertion that as long as the contract was not valid, he wouldn't get NRD wouldn't have a mining licence. So in a sense, the contract the licence stemmed from the contract. So if they continued the government continued extending NRD's licence, implicitly it was the contract was still valid. Q. My question, Mr Rwamasirabo, was that you've cited no provision of Rwandan law in support of paragraph 6, have you? A. No. Q. If we could go down to paragraph 7, please. Again, on the fourth line you say that: " the Contract was implicitly extended with each extension of the Licenses, or [you say] the Licenses independently grant the right to conduct mining operations at the Concessions covered by the licenses."

- 13:37 1 Q. But it's right that the licences only granted the right
 - 2 to conduct mining operations only whilst they remained
 - 3 on foot?
 - 4 A. Can you repeat your question, please?
 - 5 Q. It is right that the licences only granted the right to
 - conduct mining operations whilst they remained on foot?
 - 7 A. Could you qualify "whil[e] staying on foot", please, for
 - 8 me to understand clearly your question?
 - 9 Q. So prior to the period before they'd expired.
 - 10 A. Yes.
 - 11 Q. Yes, you agree?
 - 12 A. I don't agree.
 - 13 Q. Well, it's right, isn't it, that the licences only grant
 - 14 the right to conduct operations when the licence is
 - 15 valid?
 - 16 A. If you are granted a licence, if you are -- and when NRD
 - got extension of licence, it had a right to mine -- to
 - 18 carry out mining operations in all the concessions for
 - which they are granted the extension.
 - 20 Q. But if the licences no longer remained valid after
 - 21 they'd expired, there's no right to conduct mining
 - 22 operations?
 - 23 A. I don't think so. But if also the regulator does not
 - stop the holder of the mining licence, even if it was
 - 25 expired, and is made to believe -- is left to continue

- 14:16 1 to hold negotiations with NRD was a violation of NRD's
 - 2 rights of due process under Rwandan law?
 - 3 A. Yes.
 - 4 Q. In paragraph 10 you say that:
 - 5 "Under Rwandan law, a failure to initiate
 - 6 negotiations following an invitation to negotiate is
 - 7 a violation of due process."
 - 8 A. Yes
 - 9 Q. And paragraph 11 you say that Minister Imena violated
 - NRD's rights of due process when he requested NRD to
 - submit documents in support of the application for
 - 12 concessions under the 2014 law?
 - 13 A. Yes
 - $14\,$ $\,$ Q. And in paragraph 12 you again make the allegation that
 - a refusal to meet with or communicate with NRD was
 - a violation of due process under Rwandan law?
 - 17 A. Yes.
 - 18 Q. In paragraphs 9 to 12 you have cited no provisions of
 - 19 Rwandan law in support of the propositions you make in
 - 20 relation to alleged violations of due process?
 - 21 A. Yes.
 - 22 Q. Operator, if we could get up Mr Mugisha's first report,
 - please, at paragraphs 53 and 54. That's page 14 of the
 - 24 PDF.
 - Thank you. Sorry, this doesn't appear to be the

Page 55

- 13:39 1 operating, to continue mining, I take it as implicitly
 - 2 letting the -- you know, the company continue to do
 - 3 their operations.
 - 4 Q. You've not made that point in your witness statement and
 - 5 you've not cited any provision of Rwandan law to support
 - 6 that
 - 7 A. I responded to your question, Mr Daniel.
 - 8 Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, if we could now consider due process.
 - 9 Operator, if we could get up Mr Rwamasirabo's first
 - witness statement, paragraphs 9 to 12.
 - 11 In paragraphs 9 to 12 you make various --
 - 12 THE PRESIDENT: I think, Mr McCarthy, if you're getting into
 - 13 a new topic, it might be a convenient moment to break
 - for 30 minutes.
 - 15 MR McCARTHY: Sure.
 - 16 (1.40 pm)
 - 17 (A short break)
 - 18 (2.15 pm)
 - 19 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr McCarthy.
 - 20 MR McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr President.
 - 21 Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm going to ask you some questions
 - about due process.
 - Operator, please could we have Mr Rwamasirabo's
 - first witness statement at paragraphs 9 to 12.
 - 25 In paragraph 9 you say that Minister Imena's failure

Page 54

- 14:17 1 correct document. Mr Mugisha's first expert report,
 - 2 please. I think that's his witness statement.
 - 3 At paragraph 54 Mr Mugisha explains that there is no
 - 4 such law in Rwanda that a failure to initiate
 - 5 negotiations is a violation of due process?
 - 6 A. Yes, I can read that.
 - 7 Q. In paragraph 56 Mr Mugisha says:
 - 8 "There is no codified law on due process in Rwanda."
 - 9 A. I can read that.
 - 10 Q. And Mr Mugisha also says that requesting the submission
 - of relevant and required documents is also not illegal
 - 12 under Rwandan law?
 - 13 A. I can read that.
 - 14 Q. Now, you've subsequently had an opportunity to respond
 - 15 to Mr Mugisha's first report in your second and third
 - 16 witness statements.
 - 17 A. Mm-hm.
 - 18 Q. Yes?
 - 19 A. Yes.
 - 20 Q. If we could have a look at your third witness statement,
 - 21 please, paragraphs 21 and 22. You again make assertions
 - here that Rwanda violated NRD's due process rights?
 - 23 A. True.
 - 24 Q. Again, you do not cite any provisions of Rwandan law in
 - support of your assertions about the violation of due

14:20 1	process rights?	14:23 1	the four years.
2	A. Yes, I did not.	2	Q. You cited nothing at all in any of your statements
3	Q. You didn't challenge in either of your second or third	3	regarding due process, did you?
4	witness statements the conclusions in paragraphs 53	4	A. Can you repeat the question, please?
5	to 56 of Mr Mugisha's report that there is no such law	5	Q. You cited nothing at all in any of your witness
6	in Rwanda?	6	statements about Rwandan law on due process?
7	A. But I explained it I explained, and I can explain:	7	A. I've explained to you: due process is a legal principle
8	due process as a concept, due process as a legal	8	and it's a concept. You can see that through many laws.
9	principle, is not necessarily it does not necessarily need to be codified, because these are legal	9	It doesn't necessarily have to be codified.
10 11	requirements. It's reflected in the legal procedures,	10 11	Q. And that's because there is no Rwandan law imposing obligations in respect of due process, as you claim in
12	the legal requirements that are afforded to any citizen,	12	your witness statement?
13	and in our case afforded to NRD's right to the	13	A. I think I've let me repeat it.
14	concessions.	14	Due process is reflected in the various laws,
15	Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, if I could just repeat my question. You	15	including the 2008, the 2014 law. For example, where
16	did not challenge the conclusions of Mr Mugisha in	16	they say that within 60 days an application has to be
17	paragraphs 53 to 56 in either of your second or third	17	made, and within, I think, 60 days, again in the law
18	witness statements, do you?	18	the 2014 law that a response has to be made to the
19	A. Can you yes, can you put on screen paragraph 53,	19	applicant. And the reasons why they have to
20	please, of Mugisha's conclusions.	20	communicate the reasons why the licence or the contract
21	Q. Operator, if we could just have 53 to 56 back up,	21	has been denied; that is, if it has been denied.
22	please.	22	But nothing was done. In the case of NRD, they had
23	Those paragraphs you did not challenge anywhere in	23	to wait for more than a year, close to two years, to be
24	your second or third witness statements, did you?	24	told that unilaterally be told that, "Your
25	A. I think I challenged it in several statements I made	25	application was rejected".
	Page 57		Page 59
	-		
14.22 1	shout the due process. The estions the statements that	14.05 1	O. We don't account you sited any provisions. But I'm acing
14:22 1	about the due process. The actions, the statements that	14:25 1	Q. We don't accept you cited any provisions. But I'm going to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your
2	were made by the ministry, the different officials in	2	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your
	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the	2 3	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background.
2 3	were made by the ministry, the different officials in	2	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your
2 3 4	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD.	2 3 4	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243.
2 3 4 5	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it.	2 3 4 5	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please.
2 3 4 5 6	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't	2 3 4 5 6	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted
2 3 4 5 6 7	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such	2 3 4 5 6 7	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you cited sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice in 2016?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you cited sorry. A. That's why I in my statement I said there was lack of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice in 2016? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you cited sorry. A. That's why I in my statement I said there was lack of a minimum due process that was accorded to NRD, bearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice in 2016? A. Yes. Q. And that's a vocational course to be completed by those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you cited sorry. A. That's why I in my statement I said there was lack of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice in 2016? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	were made by the ministry, the different officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources, the actions, the statements and the letters that were being sent to NRD. I think we explained it. Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that you didn't challenge Mr Mugisha's conclusion that there is no such law in Rwanda. A. I've explained to you that due process does not necessarily need to be codified. You don't necessarily need to have a very specific, explicit clause in the law to say that this is due process; no. It's reflected in the legal procedures. It's reflected in the requirement that before you take away somebody's property, in our case, that person, that citizen, being an individual, a company, has to be given the minimum due process: the right to be heard, the right to know why that property is being taken away or infringed on, the right of response. And in this case NRD waited almost two years to get a response. And that's a Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you cited sorry. A. That's why I in my statement I said there was lack of a minimum due process that was accorded to NRD, bearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to move on and I'm going to ask you now about your background. Operator, please could we have Exhibit R-243. Page 7, please. This is your curriculum vitae which you've submitted as part of your declaration? A. Yes. Q. If we can go to page 2 of the CV, please, operator. You set out your employment record? A. Yes. Q. Prior to 2015, you worked in regulatory affairs for multinational companies outside of Rwanda A. Yes. Q in the period to 2007? A. Yes. Q. Then in 2015 you say you started as managing partner at LegalWise Chambers in Rwanda? A. Sure. Q. If we could go back to page 1 of the CV, please. You state you received your Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice in 2016? A. Yes. Q. And that's a vocational course to be completed by those

Day 8 H	earing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case N		
14:27 1	Rwanda?	14:30 1	instructed to act as an independent expert in these
2	A. To practise as an attorney in the courts of law, yes.	2	proceedings, were you?
3	But you can you can you can be a consultant.	3	A. No.
4	Q. And you	4	Q. We looked a moment ago at your CV and employment
5	A. You're allowed you're allowed to set up the law firm,	5	background, and your employment record shows no evidence
6	but you cannot represent a client in court.	6	of you being an expert in the mining industry. (Pause)
7	Q. And you were admitted to the Role of Advocates in Rwanda	7	THE PRESIDENT: Is the witness still connected?
8	on 24th October 2017?	8	Ah, you're still there. You vanished from our
9	A. Yes.	9	screen for a minute.
10	Q. When you made your first witness statement in	10	MR McCARTHY: Mr Rwamasirabo, I think you are on mute. Did
11	February 2019, you'd been admitted to the roll for	11	you hear my question or would you like me to put it
12	around 18 months?	12	again?
13	A. I beg your pardon?	13	A. Can you put it again, please?
14	Q. When you made your first witness statement in these	14	Q. I said: on the basis of your employment record
15	proceedings in February 2019, you'd been admitted to the	15	A. Yes.
16	roll in Rwanda for around 18 months?	16	Q that shows no evidence of you being an expert in the
17	A. Yes.	17	mining industry.
18	Q. When preparing your evidence, you've done so in the form	18	A. If you look at page 2 of my CV, I was the head of
19	of three witness statements?	19	corporate and regulatory affairs, Africa and
20	A. Yes.	20	Middle East, Vale Mozambique.
21	Q. And you subsequently made a declaration, which was made	21	Vale is one of the top five mining companies,
22	after you'd prepared your three witness statements?	22	specialising in metals, specialising in coal. I was in
23	A. Yes.	23	charge of the regulatory affairs, particularly in charge
24	Q. If we could just go up to page 3 of the current exhibit,	24	of negotiating concession agreements, mining
25	please, operator.	25	concessions, railway concessions, port concessions,
	Page 61		Page 63
14:28 1	This is the declaration you made on 18th May 2020.	14:33 1	across Africa and the Middle East.
2	Sorry, if we could just go on to the previous page. In	2	So I consider that I have expertise in mining,
3	paragraph 2 you aver that you have complied with	3	especially negotiation of licences and contracts.
4	Article 5.2 of the IBA Rules?	4	Q. But that wasn't in Rwanda?
5	A. Yes.	5	A. No.
6	Q. And that included you making a declaration of your	6	Q. You do not have any direct knowledge of the facts of
7	independence from the parties and their legal advisors?	7	this case, do you?
8	A. Yes.	8	A. I was provided information from the Claimant, sufficient
9	Q. When making your witness statements, you did not provide	9	documents, which I reviewed using my knowledge of the
10	any declaration as to your independence from the parties	10	mining sector. And I considered that having had
11	and their legal advisors?	11	sufficient information on the case, sufficient facts on
12	A. I did not, because I was requested by the Claimant to	12	which I based my assessment and my witness statement.
13	provide an assessment, to provide assistance as to	13	Q. You have no firsthand knowledge yourself?
14	whether his case as to whether his situation, okay,	14	A. Could you repeat that, please? Can you repeat your
15	will have a case in Rwanda, okay? And that's the reason	15	question?
16	why I came in as a witness statement.	16	Q. Sorry. You have no firsthand knowledge yourself of the
17		17	facts?
18		18	A. I've relied on the documents and the facts provided by
19		19	the Claimant.
20	statement, he responded it as a lawyer. He raised the	20	Q. Your knowledge is based on what you've been provided by

Mr Marshall?

the Claimants and also your conversations with

Mr Marshall, I will get back to him, I interrupt with

him and ask questions. It's very normal that I will

23 A. Of course, in working together with

21

22

24

25

19 (Pages 61 to 64)

legal issues. And other lawyer, I thought that I could

But this issue never came up again, as to whether

25 Q. When you gave your witness statements, you were not

Page 62

21

22

23

24

respond accordingly.

I should be an expert witness.

- 14:34 1 speak to him and we will have conversations, as
 - 2 a client, as someone who sought my assistance.
 - 3 Q. In your witness statement you've expressed various
 - 4 opinions on the facts, haven't you?
 - 5 A. Again, I said on the basis of the facts and the
 - 6 documents I've reviewed, and on the basis of that
 - 7 I expressed my opinion.
 - 8 Q. If we could have a look at some of the examples in your
 - 9 witness statement.
 - 10 Operator, please, could we have Mr Rwamasirabo's
 - third witness statement at paragraph 9.
 - 12 You say in paragraph 9, first sentence, that:
 - "... Rwanda [has] always acted as though the
 - 14 Contract and Licenses remained in effect."
 - 15 A. Yes, I did.
 - 16 Q. If we could look at paragraph 10, please. You say that:
 - 17 "... during the review process of NRD's
 - 18 're-application,' Rwanda acknowledged that NRD's
 - 19 Contract and Licenses remained valid."
 - 20 A. Yes.
 - 21 Q. If we could have a look at paragraph 13, please. You
 - 22 say:
 - "Based upon [your] review of the documents and
 - 24 evidence, NRD fulfilled its five contractual
 - 25 obligations."

- 14:38 1 Q. Operator, if we could get up the transcript for Day 5,
 - 2 please. If we could go to page 33.
 - Mr Cowley said on Day 5 that you assisted in the
 - 4 preparation of Mr Bidega's witness statement.
 - 5 MR COWLEY: I would appreciate that you let him read the
 - 6 rest of what was said. We didn't discuss with this
 - 7 witness anything about this testimony --
 - 8 MR McCARTHY: Mr Cowley, if you could let the witness
 - 9 answer, please.

3

- 10 A. But this is not part of the witness -- my witness
- 11 statement. It's not part of the scope of my witness
- 12 statement, Mr Daniel.
- 13 Q. But Mr Cowley was right, was he, that you assisted in
- the preparation of Mr Bidega's witness statement?
- 15 A. I said I did not participate in the preparation of that
- statement. And again, it's out of the scope of my
- 17 witness statement, Mr Daniel.
- 18 Q. So what Mr Cowley says is wrong?
- 19 MR COWLEY: Again, I think this is greatly unfair, when
- I have explained the assistance that was provided and
- 21 it's not being disclosed to this witness, yet he is
- asked to opine on it, as to whether it's wrong, without
- 23 seeing it.
- 24 MR McCARTHY: Operator, if I could get up CL-020, please.
- 25 This is the 2008 Mining Law. If we could go to

Page 67

14:36 1 A. Yes.

- 2 Q. These are all factual assertions [on] which the Tribunal
- 3 can form their own view, based on the evidence and
- 4 having seen the witnesses' testimony?
- 5 A. Yes, yes. And I made those statements on the basis of
- 6 the documents which had been submitted by the Claimant,
- 7 which had been provided to me, and I saw that they had
- 8 met the requirements of the law, they had submitted the
- 9 documents in time and in full.
- 10 Q. The preparation of these witness statements has not been
- 11 your only role in relation to these proceedings?
- 12 A. What do you mean exactly, Mr Daniel?
- 13 Q. You've had a bigger role in this case than simply
- preparing your witness statements, haven't you?
- 15 A. No. My role was purely preparing a witness statement.
- 16 Q. You've assisted in the preparation of the Claimants'
- 17 factual evidence?
- 18 A. Can you please repeat your question, Mr Daniel?
- $19\ \ \,$ Q. You assisted in the preparation of the Claimants'
- 20 factual evidence?
- 21 A. I assisted the Claimants in giving my assessments as to
- what the case will hold vis-à-vis -- in Rwanda, yes.
- 23 Q. And you assisted in the preparation of Mr Bidega's
- 24 witness statement as well?
- 25 A. No.

Page 66

- 14:40 1 Article 118, which is on page 75 of the PDF.
 - 2 This provided for the repeal of the decree of 1976
 - 3 and the 1971 Mining Law?
 - 4 A. Yes.
 - 5 Q. If we could have a look at Article 119. This provided
 - 6 that the law came into force on the date of the
 - 7 publication of the gazette. And if you look in the top
 - 8 right-hand corner, you can see that the gazette was
 - 9 published on 6th April 2009.
 - 10 A. Yes.
 - 11 Q. This is after the licences were granted to NRD in 2007?
 - 12 A. Yes.
 - 13 Q. So the relevant Mining Law in place when NRD were
 - granted the licence was the 1971 law?
 - 15 A. Yes.
 - 16 Q. Operator, please could we have CL-002. This is the 2014
 - 17 Mining Law. And if we could go to Article 52, which
 - 18 I think is on page 52.
 - 19 These are transitional provisions under the
 - 20 2014 Mining Law?
 - 21 A. Mm-hm. Yes.
 - 22 Q. The first paragraph provided that:
 - 23 "Any mineral licence or quarry permit granted under
 - 24 [the 2008 law] on mining and ... exploitation shall
 - 25 remain in force until expiration of the period for which

- 14:42 1 it was granted."
 - 2 A. Yes.
 - 3 Q. And the licences were granted under the 1971 law, so
 - 4 this paragraph was not applicable in respect of NRD's
 - 5 licences?
 - 6 A. Can you just go down to the paragraph 2, just go down --
 - 7 Q. I'm just focusing on paragraph 1, if that helps, for the
 - 8 moment.
 - 9 A. Okay. Okay.
 - 10 Q. Paragraph 1 is not applicable because it relates to
 - licences under the 2008 law; yes?
 - 12 A. Yes, yes.
 - 13 Q. The second paragraph provides that:
 - 14 "No mineral or quarry licence granted prior to this
 - 15 law shall be extended or renewed. However, where the
 - mineral or quarry licence granted prior to this law
 - 17 provided for a right to apply for a renewal or extension
 - of the licence, the holder ... may be granted, subject
 - 19 to this law, a similar type of licence ..."
 - 20 A. Yes.
 - 21 Q. You've had a chance to review the licences which were
 - 22 granted to NRD in preparing your witness statements?
 - 23 A. As far as responding to expert Richard Mugisha's
 - 24 statement.
 - 25 Q. None of the licences granted in 2007 contained a right

- 14:46 1 Q. An arbitration award was made following a shareholder
 - 2 dispute between NRD and Mr Benzinge?
 - 3 A. Yes.
 - 4 Q. The dispute concerned the appointment of Mr Marshall and
 - 5 Ms Mruskovicova to the board of NRD and the legality of
 - 6 the transfer of shares in NRD?
 - 7 A. Yes.
 - 8 Q. The arbitrator found the appointment of Ms Mruskovicova
 - 9 and Mr Marshall was unlawful and they should be
 - 10 dismissed as directors?
 - 11 A. Yes.
 - 12 Q. And the arbitrator declared that the transfer of the
 - shares to NRD Holding and HC Starck was illegal and null
 - 14 and void?
 - 15 A. That's what the arbitrator declared.
 - 16 Q. The consequence of the arbitrator's decision is that the
 - 17 legal shareholders of NRD reverted to being Mr Benzinge
 - and the Zarnacks?
 - 19 A. That was the decision.
 - 20 Q. And the board reverted to the composition it had before
 - 21 the appointment of Ms Mruskovicova and Mr Marshall?
 - 22 A. That would have been the implication of the ruling.
 - 23 Q. Operator, if we could get Exhibit R-014. This is the
 - decision of the Rwandan High Court on NRD's appeal
 - 25 against the arbitrator's decision.

Page 71

- 14:44 1 of renewal or extension?
 - 2 A. Yes, if you read Article 52, paragraph 1.
 - 3 Q. Sorry, my question was: none of the licences granted to
 - 4 NRD in 2007 contained a right of renewal or extension?
 - 5 A. It did.
 - 6 Q. Operator, if we could have a look at C-018. This is the
 - 7 licence granted to NRD in respect of Giciye. And if we
 - 8 could just scroll through the document, please. Into
 - 9 the English, please. Thank you. Could you just
 - 10 continue into the operative provisions, please, and you
 - see Article 1 -- there's three pages. Sorry, you've
 - gone past it.
 - Now, Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm putting to you that in this
 - 14 document --
 - 15 A. Mm-hm.
 - 16 Q. -- there was no right of renewal or extension.
 - 17 A. Mm-hm.
 - 18 Q. Yes?
 - 19 A. Yes.
 - 20 Q. And accordingly, the second paragraph of Article 52 did
 - 21 not apply either?
 - 22 A. Yes, to that case, yes.
 - 23 Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, I'd like to ask you about the
 - arbitration between NRD and Mr Benzinge.
 - 25 A. Okay, yes.

Page 70

- 14:47 1 A. Yes.
 - 2 Q. If we could go to paragraph 10, please.
 - 3 The judgment records here that the ground of appeal
 - 4 was that NRD sought the annulment of the arbitrator's
 - 5 decision on the grounds that NRD had not been notified
 - 6 of the hearing?
 - 7 A. Yes.
 - 8 Q. If we could go to paragraph 17, please.
 - 9 Here the court ruled that the appeal failed because
 - NRD had in fact been notified of the arbitrator's
 - 11 appointment?
 - 12 A. Okay, yes.
 - 13 Q. And NRD had not started any procedures opposing her
 - 14 appointment, as provided for under the Rwandan
 - 15 Arbitration Law?
 - 16 A. I disagree with that. From the documents that
 - 17 I reviewed, to the best of my knowledge from the
 - documents provided by the Claimant, the Claimant had
 - objected to the arbitration centre about one of the
 - arbitrators, citing conflict of interests. But it was
 - 21 not acted upon.
 - 22 Q. Well, I'm putting to you, Mr Rwamasirabo, that's not
 - what the judgment says. The judgment is clear that the
 - 24 findings included that:
 - "... the company did not start any procedures

- 14:49 1 opposing her appointment as provided for in the
 - 2 [arbitration] law."
 - 3 A. I've answered your question on the basis of the
 - 4 documents that were furnished to me by the Claimant,
 - 5 which I saw, reviewed, and having reviewed also the
 - 6 procedures.
 - 7 Q. There's nothing in the judgment which says what you've
 - 8 just said?
 - 9 A. I stand to my statement that I reviewed and I saw the
 - 10 Claimant's notice objecting the appointment of the
 - arbitrator before the arbitration took place, in
 - 12 accordance with the procedures.
 - 13 Q. Yes, Mr Rwamasirabo, I'm trying to concentrate on what
 - the High Court found. And the High Court found that:
 - "... the company [had not] start[ed] any procedures
 - opposing her appointment as provided ... in the
 - 17 [arbitration] law."
 - 18 That's right, isn't it?
 - 19 A. I do -- I do respect judgments, I do respect the
 - 20 independence of the arbitrator. But I also say that
 - 21 I have reviewed evidence, I've reviewed documents from
 - the Claimant objecting the appointment of the
 - arbitrator, and on the basis of my assessment, the
 - 24 Claimant had followed the required procedures in terms
 - of objecting the appointment of the arbitrator.

- 14:53 1 or if he or she does not possess qualifications agreed
 - 2 to by the parties ..."
 - 3 A. Yes.
 - 4 Q. Article 15, please, operator.
 - 5 This sets out the challenge procedure for the
 - 6 disqualification of arbitrators; yes?
 - 7 A. Yes.
 - 8 Q. And the second paragraph provides that any challenge
 - 9 must be made within seven days:
 - "... after becoming aware of the constitution of
 - the ... tribunal or ... of any circumstance referred to
 - in Article 14, paragraph 2 ..."
 - 13 A. Yes.
 - 14 Q. But NRD never made such a challenge at the time, and
 - it's now too late for it to do so?
 - 16 A. To the best of my knowledge, they made an objection in
 - 17 accordance with the required procedures.
 - 18 Q. The only challenges made are those recorded in the
 - 19 High Court and Supreme Court decisions?
 - 20 A. Did you require an answer, please?
 - Q. I put to you that the challenges are those which were
 - 22 recorded in the High Court and Supreme Court decisions
 - which we've looked at.
 - 24 A. No, they -- the Claimant made the challenges also to the
 - arbitration before the arbitration took place.

Page 75

- 14:51 1 Q. If we could go to R-015, please. This is the
 - 2 Supreme Court decision in respect of NRD's appeal.
 - 3 A. Sure.
 - 4 Q. Please could we go to paragraph 14.
 - 5 Paragraph 14 records that NRD were appealing on the
 - 6 basis that the procedure and the articles of association
 - 7 of the company had not been complied with, and only one
 - 8 arbitrator was appointed instead of three?
 - 9 A. Yes.
 - 10 Q. And those grounds of appeal were rejected by the
 - 11 Supreme Court?
 - 12 A. Yes.
 - 13 Q. Now, in your third witness statement -- I can take you
 - 14 to the paragraph if you want, but as you've already
 - 15 mentioned it -- you say that the arbitrator failed to
 - disclose her relationship with Mr Benzinge?
 - 17 A. True.
 - 18 Q. Now, if we could have a look at RM-002, please.
 - 19 Article 14.2, please, page 20. And the second
 - 20 paragraph, where the cursor is, "An arbitrator may be
 - 21 challenged", please.
 - 22 Article 14.2 provides that:
 - "An arbitrator may [only] be challenged ... if
 - 24 circumstances that exist give rise to justifiable
 - 25 reasons as to his or her impartiality or independence,

Page 74

- 14:55 1 Q. Please could we have Mr Rwamasirabo's first witness
 - 2 statement at paragraph 17. You say that:
 - 3 "The law in Rwanda is such that the [RDB] determines
 - 4 who is and who is not a shareholder of a company. The
 - 5 Registrar's records on this matter are determinative of
 - 6 shareholder ownership."
 - 7 A. Yes.
 - 8 Q. You cite no Rwandan law in support of this statement?
 - 9 A. I cited them somewhere in my statement.
 - 10 Q. In your first statement -- and we can look at
 - paragraph 17 without being zoomed in -- but you cite no
 - 12 provisions there of Rwandan law?
 - 13 A. I did not cite. But in my other -- on my other witness
 - 14 statements, it is cited.
 - 15 Q. There is nothing in the first statement; yes?
 - 16 A. Yes, it is not there.
 - 17 Q. If we could have a look at Mr Rwamasirabo's third
 - witness statement, please, at paragraphs 33 and 34,
 - 19 please.
 - 20 You cite here Article 22 of the Law Governing
 - 21 Companies?
 - 22 A. Yes.
 - 23 Q. And at paragraph 34 you say that:
 - "... a certificate of incorporation from the RDB is
 - 25 conclusive evidence that the requirements of the law

		450:		
14:57 1	1	15:01		says:
2			2	" a certificate of incorporation is conclusive
3	•		3	only as to the fact of incorporation and the date of
4 5	1		4 5	incorporation." A. Yes.
6	-		5 6	Q. And that's right, isn't it, on the plain words of
7			7	Article 22?
8	•		8	A. No, it is not. I disagree with Mugisha's statement.
9			9	Q. If we could have a look at paragraph 50. Mr Mugisha
10	• •		0	says, in the first sentence:
11			1	"Nowhere in the Companies Law is it provided that
12		1	2	any records held by the Registrar are conclusive
13			3	evidence as to ownership of the company"
14		1	4	And you have not identified any such provisions,
15	has satisfied the requirements of the law, okay? So	1	5	have you?
16	when you are issued this title, it is a right that is	1	6	A. That is very wrong. That is very wrong. And he,
17	inviolable, unless it has been issued contrary to the	1	7	Mugisha, misinterprets Article 22 of the Company Law.
18	•	1	8	And I think it's very clear that the Company Law says
19			9	that the recourse that Mugisha is talking here is the
20			20	paper the documents that are required during
21			21	application.
22			22	So you have a series of documents that are required
23			23	by the Registrar General, and once you submit these
24			4	documents which Richard calls "records" once they
25	report, please.	2	25	have met the requirements of the law, then you are
	Page 77			Page 79
15:00 1	Mr Mugisha responds here in relation to Article 22	15:03	1	issued a certificate of incorporation, which is
2	*	2	2	equivalent to a property right to a company or the
3	"'A certificate of incorporation is conclusive	(3	individual.
4	evidence that all the requirements of [the company] law	4	4	And they here I think Mugisha disregarded the
5	1 1	:	5	spirit of the law, the intention of the legislator here.
6			6	And there is a reason why the legislator says this
7			7	should be a conclusive evidence: because it's a right to
8	č		8	a property, and that right to property is such
9			9	certificate of incorporation that gives you a right to
10	- 1		0	the shares that you hold. And that's why the law
11 12		1 1:		says concludes as saying in Article 22 it is determinative of ownership in the company.
13		1:		Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, we don't accept that account, but
14		1.		I propose to move on. I'd like to ask you about what
15		1.		you say about the handover of the mining concessions.
16			6	If we could have Mr Rwamasirabo's second witness
17		1	7	statement, paragraph 5, please. Paragraphs 5-10,
18		1	8	please.
19	the Office of the Registrar General, empowered by the	1	9	In paragraphs 5-10 you set out what you say
20	•	2		an informal handover process involves under Rwandan law?
21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2		A. Yes, I mentioned the regulations and standard practice.
22	*	2		Q. You refer to Articles 26 and 27 of the 2014 law and
23		2		Article 6 of the 2015 Law on Investment Protection?
24		2		A. Yes.
25	Q. If we could have a look at paragraph 49. Mr Mugisha	2.	3	Q. Operator, if we could get up CL-002, the 2014 law.
	Page 78			Page 80

15:06 1 CL-002, please, Articles 26 and 27. Page 41, I think. 2 Sorry, I think that's the index. 3 Article 26 requires concession holders on 4 cancellation of licences to provide: 5 " a full register of assets which the licence 6 holder intends to remove or leave in the mineral 7 area" 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. It also requires the concession holder to notify the 10 minister of any potentially hazardous substances or 11 excavations? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Article 27, please. Article 27 requires the concession 14 holder to: 15 " deliver to the minister all records which the 16 holder is obliged under [the] law to maintain" 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Articles 26 and 27 don't impose any obligations on the 19 state? 20 A. Correct. 21 Q. Please could we have CL-045, [internal] page 13, 22 Article 6. 23 This provision protects private property rights 24 under Rwandan law and prohibits expropriation of 25 an investor's property? Page 81	15:10 1 company in the large-scale mining, been operating mining 2 for four years, that you will just cancel a mining 3 licence without a proper handover. This is a standard 4 practice, as my experience in any mining — in the 5 mining sector and where I've worked before. Such 6 handover process was a standard practice. 7 MR McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr Rwamasirabo. I have no further 8 questions. 9 (3.11 pm) 10 Re-direct examination by MR COWLEY 11 Q. May I ask that RM-007 be brought up. Is that the 12 Company Law? Can I ask you to turn to that. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Can I ask you to turn to page 66, and it goes on to 15 page 67. So if you leave it — Article 22 continues 16 from page 66 to page 67. 17 Mr Rwamasirabo, you've mentioned Article 22. Please 18 explain what impact or effect this article has on the 19 testimony of Mr Mugisha that was read to you and put to 20 you by Attorney McCarthy, as you understand it. 21 A. My understanding of Article 22 is that, first, the power 22 to issue the certificate of incorporation is vested in 23 the Office of the Registrar General, and the law, 24 including other requirements as set by the Office of the 25 Registrar General, highlights their requirements to be
15:08 1 A. Yes. 2 Q. It does not contain any provisions relating to the handover of a mining concession? 4 A. No. But this was made with regard to protection of the investor's assets. 6 Q. If we could have Mr Rwamasirabo's second witness statement back, please. Paragraphs 5-10 again, please. 8 The provisions of Rwandan law which you cite there don't support the propositions which you make in relation to a formal handover process, do they? 11 A. Again, as a standard practice, a formal handover had to take place. And this had to be again facilitated by the ministry because, from the facts provided to me by the Claimant and which I saw, they had no access to the offices and some of their files had been confiscated. 16 So from the facts and from the information provided by the Claimant, there's no way that a handover could have taken place. 19 Q. Mr Rwamasirabo, you've cited no provisions of Rwandan law which support the propositions you make here, and that's because the handover process which you set out in your second witness statement doesn't exist under Rwandan law? 24 A. But there is it doesn't exist, but there's standard practice. And it's quite normal (sic) that such a big	15:13 1 fulfilled by all applicants. 2 Now, the Office of the Registrar General examines 3 the documents. And once these documents have satisfied 4 the following, which are mentioned in the in 5 Article in paragraph 2 and points 1, 2 and 3, once 6 the application for registration that is complied with 7 the law, then the Registrar General does the following, 8 which are mentioned in paragraph 2: to register the 9 application; register the matters relating to the 10 company in the register of companies and business; and 11 issue a certificate of incorporation. 12 Within these three, already even the owners, the 13 shareholders, have been determined, on the basis of the 14 information. So the office examines, including the 15 minutes appointing the directors, including the minutes 16 determining the share capital, including the minutes 17 appointing who is the chairman as well. And once they 18 have satisfied their legal requirement, a certificate of 19 incorporation is then issued. 20 And here we have to look at the intention of the 21 legislator, what was the spirit of the law. And here 22 the legislator wanted to make this like any other right 23 to property, your right to the shares you hold in that 24 company. And the reason why the legislator made it 25 clear to say it is conclusive evidence that this

15:14		application has complied with the law, and this Mugisha	15:19 1		back with the signature being a PDF, or perhaps
	2	disregarded it and he has misinterpreted Article 22.	2	2	a picture that was static, so when we printed it out, it
	3	And being conclusive evidence, it's also	3	3	fills up much less than a full page itself. So it's
	4	determinative of the ownership, because that ownership	4	1	printed on a page. As opposed to a different font. It
	5	is included in the certificate of incorporation.	5	5	prints in the right font, but the document itself is
	6	Q. If I could ask that document C-144 now be brought up.	6		smaller than this page. That's just for the appearance
	7	Have you seen this document before, Mr Rwamasirabo?	7		of it.
	8	A. Yes, I saw.	8		As I understand, the I'm looking at the first
	9	Q. What do you understand this document to be?	9		one, I don't have the second one open, and I'll take
	10	A. This is an objection to the appointment of the	10		a look if there's a difference. But what I understand
	11	arbitrator Mrs Nelly Umugwaneza. And the letter was	11		was: in going back and forth with drafts, a final draft
	12	requesting an investigation into the allegations made by	12		based on revisions by Mr Rwamasirabo, who provided the
	13	the Claimant, which were the conflict of interest of the	13		testimony that we looked at, we made comments on, we
	14	arbitrator in the case.	14		asked him to send it back, we separated the last page,
	15	MR COWLEY: No further questions.	15		just in case he could just send that one page back, as
	16	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. You're free to go now.	16		opposed to the whole thing, once he confirmed that the
	17	(The witness withdrew)	17		document that we were holding in our hands included
	18	(3.16 pm)	18		every comment he made, anything he added or wanted
	19	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	19		changed.
	20	MS DOHMANN: Yes, Mr Rwamasirabo, I have a question, which	20		We drafted it for printing here in that sense, but
	21 22	is this. I'm looking at your first witness statement and your second witness statement, and in both cases	21		this was what he told us. We did not purport to add on
	23	-	22 23		our own any substantive statement in here, if that's the
	23	I see MP WATKINS: Pardon me. The witness humand off: I'm trying	24		basis of the question. We were typing up here what he told us in communications.
	25	MR WATKINS: Pardon me. The witness bumped off; I'm trying to get him back on real quick. I apologise. I just	25		MS DOHMANN: So when we read the sentence that, "I have
	23	to get min back on real quick. Tapologise. Tjust	23	,	INS DOMINANN. So when we read the sentence that, I have
		Page 85			Page 87
15:17		wanted to let you know he is coming back in right now.	15:21 1		prepared this witness statement with the assistance of
	2	MS DOHMANN: Okay.	2		counsel for the Claimants", is that to tell us that it
	3	MR WATKINS: We're attempting to log in. The internet connection is very unstable there. (Pause)	3		was simply production assistance?
	4 5	Mr President, we may need to reach out and get in	5		MR COWLEY: Yes. We talked to him, we gave him before
	6	contact. Our system is offline.	6		this was finalised, we gave him anything he asked for. But there was some basic information, especially with
	7	THE PRESIDENT: Okay, look, it's not of we don't need to	7		the second, we had to ask him because he would have
	8	bring him back. Yes. Ms Dohmann can ask Mr Cowley to	8		no other access to it the expert testimony of
	9	help with this.	9		Mr Mugisha. So we had to reach out to him and tell him
	10	MS DOHMANN: Mr Cowley, I was going to ask the witness the	10		what we wanted him to look at, ask him questions about
	11	question, of course, but I'm sure you can help us as	11		what he could say, would say, and that's the assistance
	12	well.	12		he's talking about.
	13	I'm looking at the first and the second witness	13		I cannot recall if he had a specific request for
	14	statements of Mr Rwamasirabo, and I note that the	14		a document in the file that he didn't have from
	15	signature page is entirely different from the rest of	15		Mr Marshall, from his time he met with Mr Marshall,
	16	the document. Each of the reports had sufficient space	16		spoke with Mr Marshall, had his own file on this matter,
	17	on the last page to have the signature and its date	17		before we ever talked to him about the first witness
	18	appear there, and the last sentence. But in fact it's	18		statement. I do not have a specific memory as to
	19	a signature page separately appended to the preceding	19		whether he asked us for something more from our case for
	20	statement in a different font. And I therefore ask	20		the first statement. For the second, we had to give him
	21	whether the statement was in fact prepared for this	21		almost everything that he was commenting on because he
	22	witness by counsel to the Claimants.	22		would have no other access to that.
	23	MR COWLEY: First, as to the appearance of it being in	23		MS DOHMANN: Thank you, Mr Cowley.
	24	a different font, I think it's in a different size.	24		THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Shall we proceed, please, with the
	25	I think that's as a result of the page that was sent	25		final witness?
		* *	1		
		Page 86			Page 88

15:22 MR HILL Ves, we now have McMogloba. 2 MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in: (Pause) 3 (3.24 pm) 4 MR RICHARD MUGISHA (Called) 5 THE PRESIDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 6 in front of you. 7 MR MUGISHA: Yes, 1do. 10 THE PRESIDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 8 THE PRESIDENT: To an expert with it, would you please for all tout. 12 MR MIGISHA: 1 solemely declare upon my honour and it one considered that my sincere belief. 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please to it regist tout. 16 MR HILL Good. So I will let you give your presentation. 17 a presentation to the Tribunal is a moment. Is that right? 18 mg MIGISHA: Yes, it is. 29 MR MIGISHA: Ves, it is. 20 MR MIGISHA: Okay, thank you. 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Chinamats, will ask you some questions. 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 23 MR MIGISHA: Okay, thank you. 22 Presentation to the Tribunal is a moment. Is that right? 23 MR MIGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 24 I have been involved in a moment of moment in order for these conditions to be deemed suspensive, there had to be the apprention. 29 MR MIGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 20 I are all the after that Mr Cowley, who represents the mining rights are derived from the licences where the country including in the mining sector. The above the major of the country including in the mining sector. The above the provided as a government of licitation of the mining of the country of including in the mining sector. The above the provided may are preventing high-profile microstors in the country including in the mining sector. The above the country including in the mining sector. The above the provided may are prevented to the first provided the same of the first provided reasons				
2 MR WATKINS: Obay, we are bringing the witness in. (Pause) 3 (3.24 mp) 4 MR RICHARD MUGISHA (called) 5 THE PRESIDENT: Could you please look at the screen that's 6 in frout of you. 7 MR MUGISHA Yes, 8 THE PRESIDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGISHA: Yes, 1 do. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Tyou see an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGISHA: Isolemuly declare upon my honour and 1 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 1 any sincere bellef. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 1 a presentation to the Tribural in a moment. Is that 1 any sincere bellef. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 2 MR HILL: Mr Muglish L. undrestand you're going to give 2 I make a Mucisha. Yes, 1 do. 2 MR HULL: Mr Muglish L. undrestand you're going to give 2 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 2 MR HULL: Mr Muglish L. whose you have been an obligation to grant a long term concession. 2 MR HULL: Grood, Sol I will let you give your presentation, 2 and then after than the Codey, who represents the 2 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 2 MR HULL: Grood, Sol I will let you give your presentation, 2 and then after than the Codey, who represents the 2 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 2 MR HULL: Grood, Sol I will let you give your presentation, 2 and then after than the Codey, who represents the 2 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 2 MR HULL: Grood, Sol I will let you give your presentation, 2 and the nafter than the Codey, who represents the 2 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 3 presentation to the Tribural in a moment. I shall 4 present the presentation of the financial of the presentation, 2 presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please, 2 1 am a Rawandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, de have from the sessment of the feeling of the country. 1 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal pract	15:22 1	MR HILL: Yes, we now have Mr Mugisha.	15:27 1	four years
3 (3.24 pm) 4 MR RICHARD MUGISHA (called) 5 THE PRESIDENT: Could you please look at the sercen that's in from of you. 6 In Front of you. 7 MR MUGISHA: Vos. sea expert declaration there? 8 MR MUGISHA: I you are happy with it, would you please? 10 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please? 11 read it out. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and of the in contained with my sincere belief. 13 on science than systament will be in accordance with my sincere belief. 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a pessentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that if right in the properties of the properti				
4 MR RUGHARD MUGHAR (called) 5 THE PRESIDENT: Could you please look at the screen that's in front of you. 7 MR MUGHAR: Yes, I do. 8 THE PRESIDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGHAR: Ves, I do. 11 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please the read at out. 12 MR MUGHAR: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my surcer belief. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mughala, I understand you're going to give a right? 16 MR HILL: Mr Mughala, I understand you're going to give a right? 17 persentation to the Tithoual in a moment. Is that right? 18 MR MUGHAR: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good, So I will let you give your presentation, and the onsert that Mr Cowley, who represents the Called an after that Mr Cowley, who represents the Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGHAR: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 21 Jam a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in privileged to have chaired the Husiness Law Reform Committee of the Residue of the presentation of the incidency in privileged to have chaired the Husiness Law Reform Committee of the Residue of				
5 THE PRENDENT: Could you please look at the screen that's 6 in front of you. 7 MR MUGISHA: Yes. 8 THE PRENDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGISHA: Yes. 10 THE PRENDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please raid tout. 11 The and tout. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solermly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. 13 THE PRENDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please read to the large science that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRENDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribural in a moment. Is that 18 right of the Contract of the Obligations stipulated in the agreements. I disagree on the basis that the language in Rawarda. 15 THE PRENDENT: Thank you. 15 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribural in a moment. Is that 18 right of the Contract with the supervise conditions. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribural in a moment. Is that 18 right of the Contract with the supervised of the contract of the contract with the supervised of the contract of the				
6 in front of you. 7 MR MUGISHA: Yes. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Pro use an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGISHA: Yes, I.do. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Pro use the paper with it, would you please read it out. 11 MR MUGISHA: I solemally declare upon my borour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with a right? 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemally declare upon my borour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with a right? 13 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: My migisha, I understand you're going to give a paper secretary of the propersion of the intervention to the tributant in a moment. Is that right? 18 THE PRESIDENT: Think you. 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation. 21 and then after hat Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 22 MR MUGISHA: Clay, thank you. 23 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 24 (3,25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 27 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 28 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 29 Than a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up I'rust I aw Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 31 Thank post of the Contract Law applicable in the language suppressive conditions. Not be deemed suspensive, there had to be the suspensive conditions. 32 The presentation by MR MUGISHA 33 The Presentation of the contract of the contract which provided the suspension to grant a long-term concession. 34 There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the facisability study make it a failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the facisability study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 34 There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the facisability				
7 MR MUGISHA: Yes, I do. 10 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please real it cut. 11 MR MUGISHA: I solemally declare upon my bnoour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincore belief. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 13 my sincore belief. 14 my sincore belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR Hill 2: Mr Mugisha, Lunderstand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribman in a moment. Is that right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR Hill 2: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimonts, will ask you some questions. 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimonts, will ask you some questions. 22 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 23 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 24 Tam a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 32 Dy years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. Eve been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 Pan a partner, in 2004. 3 Place been involved in a number of matters since 5 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I vea how here the years 2008 and 2007. 3 Next slide (3), please. 4 Thus is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract (Col17), and it imposes of high grants of manufactions of perimeters; (2) providing an an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 19 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 7 The preserved the contract of color than the failure to a delivery with an action plan, an entrommental action plan and an airomplan, an entromposmate action plan and an airomplan, an entromposmate action plan and an airomplane and menting thereous an aniomal research after two years and finally (5) to provide an airomplane anteriorm plan and an airomplane and plan plan and plan plan and pla		• •		
8 THE PRESIDENT: You see an expert declaration there? 9 MR MUGISHA: Yes, 1 do 10 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please 11 read it out. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and 13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR IHILL: Mr. Mugisha, Inuderstand you're going to give 17 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Mr. Mugisha, Inuderstand you're going to give 21 and then after hath the Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR AWGISHA: Clay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 27 Page 89 28 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 28 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 29 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over a setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where seen been anothered in a manner of matters since been anothered in the matter state where a sectioning a private legal practitioner, including in the mining sector. I've also been in mining sector. I've also been an assertion that the failure to administrative discission of the mining concession and mining licence. 16 Page 91 15:25 1 That a section plan and an interpretation of the contract (Co17), and it imposes objection of the mining sector. I've also been an assertion that the failure to assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract (Co17), and it imposes objects of the mining concession and mining licence. 16 Prove eviewed the contract (Co17), and it imposes objects and interpretation of the contract (Co17), a		-		
9 MR MUGISHA: Yes, I do. 10 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please 11 read it out. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemply declare upon my honour and 13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give 17 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good, So I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimans, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Page 89 27 Lam a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 28 20 years, having studied as a government official in 29 System, in a substance of the interest of the feasibility study was from the leisences were the mining rights are derived from the licences who mind the feature to 27 I have been involved in a number of matters since 28 becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, 19 including in the mining sector. I've also been 10 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 11 commission betweened the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 Thave also noted that these were 15 of my expert report, and PII begin with my including in the mining sector. I've also been 16 feasibility study was within the absolute decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was a mid-terefore reasons why the feasibility study was a more and transparent on the country. 16 including in the mining sector. I've also been 17 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 18 presenting high-profile investors in the country. 19 including in the mining sector. I've also been 19 provides to have chaired the Business Law Reform 20 geographical demacrations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan and environmental action pla				
10 THE PRESIDENT: If you are happy with it, would you please read it out. 11 read it out. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. 13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere belief. 14 greenest. I disagree on the sist that the language is uspensive conditions to be deemed suspensive, there had to be the language is uspensive condition. The language is uspensive conditions to be deemed suspensive, there had to be the language is uspensive condition. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha. I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribumal in a moment. Is that right? 18 Inuderstand that the NRD feasibility study was found unsatisfactory, and therefore there couldn't have been an obligation to grant a long-term concession. 18 MR MUGISHA: Otaly, thank you. 29 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation. 21 and then after that MC Gowley, who represents the country. 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Otaly, thank you. 24 Tam a Rwandan. 25 Presentation to the Tribumal in a moment. I sthat right? 26 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 27 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 28 Prage 89 15.25 I MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 29 I Tam a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over a 20 years, having studied as a government official in the mining reserve in a 2001, and a 14 pop 55. Two been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and the presenting high-profile investors in the country, including representing high-profile investors in the country, presenting high-profile investors in the country, provide the provide the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the mini		•		
11 read it out. 12 MR MUGISHA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and 13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give 17 a presentation to the Tribumal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good, Sol I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Out, shark you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 (3.25 pm) 27 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 27 Page 89 28 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 28 Setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 29 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 30 years, having studied as a government official in 41 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 Fm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 15 The Page 10 Presenting high-profile investors in the country, 16 Interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of googeraphical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an anteropation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on Provide prospects reports on reserves and feasibility after 18 Preserviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on Provide prospects reports on reserves and feasibility after 19 provide for that, in order for these condition's top the bair special provide for special supersivace read suspensive conditions. 19 Page 89 10 Lawca stole (4), please. 11 In lawca slose demend suspensive on the basisfactory, and deferror these outlets place in place and thr				
12 MR MUGISHA: I solemuly declare upon my honour and 13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 14 my sincere beltef. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Myagisha, I understand you're groing to give 16 my sincere beltef. 17 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mc Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 21 and then after that Mc Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 22 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Page 89 27 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 16 I'm a partner, in 2004. 28 becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 18 Next slide (3), please. 15:29 1 Contract is independent of the licences; and the Fage 91 15:29 1 Three been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 18 Three slass been an assertion that the failure to administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was not demendent assertion that the feasibility study was not demendent assertion that the feasibility study was not demendent assertion to the administrative discretion of	11		11	
13 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with 14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give 17 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2	12	MR MUGISHA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and	12	
14 my sincere belief. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that right? 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 23 MR MUGISHA: A Clay, thank you. 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 24 G1255 pm] 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Page 89 15:25 I MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I arn a Rawandan lawyer with experience spaming over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, he law firm where 6 Irm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 10 interpretation of the contract G107, and It begin with my interpretation of the contract G107, and It imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demacrations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 32 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 15	13			
15 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. 16 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Ckay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 1 and a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over a 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 1 have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 10 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provide is sued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provide issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provide issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provide issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the lic				
15 MR HILL: Mr Mugisha, I understand you're going to give a right? 18 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that right? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good, So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 21 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 22 To Alimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been becoming a private legal practitioner, including 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (4), please. (Pause) 14 The also noted that there has Deen an assertion that the each time the licences were stended, that made and that there has been an assertion that the failure to contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 16 There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the davise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the ministrative discretion of the ministrative discretion of the ministrative discretion of the ministrative discretion of the m	15	-		
17 a presentation to the Tribunal in a moment. Is that 18 ight? 19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 1 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. Twe been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presenting high each of the contract of the final tree has been an absertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was in the result of the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study, was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 16 feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 17 I have been an absention that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 18 Throw also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 19 Average of the propersion of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. 10 mining concession and mining licence. 11 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern ab	16	-		÷
19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 26 Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 27 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over a 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 27 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 18 Next slide (3), please. 19 found unsatisfactory, and therefore there couldn't have been an obligation to grant a long-term concession. 1 Lave also noted that there has been an assertion that the cabrity of the time contract which provided the framework for the licences. This is inaccurate because the emining rights are derived from the licences; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences with emining regists are derived from the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences of the assessment of the feasibility study as wild be issued. 3 would be issued. 4 There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the reasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been an ostrophy of the decument of the minister. 11 have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to adhere to s	17		17	<u>-</u>
19 MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is. 20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 21 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 26 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over a 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I ve been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 27 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 18 Next slide (3), please. 19 found unsatisfactory, and therefore there couldn't have been an obligation to grant a long-term contact which provided the framework for the licences were extended, that made an automatic renewal of the contract det be mining rights are derived from the licences, and the Page 91 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences will be suited an automatic renewal of the licences. This is inaccurate because the mining rights are derived from the licences, and the Page 91 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences will be an automatic renewal of the contract of the licences, and the mining rights are derived from the licences, and the mining rights are derived from the licences of the mining rights are derived from the licences of the feasibility and was been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract for the assessment of the feasibility study was within	18	-	18	* /: *
20 MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation, and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Chainanus, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 I MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 ari investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 12 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after	19	MR MUGISHA: Yes, it is.	19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
21 and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the 22 Claimants, will ask you some questions. 23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Page 89 27 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 28 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of goographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 21 I have also noted that there has been an assertion that theach time the licences. This is inaccurate because the themining rights are derived from the licences, and the framework of the heicences, and the framework of the hiecences, and the framework of the hiecences, and the framework on the bicences; the mining rights are derived from the licences; the mining rights are derived from the licences, and the framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 15:29 1 15:29 1 15:29 1 20 contract is independent of the licences; this independent of the licences; and the feasibility study was in the feasibility study was unit the failure	20	MR HILL: Good. So I will let you give your presentation,	20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
23 MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you. 24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA Page 89 15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2	21	and then after that Mr Cowley, who represents the	21	I have also noted that there has been an assertion
24 (3.25 pm) 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 26 Page 89 27 If ma Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 28 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 29 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 19 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. 10 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to adhere to discretion of the minister. 11 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to rothe feasibility study, was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 11 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 12 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to does not provide progress. Pown, just to make it clear here, and investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after	22	Claimants, will ask you some questions.	22	that each time the licences were extended, that made
15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 22 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 25 Presentation by MR MUGISHA 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 15:29 1 contract is independent of the licence; it simply provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 4 There's also abeen an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the finister. 11 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rw	23	MR MUGISHA: Okay, thank you.	23	an automatic renewal of the contract which provided the
15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) provider 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 12 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 12 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 provides a framework on the basis of which licences 26 would be issued. 27 contract is independent of the licence; it simply 28 would be issued. 28 the criteria for the assessment of the 29 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 20 advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the 29 assessment of the feasibility study was within the easibility study was within the easibility study was noted that there was an assertion that the feasibility study was noted that there was an assertion that the failure to orbovide reasons why the feasibility study 29 was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 20 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are	24	(3.25 pm)	24	framework for the licences. This is inaccurate because
15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after	25	Presentation by MR MUGISHA	25	the mining rights are derived from the licences, and the
15:25 1 MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please. 2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after		Doga 80		Page 01
2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. Twe been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after		- 1000		- 100 / 1
2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. Twe been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after				
2 I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 3 20 years, having studied as a government official in 4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. 4 There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the advise nRD of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. 1				
4 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and 5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 4 There's also been an assertion that the failure to 5 advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the 6 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 6 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 6 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 6 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 8 administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. 1 because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. 1 because the contract does not have any criteria for the administrative discretion of the minister. 1 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister	15:25 1	MR MUGISHA: Can I go to the next slide (2), please.	15:29 1	contract is independent of the licence; it simply
5 setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where 6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after				
6 I'm a partner, in 2004. 7 I have been involved in a number of matters since 8 becoming a private legal practitioner, including 9 representing high-profile investors in the country, 10 including in the mining sector. I've also been 11 privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform 12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility atters 6 feasibility study makes it a failure on the 26 administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, 28 because the contract does not have any criteria for the 28 abecause the contract does not have any criteria for the 29 assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute 4 discretion of the feasibility study, which therefore 10 means that the feasibility study was within the absolute 4 discretion of the minister. 11 daministrative discretion of the contract does not have any criteria for the 29 assessment of the feasibility study was within the absolute 4 discretion of the feasibility study was within the absolute 11 discretion of the feasibility study was within the absolute 12 discretion of the feasibility study was within the absolute 13 the feasibility study was within the absolute 14 discretion of the feasibility study was vithin the absolute 15 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 16 because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a conc	2	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over	2	provides a framework on the basis of which licences
Thave been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I disagree, secause the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for a framework under which any admini	2 3	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in	2 3	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued.
becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of interpretation of the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after secuse the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because the contract does not have any criteria for the means that the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislation wil	2 3 4	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and	2 3 4	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to
representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country including in the mining sector. I've also been representing high-profile investors in the country representing high-profile investors in the country representing high-profile investors. I've also been representing high-profile beasibility study was within the absolute research after two years; and fill discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislation of provide for a framework under which any administrative actio	2 3 4 5	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where	2 3 4 5	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the
including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and are research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 10 means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. 12 I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to progress. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is	2 3 4 5 6	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004.	2 3 4 5 6	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the
privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on progress reports on reserves and feasibility after I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislation will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including	2 3 4 5 6 7	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the
12 Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. 13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 12 I have also noted that there was an assertion that 13 the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study 14 was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the 15 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 16 because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that 18 the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study 19 was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the 10 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 11 Through my review of the documents, I noted that 12 there was a concern about the failure to adhere to 13 PRWanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, 24 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 25 does happen is that sector-specific legislation will 26 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 27 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore
13 Next slide (3), please. 14 This is going to be an overview of the key aspects 15 of my expert report, and I'll begin with my 16 interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of 17 mining concession and mining licence. 18 I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes 19 obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of 20 geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing 21 an action plan, an environmental action plan and 22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 13 the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study 26 was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the 27 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 28 because there is no legal basis for it. 29 Through my review of the documents, I noted that 20 Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, 20 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 21 the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study 25 was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the 26 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 26 because there is no legal basis for it. 27 Through my review of the documents, I noted that 28 there was a concern about the failure to adhere to 29 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 20 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 21 there is no such thing as a law on due process. What 22 does happen is that sector-specific legislation will 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 25 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute
This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of interpretation of the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion in decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion in the acquisition of the decision. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, in the prev	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister.
of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 15 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 16 because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that 18 there was a concern about the failure to adhere to 19 Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, 20 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 21 there is no such thing as a law on due process. What 22 does happen is that sector-specific legislations will 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 25 decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion 26 because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that 28 there was a concern about the failure to adhere to 29 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 21 does happen is that sector-specific legislations will 22 does happen is that sector-specific legislation 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 25 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that
interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 16 because there is no legal basis for it. 17 Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study
mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the
I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion
obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 19 Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, and as is the case with most civ	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it.
geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 20 and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, 21 there is no such thing as a law on due process. What 22 does happen is that sector-specific legislations will 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 25 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that
an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on reserves and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 21 there is no such thing as a law on due process. What 22 does happen is that sector-specific legislations will 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 25 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to
22 an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to 23 industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on 24 research after two years; and finally (5) to provide 25 progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 26 does happen is that sector-specific legislations will 27 provide for a framework under which any administrative 28 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation 29 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here,
industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 23 provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions,
research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 24 actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What
progress reports on reserves and feasibility after 25 doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative
Page 90 Page 92	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I am a Rwandan lawyer with experience spanning over 20 years, having studied as a government official in 1995. I've been admitted to the Bar in 2001, and setting up Trust Law Chambers, the law firm where I'm a partner, in 2004. I have been involved in a number of matters since becoming a private legal practitioner, including representing high-profile investors in the country, including in the mining sector. I've also been privileged to have chaired the Business Law Reform Commission between the years 2005 and 2007. Next slide (3), please. This is going to be an overview of the key aspects of my expert report, and I'll begin with my interpretation of the contract for the acquisition of mining concession and mining licence. I've reviewed the contract (C-017), and it imposes obligations on NRD in Article 2 as: (1) the making of geographical demarcations of perimeters; (2) providing an action plan, an environmental action plan and an investment plan; (3) to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation; (4) provide progress reports on research after two years; and finally (5) to provide progress reports on reserves and feasibility after	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provides a framework on the basis of which licences would be issued. There's also been an assertion that the failure to advise NRD of the criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study makes it a failure on the administrative discretion of the minister. I disagree, because the contract does not have any criteria for the assessment of the feasibility study, which therefore means that the feasibility study was within the absolute discretion of the minister. I have also noted that there was an assertion that the failure to provide reasons why the feasibility study was not deemed satisfactory does invalidate the decision. Again, I do not agree with this assertion because there is no legal basis for it. Through my review of the documents, I noted that there was a concern about the failure to adhere to Rwanda's due process. Now, just to make it clear here, and as is the case with most civil law jurisdictions, there is no such thing as a law on due process. What does happen is that sector-specific legislations will provide for a framework under which any administrative actions are taken. Where sector-specific legislation doesn't provide for that, there is a procedure in the

,			
15:31 1	Code of Civil, Commercial, Administrative and Labour Law	15:36 1	the requirements of the law and upheld the award.
2	under which dissatisfied members of the public can seek	2	NRD appealed to the Supreme Court on the same
3	recourse from the court of law.	3	grounds, and the Supreme Court upheld the High Court
4	So again, just to emphasise, there's no such thing	4	decision and confirmed the arbitral award.
5	as a code on due process.	5	It is important here to note that the courts in
6	Next slide (5).	6	Rwanda have taken a very strict approach when it comes
7	I will now turn on the framework for mining in the	7	to arbitration proceedings, and taken the view that the
8	country as it applies to the matter before the Tribunal.	8	involvement of the court would only be to the extent of
9	There has been an assertion that the NRD concessions	9	supporting the implementation of the arbitration
10	were grandfathered by Article 52 of the 2014 law, which	10	
11	provided that all concessions granted under the 2008	11	challenging arbitration decisions, and it is provided in
12	legislation would be grandfathered.	12	
13	My opinion is that this cannot apply to the NRD	13	
14	licences, which were granted in 2007 pursuant to the	14	
15	1971 legislation. In addition, they did not provide for	15	
16	an automatic right of renewal or extension.	16	_
17	I have noted that there were a number of extensions	17	_
18	granted to NRD up to October 2012. My opinion is that	18	
19	the extensions, authorisations, were not a contractual	19	
20	obligation but only a courtesy extended to allow for	20	
21	better preparation for negotiations of the new licences.	21	the shares in NRD reverted to both Ben Benzinge and the
22	Again, such a practice is not entirely unusual, and it's	22	
23	done as a good faith gesture to facilitate applicants	23	Next and final slide (8), I guess.
24	who would require that kind of time.	24	
25	These were indeed, as I said, courtesy gestures	25	
	Page 93		Page 95
15:33 1	which could be revoked at any time if the government	15:38 1	which was not followed when the licences were when
13.33	deemed it appropriate.	2	the handover of the concessions should have been done.
3	There has also been an assertion that the	3	Here I have to say that I'm not aware of any
4	requirement for NRD to re-apply for licences was	4	legislation, regulation or guidance setting out formal
5	a breach of the law. I disagree, because there's no	5	handover processes, and throughout my time as
6	contractual basis for making such an assertion. In	6	a practitioner, I've never had to attend to any of
7	fact, re-application was rather a requirement of the	7	these.
8	law.	8	What I do know is that the law does impose
9	Next slide (6).	9	obligations on existing concession holders, and mainly
10	With respect to the legal effects of the arbitral	10	this is to do with making good the concession areas, so
11	award and the court decisions thereof, I looked at the	11	that whatever environmental damage could have been
12	award as well as the court decisions, and I noted that	12	occasioned on the locations can be made good. There are
13	Mr Benzinge challenged brought an arbitral claim	13	no corresponding obligations on the state that I know of
14	which challenged: the transfer of shares to NRD and	14	in any legislation.
15	HC Starck; the appointment of Mr Marshall as managing	15	Thank you very much for your attention.
16	director; the appointment of Mr Marshall and	16	THE PRESIDENT: I think it would be a good idea if we take
17	Ms Mruskovicova to the board of NRD.	17	the half-hour break now.
18	The arbitrator found these three decisions unlawful	18	Could I just say this to counsel. The role of
19	and rendered them void ab initio.	19	an expert evidence on foreign law is to inform the
20	Next slide (7). (Pause)	20	Tribunal of the law; it's not to inform the Tribunal of
21	NRD challenged the award in the High Court and	21	the answer applying the law. Almost inevitably, it's
22	sought its annulment, alleging that the procedure in the	22	very, very difficult for expert witnesses to distinguish
23	articles of NRD was not followed and NRD was not	23	between the two. But when cross-examining, Mr Cowley,
24	notified of the arbitration proceedings. The High Court	24	bear in mind that the decision of the effect of Rwandan
25	found that the arbitration proceedings had followed all	25	law is for us. The question of what Rwandan law is
	Do 04		P 07
	Page 94		Page 96
Ī			

15.40 1	is one of expert avidence that we have to receive on the	16:26 1	I'm going to tall you that these both were
15:40 1	is one of expert evidence that we have to resolve on the evidence.		I'm going to tell you that these both were attributed by Dr Mike Biryabarema and I'm sure
2 3	Do you follow the distinction?	2 3	I mispronounce that; I apologise to him in his
	MR COWLEY: I will do my best to take that to heart.	4	absence but who we've been referring to as "Dr Mike"
4	THE PRESIDENT: It is hard. It is hard.	5	testified that both of these documents were his, he
5	MR COWLEY: I do not have the expectation or the intention	6	authored.
7	of asking the ultimate question that you are being posed	7	If I could ask that now the Contract Law,
8	with and challenging Mr Mugisha with it. That's not my	8	Article 67 the Contract Law document is RM-001. Can
	intent. I have some specific questions about his	9	Article 67 the Contract Law document is RM-001. Can Article 67 be brought up, please. It's on page 45.
9	reports. And I will do my best during the break to make	10	Mr Mugisha, I'll go back through it slower if
11	sure I'm complying with your expectations.	11	necessary, because you can only put up so much at one
12	THE PRESIDENT: Very well. We will adjourn for half	12	time, and I don't want to make this an exercise in
13	an hour.	13	short-term memory.
14	(3.41 pm)	14	But if the Tribunal were to find that Dr Mike is one
15	(Adjourned until 4.10 pm)	15	of or the representative of the Respondent responsible
16	(4.23 pm)	16	for interpreting Article 4 of the contract when making
17	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, you have the witness.	17	the assessment that's referred to there, and if the
18	MR COWLEY: Thank you, your Honour.	18	Tribunal were to find that the plaintiffs agree with
19	Cross-examination by MR COWLEY	19	Dr Mike's interpretation of that provision, you'll agree
20	Q. Mr Mugisha, good afternoon. It may be evening your	20	that Article 67's first paragraph then applies; correct?
20 21	time.	20 21	A. Yes.
21 22	A. Good morning.	22	Q. And even if those two preliminary findings are not made
23	Q. Can I ask that the second expert report of Mr Mugisha be	23	by the Tribunal, will you agree, sir, that Article 67
23	brought up, and we'll focus on paragraph 17.	23	if we can scroll up. Article 66, I'm sorry. I didn't
25	Is this the May 27th 2020 report? Yes, it is.	25	
23	is this the May 27th 2020 report? Tes, it is.	23	mean to repeat 67 Article 66 of the Contract Law
	Page 97		Page 99
16:24 1	Thank you.	16:29 1	applies in any event to any interpretation of a clause
2	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and	2	or provision in a contract; correct?
2 3	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side	2 3	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it
2 3 4	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number,	2 3 4	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its
2 3 4 5	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you.	2 3 4 5	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature.
2 3 4	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your	2 3 4	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure
2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen. Q. Now if I could ask that two documents be brought up:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct? A. I still don't understand your question. Can you go over that again?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen. Q. Now if I could ask that two documents be brought up: R-111 and C-032. For R-111, if I could ask you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct? A. I still don't understand your question. Can you go over that again? Q. Yes. In the event the Tribunal does not determine facts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen. Q. Now if I could ask that two documents be brought up: R-111 and C-032. For R-111, if I could ask you to highlight the second paragraph, please. And for C-032,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct? A. I still don't understand your question. Can you go over that again? Q. Yes. In the event the Tribunal does not determine facts such that Article 67 is determinative we talked about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen. Q. Now if I could ask that two documents be brought up: R-111 and C-032. For R-111, if I could ask you to highlight the second paragraph, please. And for C-032,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct? A. I still don't understand your question. Can you go over that again? Q. Yes. In the event the Tribunal does not determine facts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Mr Mugisha, paragraph 17 talks about what is and I'll ask if it can be brought up and put side by side in the contract that's C-017 as a document number, Article 4; correct? And we'll bring it up to show you. Your paragraph 17 is talking in part about your opinion regarding that article; correct? A. It's talking in general terms about how decisions of government are taken. Q. Because your expert report goes on to apply the law as you've described it to Article 4; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. Your report goes on to apply what you're describing as Rwandan law in paragraph 17 to Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Q. You'll agree there's no other provision in the contract that we need to look at that you believe constitutes an agreement in the contract as to how a positive evaluation of a submitted feasibility study is to be interpreted; correct? A. There's none that I've seen. Q. Now if I could ask that two documents be brought up: R-111 and C-032. For R-111, if I could ask you to highlight the second paragraph, please. And for C-032,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	or provision in a contract; correct? A. Well, Article 66 is very clear, in the sense that it refers to the intent of the contract at the time of its signature. Q. I'm just I'll ask the question again. I'm not sure if you're done answering it; I don't mean to speak over you if you are still trying to answer. But if you've completed your answer, my question again is: regardless of whether or not the Tribunal makes the factual determinations that I premised my last question on regarding Article 67, if they do not make those determinations, Article 66 does apply to any interpretation of the contract that the Tribunal is to make concerning Article 4 of the contract; correct? A. Can you say that again? Q. If Article 67 is determined by the Tribunal not to control, then Article 66 of the Contract Law does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal makes of Article 4 of the parties' contract; correct? A. I still don't understand your question. Can you go over that again? Q. Yes. In the event the Tribunal does not determine facts such that Article 67 is determinative we talked about

Day 8 He	earing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case N	Vo. ARB/18/21 Wednesday, 30 June 202
16:31 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 7 8 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Tribunal determines that doesn't apply then Article [66] does apply to whatever interpretation the Tribunal is to give to the contract's Article 4; correct? A. Read together with Article 2. Q. And Article 69 of the Contract Law; correct? A. Mm-hm. Q. That's on page 47, if it can be brought up. I see that it wasn't brought up; I think that's what I was being asked to look at. So in RM-001, page 47. (Pause) Are you done reading, sir? A. Yes. Q. So in the event that the Tribunal does not determine that Article 67 of the Contract Law is determinative, then in addition to Article 2, Article 66, also Article 69 of the Contract Law applies to any interpretation that should be made of the parties' contract at Article 4; correct? A. That's correct. Only that where the clauses are explicit, then that is what takes precedence. Q. If I could ask that the first report be brought up, and if we could go to I believe it's the last substantive paragraph. Yes, page 15, paragraph 58. And if we could	16:38 1 A. Obviously, as long as there is no express extension, the principle applies. 3 Q. So your opinion to the Tribunal is: the principle in paragraph 58 applied when the first written extension expired without another written extension being provided? 7 A. That's correct. 8 Q. Then you note in paragraph 18 that a second extension was provided in writing, with a gap period not covered. 10 But what is your opinion that you're expressing to the Tribunal about the principle in paragraph 58? Does it now no longer apply? 13 A. I don't understand where you're getting with this. I've said that a duration of the extension is what it is, and the principle does apply. 16 Q. So six months after August 2nd 2011, the mining concessions reverted to Rwanda as government property; that principle in paragraph 58 you're saying applies at that date, correct? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. So what principle do you identify in your report permits Rwanda to grant the second extension after the mining concessions had reverted to it? Is there anything in
23	paragraph. Yes, page 15, paragraph 58. And if we could	concessions had reverted to it? Is there anything in
24 25	put that testimony to the left, raise it up again, so he can read his own language again. (Pause)	your report that identifies the authority of the government to grant a licence to only one party for
	Page 101	Page 103
16:35 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	If we could leave that paragraph 58 highlighted up and also go back to paragraph 18 in the same report and highlight that paragraph, and show them together. (Pause) The principle you identify in paragraph 58 that the public mines revert to the Government of Rwanda when the licence expires, is it your opinion that that principle applies during the gaps between the written extensions	16:40 1 a mining concession, without making it publicly 2 available for competitive bid? 3 A. Of course. That's the discretion of government. 4 Q. So it's your testimony that under Rwandan law, the 5 Government of Rwanda has discretion to license or 6 otherwise transfer government property to one party, 7 without making it publicly available for competitive 8 bid?
9 10 11 12 13	of the licence agreement, of NRD's licence agreement, that expired at the beginning of 2011? A. Can you say that again? Q. Yes. You see in paragraph 18 of your witness statement you talk about short-term licences?	9 A. There are two ways in which this can happen. One would 10 be by way of a competitive bid; the other is where 11 unsolicited proposals are presented to government. In 12 either 13 Q. Well
14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yes. Q. And the other principles that you were talking about, you say what effect you believe those short-term licences have which is none on your prior principles. But I want to focus you on the dates that the extensions cover. 	14 A the government does take a decision. 15 Q. You are aware that there are public tender principles 16 under Rwandan law limiting the government and its 17 agencies' ability to transfer government property; 18 correct? 19 A. I'm not aware of those laws.
20 21	Referencing those gaps that show in the written	20 Q. So is it your testimony that no such law applies to the

25

second extensions?

Page 102

25 Q. Forgetting the gap period now in between the three

Day 8 1	Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case N	No. ARB/18	Wednesday, 30 June 202
16:42	written extensions that you reference in paragraph 18,	16:46 1	that institution, the RDB:
	2 it's your testimony to the Tribunal that the principle	2	" states that the last amendment was made on
	identified in paragraph 58 applied again at the end of	3	02 August 2012 and it shows that Mr Marshal was the
	the one-month extension of a licence to NRD that began	4	company representative"
	on September 13th 2012?	5	A. Yes, I read it.
	5 A. That's correct.	6	Q. " whereas Mr BENZINGE was the Managing Director."
	Q. Is it your testimony to the Tribunal that that same	7	Do you see that?
	3 principle equally applies to all other applicants for	8	A. Mm-hm.
	concessions who had requests for licences or	9	Q. Is that a "yes"?
1	long-term licences, I should say to concessions still	10	A. Yes.
1	being discussed when a last written extension of their	11	Q. And you talk about this principle of reversion and you
1	_	12	refer to that sentence; do you see that? Do you agree
1		13	with that? Excuse me.
1		14	A. I don't refer to that sentence; I refer to the entire
1		15	award.
1		16	Q. Right. But you refer to the reference to Mr Benzinge as
1		17	managing director when you refer to the principle of
1		18	reversion; is that correct?
1		19	A. It talked about the shareholders, the shares reverting;
2	•	20	not who is the official.
2		21	Q. I didn't catch the last word. Not who is what?
2		22	A. I talked about the reversion of shares, going back to
2		23	Mr Benzinge and the Zarnacks.
2	• .	24	Q. May I ask that the first report be brought up and
2	the Ben Benzinge dispute with NRD; correct?	25	paragraph 46 highlighted.
	Page 105		Page 107
16:44	A. That's right.	16:48 1	In this paragraph you talk about the application of
	Q. Including testimony about the effect of the arbitration	2	the reversion principle as a result of the arbitration
	award between Ben Benzinge and NRD; correct?	3	decision; correct?
	4 A. Yes, that's right.	4	A. That's right.
	Q. If I could ask that page 4 be brought up.	5	Q. Okay. And my previous request was in terms of bringing
	THE PRESIDENT: What number is the award?	6	up the arbitration award itself, but we can put it side
	7 MR COWLEY: R-013, Mr President.	7	by side, R-013, and page 4, the first paragraph.
	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	8	Based on your explanation of the reversion principle
	MR COWLEY: Now, in your testimony you talk about the	9	that you say applies to the arbitrator's decision
1		10	nullifying certain actions, it applies equally to the
1	•	11	record in the RDB in both the first and second
1		12	sentences, so both the reference to the record including
1		13	Mr Benzinge as managing director and Mr Marshall as
1	• •	14	representative, and the prior sentence talking about, on
1		15	August 6th 2012, the action of suspending Mr Benzinge as
1		16	managing director. The reversion principle you
1		17	announced applies to both documents in the RDB's files;
1		18	correct?
1	•	19	A. I am just reading the conclusions of the award and just
2	<u> </u>	20	inferring what they are about. I have not gone into the
2		20	analysis of the award, as you would like me to.
2		22	Q. I'm not asking you to do an analysis. I'm asking you to
2		23	explain the reversion principle. You refer to certain
	out junut muu one round in the RDD's corporate intes		explain the reversion principle. Tou left to certain
	-		prior findings in the or prior statements about the
2 2	as submitted to her included a "Full registration	24 25	prior findings in the or prior statements about the parties' positions.

16:50 1 A. I'm only saying that following the award, the effect was thus. That's it. Q. And the reason for the opinion you give about the effects I'm simply asking you to clarify that same reasoning applies to the other documents in the RDB's files regarding the parties' status. Not just one, but the full file as to the parties' respective status get the benefit of this reversion principle; correct? A. Look, I've told you what the conclusions of the award are and the effect they have. Q. Do you agree with me, sir, that the reversion principle that you rely on applies to both of the documents that are referenced in the first paragraph on page 4 of the	16:56 1 of the last amendment. Can you look at it? 2 Q. Is it your testimony that Article 22 does not apply to the document issued by the RDB on July 3rd 2014? 4 A. July 3rd July 2014 is an amendment, just like at the date of 2006 the information could have been different. 6 Because clearly this is an amendment. 7 Article 22 is about the information provided at the time of incorporation, because it's actually an article about incorporation of a company: when does a company come to life? 11 Q. So I'm trying to focus the question on whether it's your testimony to the Tribunal that in determining the import of document C-005 that's on the left of the screen
14 arbitration award?	they are to look to Article 22 of the Company Law or
15 A. It should.	15 not. 16 A Article 22 of the Company Law talks about information
 Q. The same law applies, right? A. Yes. Q. If I could ask now that C-005 be brought up. As well, side by side, if I could ask that the Company Law be brought up, and focus on Article 22: RM-007. 	16 A. Article 22 of the Company Law talks about information 17 that is provided at the time of incorporation and the 18 information that is necessary to complete the 19 requirements of the law for purposes of incorporation. 20 Now, the document on the left-hand side of the
Thank you for highlighting Article 22. On the left,	21 screen is information that provides records as and when
the document I brought up, can we show Mr Mugisha what	there are amendments. It could be because of
the document consists of, so he knows what I'm referring to.	shareholders, it could be directors, it could be share capital; it could be any other record that is different
24 to.25 Mr Mugisha, please take your time, look at the	capital; it could be any other record that is different from the information provided to the date of
Page 109	Page 111
16:53 1 document, and then you say when you're ready for it to 2 be scrolled, when you know what you've looked at. 3 A. Yes, you can scroll down. (Pause) So what's your 4 question? 5 Q. If you could go back up. I believe it's the second 6 page. I don't have the document in hand, so I'm relying 7 on what is a small screen for me. But if that has the 8 date on it, the date of the document yes, it does. 9 I want to make sure you're aware of the date that this 10 document that was transmitted by the cover letter, but 11 the date of the actual document that's being referred to 12 do you see is July 3rd 2014? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Article 22 of the Company Law applies to the RDB's "Full 15 Registration Information for Domestic Company" report 16 when it was issued in July 2014; correct? 17 A. Article 22 talks about the information in the register 18 on the dates of incorporation. What I see that took 19 place on 3rd July 2014 is an amendment to the 20 information in the records of the registry. 21 Q. Article 22 of the Company Law applies to the RDB's 22 action that's titled "Full Registration Information for 23 Domestic Company", "Company name: NATURAL RESOURCES 24 DEVELOPMENT RWANDA LTD", on July 3rd 2014; correct? 25 A. That is not the date of incorporation; that is the date	16:58 1 incorporation. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Is that a way of saying: no, Article 22 does 3 not apply to this document? 4 A. Yes, it does not. 5 THE PRESIDENT: That's what I thought. Well, that was the 6 question you were asked. 7 Perhaps it would be a good idea, Mr Cowley, to look 8 at Article 25 and ask the same question. 9 MR COWLEY: Yes, I'm trying to look at that, sir. Just 10 a second. (Pause) 11 Mr Mugisha, is it your testimony to the Tribunal 12 that Article 25 of the Company Law applies to the RDB's 13 "Full Registration Information for Domestic Company" NRD 14 issued on July 3rd 2014? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. I didn't hear what you said. "Yes" is what you said, or 17 did you say something else? 18 A. Yes. Yes. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Is that right? That's dealing with 20 amendment to the company's name. I think the point 21 you're making is we are dealing with an amendment to the 22 registry, not with the original certification. 23 Article 25 deals with an amendment to the 25 representation of the company?

		I	
17.00 1	A TO 1 2 1 d a 1 1 2d d 1 1 a Cd	17.05 1	him and I am had a label a had a few minutes and a
17:00 1	A. There's no article that deals with the amendment of the	17:05 1	him, and I apologise in his absence for mispronouncing
2	information at the date of incorporation. But there are	2	it again and bring it to paragraph 20. (Pause)
3	articles off the top of my head, I can think of	3	If I could ask you to highlight the second-to-last
4	Article 212, which obliges the registrar to amend the	4	sentence, "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge", and
5	registry on the basis of information provided from time	5	highlight the whole sentence.
6	to time.	6	Do you agree with Bailiff Bosco's statement of
7	MR COWLEY: I did not catch that number; please say it	7	Rwandan law in paragraph 20 of his witness statement
8	again.	8	that shareholders in NRD are liable for its debts?
9	A. I think it's 212.	9	A. I do not.
10	Q. I've been told that that's on page 265, if the	10	Q. It's your testimony to the Tribunal that Bailiff Bosco
11	controller can bring that up, please.	11	misstated the applicable Rwandan law to the principle of
12	Is that the provision you were referring to,	12	whether or not shareholders of the company are liable
13	Mr Mugisha?	13	for its debts? (Pause)
14	A. No. I said it was off the head, so But it's around	14	THE PRESIDENT: Our recollection is that Mr Bosco, if we may
15	the power of the registrar to update the registry.	15	call him that, stated firmly that shareholders were not
16	Q. For corporations that are registered in Rwanda, to what	16	liable for the debt of the company.
17	entity or agency are they required to provide	17	MR COWLEY: It's Claimants' position and I don't contest
18	information about the change in shareholders or	18	the Tribunal's recollection of one of Mr Bosco's
19	directors or managing director appointment?	19	statements on the subject it's Claimants' position
20	A. It is the Office of the Registrar General.	20	that in a different part of his testimony he confirmed
21	Q. In your testimony, is there any question that Rwandan	21	this representation in his witness statement as to
22	law requires corporations registered in Rwanda to make	22	a different action, as to why he served a certain letter
23	those reports to the Registrar General?	23	on Mr Benzinge, and the testimony that you're
24	A. There is yes, there is an obligation to file those	24	recollecting related to whether or not he agreed that
25	returns.	25	a car he was seizing was Mr Marshall's personal car or
	Page 113		Page 115
	1 uge 113		ruge 113
17:03 1	Q. And that obligation applies only to the Registrar	17:07 1	not.
17:03 1 2	Q. And that obligation applies only to the Registrar General and to no one else; correct?	17:07 1	not. So I would suggest that our recollection and
2	General and to no one else; correct?	2	So I would suggest that our recollection and
2 3	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct.	2 3	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the
2 3 4	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up.	2 3 4	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was
2 3 4 5	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one	2 3 4 5	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this
2 3 4 5 6	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe,	2 3 4 5 6	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once.
2 3 4 5 6 7	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction	2 3 4 5 6 7	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct. Q. The other shareholder, the minority shareholder in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct. Q. The other shareholder, the minority shareholder in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up to show it to him has already been served. I asked the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up to show it to him has already been served. I asked the question as to what his testimony was, and he's given
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct. Q. The other shareholder, the minority shareholder in NRD Rwanda Limited was Ben Benzinge at the time; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If that could be left up on the left, but if I could ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up to show it to him has already been served. I asked the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct. Q. The other shareholder, the minority shareholder in NRD Rwanda Limited was Ben Benzinge at the time; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If that could be left up on the left, but if I could ask for the Respondent's witness statement of Jean Bosco	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up to show it to him has already been served. I asked the question as to what his testimony was, and he's given it. So I wasn't going to press the issue further with the statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	General and to no one else; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If I could ask that document C-186 be brought up. Mr Mugisha, C-186 is a May 22nd 2008 letter from one of your colleagues at your firm Mr Apollo, I believe, under the stamp and it's discussing a transaction relating to the Zarnacks' percentage interest in NRD Holding GmbH; do you see that? A. Yes, that's right. Q. And that entity, NRD Holding GmbH, you understood was the holding company that owned NRD Rwanda Limited; correct? A. Yes. It's clear on the face of this. Q. And your firm represented the Zarnacks, the majority shareholders in NRD Rwanda Limited, in connection with the transaction that's discussed here; correct? A. That's correct. Q. The other shareholder, the minority shareholder in NRD Rwanda Limited was Ben Benzinge at the time; correct? A. That's correct. Q. If that could be left up on the left, but if I could ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	So I would suggest that our recollection and I can't quote the transcript. I would just suggest the reason I'm asking this is because I thought there was a basis from his live testimony that he confirmed this principle once. MR HILL: I don't recall that there's any basis for it. And my recollection is exactly the same as the Tribunal's: he was very clear in his testimony that shareholders are not liable for the debts of the company. MS DOHMANN: It was very clear, definitely. THE PRESIDENT: I have a recollection, I think, that accords with Mr Cowley that earlier, before he made that very clear statement, he had suggested that a shareholder might be liable for a company's debt. But certainly I took him as making a quite clear correction to that statement. Anyway, if they're conflicting statements that he's made, they're conflicting statements. MR COWLEY: Yes. And I think the purpose of bringing it up to show it to him has already been served. I asked the question as to what his testimony was, and he's given it. So I wasn't going to press the issue further with

17:09 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	document right now, it may save time if I can ask a question of Mr Mugisha. Mr Mugisha, looking at the document of 22nd May 2008 (C-186), it talks about the transfer of the shares "upon payment of the price". What is the effect of non-payment of the price in relation to the transfer, if any? Is the transfer valid anyway and there's a debt, or is there no valid transfer? Can you help us on that? A. It would depend on the underlying agreements for the transaction.	17:14 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	paragraph 47 that "the Zarnacks no longer wish to exercise authority over the company"? What was your source of information, what was the source of your testimony as to the Zarnacks' stated desire or lack of desire on that topic? A. Look, I as I said, when I was requested to provide an expert report, I was provided with documentation. So obviously I know the facts of the case, and that is what was at the back of my mind when I made that statement. Q. It's now closed, but we looked at a letter in which you
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS DOHMANN: Thank you. (Pause) MR COWLEY: If I could ask that the first report be brought up, and highlight paragraph 47, please. Mr Mugisha, you give testimony here about the consequence of both the arbitration award as upheld by the Supreme Court, and you state the circumstances were that "the Zarnacks no longer wish to exercise authority over the company". To what do you cite for the principle that's been established as to the Zarnacks' position with regard to whatever interest they may wish to assert in NRD in light of the arbitration award? A. Let me give some context to this statement, and the	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	were representing the Zarnacks THE PRESIDENT: If you're going away from this, I'm very anxious not to spend a very long time chasing red herrings. You have qualified your statement in paragraph 47 by the words: " in circumstances where the Zarnacks no longer wish to exercise authority and the dispute is between Mr Marshall and Mr Benzinge" If one struck out all of that, would your statement be accurate? A. Sorry, sir, can you repeat the sentence? THE PRESIDENT: If you put a line through paragraph 47
23 24 25	A. Let the give some context to this statement, and the context is this. Following the judgment, the arbitration award and Page 117	25 24 25	A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: beginning at the last word of the first Page 119
17:11 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	its confirmation by the Supreme Court, everybody was entitled to deal with either the Zarnacks or Mr Benzinge on matters related to NRD. And in the event that the Zarnacks were not able to do so, there should have been no vacuum as long as Mr Benzinge was available. And the reason I say this is that under Rwandan law, especially the Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda, Article 151, every individual or public authority is obliged to respect court decisions, and only challenge them through procedures determined by the law. Now, with such a decision having come from the Supreme Court, it is obvious that no vacuum was expected to be at the company. So this is the context to this statement. Q. I'm sorry, the last part I missed. What was the context of the statement, that last part? You said it was obvious that nobody what? A. That in the absence of the Zarnacks, Mr Benzinge could act on behalf of the company, and everyone else was entitled to treat him as acting for the company. Q. Well thank you. Are you done? A. Yes, I am. Q. Okay. I appreciate your explanation, but I'm still troubled by trying to understand. Why is it that you're making a representation in	17:15	line and ending before "it is Mr Benzinge", so the statement read, "As a consequence of the Arbitration award as upheld by the Supreme Court, it is Mr Benzinge who would have authority to act on behalf of the Company", would that be accurate? A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: It would? A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: That is in conflict with the document produced by the registry on 3rd July 2014 that we have just looked at: C-005. A. Yes. And like I explained, pursuant to Article 151 of the Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda, it would—the registrar would be—would have no choice but to update the registry accordingly. THE PRESIDENT: So does it look as though something must have happened between the time of that award and 3rd July 2014 that resulted in the registrar making the record that he did? A. I'm not privy to what certainly did happen. All I'm saying is that if the award had been presented, the registrar was entitled to record the contents of the award, i.e. to say that the status quo before the transfer of shares was done should be—should revert. THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

17:17 1	A. I don't see	17:21 1	view.
2	MR COWLEY: It may help with this questioning if we bring up	2	THE PRESIDENT: Can I raise the difficulty I have with all
3	the Supreme Court's decision so the date of that can be	3	of this.
4	looked at compared to the registrar's action, so there's	4	The arbitration was based upon, as I understand it,
5	no confusion as to which came first and which came	5	an arbitration agreement between the original
6	second.	6	shareholders who formed the company, and as it seems to
7	THE PRESIDENT: What is the date of the Supreme Court	7	me, it's an arbitration agreement which would apply in
8	decision?	8	relation to a dispute between shareholders. The
9	MR COWLEY: It is May 2nd 2014, and the document number is	9	arbitration purports to have been between the company on
10	R-015-ENG. It should be up at the top, in the bold	10	the one side and Mr Benzinge on the other.
11	section at the very top caption. There you go.	11	I have great difficulty in seeing: (a) how the
12	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Hill, this arbitration has proceeded on	12	arbitration agreement could result in such
13	the basis, as I understand it, that the particulars in	13	an arbitration, as opposed to an inter-shareholder
14	that amended registration of 3rd July 2014 were correct,	14	arbitration; and (b) I have difficulty seeing how the
15	i.e. that Mr Marshall has authority to act for the	15	result of the arbitration could operate in rem so as to
16	company.	16	divorce Spalena from its shareholding.
17	MR HILL: Well, in this arbitration Mr Marshall is acting on	17	Those are the difficulties I have.
18	behalf of the Claimants. NRD isn't a party.	18	MR HILL: Yes. I wonder whether, rather than trying to
19	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	19	tackle all of those on the hoof, I could digest those,
20	MR HILL: So in terms of representing NRD in the	20	and it may be points that we can pick up in closing.
21	arbitration, NRD doesn't have a role in the arbitration.	21	I understand the difficulties.
22	THE PRESIDENT: No, that's true. But if Mr Marshall has	22	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
23	authority to act for the company, it can only be through	23	MR HILL: I'm not sure how much those difficulties are
24	Spalena.	24	central to any issues that you're actually deciding, and
25	MR HILL: Yes. But as I say, it doesn't arise, because in	25	that's perhaps something that I'd like to consider and
	Page 121		Page 123
	1 age 121		1 age 123
17:19 1	the arbitration NRD is not a party.	17:22 1	address.
17:19 1 2	the arbitration NRD is not a party. MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that	17:22 1 2	Because our standing point is that this is not
	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry		Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our
2 3 4	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was	2 3 4	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation
2 3 4 5	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this	2 3 4 5	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of
2 3 4 5 6	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well.	2 3 4 5 6	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see?	2 3 4 5 6 7	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge. That's why he says: in circumstances where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that consequence, and such that Mr Imena, for example, would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge. That's why he says: in circumstances where the Zarnacks are not on the scene, Benzinge can have authority. But obviously if the Zarnacks were on the scene, the shareholdings would have reverted to them and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that consequence, and such that Mr Imena, for example, would have been acting entirely reasonably in taking the position that he did. MR COWLEY: If I was permitted to finish my sentence, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge. That's why he says: in circumstances where the Zarnacks are not on the scene, Benzinge can have authority. But obviously if the Zarnacks were on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that consequence, and such that Mr Imena, for example, would have been acting entirely reasonably in taking the position that he did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge. That's why he says: in circumstances where the Zarnacks are not on the scene, Benzinge can have authority. But obviously if the Zarnacks were on the scene, the shareholdings would have reverted to them and they could take actions as shareholders. So that's his	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that consequence, and such that Mr Imena, for example, would have been acting entirely reasonably in taking the position that he did. MR COWLEY: If I was permitted to finish my sentence, what I was trying to say was: it certainly couldn't be in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS DOHMANN: Mr Hill, we follow that MR HILL: I'm sorry MS DOHMANN: the company into which the investment was made is not a party under the BIT and in this arbitration. We follow that very well. But what is the position with Spalena, you see? Because they were meant to be the people who acquired the shares. And it's very confusing. At the moment it doesn't seem to us to have been resolved with clarity as to who exactly is the shareholder as a result of this arbitration award, who are the shareholders, and where is Spalena in all of this. MR HILL: Yes. Well, as you've heard from Mr Mugisha's evidence, his view and it's at 45 as well as 47 of his [expert report] is that the effect of the award is that the transfers of shareholdings are nullified, the result being that there's a reversion to the original shareholders, who are the Zarnacks and Benzinge. That's why he says: in circumstances where the Zarnacks are not on the scene, Benzinge can have authority. But obviously if the Zarnacks were on the scene, the shareholdings would have reverted to them and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Because our standing point is that this is not this hasn't been put forward at the centre of our standing point, and where it does arise is in relation to the reasonableness of the actions in particular of Mr Imena, who considered he was caught between two people with different assertions. And unless it's being said that it should have somehow been obvious to Mr Imena that he could in some way disregard the Supreme Court award, I'm not sure the point matters that much to anything the Tribunal is actually deciding. THE PRESIDENT: I think that's right. But MR COWLEY: That's precisely our point as of July 4th 2014. That's why we've raised that. It couldn't be in doubt as of the day that that registrar's statement was MR HILL: No, I certainly don't accept that. I certainly don't accept that anything couldn't be in doubt. There is plainly, as Mr Mugisha explains, a natural consequence of the award and the Supreme Court judgment on it, that to the reader, at any rate, has that consequence, and such that Mr Imena, for example, would have been acting entirely reasonably in taking the position that he did. MR COWLEY: If I was permitted to finish my sentence, what

17:23 1 doubt what instruction Mr Imena was required to follow 2 as of July 4th 2014. 2 THE PRESIDENT: So far as I'm concerned 3 MR HILL: Well, we don't accept that either. 4 MR COWLEY: (Inaudible) as it may be to him, the registrar 4 MS DOHMANN: So far as I'm concerned,	
2 as of July 4th 2014. 2 THE PRESIDENT: So far as I'm concerned 3 MR HILL: Well, we don't accept that either. 3 perfectly fair. 4 MR COWLEY: (Inaudible) as it may be to him, the registrar 4 MS DOHMANN: So far as I'm concerned,	
3 MR HILL: Well, we don't accept that either. 3 perfectly fair. 4 MR COWLEY: (Inaudible) as it may be to him, the registrar 4 MS DOHMANN: So far as I'm concerned,	, that strikes me as
4 MR COWLEY: (Inaudible) as it may be to him, the registrar 4 MS DOHMANN: So far as I'm concerned,	
	Mr Imena can have
5 has spoken. No action was pending as of July 4th 2014 5 acted in good faith, there being conflicting	g positions
6 to challenge it; none is pending now that we've been 6 taken, and he then proceeded in a careful	
7 informed of. 7 That's one way of seeing it.	
8 But the point was: as of a certain date our point 8 MR COWLEY: Rather than argue it now, p	lease just note our
9 has been: as of a certain date, he was required to 9 position is we have more to point to in M	-
10 follow the law and let the registrar who has spoken 10 testimony, both in his witness statements	
11 speak and have effect, and 11 the hearings, that supports our position th	
12 MR HILL: We don't accept that for a moment, because we 12 exactly what he was supposed to do and h	
don't accept the conclusiveness that Mr Cowley asserts 13 he was doing it; meanwhile, we say the re	
14 of the registrar. Anything in the register could be 14 contrary.	
open to challenge, and Mr Benzinge was armed with the 15 But we'll pick up this point, both of us,	in the
16 material prima facie to challenge it. 16 closing. At the risk of belabouring a poin	
17 MR COWLEY: I was speaking to our position, because that's 17 think is over, I actually had a different pu	
what you asked, in rhetorical form albeit, but it wasn't 18 trying to address a couple of questions to	•
19 a joke and it shouldn't have been rhetorical. That was 19 this topic, so for clarity's sake and to avoi	
20 our very position. The reason I spoke about it is 20 frustrating everybody that you think I'm p	
21 because that's how you phrased it 21 an issue that we've now talked through.	
22 THE PRESIDENT: Can we come back to the fundamental point 22 To be clear, the Claimants remained ve	rv concerned
23 which is worrying me, and that is that when this 23 that Mr Mugisha, as far as the record has	-
24 arbitration began on Day 1, I understood it to be common 24 his firm and Mr Mugisha's personal repre	
25 ground that Spalena was the ultimate holding company of 25 conflict, because the only certainly the	
25 ground and spation was are animate noteing company of	and this wil
Page 125 Page 127	
17:25 1 NRD, and that's the basis upon which we've been 17:28 1 representative of the Zarnacks in Rwa	
2 proceeding. And if that's not correct, there's a very 2 inform them, give them notice, talk to	
3 short answer to Spalena's claim. 3 interest they may have in reasserting of	
4 MR COWLEY: It's the basis [on which] we've been proceeding 4 and doing another transaction like cla	
5 as well. We thought it was an agreed fact before the 5 shareholders' shareholdings or not b	
6 hearings started. 6 from a lawyer, that lawyer would be N	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Mr Mugisha or his
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 7 firm.	_
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 8 And at the same time, the Respondent	ent has an interest
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 9 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E	ent has an interest denzinge's how
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responders in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 And at the same time, the Responder 9 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they t his status and
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 15 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they t his status and relies very much
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder 19 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is 14 in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder 19 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about 14 arbitration award and the decision uple	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder 9 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is 14 in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony ab 15 arbitration award and the decision upl 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 16 interpreted under Rwandan law.	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they it his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 And at the same time, the Respondent 19 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is arbitration award and the decision uplication in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about 14 in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about 15 interpreted under Rwandan law. 16 We see a very clear at least potential	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 a working way forward, I would just want to stress that 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E in continuing to breat	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be al conflict actions. And
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the position on the registry ever since. That's my current approach. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: Can we consider that? MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as a working way forward, I would just want to stress that we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from firm. And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony ab 15 arbitration award and the decision upl 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 16 interpreted under Rwandan law. 17 We see a very clear at least potentian 18 between two clients on the same trans 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 19 that's what we raised in advance of the	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they it his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be al conflict actions. And e arbitration; we
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the position on the registry ever since. That's my current approach. THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: Can we consider that? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as a working way forward, I would just want to stress that we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from the that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena The president in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about interpreted under Rwandan law. We see a very clear at least potential between two clients on the same trans that's what we raised in advance of the that's what we raised in advance of the were told to pick it up at cross-examin	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And e arbitration; we nation for
7 THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on 8 the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely 9 the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 a working way forward, I would just want to stress that 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 20 that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena 21 that Mr Benzinge was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responder 10 in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is arbitration award and the decision upled in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is arbitration award and the decision upled in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 12 benefit from lingering confusion about 13 the status of the shareholding, which is arbitration award and the decision upled in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 14 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 15 arbitration award and the decision upled in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 16 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 18 a working we consider that? 19 we see a very clear at least potential between two clients on the same trans 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 19 that Mr Benzinge was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And e arbitration; we nation for
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 3rd July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 a working way forward, I would just want to stress that 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 20 that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena 21 that Mr Benzinge was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme 22 Court award at him and Mr Imena was in some way required 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Responde in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 10 shall I call it? efforts to confuse the 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about the samethabout the sarting in continuing to breathe life into Mr E 11 thoroughly. Because the Respondent 12 benefit from lingering confusion about the samethabout the samethabout the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the satus of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the satus of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's testimony about the status of the shareholding, which is in part on Mr Mugisha's test	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And the arbitration; we hation for weight to be
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 ard July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 a working way forward, I would just want to stress that 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 20 that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena 21 that Mr Benzinge was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme 22 Court award at him and Mr Imena was in some way required 23 to ignore Mr Benzinge. So it's a slightly different 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the refforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the forting in continuing to shall sall latel it? efforts to confuse the	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much cout how the holding it must be all conflict factions. And the arbitration; we hation for weight to be sever quite got to
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by that we would proceed on the common ground that by The arbitrary and, as we understand it, has remained the position on the registry ever since. That's my current approach. The PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: Can we consider that? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as a working way forward, I would just want to stress that we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena a working was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme Court award at him and Mr Imena was in some way required to ignore Mr Benzinge. So it's a slightly different nuance. But I want to be clear that any acceptance of Tirm. And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E shall I call it? efforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent thoroughly. Because the Respondent the share life into Mr E thoroughly. Because the Respondent the share to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to behall I call it? efforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to behall the flow s	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And the arbitration; we hation for weight to be ever quite got to to rely on to speak
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by 10 that we would proceed on the common ground that by 11 ard July 2014 the position was as stated by the 12 registrar and, as we understand it, has remained the 13 position on the registry ever since. That's my current 14 approach. 15 MR HILL: Can we consider that? 16 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 17 MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as 18 a working way forward, I would just want to stress that 19 we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from 20 that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena 21 that Mr Benzinge was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme 22 Court award at him and Mr Imena was in some way required 23 to ignore Mr Benzinge. So it's a slightly different 7 firm. 8 And at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the refforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to breathe life into Mr E and at the same time, the forting in continuing to shall sall latel it? efforts to confuse the	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And the arbitration; we hation for weight to be ever quite got to to rely on to speak
THE PRESIDENT: I currently would be inclined to proceed on the basis that it's very hard to understand precisely the nature and effect of this arbitration award, but that we would proceed on the common ground that by that we would proceed on the common ground that by The arbitrary and, as we understand it, has remained the position on the registry ever since. That's my current approach. The PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: Can we consider that? THE PRESIDENT: Yes. MR HILL: While we do, even were we to accept that as a working way forward, I would just want to stress that we certainly wouldn't be accepting that it follows from that that it would have been obvious, say, to Mr Imena a working was wrong to be brandishing a Supreme Court award at him and Mr Imena was in some way required to ignore Mr Benzinge. So it's a slightly different nuance. But I want to be clear that any acceptance of Tirm. And at the same time, the Responder in continuing to breathe life into Mr E shall I call it? efforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent thoroughly. Because the Respondent the share life into Mr E thoroughly. Because the Respondent the share to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to behall I call it? efforts to confuse the thoroughly. Because the Respondent the thoroughly. Because the Respondent in continuing to behall the flow s	ent has an interest denzinge's how situation believes they at his status and relies very much out how the holding it must be all conflict actions. And the arbitration; we hation for weight to be ever quite got to to rely on to speak

17:29 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	have no interest in taking control of the company again. Because it seems to be quite possible he's taking the position for one client that supports a different one, without ever providing notice to the first. THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I follow the point you are making Mr Cowley. And if you want to ask about the apparent qualification in paragraph 47, you are free to do so. MR COWLEY: Thank you. If you could bring back up the first report of Mr Mugisha at paragraph 47. I apologise in advance for the awkwardness of phrasing of this, because it's going to come out with an awkward negative. But, Mr Mugisha, who do you purport to rely upon in informing the Tribunal of the Zarnacks' lack of wish to exercise authority over the company? A. Mr Cowley, I've already answered your question to say I am privy to the purpose of this case on the basis of information provided to me in the documents, and that is on the basis of which I made this statement. Q. Please provide the name of the person upon whom you're relying in making that statement. A. I have told you: I am relying on documents that I was made privy to when I took on the assignment to provide	17:33 1 that could be ever be given by any lawyer as to 2 Mr Benzinge's role, regardless of how the confusion 3 comes out. Who is protecting that client? 4 THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, this witness has said quite 5 unequivocally that his understanding that "the Zarnacks 6 no longer wish to exercise authority over the company" 7 is derived from all the documents that are in front of 8 us. 9 Speaking for myself, it seems to me nothing could be 10 clearer from the documents than that the Zarnacks were 11 not interested in the company, because the documents 12 state that and this has never been challenged they 13 sold their interest in the company years and years ago. 14 And if they had got on to this witness and said, 15 "Well, we would like to get the company back", or if 16 they'd got on to this witness and said, "We just heard 17 that it's suggested we could get the company back, but 18 we don't want it", then this witness would have told us 19 that that was the basis of his statement. He hasn't 20 said so; he said that it was based on the documents. 21 MR COWLEY: But that's the problem, Mr President. I'm sorry 22 I'm not being clear. 23 But all of what you just said, I understand if 24 someone can confirm that the Zarnacks were informed,
25	this Tribunal with an expert report.	told about the ruling and advised as to the related
	Page 129	Page 131
17:31 1 2 3 4 4 5 6 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	 Q. Please identify the documents. A. It's the Memorial, it's the Counter-Memorial, it's basically these judgments. That is what I relied on. Q. I asked a poor question. I cut it short; I shouldn't have. Please identify the document or documents that you point to and rely upon for the information about the Zarnacks' lack of a wish to any longer exercise authority over the company. What do you point to as the source of that statement? A. Look, I've provided you with the context, and that's it. I mean, I don't have any other answer for you. MR COWLEY: In light of this effort to try to get a direct response, and based on the clear concern that a lawyer with presumably a lingering obligation to either a current client, or at least a former client for whom he had responsibility or his firm had responsibility in a transaction, knowing about material change by an action of the Supreme Court affecting that very transaction, knowing that he holds the information and perhaps his client does not know about it, I am very concerned about not being able to confirm, given the answers that we're permitted to hear, that the client who he's telling the Tribunal has no interest in something, which may be very material to the opinion 	17:35 1 transactions, not just the ones discussed by the 2 arbitrator but the related transactions that may be 3 impacted if that ruling is not dealt with. That may 4 cause liability to Mr Benzinge. Because there's aspects 5 in the transaction and we raised it in our motion 6 as to the change in shareholding positions, which 7 definitely would have some effect as to the share of the 8 money that resulted from the transaction. 9 So if Mr Benzinge has benefited by the Zarnacks not 10 being informed, not taking action to address it, not 11 taking action to revive the effectiveness of the prior 12 transaction, because of the silence of the lawyer who 13 has an obligation to tell them, and that lawyer is now 14 representing a party that benefits, along with 15 Mr Benzinge, from them not knowing and not taking 16 an action, that's the concern. 17 MS DOHMANN: Mr Cowley, hold on. 18 You have had this expert statement for over 19 two years. If you had the concerns you've just 20 expressed, you could have written and said, "Have you 21 informed the Zarnacks about their not having 22 an interest?", and so forth. You are effectively making 23 accusations of professional misconduct right now, 24 dealing with a conflict of interest with another former 25 client that Mr Mugisha had. And it is not before us,

17:37 1	this kind of point. It is a point that needed to be	17:40 1	I have no further questions
17.57 1	resolved, if it arises really, differently and	17.40 1	I have no further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Could you then please carry on with your
3	elsewhere.	3	cross-examination.
4	I speak for myself, of course. But I do not see how	4	MR HILL: I think Mr Cowley said he has no further
	we can deal here within the question of an alleged	5	questions. And I have no re-examination.
5			-
6	non-disclosure in relation to which there is zero	6	THE PRESIDENT: I just have one or two questions I'd like
7	evidence and it's not a problem for us.	7	some help on.
8	Our position is that we have an expert in front of	8	(5.40 pm)
9	us who ought to speak, and does speak, about what	9	Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
10	Rwandan law provides in relation to contracts and mining	10	THE PRESIDENT: Could we have the contract back, please,
11	concessions and so forth. That is what we are looking	11	C-017.
12	at. And we are also looking at the arbitration award.	12	You said, Mr Mugisha, that the question of whether
13	We are not looking at Mr Mugisha's former clients and	13	there was a positive evaluation of the feasibility study
14	whether he has fulfilled his obligations towards them.	14	was in the entire discretion of the minister; is that
15	And I reiterate: I speak for myself.	15	right?
16	MR COWLEY: And I will not belabour the point. I appreciate	16	A. Yes, that's right.
17	what you said. I just want to remind the Tribunal: we	17	THE PRESIDENT: Does it follow from that that no claim could
18	did raise it in writing in a motion. We felt it	18	be brought no valid claim could be brought for breach
19	completely inappropriate to then take direct action with	19	of contract if the minister said, "I'm not satisfied"?
20	Mr Mugisha, or otherwise take direct action to affect	20	A. That is right, sir.
21	the record, having raised it, and the instruction we	21	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
22	received as a result of our motion was to raise it in	22	It may well no longer arise, but I would like to
23	cross-examination.	23	just look with you a little further at this arbitration
24	So while I appreciate your position, I just would	24	award.
25	like to remind you as to the reason why we thought we	25	Could we have R-009, please. These are the
	Page 133		Page 135
	Ç		Ü
17:38 1	were following the instruction as exactly what you	17:42 1	memorandum and articles of association of NRD. Have you
17:38 1 2	were following the instruction as exactly what you wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it.	17:42 1 2	memorandum and articles of association of NRD. Have you looked at this before?
2	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it.	2	looked at this before?
2 3	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it	2 3	looked at this before? A. Not lately.
2 3 4	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was	2 3 4	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the
2 3 4 5	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that,	2 3 4 5	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and
2 3 4 5 6	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it	2 3 4 5 6	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6,
2 3 4 5 6 7	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that	2 3 4 5 6 7	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement? A. It's a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But again, this is a matter that was presented to a court;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's even possible. Even if he does everything right, he	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's even possible. Even if he does everything right, he shouldn't be opining on the effect of the Benzinge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement? A. It's a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But again, this is a matter that was presented to a court;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's even possible. Even if he does everything right, he shouldn't be opining on the effect of the Benzinge arbitration award at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement? A. It's a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But again, this is a matter that was presented to a court; the court did take a decision. And so it doesn't really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's even possible. Even if he does everything right, he shouldn't be opining on the effect of the Benzinge arbitration award at all. That was our point; nothing more. I've made it, and I respect whatever decision the Tribunal issues on it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement? A. It's a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But again, this is a matter that was presented to a court; the court did take a decision. And so it doesn't really matter what opinion anybody has on the rulings: once it becomes a court decision, then it is what it is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	wanted us to do and how you wanted us to pursue it. I wouldn't have done it MS DOHMANN: The objection you raised before was an objection of lack of independence on the basis that, allegedly, Mr Mugisha had acted for NRD. And he made it very plain in evidence presented to this Tribunal that he had acted not for NRD but for the Zarnacks. That was the point then raised. What was not then raised is what you have produced this afternoon by way of allegation of non-disclosure to a former client. MR COWLEY: I have nothing further to say. I'm not trying to antagonise the Tribunal. I thought we had raised it appropriately. And our point is not to accuse him of having done something wrong. I simply try to raise the point that he can't serve in a position where he has two potentially competing obligations. He simply can't do it. I'm not suggesting he did something wrong. I'm suggesting he should not sit in a position where it's even possible. Even if he does everything right, he shouldn't be opining on the effect of the Benzinge arbitration award at all. That was our point; nothing more. I've made it, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	looked at this before? A. Not lately. THE PRESIDENT: No. Well, you will see that it is in the form of an agreement between initial shareholders, and we can see the capital they are putting up in Article 6, the Zarnacks and Mr Benzinge A. Yes, that's correct. THE PRESIDENT: as to the memorandum and articles of association. A. Yes. THE PRESIDENT: And if you turn to Article 30: "All disputes involving the Company shall first be brought to the attention of the general meeting and when the general meeting fails to resolve the matter; it shall be referred to the arbitrator agreed upon by the parties." Does Rwandan law help at all with deciding who the parties are, or is that simply a matter of interpretation of the agreement? A. It's a matter of interpretation of the agreement. But again, this is a matter that was presented to a court; the court did take a decision. And so it doesn't really matter what opinion anybody has on the rulings: once it

17:44 1	THE PRESIDENT: Who would the court decision bind?	17:48 1 MR HILL: I'm not in a position to do so now, I must say.
	A. It does bind every individual and public authority.	
2		-
3	THE PRESIDENT: Sorry?	3 MR KAPLAN: What they are but you know.
4	A. It does bind every individual and all public	4 MS DOHMANN: Can I just say that it will be helpful to the
5	authorities.	5 Tribunal to have the parties look through the
6	THE PRESIDENT: So even if the shareholders were not party	6 transcripts not only with regard to transcribing errors,
7	to the arbitration, it could divest them of their	7 but even slips of the tongue and so on, which we have
8	ownership in the company?	8 noticed. And it will be important to have a correct
9	A. Yes, I think the only the challenge here is that, for	9 record of everything. So we would be grateful for that.
10	1 3	10 MR COWLEY: Could I suggest three weeks? I do not have the
11	all the actions for notification of all the parties	next week available at all. So three weeks would be
12	**	12 preferable from our end.
13	the proceedings to go on in the absence of all the	13 MR HILL: Yes, that's fine from our end.
14	parties concerned.	14 THE PRESIDENT: Very well: transcript corrections within
15	THE PRESIDENT: Can you understand how this arbitration	15 three weeks.
16	agreement could give rise to an arbitration between one	16 Any other business?
17	shareholder and the company?	17 MR KAPLAN: There would be cost submissions, if those flow
18	A. It is very possible, yes.	from the date of post-hearing briefs. But also the
19	THE PRESIDENT: Can you explain how?	dates can be confirmed at a later date; they can also be
20		20 confirmed now. I'm just raising it, since we're all
21	becomes an entity in itself. And the dispute resolution	21 together.
22	mechanism in the articles does apply to the company, as	22 MR HILL: I wonder if that can be left for agreement between
23	well as to its shareholders.	the parties. I'm sure there won't be
24	THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it's profitable to pursue this	24 THE PRESIDENT: I'm sure the parties can agree that. Yes,
25	any further. I don't know whether either counsel wishes	25 well, we'll leave that to you then.
23	any futures. I don't know whether entires counses wishes	25 well, we it leave that to you then.
	Page 137	Page 139
15.15.1		
17:47 1	to ask any questions in relation to this?	17:49 1 Right. Well, it just remains to thank all three of
2	MR HILL: Not from me.	2 you and wish you a good evening.
2 3	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions.	you and wish you a good evening.MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President.
2 3 4	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you.
2 3 4 5	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm)
2 3 4 5 6	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you.
2 3 4 5	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew)	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm)
2 3 4 5 6	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded)
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing?	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks.	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks.	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks.	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday.	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley?	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed.	you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect. MR KAPLAN: Yes, indeed. I will confirm this in my daily email.	2 you and wish you a good evening. 3 MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. 4 MR COWLEY: Thank you. 5 (5.50 pm) 6 (The hearing concluded) 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect. MR KAPLAN: Yes, indeed. I will confirm this in my daily email. THE PRESIDENT: Good.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect. MR KAPLAN: Yes, indeed. I will confirm this in my daily email. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR KAPLAN: Additionally, would the parties like to confer	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect. MR KAPLAN: Yes, indeed. I will confirm this in my daily email. THE PRESIDENT: Good.	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR HILL: Not from me. MR COWLEY: No further questions. THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much for your assistance. You are now free to go. MR MUGISHA: Thank you. (The witness withdrew) THE PRESIDENT: Housekeeping. Post-hearing briefs. You've agreed on the size of these; have you agreed on the timing? MR HILL: Yes, the timing is actually in one of the procedural orders: it's six weeks. THE PRESIDENT: Six weeks. MR HILL: It's been suggested to me that six weeks actually expires on a Wednesday, and it might be sensible to make it six weeks and two days, so it expires on the Friday. THE PRESIDENT: Seems sensible. Mr Cowley? MR COWLEY: Agreed. THE PRESIDENT: Mr Kaplan, can we draw up an order to that effect. MR KAPLAN: Yes, indeed. I will confirm this in my daily email. THE PRESIDENT: Good. MR KAPLAN: Additionally, would the parties like to confer	 you and wish you a good evening. MR HILL: Thank you very much, Mr President. MR COWLEY: Thank you. (5.50 pm) (The hearing concluded) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

26.64 30.18.24 32.15 32.18 33.57, 84, 132.12 32.18 33.57, 84, 132.12 32.18 33.57, 132.12 32.18 32.12 3			Г	Г		Г
39.93 39.9	A		after 6:4 18:18 26:11	116:21 129:17	applicant 50:3 59:19	area 9:17,20 81:7
ad 94.19 d. 16.10 l. 18.18 32.2 (14.17 l. 18.18 1.19 1.19 d. 18.18 1.1	Aaronson 2:7.7.8.8	O				
18						
18:18 32:2 10:417 about 4:17 6:5 8:119	ability 6:14 16:10				*	
	18:18 32:2 104:17					
1184 13022 about 4:77 6:5 8:11.19 29:1115.16 18:3 18:11 9:1011 115.25 3	able 6:22 8:19 14:18	•				
abmort 4:17:63:81.1.p. 121:15:23 365.63:71:2.13 379:20:134:10 112:20:121:35 221:131:34:68 381:119:10.11.20:82 202-32:114:22-24 522:131:34:68 389:20:121 124:22 525.20:53:145:521 133:131:34:84:84:95.70:02.23 335:13:73:14.54:221 525:13:13:14.54:221 525:13:13:14.54:221 525:13:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.54:35:13:14.35:13:14.35:15:15:15:15:13:14.35:15:15:15:15:13:14.35:15:15:15:15:15:13:15:15:15:13:14.35:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15:15						
9.51 15.16 18.37 2.15 16.15 18.11 19.10 1.08 20.25 21.14 22.45 22.15 24.13 22.15 22.16 22.15 24.13 22.15 22.16 22.15 22.25 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.25 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.15 22.25 22.15 2						
18-11 19-10.11 20-82 20-82 21-82 21-84 22-84 22-84 21-84 22-84 2	-					
2002-20 20-14 20-14 20-15 20-1	·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	* *	
22.15 23.11 32.62 12.43 23.15	*					
264 5918;24 32:15 32:18 338;78,17 35:11 37:14 54:22 56:25 581:96-6 602: 67:70:23 72:19 80:14,15 88:10,12,17 92:18 97:99 98:26,8 100:24 102:13,15 102:23 103:11 105:24 106:29 107:11,19.22 108:1 105:24 106:31 108:14,20,24 109:3 110:52 112:12 113:12 106:33 113:10 105:24 106:29 107:11,19.22 108:1 100:71 117-9,16 113:18 1177-41,4 129:6 130:71,19.22 108:1 100:71 117-9,16 113:18 1177-14 129:6 130:71,19.22 108:1 100:71 117-9,16 113:18 1174-14 129:6 130:71 118-12 130:22 113:9 15:20 128:21,124 129:0 130:71 118-12 130:22 113:9 118:18 137:13 130:22 113:9 130:22 113:9 118:18 137:13 130:24 130:11 105:24 106:19 118:18 1174-14 129:6 130:71 118-12 130:22 133:9 118:11-14 129:6 130:71 118-12 130:22 133:9 110:15 130:18 1170-14 129:18 100:13 108:10 192:21 130:11 105:24 106:29 106:18 20:24 13:25 106:18 2				amendments 111:22		articles 41:5 44:8 74:6
32:18 33.5.7.8.17 30:15 110-22 121:4 122:5 562:5 83:1 59:6 60:2 67:7 70-23 31:16 133:19.20 22:15 22:15 23:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 59:4.2 29:12 21:4 125:5 100:23 103:11 100:24 100:21,15 100:24 100:24 10:2 100:24 10:24 25 10:21 13:0 100:24 10:23 103:11 100:24 10:23 103:11 100:24 10:23 103:11 100:24 10:23 103:11 10:22 10:34 10:34 10:24 10:34 10:24 10:3		action 38:8 90:21,21	56:24 59:17 62:23	American 33:19,21	103:2,18 104:20	80:22 81:1,18 91:9
35311 37:14 54:22 56:25 58:15 96:602 67:7 70:23 50:25 58:15 96:602 67:7 70:23 58:10.12,17 92:18 58:10.12,17 92:18 58:10.12,17 92:18 59:19 98:26,8 100:24 102:13,15 102:23 103:11 105:24 106:29 103:11 105:24 106:29 103:11 105:24 106:29 103:11 105:24 106:29 103:11 105:24 106:29 107:11.19.22 108:1 108:11/19.22 108:1 108:14,20.24 109:3 108:17 11:19.22 108:1 108:14 20.24 109:3 108:17 11:19.25 108:13 11:19.25 108:11 11:19.25 108:13 11	· ·	108:15 110:22	63:12,13 65:5 67:16	34:2	105:8,16 106:11	94:23 113:3 136:1,9
602-677-70-23 72:19 80:14.15 88:10.12.17 9.218 88:10.12.18 9.23 88:10.12.17 9.218 88:10.12.18 1.18.12.13 9.219 88:10.12.18 1.18.12.13 9.219 88:10.12.18 1.18.12.13 9.219 88:10.12.18 1.18.12.13 9.219 88:10.12.18 1.18.12.13 9.219 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218 9.218 9.218 118:18 137:13 88:10.14 9.218						
2.21 98.01.4.2 188.10.1.2 17.2 118	56:25 58:1 59:6		· ·		-	
100-24 102-13 100-24 102-13 100-24 102-13 103-13 103-14 103-14 1	60:2 67:7 70:23					
999-82-68 122:25 124-5 129:1 136:22 against 167-125 agains	72:19 80:14,15					
137-11						
102:23 103:11 actively 13:3 32:10 activities 12:9 13:8 agencies 104:17 agenc						
105:24 106:29 138 142:23 152:20 150:142,23 152:20 150:143,23 173 39:19 150:143,23 173 39:19 150:143,23 173 39:19 151:33 241:8 266 27:11 32:21 33:18 151:33 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:1133 9 152:113 126:11 9 15	-					
107.111,0.22 108.1			8		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1618,123,173,39,9 1618,23,173,39,19 1618			aggregating 25:14	38:20 103:5 128:4	-	•
131:13 174:14 125:20 128:2,12,14 129:6 130:22 131:125 130:22 131:25 131:25 132:21 133:9 111:8 123:24 124:11 127:12,17 138:11,14 128:137:13 138:11,14 128:137:13 138:11,14 138:11,14 138:137:13 138:11,14 138:11,14 138:137:13 138:11,14 138:11,14 138:132:14 107:12 109:11 138:12,246:14,17 138:11,14 138:12,14 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:12 138:13 138:12 138:13 138:12 138:13 138:12 138:13 138:12 138:13 138:12 138:13 138	T T	16:18,23 17:3 39:19	ago 3:20 7:13 63:4	132:24	applying 96:21 105:15	125:18 128:23
1318 1174,14 12520 1252 1252 1252 1213 129:6 130:7,18,21 130:2 131:2 133:2 133:2 133:8 111:8 123:24 133:2 133:8 111:8 123:24 133:18 133:13 138 133:13 138 133:13 138 133:13 138 138:11,14	T T			answer 8:19 14:19		
19:13.07.18.21 130:27.13.23 4:18 26.6 53:11.12 92:15 100:8.9 126:3 73:10.16.22.25 109:4 116:4 130:21 33:18 130:21 33:18 131:8 123:24 107:12 109:11 115:6 139:24 absolute 92:10 absolute 17:13 absolute 92:10 absolute 92:10 absolute 17:13 absolute 92:10 absolute 92:10 absolute 92:10 absolute 17:13 absolute 92:10 absolute 92:10 absolute 92:10 absolute 19:10 accept 30:25 40:25 60:178:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:3.12 125:13 126:17 acceptable 10:12 address 124:1127:18 132:10 adjourn 97:12 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 acceptage 13:30:18 adjourn 97:12 adjourn 97:15 adjourned 97:15 adjourned 97:15 acceptage 13:30:18 acceptage 13:30:18 acceptage 13:30:18 acceptage 13:30:18 adjourn 97:12 adjourned 97:15				-		
130:22 131:25 132:21 133:9 111:8 123:24 130:12 138:11,14 138	125:20 128:2,12,14	_				
111:8 123:24 113:19 124:11 127:12,17 138:11,14 aproed 16.9,10 45:6,9 45:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22 46:4,12 46:13,22		T			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
absence 99-34 115:1 118:18 137:13 absence 99-32 115:1 118:18 137:13 adsolute 91:10 absolutely 16:19 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:16 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,22 132:15 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 101:15 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 132:10 accept 30:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:31,24 140:51 133:10 adderss 124:1 127:18 139:22 accept 30:13 117:16 139:22 accept 30:13 117:16 130:19 accept 30:13 117:17 accept 40:10:13 accept 40:10:12 accept 40:14 13:42:4 adderess 124:1 127:18 139:22 accept 40:15:13 13:10 adderess 124:1 127:18 139:22 accept 40:15:13 13:10 accept 40:10:12 accept 40:14 13:42:4 adress 124:1 127:18 139:22 accept 40:15:13 13:10 accept 40:10:12 accept 40:14 13:42:4 anthur 40:10 anthur 40:10:15 appropriate 10:24 19:8 antagonise 13:1:1 antagonius 13:13 antagonise 13:1:1 appropriate 37:2 94:2 appropriate 37:2 94:2 appropriate 37:2 94:2 appropriate 10:24 19:8 anthur 40:10:3 34:11 17:15 25:4 16:24 anyhow 22:14 anyhow 22:14 anyhow 22:14 anyhow 21:14 a						
18:18 137:13 absolute 92:10 adde 87:12 accept 39:25 40:25 accept 39:25					-	_
absolute 92:10 Absolutely 16:19 added 87:18 addition 232:93:15 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:3,12 125:13 126:17 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:11 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:11 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:11 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:13 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:18 adderes 12:1 127:18 139:10 acceptade 10:18 126:24 127:13 adderes 12:1 127:18 139:10 added 87:18 136:16 138:9,10,18 approach 95:6,14 17:15 25:4 136:24 approproach 95:6,14 17:15 25:4 136:24 appropriate 37:2 94:2 appropriate 37:2 94:				C		_
Absolutely 16:19 accept 39:25 40:25 60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16.17 125:3,12 125:13 126:17 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:13 130:17 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 acceptable 10:12 additionally 138:24 address 124:1 127:18 132:10 address 124:1 127:18 132:10 address 124:1 127:18 adjourn of 97:12 administration 15:22 17:5 assessing 15:22 accordance 73:12 79:2.7.23 93:1 administration 41:7.15 90:4 Ab638 abead 27:10 34:19 90:4 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accord s 116:12 advance 128:19 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 advance 128:19 accurate 21:20 25:17 33:43:43 13:25 advise 92:5 advised 13:25 advised 13:25 advised 61:3 23:41:5 accurately 22:16 accurate 23:23 accuse 134:15 accurate 24:25 accurately 22:16 accurate 24:25 advised 13:25 adv						
acceptable 10:12 acceptance 10:18 126:24 127:1 acceptaccepta 19:25 40:25 62:18 acceptance 10:18 126:24 127:1 acceptace 10:18 126:24 127:1 accepta 126:19 additionally 138:24 address 124:1 127:18 139:22 accepta 126:19						assertion 41:3 43:1,7
60:1 78:13 80:13 124:16,17 125:3,12 125:13 126:17 acceptable 10:12 acceptance 10:18 126:24 127:1 accepted 4:14 33:22 62:18 accepting 126:19 alditional 77:13 accipting 19:4 20:8 appropriated 37:2 94:2 appropriated 37:2 94:2 appropriated 37:20 acprile 37:2 94:2 appropriate 37:2 94:2 apprit appric 167:78:18:8:5 arbitration 1:1,1 2:22 appropriate 37:2 94:2 appropriate	•	addition 23:2 93:15	136:16 138:9,10,18	anybody 14:11 17:4	approach 95:6,14	52:6,8 91:11,21
124:16,17 125:3,12 125:13 126:17 28:17 29:2 123:5,12 123:5,12 136:20 125:13 126:17 125:13 126:17 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 136:21 137:16 139:22 125:14 141:17:9 172:22,24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 17:6 23:11 administration 15:22 17:6 23:11 administrative 47:7 90:4 17:22,24 25:6 82:14 17:23 191:8 95:15 136:21 134:10 134	•		S			
acceptable 10:12 acceptance 10:18 12:10 13:2:10 adjacent 10:3 adjourn 97:12 accepting 126:19 access 1:16 17:17,19 17:22,24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 accordance 73:12 75:17 89:13 91:8 92:7,23 93:1 administration 15:22 17:6 23:11 administrative 47:7 92:7,23 93:1 administra						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
acceptance 10:18 126:24 127:1 accepted 4:14 33:22 62:18 accepting 126:19 accepting 126:18 accepting 126:19 accepting 126:18 accepting 126:19 accepting 126:18 accepting 126:19 accepting 126:14 accepting 126:14 accepting 126:18 accepting 126:14 accepting 126:14 accepting 126:18 accepting 126:14 a	125:13 126:17					
126:24 127:1 adhere 128:18 adjacent 103:23 124:11,17 125:14 2:25 70:20 120:15 accorded 58:24 adopted 3:23 4:8 adjourn 57:12 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accord 16:12 advance 128:19 129:11 advance 128:19 129:11 advance 128:19 129:11 advance 128:19 129:11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:17 afforded 57:12,13 advisor 132:23 afforded 57:12,13 advance 128:15 advisors 62:17 advance 128:16 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:7,11 advisors 62:17 advance 128:16 advisors 62:17 a	acceptable 10:12				-	
accepted 4:14 33:22 62:18 accepting 126:19 access 1:16 17:17,19 17:22,24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 accordance 73:12 75:17 89:13 91:8 95:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accorded 58:19 129:11 adopting 7:12 account 80:13 accorded 58:19 129:11 advisor 129:11 advisor 129:11 accorded 58:19 accurated 22:16 accurated 23:23 accurated 24:26 accurated 25:26 accurated 25:26 accurated 25:27 accurated 25:26 accurated 25:27 accurated 25:26 accurated 25:27 accurated 25:27 accurated 25:28 accurate 25:29 accurated 25:28 accurate 25:29 accurated 25:28 accurate 25:28 accurate 25:28 accurate 25:28 accurate 25:28 accurate 25:29 accurate 25:28 accura						
accepting 126:19 adjourn 97:12 Adjourned 97:15 ALEX 1:22 Allegation 55:14 Appeal 71:24 72:3,9 121:12,17,21,21 Assistance 62:13 65:2 Appeal 71:24 72:3,9 122:16,12 123:4,5 Alegation 55:14 Appeal 71:24 72:3,9 133:23 Adjourned 97:15 Adjourned 97:15 Alegation 97:14 Alegation 97:14 Alegation 97:14 Alegation 97:14 Alegation			S			O
according 126:19 access 1:16 17:17,19 17:22.24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 17:6 23:11 administration 15:22 17:6 23:11 administrative 47:7 92:7,23 93:1 95:15 accorded 58:24 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurately 23:17 accurately 23:17 accurately 23:18 accurately 23:16 accurately 2						
access 1:16 17:17,19 17:22,24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 accordance 73:12 95:17 89:13 91:8 95:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 accordingly 62:22 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 accurately 22:16 accurately 23:16 accurately 23:16 accurately 23:16 accurately 23:16 accurately 24:15 accurately 25:16 accurately 25:16 accurately 25:16 accurately 26:16 accurately 26:17 advise 26:10 advise 26:17 advise 26:10 advise 26:10 alleged 55:20 133:5 alleged 55:20 133:5 alleged 55:20 133:5 alleged 18:22 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 61:20 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 61:20 allow 61:20 allow 61:20 allow 61:20 allow 62:20 allow 62:10 accurately 26:16 acc		•				
T17:22,24 25:6 82:14 88:8,22 17:6 23:11 administration 15:22 17:6 23:11 administrative 47:7 92:7,23 93:1 administrative 47:7 92:7,23 93:1 admitted 61:7,11,15 90:4 adopting 7:12 adopting 7:12 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 accord 116:12 accord 180:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurate 21:20 25:17 advised 131:25 advised 131:25 advised 131:25 advised 131:25 advised 131:25 accurate 21:20 25:16 accurate 34:15		•				
88:8,22 accordance 73:12 75:17 89:13 91:8 95:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurate 33:23		administration 15:22	15:18	48:16 57:23		assets 5:13 81:5 82:5
accordance 73:12 75:17 89:13 91:8 95:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16	,					_
75:17 89:13 91:8 95:15 accorded 58:24 accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16	,					C
accorded 58:24 adopted 3:23 4:8 adopting 7:12 advance 128:19 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 ALEX 1:22 allegation 55:14 apparent 129:6 appeal 71:24 72:3,9 74:2,10 appeal 71:24 72					, , ,	
accordingly 62:22 70:20 120:15 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurately 23:16 accurately 24:15 accurately 25:17 accurately 25:17 accurately 25:16 acc		, ,				
according 92:22 advance 128:19 accords 116:12 account 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 advance 128:19 advance 128:19 advised 31:25 alknowledge 6:10 62:17 advance 128:19 advance 128:19 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 5:24 93:25 allow 5:25 93:20 allow 5:25 93:20 allow 48:18,18 49:25 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 accurately 22:16 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 accurately 22:16 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 accurately 22:16 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 accurately 22:16 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge						′ ′
accords 116:12 account 80:13 avince 128:19 129:11 advice 128:5 alleged 55:20 133:5 allegedly 134:6 appealing 74:5 appealing 74:5 appealing 74:5 appealing 74:5 appealing 74:5 associated 28:21 association 74:6 136:10 associated 28:21 associated 28:21 associated 28:21 association 74:6 136:10 asso	0.	_	8			
accourt 80:13 accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurately 22:16 accurately 22:16 accurately 32:23 accurately 32:23 accurately 32:23 accurately 4:15 accurately 4:15 accurately 4:15 accurately 4:15 accurately 5:20 accurately 5:						
accurate 21:20 25:17 30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 accuse 134:15 accuse 134:15 achieved 6:3 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 advice 128:5 advise 92:5 advised 131:25 adlegedly 134:6 alleged 55:20 133:5 allegedly 134:6 allegedly 134:6 alleged 55:20 133:5 allegedly 134:6 alleged 55:20 133:5 allegedly 134:6 allegedly 134:6 allegedly 134:6 alleged 55:20 133:5 appear 35:5 55:25 appearance 86:23 87:6 APPEARANCES 2:1 appears 38:25 arbitrator 71:8,12,15 73:11,20,23,25 74:8 associated 28:21 association 74:6 136:10 assure 15:20 attempting 10:25 86:16 arbitrator's 71:16,25 appears 38:25 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:19 appeared 86:23 appeared 86:18 appeared 86:23 appeared 8			C			
30:5 78:13 119:21 120:5 accurately 22:16 accurately 22:16 accuration 132:23 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 61:5,5 almost 48:18,18 49:25 almost 48:18,18 49:25 acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 accuration 132:23 accuration 132:23 allow 5:22 93:20 allow 61:5,5 almost 48:18,18 49:25 accuration 132:23 accuration 132:20 accuration 132:20 accuration 132:20 accuration 132:20						
120:5 advised 131:25 alleging 94:22 86:18 74:15,20,23 85:11 136:10 accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 accusations 132:23 accusations 132:23 accusations 60:12 63:19,23 allowed 14:10 61:5,5 87:6 132:2 136:16 assure 15:20 accuse 134:15 accuse 134:15 affect 133:20 affect 133:20 affect 133:20 assure 15:20 attempting 10:25 86: acknowledge 6:10 afforded 57:12,13 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 appended 86:19 arbitrator's 71:16,25 attention 3:19 7:21 62:17 afforded 57:12,13 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 applicable 69:4,10 applicable 69:4,10 108:9 APPR/89/11-14 APPR/89/11-14 126:15 126:15			C C		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	association 74:6 136:1
accurately 22:16 accusations 132:23 accuse 134:15 achieved 6:3 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 advisors 62:7,11 Advocates 61:7 affairs 60:12 63:19,23 allowed 14:10 61:5,5 almost 48:18,18 49:25 58:20 88:21 96:21 along 132:14 along 132:14 appearance 86:23 87:6 APPEARANCES 2:1 appearance 86:23 132:2 136:16 arbitrators 72:20 75:6 attention 3:19 7:21 11:2 25:24 35:8,10 96:15 106:15			0 0			
accusations 132:23 accuse 134:15 achieved 6:3 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 Advanced 57:12,13 allowed 14:10 61:5,5 almost 48:18,18 49:25 58:20 88:21 96:21 along 132:14 along 132:14 along 2:14 36:12 37:5 along 2:14 al						
actuse 134:13 achieved 6:3 achieved 6:3 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 affect 133:20 affecting 130:19 afforded 57:12,13 along 132:14 along 132	•					1 0
acknowledge 6:10 acknowledge 6:10 62:17 afforded 57:12,13 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 applicable 69:4,10 11:2 25:24 35:8,10 applicable 69:4,10 108:9 96:15 106:15 12:614			· ·			
acknowledge 6.10 afforded 57:12,13 aloud 2:14 36:12 37:5 applicable 69:4,10 108:9 96:15 106:15						
02.17 Apr. (2.10 (4.1 -1174.14.94.12 01.0.115.11 App./19/01.1.4 12(.14	O	C	C C		-	
acknowieugeu 47.10						
	acknowledged 4/:18					

Wednesday, 30 June 2021

attorney 60:25 61:2
83:20
attractive 32:3
attribute 24:19 25:11
attributed 99:2
August 47:24 103:16
107:3 108:15
authored 99:6
authorisations 93:19
authorities 95:18
137:5
authority 23:13,13
103:24 117:17
118:8 119:2,18
120:4 121:15,23
122:23 129:15
130:9 131:6 137:2
automatic 91:23 93:16
available 34:18 36:2
104:2,7 118:5
139:11
aver 62:3
avei 02.3 avoid 127:19
award 71:1 94:11,12
94:21 95:1,4 105:22
106:3,6,10,14,22
107:15 108:6,19,21
107:15 108:0,19,21
109:1,9,14 117:15
117:22,25 120:3,17
120:21,23 122:12
122:16 124:10,19
126:9,22 128:15
133:12 134:23
135:24
aware 13:22 14:8
18:13 75:10 96:3
104:15,19 105:13
110:9
away 17:10 58:14,18
119:12
awkward 129:13
awkwardness 129:11

В **b** 1:22 123:14 back 4:4 8:15 13:20 18:23.24 24:16.17 28:8 29:5.22 33:23 41:21 48:25 49:11 50:18 51:3 57:21 60:20 64:24 82:7 85:25 86:1,8 87:1 87:11,14,15 99:10 102:2 107:22 110:5 119:9 125:22 129:9 131:15,17 135:10 background 30:16 31:7 43:11 60:3 63:5 bag 21:23 **bagged** 21:22 bagging 23:14 24:1 bag-and-tag 22:15 24:7 Bailiff 115:6,10 bandwidth 35:21,23 Bar 90:4

BARBARA 1:12	
barred 13:14	
based 30:4 43:3 64:12	
64:20 65:23 66:3	
87:12 106:10 108:8 123:4 130:14	
131:20	
basic 88:6	
basically 77:21 130:3	
basis 19:20 22:23	
24:10,14,15 52:8 63:14 65:5,6 66:5	
73:3,23 74:6 84:13	
87:23 91:4,14 92:2	
92:16 94:6 113:5	
116:5,7 121:13	
126:1,4,8 129:18,20	
131:19 134:5	
Bay 1:15 2:4 bear 96:24	١
bearing 58:24	١
become 23:20	ĺ
becomes 1:7 43:25	ĺ
44:21 78:23 136:25	
137:21	ĺ
becoming 75:10 90:8 before 1:10 1:5 19:4	ĺ
29:10 35:7 40:1	
43:24 44:11,20 45:7	
46:4,13 53:9 58:14	
71:20 73:11 75:25	
83:5 85:7 88:4,17	
93:8 116:13 120:1	
120:23 126:5	
132:25 134:4 136:2	
beg 42:20 61:13 began 105:4 125:24	
begin 90:15	
beginning 11:2 13:13 29:25 45:23 102:10	
119:25	
begins 6:4 25:20	
behalf 1:24 35:4	
118:19 120:4 121:18	
being 5:11 13:20,25	
15:11 21:3 22:4	
33:18 58:4,15,18	
63:6,16 67:21 71:17	
76:11 85:3 86:23	
87:1 97:7 101:9	
103:5 105:11	
110:11 122:18 124:7 127:5 130:22	
131:22 132:10	
belabour 133:16	
belabouring 127:16	
belief 89:14	
believe 20:16 27:18	ĺ
43:8 51:6 53:25	
98:17 101:22	ĺ
102:16 106:16,18 110:5 114:6	ĺ
believes 128:11	ĺ
below 48:23	ĺ
Ben 95:21 105:25	ĺ
	1

106:3 114:20

```
benefit 109:8 128:12
benefited 132:9
benefits 39:7,12
  132:14
Benzinge 70:24 71:2
  71:17 74:16 94:13
  95:21 105:25 106:3
  107:6,16,23 108:13
  108:15 114:20
  115:4,23 118:2,5,18
  119:19 120:1,3
  122:20,22 123:10
  125:15 126:21,23
  132:4,9,15 134:22
  136:7
Benzinge's 128:9
  131:2
best 15:13 72:17 75:16
  97:4,10 106:20
better 38:24,25 93:21
between 5:4 6:24 11:4
  27:13 37:16 44:4
  45:6,9,22 46:4,12
  70:24 71:2 90:12
  96:23 102:8,24
  104:25 106:3
  119:19 120:17
  123:5,8,9 124:6
  128:18 136:5
  137:16 139:22
bid 104:2,8,10
Bidega's 66:23 67:4
  67:14
BIDWELL 1:11
big 82:25
bigger 66:13
bind 137:1,2,4
binding 95:17
Biryabarema 99:2
bit 1:22 20:15 30:15
  41:4 43:11 122:5
black 35:18
board 2:9 23:21 29:19
  71:5,20 94:17
bold 121:10
Bosco 114:24 115:10
  115:14
Bosco's 115:6,18
both 41:8,12 85:22
  95:21 99:1,5 108:11
  108:12,17 109:12
  117:15 127:10,15
bottom 32:16
brandishing 126:21
breach 94:5 135:18
break 21:7 35:10,12
  54:13,17 96:17
  97:10
breathe 128:9
brief 1:10
briefs 138:9 139:18
bring 6:7 20:9 26:10
  32:13 34:23 35:13
  86:8 98:5 113:11
  115:2 121:2 129:9
bringing 2:1 3:17 89:2
  108:5 116:20
```

To. ARB/18/21	кер
British 1:2	ca
broad 30:25 broader 5:15 9:20	C
broadly 30:22	C
BRODSKY 2:22	C
broken 1:12,19	ce
brought 3:7 8:15,15	
12:22 19:2 20:5	
29:8 83:11 85:6	
94:13 97:24 98:3,22	C
99:9 101:8,9,21	
105:23 106:5 107:24 109:18,20	
109:22 114:4	ce
117:12 135:18,18	C
136:14	cl
BRYAN 2:3	cl
Buildings 2:6,6	cl
bullet 3:16	
bumped 85:24	
BURNHAM 2:18	١.
business 26:16 31:20 84:10 90:11 139:16	cl
buy 15:24	
buy 13.24	
С	cl
call 115:15 128:10	_,
called 3:1,4,8 2:3	cl
23:17 36:4 89:4	C
calling 50:25 calls 79:24	cl
came 13:12 33:14	
48:18 49:25 50:9	cl
62:16,23 68:6 121:5	
121:5	cl
camera 34:22 35:5,21	cl
camp 11:18	cl
camps 14:22	C
cancel 83:2	CI
cancellation 81:4 capable 7:3	cl
capital 8:4 84:16	cl
111:24 136:6	cl
caption 121:11	cl
car 115:25,25	cl
care 18:12 26:15	cl ci
careful 127:6	ci
cares 18:11	CI
carry 15:20 17:15 53:18 126:25 135:2	
carrying 28:19	ci
carryover 3:15	
case 1:4 9:6,7 10:6	
14:8 20:11 24:13	ci
57:13 58:15,20	
59:22 62:14,15 64:7	
64:11 66:13,22	ci
70:22 85:14 87:15 88:19 92:20 104:21	ci
88:19 92:20 104:21 119:8 129:18	ci
cases 9:10 10:19 85:22	ci
105:13	cl
cash 14:6	
catch 107:21 113:7	C
CATHERINE 2:14	
cought 124.6	

```
aused 26:24
entral 123:24
entre 1:2 72:19 124:3
ertain 38:4 108:10,2
 115:22 125:8,9
ertainly 8:8 116:15
 120:20 124:16,16
 124:25 126:19
 127:25 139:2
ertificate 76:24 77:4
 77:6,13 78:3,11,22
 79:2 80:1,9 83:22
 84:11,18 85:5
ertification 112:22
CHABINSKA 2:24
haired 90:11
hairman 84:17
hallenge 10:25 57:3
 57:16,23 58:7 75:5
 75:8,14 118:9 125:6
 125:15,16 137:9
hallenged 30:23
 57:25 74:21,23
 94:13,14,21 95:19
 131:12
hallenges 75:18,21
 75:24
hallenging 95:11
Chambers 60:18 90:5
hance 3:25 20:7
69:21
hange 6:13 113:18
 130:18 132:6
hanged 87:19
hanges 7:4,8 10:20
hanging 6:15
CHAPIN 2:16
haracterisation
26:20
harge 63:23,23
hart 20:23.23 21:2
hasing 119:13
heck 18:22,23 22:10
hoice 120:14
hooses 24:14
ircumstance 75:11
ircumstances 27:9
 74:24 117:16
 119:17 122:21
ite 56:24 76:8,11,13
 76:20 77:9,11 82:8
 117:19
ited 47:20 52:5,15
 54:5 55:18 58:22
 59:2,5 60:1 76:9,14
 82:19
ites 21:6
iting 72:20
itizen 57:12 58:15
ivil 92:20 93:1
laim 59:11 94:13
 126:3 135:17,18
Claimant 62:12 64:8
 64:19 66:6 72:18,18
 73:4,22,24 75:24
                        coming 11:18 12:19
 82:14,17 85:13
```

	Claimants 1:17 2:2
3	1:8 2:25 19:11,12 24:12 42:18,22
3	64:21 66:16,19,21
	86:22 88:2 89:22
	115:17,19 121:18
	127:22 Claimant's 73:10
	Claims 2:11,12,14
	clarification 10:24
	clarify 109:4
	clarifying 128:4
	clarity 122:10 clarity's 127:19
	CLAUDE 2:19
	clause 58:11 100:1
	clauses 101:19
	clear 25:11 49:7 72:23 79:18 84:25 91:15
5	92:19 100:3 114:14
,	116:9,11,14,16
	126:24 127:22
	128:17 130:14
	131:22 clearer 131:10
	clearly 53:8 78:17
	111:6
	client 61:6 65:2 129:3
	130:16,16,21,23 131:3 132:25
'	134:11
	clients 42:15 128:18
	133:13
	close 9:11 14:3 59:23 closed 1:18 105:21
	119:10
	closely 19:14 43:10
	closing 1:10 123:20 127:16
	closure 26:23
	CL-002 68:16 80:25
	81:1
	CL-020 67:24 CL-045 81:21
	coal 63:22
	code 93:1,5
	codified 56:8 57:10
	58:10 59:9 coexistence 7:14 9:21
	COFFEE 2:15
	colleagues 114:6
	collected 21:24 22:2
	23:1,24 collection 21:20
	collectively 24:15
	COLLEEN 2:23
	colour-coding 4:11
	come 2:8 5:3 18:23,24 31:13,19 41:4 43:11
	50:18 111:10
	118:11 125:22
	129:12
	comes 6:4 12:18 14:21 95:6 131:3
3	95:6 131:3 comfortable 20:10
	comfortably 22:15

caught 124:6

cause 132:4

13:3 28:7 33:20	complicated 1:22	conducted 35:3	39:22 40:5,8,16,18	counsel 35:22 42:19	CV 60:9,20 63:4,18
35:19 86:1	50:19	conducting 12:5,9	41:1,5,7,9,24 42:8	42:23 86:22 88:2	cynical 25:16
comment 13:7 87:18	complied 23:4 25:6	confer 138:24	43:25 44:20,25 45:3	96:18 137:25	C-005 109:18 111:13
commenting 88:21	62:3 74:7 77:1 78:5	conference 1:5	45:8,17,21 46:1,10	count 19:12	120:11
comments 19:10	78:21 84:6 85:1	confidence 25:15	46:20 48:3,10,14,23	counter 62:19	C-015 3:7
87:13	complying 97:11	confident 22:12	49:23 50:19 51:16	Counter-Memorial	C-017 37:15 44:8
commerce 18:9	composition 71:20	confidential 25:3	51:18,24 52:3,7,9	130:2	90:18 98:4 135:11
Commercial 93:1	concentrate 73:13	confirm 7:22 130:22	52:11,11,13,21	country 7:2,6,20 8:8	C-018 70:6
Commission 90:12	concentration 14:22	131:24 138:21	59:20 65:14,19	24:16 90:9 93:8	C-032 98:23,24
common 15:23 16:15	concept 22:21 57:8	confirmation 118:1	90:16,18 91:2,9,23	couple 1:15 10:8	C-032 96:23,24 C-038 29:8
16:17 17:2 42:7	59:8	confirmed 87:16 95:4	92:1,8 98:4,16,18	127:18	C-062 47:23 49:12,14
43:1 125:24 126:10	concern 92:18 130:14	115:20 116:5	99:7,8,16,25 100:2	course 28:16 41:2	C-132 32:13
communicate 55:15	132:16	139:19,20	100:4,14,15,18,20	60:24 64:23,23	C-144 85:6
59:20	concerned 71:4 95:18	confiscated 82:15	101:6,14,16,18	86:11 104:3 133:4	C-186 114:4,5 117:4
communications	127:2,4,22 130:22	conflict 72:20 85:13	135:10,19	court 44:5 45:7,10	C 100 11,c 117
87:24	137:14	120:9 127:25	contracts 43:15,19	61:6 71:24 72:9	
communities 9:2,3,12	concerning 100:15	128:17 132:24	45:17 64:3 133:10	73:14,14 74:2,11	daily 14:2 138:21
9:25 10:3,14,20	concerns 132:19	conflicting 116:18,19	contractual 40:10,14	75:19,19,22,22 93:3	DALEY 2:12
11:3,5,16 13:5	concession 6:2 13:4	127:5	40:20,22,23 49:7	94:11,12,21,24 95:2	
14:20,23 16:25	14:10,11,12 17:22	confuse 128:10	51:1 65:24 93:19	95:3,3,8,17 117:16	damage 96:11 Daniel 2:7 42:20 54:7
community 9:21	19:23,24 20:1 21:13	confusing 122:9	94:6	118:1,9,12 120:3	66:12,18 67:12,17
10:12 12:19,21	27:12 28:7 29:5	confusion 121:5	contract's 101:3	121:7 124:10,19	DANIELLE 2:8
community's 10:17	51:8 63:24 81:3,9	128:12 131:2	contrary 77:17 127:14	126:22 130:19	data 21:1,11,12,14,20
companies 5:2,17,20	81:13 82:3 90:17	connected 34:17 35:17	contrast 6:24	136:22,23,25 137:1	21:24 22:1,19 23:1
7:7 9:14 12:15,17	91:5,6,20 96:9,10	63:7	control 100:18 128:3	137:10	23:1,3,6,9,23,25
17:20 18:16 22:2	104:1 105:17	connection 86:4	129:1	courtesy 26:18 93:20	24:7,9,14,17,23
23:5 28:15 31:20	concessions 4:19,22	114:16	controller 113:11	93:25	25:3
60:13 63:21 76:21	5:3,6,11 9:4,5,7,14	connectivity 35:20	convenient 54:13	courts 61:2 95:5	date 29:14 33:11 68:6
77:12 78:10 79:11	10:4 12:6 14:2,3	conscience 2:16 37:7	conversations 64:21	Court's 121:3	78:10 79:3 86:17
84:10	16:9,10 17:8,10	89:13	65:1	cover 102:19 110:10	103:19 110:8,8,9,11
company 1:16 14:9	18:7,14,16 19:23	consensus 4:14 10:11	copied 29:18	covered 52:24 103:9	110:25,25 111:5,25
25:3,5 26:4 27:11	20:2 21:3 22:22	consent 25:4	copy 24:4	Cowley 2:3 3:3,6,10	113:2 121:3,7 125:8
27:14 28:10,11,16	26:5 29:22 30:11	consequence 71:16	corner 68:8	1:14,20,21 2:24 3:4	125:9 139:18,19
28:19 29:2 42:8	32:6,7,9 37:17 40:2	117:15 120:2	corporate 63:19	3:6 10:7 14:18 34:7	dated 33:20 47:24
51:10 54:2 58:16	40:6,10,19 42:9	124:19,21	106:23	34:15 35:7 67:3,5,8	dates 102:18 110:18
72:25 73:15 74:7	44:13 46:25 48:22	consider 41:15 45:11	corporations 113:16	67:13,18,19 83:10	139:19
76:4 77:6,14 78:4,9	52:24 53:18 55:12	50:2 54:8 64:2	113:22	85:15 86:8,10,23	DAVID 2:22
78:16 79:13,17,18	57:14 63:25,25,25	123:25 126:15	correct 2:7,23 3:12,24	88:4,23 89:21 96:23	day 12:8 14:4 18:6
80:2,12 83:1,12	80:15 93:9,11 96:2	considered 17:4 48:2	4:9 5:7 6:2,6,19	97:4,6,17,18,19	67:1,3 124:15
84:10,24 106:25	103:17,23 104:23	50:10 64:10 124:6	7:13,25 8:12,13 9:4	106:7,9 112:7,9	125:24
107:4 109:19	105:9,10 133:11	consistent 7:20 30:13	9:5,15,16,18,19	113:7 115:17	days 26:15,18 28:25
110:14,15,21,23,23	Conciliation 95:12	consists 109:23	10:5 11:14 12:12	116:13,20,25	30:8,9 59:16,17
111:9,9,14,16	conclude 27:11 29:3	constitutes 98:17	13:6,15 14:7 20:3,4	117:12 121:2,9	75:9 138:16
112:12,13,25	32:21	constitution 75:10	21:4 22:6,7,9 23:5	124:13,24 125:4,13	day/month/year 33:23
114:12 115:12,16	concluded 28:18	95:16 118:7 120:13	23:12 24:3,10,11,21	125:17 126:4 127:8	deal 1:5 118:2 133:5
116:10 117:18	140:6	consultant 61:3	26:9,19 28:4 29:1	129:6,8,17 130:13	dealing 37:1 112:19
118:13,19,20 119:2	concludes 28:9 80:11	Consulting 2:22,22	29:23 30:12 31:1,10	131:4,21 132:17	112:21 132:24
120:5 121:16,23	concluding 28:20	contact 86:6	31:11,12,16,24	133:16 134:12	deals 112:23,24 113:1
122:4 123:6,9	conclusion 27:5 58:7	contain 82:2	33:14,15 49:17 56:1	135:4 138:3,17,18	dealt 132:3
125:25 129:1,16	106:12	contained 69:25 70:4	81:20 98:5,7,11,14	139:2,10 140:4	debt 115:16 116:15
130:9 131:6,11,13	conclusions 51:23	contentious 1:6	98:15,20 99:20	Cowley's 127:1	117:7
131:15,17 136:13	57:4,16,20 108:19	contents 120:22	100:2,15,20 101:4,6	create 46:25	debts 115:8,13 116:10
137:8,17,20,22	109:9	contest 47:8 115:17	101:18,19 103:7,19	credibility 128:21	decades 10:8
company's 112:20	conclusive 76:25 77:5	contested 20:16	104:18,24 105:6,17	criteria 92:5,8	December 33:25
116:15	77:13,22 78:3,23	context 5:12 6:20,21	105:25 106:3	cross-examination 3:3	decide 27:1
compare 20:1 compared 19:25 121:4	79:2,12 80:7 84:25 85:3	8:24 12:14 117:23	107:18 108:3,18	3:5,10 3:4 37:11	decided 36:11
compared 19:25 121:4 competing 134:18		117:24 118:13,15 130:11	109:8 110:16,24	97:19 128:20 133:23 135:3	deciding 123:24
competitive 104:2,7	conclusiveness 125:13 condition 43:21 44:3	continue 11:8 13:21	114:2,3,13,17,18,21 114:22 121:14	cross-examining	124:11 136:18
104:10	44:16 45:1,3,12,16	15:18 16:7 27:2	126:2 136:8 139:8	96:23	decision 4:18 71:16,19
complained 10:20	44:16 45:1,3,12,16 45:20 46:1,4,9,16	53:25 54:1,2 70:10	correction 116:16	current 7:10 22:5	71:24,25 72:5 74:2
complained 10:20 complete 111:18	45:20 46:1,4,9,16 46:19,23 47:1 91:13	continued 17:9 51:7	corrections 138:25	61:24 126:13	92:15 95:4 96:24
completed 60:24	conditional 42:2	52:12,12	139:14	130:16	104:14 108:3,9
100:9	conditions 45:18 91:8	continues 83:15	correspondences	currently 126:7	118:11 121:3,8
completely 133:19	91:12,16	continuing 128:9	13:16	curriculum 60:6	128:15 134:25
compliance-related	conduct 11:13 52:23	contract 37:15,16	corresponding 96:13	cursor 74:20	136:23,25 137:1
27:3	53:2,6,14,21	38:3 39:4,6,8,11,13	cost 139:17	cut 130:4	decisions 75:19,22
27.3	33.2,0,1 7,21	30.3 37. 1,0,0,11,13	2030 137.11	200 100.1	94:11,12,18 95:11
	1				

Bay View Group LLC and The Spalena Company LLC -v- Republic of Rwanda Day 8 -- Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case No. ARB/18/21 We

95:14 98:8 118:9 declaration 2:11 34:25 36:8,12,15,19 36:24 37:3 60:7 61:21 62:1,6,10,17 89:8 declare 2:15 37:6 89:12 declared 71:12,15 decree 68:2 deem 41:18 deemed 47:9,17 51:18 91:12 92:14 94:2 defines 43:21 definitely 116:11 132:7 deliver 81:15 delivered 14:16 15:12 demand 6:15 115:4 demarcations 90:20 denied 59:21,21 department 2:15,16 23:16,17 24:6 30:17 31:7 departments 23:19 dependent 91:6 depending 22:10 deposits 4:21 derived 91:25 131:7 describe 19:15,16 26:18 described 6:16 10:2 12:9 13:2 26:7 27:22 30:25 31:7 98:11 describing 26:11,22 30:13 98:13 description 8:23 27:15 30:4,15 designed 36:8,24 desire 119:4,5 despite 7:12 16:14 details 22:20 determinations 100:11,13 determinative 76:5 77:5 80:12 85:4	127:17 129:3 differently 12:15 16:4 133:2 difficult 96:22 difficulties 123:17,21 123:23 difficulty 123:2,11,14 digest 123:19 Diploma 60:21 direct 3:2 2:20 10:13 64:6 130:13 133:19 133:20 director 33:3 94:16 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 directors 71:10 84:15 111:23 113:19 disagree 51:23 72:16 78:8 79:8 91:14 92:7 94:5 disclose 74:16 disclosed 67:21 discretion 92:7,11 104:3,5 135:14 discuss 67:6 discussed 1:16 4:13 5:1 105:11 114:17 132:1 discussing 32:20 114:7 discussion 3:15 3:23 4:7 dismissed 71:10 dispute 2:13,14 71:2,4 105:25 119:18 123:8 137:21 disputes 1:2 2:12 136:13 disqualification 75:6 disregard 124:9 disregarded 80:4 85:2 dissatisfaction 48:13 distinguish 96:22 divert 137:7 divorce 123:16	72:16,18 73:4,21 78:20 79:20,22,24 84:3,3 92:17 98:22 99:5 105:21 108:17 109:5,12 129:19,23 130:1,6 131:7,10,11 131:20 Dohmann 1:12 85:20 86:2,8,10 87:25 88:23 116:11,25 117:11 122:2,4 127:4 132:17 134:4 139:4 doing 10:1 11:9,19 14:1 16:16 127:13 128:4 Domestic 106:25 110:15,23 112:13 dominated 7:24 done 5:4 8:5 35:9 46:13 59:22 61:18 93:23 96:2 100:7 101:11 118:21 120:24 134:3,15 DONNA 2:16 doubt 124:14,17 125:1 down 3:15,16 26:10 27:17 32:17 38:5 46:14 52:19 69:6,6 110:3 Dr 20:17 21:1 99:2,4 99:14,19 draft 4:6 87:11 drafted 87:20 drafts 87:11 draw 7:21 11:2 25:24 106:15 138:19 Drawing 3:19 dry 15:1 Duane 2:3,3 due 27:4 43:25 44:21 50:3,11 54:8,22 55:2,7,10,16,20 56:5,8,22,25 57:8,8 58:1,9,12,16,24 59:3,6,7,11,14 92:19,21 93:5 DUFFIELD 2:8	economic 14:23 16:23 ecosystem 9:22 effect 13:16 46:15 65:14 83:18 96:24 102:16 106:2,12 109:1,10 117:5 122:16 125:11 126:9 132:7 134:22 138:20 effectively 132:22 effectiveness 132:11 effects 94:10 109:4 effort 130:13 efforts 128:10 either 10:3 13:4 44:3 57:3,17 70:21 104:12 118:2 125:3 130:15 137:25 ELIZA 2:18 elsewhere 133:3 email 138:22 emphasise 93:4 emphasised 77:21 employed 16:21 employed 16:21 employees 11:17 28:13 employment 18:13,17 60:10 63:4,5,14 empowered 78:19 end 26:24 27:6,9,12 29:4,25 42:10 105:3 139:12,13 ending 120:1 endpoint 28:23 ends 26:15 27:7 English 41:7 70:9 enlarged 25:21 enter[ing 4:20 entire 107:14 135:14 entirely 86:15 93:22 124:22 entitled 39:7,12 40:1,6 40:15 106:17 118:2 118:20 120:22 entity 113:17 114:11 137:21 environment 9:23 10:14 11:24	22:19 28:22 32:10 45:10 48:15 51:6 53:24 84:12 99:22 126:17 134:21,21 137:6 139:7 evening 97:20 140:2 event 28:8 43:24 44:3 44:11,19 45:4,6 100:1,23 101:13 118:3 events 27:15 28:20 ever 17:7 32:4 88:17 126:13 129:4 131:1 every 12:8 18:6 25:5 87:18 114:25 118:8 137:2,4 everybody 118:1 127:20 everyone 118:19 everything 11:1 18:3 88:21 134:21 139:9 evidence 34:14 35:1 36:10 42:25 48:12 61:18 63:5,16 65:24 66:3,17,20 73:21 76:25 77:5,13,14,22 78:4,24 79:13 80:7 84:25 85:3 96:19 97:1,2 122:15 133:7 134:7 Evode 13:14,24 15:14 29:10 evolution 5:7 evolved 23:16,20 exactly 66:12 116:8 122:11 127:12 134:1 examination 3:2,6 2:20 35:2 83:10 example 9:6 30:23 59:15 124:21 example 9:6 30:23 59:15 124:21 example 9:6 30:23 59:15 124:21 examples 48:12 65:8 excavations 81:11 except 9:19 95:19 exclusive 12:20	expect 23:6 28:23 expectation 22:25 34:17 97:6 expectations 97:11 expected 29:4 30:7 48:23 49:9 118:12 experience 14:25 42:15 83:4 90:2 expert 56:1 62:19,24 63:1,6,16 69:23 77:23,24 88:8 89:8 90:15 96:19,22 97:1 97:23 98:10 119:7 122:16 129:25 132:18 133:8 expertise 64:2 expiration 68:25 expired 53:9,21,25 102:10 103:5 105:12 expires 102:7 138:15 138:16 explain 11:4 17:13 19:14 21:17 57:7 83:18 108:23 137:19 explained 20:17 26:25 27:9 57:7,7 58:5,9 59:7 67:20 78:15,16 120:12 explaining 6:21 7:1 10:24 36:23 explains 56:3 78:2 124:18 explanation 10:23 25:18 33:16 78:13 108:8 118:23 explicit 58:11 101:20 explicitly 45:16 46:1 52:2 exploitation 38:12 39:18 68:24 90:23 exploration 5:22 export 25:9,15 express 103:1 expressed 65:3,7 132:20 expressing 103:10
designed 36:8,24	disregarded 80:4 85:2	due 27:4 43:25 44:21	124:22	84:14	exploitation 38:12
despite 7:12 16:14	dissatisfied 93:2	55:2,7,10,16,20	40:15 106:17 118:2	example 9:6 30:23	exploration 5:22
, .					
				•	
100:24 101:14 determine 4:21	document 3:7 4:13,15 4:17 20:6,11,18	duly 78:9 DUNCAN 2:7	environmental 38:9 90:21 96:11	exclusively 9:9 12:24 Excuse 38:19 107:13	expressly 45:20 46:7,9 48:2
100:23 101:13	21:1,9 29:14,24	duplicate 24:3	environments 11:23	executed 48:3	expropriation 81:24
determined 84:13	32:13,14,16,20,23	duration 103:14	equally 33:16,25	executory 45:12	extend 51:9
95:20 100:17 118:10	33:6,12,18,20 34:1 43:13 50:20 56:1	during 15:3 58:25 65:17 79:20 97:10	105:8,16 108:10 equivalent 77:19 80:2	exercise 5:21,22 28:21 99:12 117:17 119:2	extended 51:24 52:1,2 52:7,21 69:15 91:22
determines 76:3 101:1	70:8,14 85:6,7,9	102:8	errors 139:6	119:18 129:15	93:20
determining 84:16 111:12	86:16 87:5,17 88:14 98:4 99:8 106:25	DUSHIMIMANA 2:9	especially 48:5 51:15 64:3 88:6 118:7	130:8 131:6 exercised 50:3	extending 52:12 extension 52:22 53:17
develop 4:23 5:23	109:22,23 110:1,6,8	E	essence 26:12	exhibit 3:14 37:15	53:19 69:17 70:1,4
development 5:24 29:19 110:24	110:10,11 111:3,13 111:20 112:3 114:4	each 14:4 21:21 24:1	established 21:20 77:7 117:20	43:12,14 47:23 49:1 49:12,14,19 50:17	70:16 93:16 103:1,4 103:5,8,14,22 105:4
dialogue 28:23 30:7	117:1,3 120:9 121:9	25:14 52:1,21 86:16 91:22	Europe 33:20	60:4 61:24 71:23	105:11
difference 25:12 87:10	130:6	earlier 116:13	evaluated 46:24 91:4	exhibits 1:16,19	extensions 51:7 52:6
different 21:2,4 24:6	documentation 4:11	earn 12:11	evaluation 41:12 42:2	exist 24:24 33:13	93:17,19 102:8,19
41:8 58:2 86:15,20 86:24,24 87:4 111:5	119:7	easier 3:18	44:10,15 45:5 46:22	74:24 82:22,24	102:21,25 105:1
T	documents 33:22	Fact 63:20 64:1	91:3 98:19 135:13	existence 33:14	extent 95:8
111:24 115:20,22	documents 33:22 55:11 56:11 64:9,18	East 63:20 64:1 easy 25:11	91:3 98:19 135:13 even 4:15 8:3,5 9:19	existence 33:14 existing 5:12 7:6 96:9	extent 95:8 extinguished 46:25
111:24 115:20,22 124:7 126:23					

extract 11:21	findings 72:24 99:22	132:22 133:11	gap 102:24 103:9	116:23 119:12	hands 9:8 29:6 87:17
extracting 12:1	108:24	forward 42:25 124:3	104:25	128:21 129:12	happen 18:18 92:22
	fine 139:13	126:18,25	gaps 102:8,20	gone 70:12 108:20	104:9 120:20
<u>F</u>	finish 44:23 124:24	found 17:11 25:8 71:8	Gas 23:21	good 1:4 2:4,5,5 3:5,6	happened 16:6 120:1
ace 114:14	firm 61:5 90:5 114:6	73:14,14 91:19	Gatare 3:1 1:5,25 2:3	29:12 36:5,6 37:12	137:12
acie 125:16	114:15 127:24	94:18,25 106:23	2:4,5,7,12,21 3:2,5	37:13 89:20 93:23	happening 29:1
acilitate 93:23	128:7 130:17	four 59:1 83:2 91:1	3:18 6:8 8:16 25:23	96:10,12,16 97:20	happens 26:8
Cacilitated 82:12	firmly 115:15	fourth 52:20	33:5 34:9,11	97:22 112:7 127:5	happy 2:13 25:5 36:1
act 3:21 9:3 14:25	first 3:9 6:10 8:15,25	four-year 42:10	gave 30:18 33:7 62:25	138:23 140:2	36:13 37:3,4 89:10
18:4 19:14 24:3,13	23:10 30:14,16 31:6	framework 91:24 92:2	88:4,5 105:24	Governing 43:15,18	hard 97:5,5 126:8
24:22 27:15 33:16	32:4 39:2,14 41:9	92:23 93:7	gazette 4:16 68:7,8	76:20 77:12	harms 11:24
33:18 34:25 36:9,24	47:2,5 49:2,21 54:9	FRANCIS 3:1 2:3	general 15:14 33:3	government 1:18 2:9	HARRISON 2:3
72:10 79:3 86:18,21	54:24 55:22 56:1,15	free 26:16,19 30:10	78:19 79:23 83:23	5:12,13,16 9:8	having 23:2 50:2,2
94:7 126:5	61:10,14 65:12	34:10 85:16 129:7	83:25 84:2,7 98:8	10:17 13:25 14:15	62:17 64:10 66:4
acts 64:6,11,17,18	68:22 76:1,10,15	138:5	113:20,23 114:2	15:15,23 17:7 18:1	73:5 90:3 95:15
65:4,5 82:13,16	79:10 83:21 85:21	French 41:7	136:14,15	18:9,11,15,20 21:15	118:11 132:21
100:23 119:8	86:13,23 87:8 88:17	French-English 2:18	geographical 90:20	21:25 24:4,13 25:8	133:21 134:15
actual 41:3 66:2,17	88:20 98:25 99:20	2:18,19	Geology 23:17	26:5,14,16 27:14,24	hazardous 81:10
66:20 100:11	101:21 102:24	Friday 138:16	Georgina 1:24	27:25 28:24,25 29:6	HC 71:13 94:15
ail 49:11	103:4 106:15,19	from 3:7,14 3:16 5:24	gesture 93:23	31:14 41:15,18 42:1	head 63:18 113:3,14
ailed 48:20 72:9	107:24 108:7,11	9:20 11:18 12:18,19	gestures 93:25	44:11 48:16 52:12	hear 34:15 35:25
74:15	109:13 117:12	12:21,22 13:3,10,12	getting 38:19 54:12	90:3 94:1 98:9	37:19,21,23,24
fails 47:8 136:15	119:25 121:5 129:4	13:14,25 14:20,21	103:13	102:6,23 103:17,25	63:11 112:16
failure 54:25 55:5	129:9 136:13	15:16 17:10 21:12	GIBSON 2:14	104:3,5,6,11,14,16	130:23
	firsthand 64:13,16	22:2,14,23 23:8,25	Giciye 70:7	104:17,21	heard 58:17 122:14
56:4 92:4,6,13,18	five 19:23 48:22 63:21	24:9 25:13 26:23	give 3:8,25 20:7 27:10	government's 4:18	131:16
fair 127:3	65:24	27:23 29:9 30:11	28:1 30:15 32:11	46:24	hearing 1:8 72:6
faith 93:23 127:5	flexible 6:14	31:15,22 33:22	34:14,24 74:24	government-owned	140:6
familiar 3:10 10:7	flow 139:17	42:18,22 44:21,25	88:20 89:16,20	5:10	hearings 126:6 127:
13:13 20:6,18 21:8	focus 8:22 11:8 12:4	47:24 49:5 50:21	101:3 106:12 109:3	gradual 6:1	heart 97:4
21:9,13,16 22:1,21	23:10 33:6 41:6	52:11 62:7,10,19	117:14,23 128:2	Graduate 60:21	heart 97.4 heavy 58:25
29:17 33:22		63:8 64:8 72:16,17	137:16	grandfathered 93:10	held 23:1 79:12
families 14:6 17:12	43:17 45:24 46:6 97:24 102:18			93:12	Hello 2:5 37:22
family 12:12		73:21 76:24 82:13	given 4:22 6:21 13:9		
far 9:20,24 12:18,22	109:20 111:11	82:16,16 83:16	13:20 17:9 19:25	grant 40:1,6,9 52:23	help 20:13 86:9,11
13:12 69:23 127:2,4	focusing 7:9 11:10	85:19 86:15 88:14	38:13 43:3 58:16	53:13 91:20 103:22	117:8 121:2 135:7
127:23,23	16:9 19:9 21:10	88:15,19 91:25 93:3	116:22 130:22	103:25	136:18
farms 15:6	22:18 69:7	111:25 113:5 114:5	131:1	granted 53:1,5,16,19	helpful 50:14 139:4
feasibility 38:16 41:10	follow 97:3 122:2,6	116:5 118:11	gives 25:15 26:14,17	68:11,14,23 69:1,3	helps 69:7
41:13,16,19 42:3	125:1,10 129:5	119:12 122:14	28:10 77:12,19 80:9	69:14,16,18,22,25	her 72:13 73:1,16
44:10,15 45:4,5	135:17	123:16 126:19	giving 26:3,8 27:24	70:3,7 93:11,14,18	74:16,25 106:24
46:23 48:7 90:25	followed 23:18 43:9	128:6,12 131:7,10	66:21 102:21	granting 91:5,6	herrings 119:14
91:3,18 92:6,9,10	73:24 94:23,25 96:1	132:8,15 135:9,17	global 7:3,7 10:7	grateful 139:9	hide 24:25
92:13 98:19 135:13	following 13:8,23 23:9	138:2 139:12,13,18	GmbH 114:9,11	great 123:11	High 71:24 73:14,14
February 61:11,15	55:6 71:1 84:4,7	front 1:24 2:10 34:21	go 3:13,16 6:8 8:16	greatly 67:19	75:19,22 94:21,24
feedback 38:20	109:1 117:25 134:1	89:6 131:7 133:8	14:4,12,17,21 16:7	Green 3:10,21 4:5,5	95:3
feel 28:17	follows 40:4 95:20	fronts 1:12	17:3 18:5 20:24	GROSH 2:11	highlight 3:17 20:9,2
fell 48:23 49:8	126:19	frustrating 127:20	24:16,17 25:4 26:19	ground 13:8 18:5 33:5	30:1 98:24 102:3
felt 9:25 133:18	font 86:20,24 87:4,5	FTI 2:22,22 34:17,20	27:10 32:16 34:10	72:3 125:25 126:10	106:21 115:3,5
FERGUSON 2:23	foot 53:3,6,7	fulfil 40:23 42:4	34:19 43:16 46:14	grounds 33:1,7,10	117:13
few 21:2	force 68:6,25	fulfilled 65:24 84:1	47:2 48:25 52:19	72:5 74:10 95:3	highlighted 19:3,7
fewer 8:3,5	foreign 30:19 31:8,13	133:14	60:9,20 61:24 62:2	group 1:15 2:4 30:17	102:1 107:25
iield 15:18	96:19	full 48:19 66:9 81:5	67:2,25 68:17 69:6	31:19	highlighting 109:21
fields 15:4,7,9	forestry 9:23 23:19	87:3 106:19,24	69:6 72:2,8 74:1,4	guarantee 40:8,18,21	highlights 83:25
figures 19:19 21:5	Forgetting 104:25	109:7 110:14,22	85:16 90:1 99:10	guaranteed 42:9	high-profile 90:9
22:17	form 21:2 61:18 66:3	112:13	100:21 101:22	guess 95:23	Hill 2:6 3:2 1:6 2:20
file 88:14,16 109:7	125:18 136:5	fully 14:11 17:20 48:3	102:2 110:5 121:11	guidance 96:4	2:24 34:8 35:2 89:
113:24	formal 3:24 4:8 12:16	49:24,24	137:13 138:5		89:16,20 116:7
files 82:15 106:23	26:6,11 27:20 28:3	fundamental 125:22	goal 6:12		121:12,17,20,25
108:17 109:6	28:5,8,20 29:1	furnished 73:4	goes 4:20 7:19 17:24	Hage 2:7,7,8,8	122:2,3,14 123:18
fills 87:3	82:10,11 96:4	further 1:23 30:7,11	83:14 98:10,13	half 35:12 97:12	123:23 124:16
final 26:15 48:6 87:11	formally 27:24	32:17 34:7 83:7	going 2:25 12:8 13:1	half-hour 96:17	125:3,12 126:15,1
88:25 95:23	formed 123:6	85:15 116:23	14:6,12 15:11,12	hand 10:5 11:12 12:9	135:4 138:2,11,14
	former 26:14 130:16	134:12 135:1,4,23	17:15 19:13 20:22		139:1,13,22 140:3
finalised 88:5	132:24 133:13	137:25 138:3	20:24 25:24 26:2	25:9,10 29:22 110:6	him 34:22,23,24 64:
finally 90:24	134:11	107.20 100.0	35:3,8 54:21 60:1,2	handover 28:6 33:4	64:25 65:1 67:5
find 1:18 18:7,15 25:5	formerly 14:8	G	86:10 87:11 89:16	80:15,20 82:3,10,11	85:25 86:8 87:14
45:18 99:14,18	forth 77:6 87:11	gainful 18:12	90:14 99:1 107:22	82:17,21 83:3,6 95:25 96:2,5	88:4,4,5,7,9,9,10,
137:10					

88:17,20 99:3 115:1
115:15 116:16,21
118:20 125:4
126:22 134:15
historically 6:14
hold 55:1 66:22 80:10
84:23 132:17
holder 26:24 27:1,23
28:1 53:24 69:18
81:6,9,14,16
holders 81:3 96:9
holding 71:13 87:17
114:9,11,12 125:25
holds 24:6 130:20
homes 11:19
HON 1:11
honour 2:15 37:6
89:12 97:18
hoof 123:19
hour 35:12,12 97:13
hours 1:8,9
house 10:5 11:12
housekeeping 1:4,15
138:8

IBA 62:4 ICSID 2:23,24 idea 96:16 112:7 ideas 15:19 identifiable 21:23 identified 22:4 79:14 105:3.15 identifies 103:24 identify 102:5 103:21 130:1,6 ignore 126:23 ignored 48:12 illegal 14:13 15:20 16:15,18 17:3,5 56:11 71:13 Imena 29:10,21 30:6 55:9 124:6,9,21 125:1 126:20,22 127:4 Imena's 54:25 127:9 immediate 6:19 immediately 17:5 38:12 39:17 90:22 impact 9:25 10:13 83:18 impacted 132:3 impartiality 74:25 implementation 95:9 implemented 4:8 5:11 implication 71:22 implicitly 52:2,2,7,13 52:21 54:1 import 25:10 111:12 important 18:15 95:5 139:8 impose 81:18 96:8 imposes 90:18 imposing 59:10

inaction 50:2 inappropriate 133:19 Inaudible 125:4 inclined 126:7 include 27:8 included 5:13 62:6 72:24 85:5 87:17 106:24 including 10:19 31:11 59:15 83:24 84:14 84:15,16 90:8,10 106:2 108:12 income 16:23 18:13 incorporated 78:9 137:20 incorporation 76:24 77:4.13 78:3.5.10 78:22 79:2,3,4 80:1 80:9 83:22 84:11,19 85:5 110:18,25 111:8,9,17,19 112:1 113:2 incorrect 4:10 16:17 24:22 26:20 increases 6:22 15:1 indeed 7:14 29:2,4 32:24 93:25 138:21 independence 62:7,10 73:20 74:25 134:5 independent 63:1 92:1 independently 52:23 index 81:2 individual 25:2 58:15 80:3 118:8 137:2,4 individuals 10:2 13:10 15:9,19 17:19 95:19 industrial 4:23 5:23 5:24 6:25 7:15 8:3,5 38:12 39:18 90:23 industrialisation 5:5 6:3.13.18 industrialise 7:13 industries 17:15 30:20 31:1,8 industry 6:11 7:3,11 7:23 31:11 42:7,13 42:14,17,21 43:2,4 43:9 63:6,17 inevitably 96:21 inferring 108:20 inform 96:19,20 128:2 informal 80:20 information 23:2 27:16 64:8,11 82:16 84:14 88:6 106:25 110:15,17,20,22

111:5,7,16,18,21,25

112:13 113:2,5,18

119:3 129:19 130:7

131:24 132:10,21

130:20

informed 125:7

informing 129:14

infringed 58:18

inhabited 9:10

initial 8:14 136:5

initiate 55:5 56:4

initio 94:19 instances 9:13 10:4 27.23 instead 33:17,21,24 50:13,15 74:8 institution 24:8,9 107:1 **institutions** 23:7 28:14 instructed 1:18 63:1 instruction 125:1 133:21 134:1 instructions 42:18,22 intends 81:6 intent 97:9 100:4 intention 80:5 84:20 97:6 interest 30:18 31:1 85:13 114:8 117:21 128:3,8 129:1 130:24 131:13 132:22,24 interested 131:11 interests 72:20 intern 2:24 internal 81:21 international 1:2 2:11 2:12.13 5:2 internet 35:19 86:3 interpretation 90:16 99:19 100:1,14,19 101:2,17 136:20,21 interpreted 98:20 128:16 interpreter 2:18,18,19 2:19,20 INTERPRETERS 2.17 interpreting 99:16 interrupt 64:24 inter-shareholder 123:13 invalidate 92:14 invest 5:3 30:22 31:20 invested 8:4 15:10 investigation 85:12 investment 1:2 2:12 2:13,14 30:19,25 32:3 38:9 58:25 80:23 90:22 122:4 investors 31:8,13,15 31:16,19,22 32:2 90.9 investor's 81:25 82:5 inviolable 77:17 invitation 55:6 invite 1:25 36:11 37:2 involved 32:10 90:7 137:12 involvement 95:8 involves 80:20 involving 136:13

92:3 106:25 110:16 111:3 112:14 issues 62:21 123:24 134:25 **issuing** 13:14 iTSCi 19:10 21:18,25 22:6,11,14 23:14,25 24:3.7 IV 25:20 IZABELA 2:24 i.e 120:23 121:15 J **J** 1:11 **JAMES** 2:22 January 22:13 33:11 33:13,24 49:4 Jean 2:19 114:24 job 16:20,22 iobs 18:17 **JOHN** 2:12 join 1:25 joke 125:19 **Joseph** 2:7,7,8,8 JR 1:11 judgment 72:3,23,23 73:7 117:25 124:19 judgments 73:19 130:3 July 110:12,16,19,24 111:3,4,4 112:14 120:10,18 121:14 124:13 125:2,5 126:11 June 1:7 1:1 **Jurisdiction** 1:8 jurisdictions 92:20 just 1:17 3:19 4:4 6:16 11:1,8,10 13:1,2 15:11,23 16:6,15 17:11 18:3,6 19:9 20:5,20 22:3 24:17 24:25 29:20 30:4 35:7 38:5,22 39:22 44:23 45:24 46:6 57:15,21 61:24 62:2 69:6.6.7 70:8.9 73:8 83:2 85:25 87:6,15 87:15 92:19 93:4 96:18 100:6,25 105:15 108:19,19 109:6 111:4 112:9 116:3 120:11 126:18 127:8 131:16,23 132:1,19 133:17,24 135:6,23 139:4,20 140:1 Justice 2:15,16 justifiable 74:24 KABIBI 2:9 Kamanzi 47:25 49:5 Kaplan 1:22 1:17

keep 16:16 50:15 keeping 50:1 keeps 24:3 kept 21:24 key 90:14 KG 1:11 kind 11:20 28:5 93:24 133:1 Kinyarwandan-Eng... 2:19,20 knew 15:10 16:14,15 127:11 know 8:19 18:22 20:10 22:20 23:24 24:12 25:21,25 28:7 34:2 50:4 54:2 58:17 86:1 96:8,13 110:2 119:8 130:21 137:12,25 139:3 knowing 15:15 130:18 130:20 132:15 knowledge 42:7,16 43:1,3,8 64:6,9,13 64:16,20 72:17 75:16 known 127:25 knows 109:23 labelled 45:20 46:1,7 46:9 labour 12:17,19 14:21 14:25 93:1 lack 58:23 119:4 129:15 130:8 134:5 laid 15:16 land 9:5,13 14:24 15:17 16:25 23:19 language 20:24 22:4 27:16 44:21,25 78:18 91:13,14 101:25 large 4:19,22 9:4 largely 6:11 7:12 larger 5:11 8:6 large-scale 6:25 7:15 7:18 8:2.9 9:7 83:1 last 7:21 8:12 10:8 27:18 29:20 30:1 31:18 32:13 86:17 86:18 87:14 100:11 101:22 105:11 107:2,21 111:1 118:15,16 119:25 127:25 lasted 13:17 late 75:15 lately 136:3 later 33:24 41:4 43:11 138:25 139:19 lawful 16:11,12 18:19 lawfully 77:7 laws 59:8,14 104:19 lawyer 33:19 62:20,21 90:2 128:6,6 130:14 131:1 132:12,13 lead 23:20 24:8

leads 16:18 least 14:1 19:15 20:14 22:21 23:9 106:20 128:17 130:16 leave 15:11 28:2,24 81:6 83:15 102:1 139:25 leaving 27:25 led 4:19 10:20 left 53:25 101:24 109:21 111:13 114:23,23 139:22 left-hand 111:20 legal 57:8,10,11,12 58:13 59:7 60:22 62:7,11,21 71:17 84:18 90:8 92:16 94:10 legality 71:5 LegalWise 60:18 legislation 92:24 93:12,15 96:4,14 legislations 7:17 92:22 legislator 77:21 80:5,6 84:21,22,24 less 26:18 32:3 87:3 let 8:18 12:14 17:13 19:3 23:10 59:13 67:5,8 86:1 89:20 117:23 125:10 letter 29:9,17,21 30:1 47:24 48:2,11,16,17 49:4 50:21 85:11 110:10 114:5 115:4 115:22 119:10 letters 58:4 letting 54:2 let's 1:25 liability 132:4 liable 115:8,12,16 116:10.15 licence 10:9,17 26:24 26:25,25 27:2,10,23 27:25 28:1,2 52:10 52:11,13 53:14,16 53:17,24 59:20 68:14,23 69:14,16 69:18,19 70:7 81:5 83:3 90:17 92:1 102:7,9,9 103:25 105:4.12 licences 12:7 13:6 19:22 32:8 51:9 52:6 53:1,5,13,20 64:3 68:11 69:3,5 69:11.21.25 70:3 81:4 91:22.24.25 92:2 93:14,21 94:4 96:1 102:13,17 104:23 105:9,10,16 license 104:5 licensed 12:14,15 14:9 14:11 17:20 licensee 26:14,14 28:24

34:16,19 35:17,22

36:2 138:19,21,24

139:3.17

issue 7:17 62:23 83:22

32:8 77:16,17 78:23

78:23 80:1 84:19

84:11 116:23

issued 13:25 17:20

127:21

impression 32:20

inaccurate 33:13

91:24

licensees 21:13 22:21

licenses 42:9 52:1,22

					-
52:22,24 65:14,19	87:13 94:11 110:2	64:22,24 71:4,9,21	metals 63:22	missed 118:15	N
licensing 7:17 10:21	119:10 120:11	88:15,15,16 94:15	method 12:2	misstated 115:11	
life 6:2 111:10 128:9	121:4 136:2	94:16 108:13	methods 11:16 12:1	mix 13:10	name 20:15 110:23
light 117:22 130:13	looking 20:11 25:25	119:19 121:15,17	12:17,24	Mm-hm 56:17 68:21	112:20,23 129:21
like 2:13 11:8 12:4	30:21 51:3 85:21	121:22	MICHAEL 2:15	70:15,17 101:7	NARCISSE 2:9
18:6 19:21 30:14	86:13 87:8 117:3	Marshall's 32:23	MICHELLE 2:7	107:8	narrow 95:10
35:13 37:14 41:4	133:11,12,13	115:25	Middle 63:20 64:1	moment 3:20 8:22	natural 23:11,13,19
45:17 63:11 70:23	loop 1:17	mastered 1:23	might 21:8 27:23	35:5 36:21 54:13	50:6 58:3 110:23
80:14 84:22 106:15	loose 26:15	material 125:16	31:23 54:13 116:15	63:4 69:8 89:17	124:18 nature 8:1 126:9
108:21 111:4	LORD 1:11	130:18,25	138:15	122:9 125:12	near 12:25 13:11
120:12 123:25	lost 16:8,10,20 18:17	matter 1:1 15:23	Mike 20:17 21:1 99:2	money 12:11 17:12	necessarily 57:9,9
128:4 131:15	18:18 28:1	16:15 27:20 76:5	99:4,14	32:4 132:8	58:10,10 59:9
133:25 135:6,22	lot 24:19 31:1 38:19	88:16 93:8 136:15	Mike's 99:19	month 22:11	necessary 1:7,9 99:11
138:24	LOUTFI 2:23	136:19,21,22,24	mind 25:16 58:25	months 33:24 61:12	111:18
Limited 114:12,16,20	low 15:2	matters 3:15 36:10	96:24 119:9	61:16 103:16	necessity 25:8
limiting 104:16	LTD 110:24	84:9 90:7 118:3	mine 10:21 12:18,20	month/day/year 33:21	need 18:22 57:10
line 6:10 52:20 119:23	LUCY 2:8	124:10	12:25 14:12 16:1,8	more 19:12 21:10	58:10,11 86:5,7
120:1	lying 33:17	may 10:7 12:19 18:4	16:21,22 17:9 18:6	24:19 26:18 31:23	98:17
lingering 128:12		19:1 28:15 29:9,15	19:19,19 20:2 21:22	48:5 50:9 59:23	needed 12:10 16:1
130:15	M	35:20,22 44:3 62:1	22:4,4 24:2,20	88:19 127:9 134:24	28:18 133:1
LISA 2:11	made 2:21 13:2 15:8	69:18 74:20,23	25:13,14 53:17	moreover 25:1,12	NEEDLE 2:8
little 1:22 20:15 37:25	19:11 24:12 37:16	77:23 83:11 86:5	mined 19:13,24,25	morning 1:4 2:4,5	negative 129:13
135:23	48:18 51:11 53:25	97:20,25 107:24	20:2 21:3	97:22	negotiate 48:21 55:6
live 9:5,13,18 10:3,14	54:4 57:25 58:2,25	114:5 115:14 117:1	mineral 4:18,21 5:21	Morris 2:3,3	negotiating 63:24
11:5,25 12:12,18	59:17,18 61:10,14	117:3,21 121:2,9	13:15 19:24 22:16	most 92:20	negotiation 64:3
13:4 14:6,22,24	61:21,21 62:1 66:5	123:20 125:4 128:3	68:23 69:14,16 81:6	motion 132:5 133:18	negotiations 55:1,6
15:15 16:24 116:5	71:1 75:9,14,16,18	130:25 132:2,3	minerals 6:15 11:13	133:22	56:5 93:21
127:10	75:24 78:15 82:4	135:22 Marsha 16:4 20:12	11:21 12:1,11 13:15	move 41:5 60:2 80:14	neither 24:24 45:9
lived 13:11 14:3 living 12:25 15:17	84:24 85:12 87:13	Maybe 16:4 20:13	13:21 14:5,12,16	Mozambique 63:20	Nelly 85:11
33:19	87:18 91:22 96:12	McCARTHY 2:7 3:5 35:3 37:11,19,23,24	15:25 16:1,8,12 17:11,14,17,20,23	Mruskovicova 71:5,8 71:21 94:17	network 21:20
LLC 1:15,16 2:4	99:22 101:17 107:2	38:2,19,22 39:1	18:6,19 19:12,25	much 1:13 8:6 19:24	never 4:8,15 25:1,8
LLP 2:3,3,7,7,8,8	116:13,19 119:9	54:12,15,19,20	20:2 21:3,21 23:18	28:23 32:3 34:9	33:3 62:23 75:14
local 15:21 17:6 25:12	122:5 129:20,24	63:10 67:8,24 83:7	miners 9:4,13 10:1	85:16 87:3 96:15	96:6 128:23 131:12
locations 96:12	134:6,24	83:20	11:5,9,12 12:4,21	99:11 123:23	new 54:13 93:21
log 86:3	mainly 96:9 maintain 81:16	McGowan 1:24	13:1,2,4,11 14:1,17	124:11 128:13	next 9:18 13:5 17:2
long 13:17 18:22	majority 114:15	mean 5:9 10:15 12:2	15:8 16:1,7 17:8	138:4 140:3	39:16 90:1,13 91:17
30:20 40:13,21 52:9	make 1:17 3:19 18:12	19:17,21 24:24,24	18:5,19,21	MUGENZI 2:19	93:6 94:9,20 95:23 139:11
78:18 103:1 118:5	20:10,20 25:25 32:3	28:5 66:12 99:25	mines 12:16 13:11	Mugisha 3:8,9 56:3,7	NICOLE 2:13
119:13	37:3 41:23 43:6	100:7 130:12	14:21 15:6 21:14	56:10 57:16 78:1,15	nimble 7:5
longer 14:9 15:6,24	47:21 54:11 55:14	meanings 41:8	22:23 102:6	78:25 79:9,17,19	Nkurunziza 32:25
16:21 17:21 18:14	55:19 56:21 82:9,20	means 4:6 6:13 16:21	mine-by-mine 24:10	80:4 83:19 85:1	33:2
27:1 53:20 103:12	84:22 92:19 97:10	16:22 28:22 92:10	24:15,23	88:9 89:1,4,7,9,12	
117:17 119:1,17		4 40 10 10 100 0		00.7 07.1,4,7,7,12	
100 0 101 5 107 00	1 99:12 100:12.15	meant 40:12,12 122:8	MINIJUST 2:9	89:16,19,23,25 90:1	nobody 118:17
130:8 131:6 135:22	99:12 100:12,15 110:9 113:22	meant 40:12,12 122:8 mechanism 137:22	MINIJUST 2:9 minimum 58:16,24		nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21
long-term 5:6 6:2		mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25	110:9 113:22	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20	110:9 113:22 138:15	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterprets 79:17	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9 119:6 120:16	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8 market 4:20 6:15 7:4	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8 mentioning 6:23	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterprets 79:17 mispronounce 99:3	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22 43:24 44:20 46:7	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22 73:7 76:15 131:9
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9 119:6 120:16 130:11 135:23	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8 market 4:20 6:15 7:4 7:8 17:17,24	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8 mentioning 6:23 mentions 77:12	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterprete 99:3 mispronounced	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22 43:24 44:20 46:7 75:9 120:16 128:15	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22 73:7 76:15 131:9 134:12,24
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9 119:6 120:16 130:11 135:23 139:5	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8 market 4:20 6:15 7:4 7:8 17:17,24 Marshal 107:3	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8 mentioning 6:23 mentions 77:12 Merits 1:8	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 99:3 mispronounced 114:25	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22 43:24 44:20 46:7 75:9 120:16 128:15 139:1	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22 73:7 76:15 131:9 134:12,24 notice 28:1 30:6,9
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9 119:6 120:16 130:11 135:23	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8 market 4:20 6:15 7:4 7:8 17:17,24 Marshal 107:3 Marshall 2:4 30:23	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8 mentioning 6:23 mentions 77:12	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterprete 99:3 mispronounced	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22 43:24 44:20 46:7 75:9 120:16 128:15	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22 73:7 76:15 131:9 134:12,24 notice 28:1 30:6,9 73:10 128:2 129:4
long-term 5:6 6:2 40:15 42:9 46:25 51:16 91:5,20 105:10,17 look 3:15 8:4,4 17:7 18:10 20:7,12 32:14 36:7,17 39:1,3 41:21 42:5 43:12 44:7 45:3 49:11 50:5 51:20 56:20 63:18 65:8,16,21 68:5,7 70:6 74:18 76:10,17 78:25 79:9 84:20 86:7 87:10 88:10 89:5 98:17 101:10 109:9,25 111:1,14 112:7,9 119:6 120:16 130:11 135:23 139:5 looked 22:3 33:23	110:9 113:22 138:15 makes 9:5,13 92:6 100:11,19 making 3:18 34:1 49:7 50:3 62:6,9 90:19 94:6 96:10 99:16 104:1,7 112:21 116:16 118:25 120:18 129:5,22 132:22 managing 60:17 94:15 107:6,17 108:13,16 113:19 manner 127:6 manufacturing 5:13 many 8:2 10:18 12:21 32:6,8,8 45:17 59:8 market 4:20 6:15 7:4 7:8 17:17,24 Marshal 107:3	mechanism 137:22 medium-scale 7:18 meet 28:12 50:23 55:15 meeting 136:14,15 member 42:12,14,17 42:21 members 4:7 35:22 93:2 memorandum 136:1,9 Memorial 130:2 memory 13:18 20:14 88:18 99:13 mention 33:10 48:20 49:11 mentioned 45:2,17 74:15 80:21 83:17 84:4,8 mentioning 6:23 mentions 77:12 Merits 1:8 met 27:3 66:8 77:14	minimum 58:16,24 MINIRENA 22:24 23:3 minister 13:14,24 29:10,21 30:6 47:25 49:5 50:21 54:25 55:9 81:10,15 92:7 92:11 135:14,19 ministry 3:24 4:7 30:10 50:6 58:2,3 82:13 minority 114:19 minute 63:9 minutes 54:14 84:15 84:15,16 misconduct 132:23 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 85:2 misinterpreted 99:3 mispronounced 114:25 mispronouncing	89:16,19,23,25 90:1 97:8,20,23 98:2 99:10 109:22,25 112:11 113:13 114:5 117:2,3,14 124:18 127:18,23 128:6,24 129:10,13 132:25 133:20 134:6 135:12 138:6 Mugisha's 51:23 52:8 55:22 56:1,15 57:5 57:20 58:7 69:23 77:23,24 79:8 122:14 127:24 128:14 133:13 MUKARUTABANA 2:20 multinational 60:13 must 10:16 16:22 43:24 44:20 46:7 75:9 120:16 128:15 139:1 mute 63:10	nobody 118:17 none 69:25 70:3 98:21 102:17 125:6 Nonetheless 4:12 non-disclosure 133:6 134:11 non-occurrence 46:15 46:18 non-payment 117:6 noon 1:3 normal 50:12,12 64:25 82:25 normally 36:8 note 86:14 95:5,24 103:8 127:8 noted 91:11,21 92:12 92:17 93:17 94:12 nothing 1:6 2:17 30:11 37:8 45:19 46:8,11 59:2,5,22 73:7 76:15 131:9 134:12,24 notice 28:1 30:6,9

		I		I	
notification 26:13	105:16	37:15 39:3 41:6,21	outstanding 28:12	partly 49:25	127:24
27:8,21,22 28:10,19	off 15:16 35:21 85:24	42:6 43:16 44:7,9	29:3	partner 60:17 90:6	Petroleum 23:21
29:1,5 137:11	113:3,14	46:14 47:23 48:25	over 6:2,18,23 10:8	party 2:10 39:6,7,7,11	PHILLIPS 1:11
notified 72:5,10 94:24	office 2:11,12,13,14	50:13,17,20 54:9,23	21:4 29:22 30:20	39:12,12 40:22 47:8	phrased 125:21
notify 27:24 81:9	78:19 83:23,24 84:2	55:22 57:21 60:4,9	31:16 90:2 100:7,21	103:25 104:6	phrasing 129:12
notwithstanding	84:14 113:20	61:25 65:10 67:1,24	117:18 119:2	121:18 122:1,5	pick 16:5 123:20
34:25	offices 21:25,25 82:15	68:16 70:6 71:23	127:17 128:3	132:14 137:6	127:15 128:20
Nowhere 79:11	official 4:16 15:15	75:4 80:25	129:15 130:9 131:6	party's 47:9	picture 87:2
NRD's 17:8 19:21	27:10 34:2 90:3	operators 7:2,15,15	132:18	past 70:12	place 5:25 8:24 9:1
41:23 47:13,17 48:9	107:20	7:18,19 8:2,2,3,5,8	overnight 6:3	Pause 4:2 8:20 19:5	16:2 18:2 22:6
48:13 49:22 50:11	officials 58:2	8:9 10:11.21	overview 90:14	32:15 34:13 35:15	31:15 32:4 68:13
50:25 51:4,17 52:13	offline 86:6	opine 67:22	owed 39:7,12	38:23 43:12 44:9	73:11 75:25 82:12
55:1,10 56:22 57:13	often 10:8 11:22 14:22	opining 134:22	own 9:15 23:3 24:20	50:16 63:6 86:4	82:18 110:19
65:17,18 69:4 71:24	okay 2:1 4:4 13:1,13	opinion 65:7 93:13,18	40:10 66:3 87:22	89:2 91:17 94:20	placed 32:1
74:2 102:9	20:20 23:22 32:18	98:7 102:7,21 103:3	88:16 101:25	101:10,25 102:4	plain 44:21,25 78:18
Nsengiyuma 114:25	36:22,25 38:2 45:9	103:10 109:3	owned 114:12	110:3 112:10 115:2	79:6 91:15 134:7
nuance 126:24	51:14 62:14,15 69:9	128:22 130:25	owners 84:12	115:13 117:11	plainly 124:18
null 71:13	69:9 70:25 72:12	136:24	ownership 76:6 77:5	pay 18:21 31:23,23	plaintiffs 99:18
nullified 122:17	77:15 86:2,7 89:2	opinions 65:4	79:13 80:12 85:4,4	35:8	plan 38:8,9,9 90:21,21
nullifying 108:10	89:23 108:5 118:23	opportunities 15:17	137:8	paying 35:10	90:22
number 4:19 8:7	OLIVIER 3:4 36:4	opportunity 3:8 13:20	137.0	payment 117:5	planning 39:19
30:20 31:8 32:11,11	once 16:8 39:6,11 42:8	28:11 56:14	P	PC 1:11	plausible 33:16,25
33:1 90:7 93:17	78:20,23 79:23,24	opposed 33:8 34:5	-	PDF 3:13 43:16 55:24	plausible 33.10,23 players 4:19
98:4 106:6 113:7	84:3,5,17 87:16	87:4,16 123:13	Pact 13:14	68:1 87:1	please 2:14 4:1 8:20
121:9	116:6 136:24	opposing 72:13 73:1	page 3:9,13 20:22,23	peace 1:11	29:11,14 30:1 31:18
numbers 19:11 21:10	137:20	73:16	25:20,22 30:2 43:16	pending 125:5,6	32:16,17 34:19
25:15,16	one 1:14 3:11 5:10	order 4:22 44:4 45:7	55:23 60:5,9,20	people 9:18 11:15,18	35:15 36:7,14 37:5
23.13,10	6:18 14:10 20:8	45:10 91:11 138:19	61:24 62:2 63:18	11:25 12:3,8,14	39:2,9 42:6 43:14
0	23:18 24:16,16,20	orders 138:12	67:2 68:1,18 74:19	13:3,3 14:4,15	44:9 46:14 47:3,6
	25:9,21 30:14 32:13	ordinary 34:24	81:1,21 83:14,15,16	15:15,16 16:16,18	47:23 49:2,13 50:14
object 47:13 48:9	32:17 33:2,5,7,10	orient 20:5	83:16 86:15,17,19	16:20,24 18:8,11	50:16,18 51:21,21
49:22 51:4,12,14	36:21 39:6,11 42:4	original 8:16 42:10	86:25 87:3,4,6,14	28:7 30:21,22 122:8	52:19 53:4,7 54:23
objected 48:17 50:10	47:8 48:18 49:25	105:12 112:22	87:15 99:9 101:8,10	124:7	55:23 56:2,21 57:20
72:19	63:21 72:19 74:7	122:19 123:5	101:23 106:5 108:7	percentage 114:8	57:22 59:4 60:4,5,9
objecting 73:10,22,25	87:9,9,15 97:1	other 5:14 14:23	109:13 110:6	perfectly 127:3	60:20 61:25 63:13
objection 75:16 85:10	99:11,14 103:25	17:11 19:16,25 20:2	113:10	perform 39:18,25 40:4	64:14 65:10,16,21
134:4,5	104:6,9 109:6 114:2	20:8 23:5,18 25:10	pages 70:11	40:25 44:12	66:18 67:2,9,24
obligated 39:17	114:5 115:18	25:14 27:21 28:3,14	panel 1:18	performance 40:11,20	68:16 70:8,9,10
obligation 22:22 46:19	119:20 123:10	28:18 29:1 31:16	paper 3:10,21 4:5,6	43:25 44:20 47:9,10	72:2,8 74:1,4,18,19
46:24 91:20 93:20	127:7 129:3,3 135:6	39:18 40:22 42:15	79:20	47:13,17 48:9,13,17	74:21 75:4,20 76:1
113:24 114:1	137:16 138:11	45:17 47:8 48:12	paragraphs 3:16	48:22 49:8,23 50:11	76:18,19 77:23,25
130:15 132:13	ones 8:9 132:1	62:21 76:13,13 77:9	19:16 25:24 26:2,7	51:1,5,17 91:7	80:17,18 81:1,13,21
obligations 23:4 28:12	one-month 105:4	83:24 84:22 88:8,22	54:10,11,24 55:18	performed 40:13,21	82:7,7 83:17 88:24
28:20 29:3 38:4	only 7:16 10:17 11:6	98:16 102:15	55:23 56:21 57:4,17	40:24	89:5,10 90:1,13
39:21,25 40:4,14,22	12:13 17:14,20	104:10 105:8,17	57:23 76:18 77:24	performing 51:10	91:17 98:24 99:9
40:23,25 41:24 42:1	25:16 33:5 48:21	109:5 111:24	80:17,19 82:7	performs 39:6,11	109:25 113:7,11
42:4 44:12 50:23	53:1,2,5,13 66:11	114:19 123:10	paralegal 2:23	perhaps 15:13 20:13	117:13 127:8
51:1 59:11 65:25	74:7,23 75:18 79:3	130:12 139:16	pardon 42:20 61:13	87:1 112:7 123:25	129:21 130:1,6
81:18 90:19 91:7	93:20 95:8 99:11	others 9:17.23 31:22	85:24	130:21	135:2,10,25
96:9,13 133:14	101:19 103:25	32:2	part 6:12 9:4 19:15	perimeters 90:20	pm 2:2,19 3:3 36:3
134:18	109:1 114:1 118:9	otherwise 104:6	31:18 60:7 67:10,11	period 6:19,23 13:13	37:10 54:16,18 83:9
obliged 81:16 118:9	121:23 127:25	133:20	98:6 115:20 118:15	13:24 16:9 19:25	85:18 89:3,24 97:14
obliges 113:4	137:9 139:6	ought 133:9	118:16 128:14	20:1 22:8 26:25	97:15,16 135:8
OBSERVERS 2:10	open 3:9 87:9 125:15	out 1:12,19 5:16 6:20	participate 67:15	27:11 28:17 29:5	140:5
obtain 5:23 10:11,16	operate 10:9,18 12:16	10:4 11:12 12:8	participating 5:20	30:9,20 32:7 53:9	point 13:21 16:11
12:10 13:21 14:5,6	14:10 21:19 123:15	14:4 15:20 16:7	particular 19:24 46:6	60:15 68:25 102:24	24:12 25:14 30:14
16:8	operated 12:6 13:6	17:16 18:5 19:13	116:25 124:5	103:9 104:25	42:18,22 54:4 77:10
obtained 42:8	15:10 23:15	25:5 28:19 38:3,23	particularly 9:7 10:15	106:18	112:20 124:2,4,10
obtaining 30:19	operating 14:9 17:22	46:15 53:18 60:10	63:23 particulars 121:13	permit 4:23 5:23	124:13 125:8,8,22
obvious 118:12,17	18:14 19:22 22:12	67:16 75:5 80:19		68:23	127:9,15,16 129:5
124:8 126:20	27:2 54:1 83:1	82:21 86:5 87:2	parties 44:4 45:7,9,13	permits 103:21	130:7,9 133:1,1,16
obviously 25:5 103:1	operation 9:20 17:21	88:9 89:11 96:4	45:22 46:4,12 62:7	permitted 124:24	134:9,15,16,24
119:8 122:23	operation 9:20 17:21 operations 9:11 10:13	104:22 106:23	62:10 75:2 95:18	130:23	points 3:16 11:7 84:5
occasioned 96:12	28:11 52:24 53:2,6	119:20 129:12	100:20 101:17	perpetuating 127:20	123:20
occupy 26:17,19 28:25	53:14,18,22 54:3	131:3	108:25 109:6,7	person 34:5 58:15	policy 3:22,22,24 4:6
30:10	operative 70:10	outnumber 8:9	136:17,19 137:11	129:21	4:8,11,13,17 5:1,10
occur 43:24 44:11,20	operator 10:16 18:20	outside 60:13	137:14 138:24	personal 115:25	5:12,15,19 6:17 7:6
October 61:8 93:18	Special 10.10 10.20	January OU.13	139:5,23,24	Personal 113.23	5.12,15,17 0.17 7.0
L	I	l	I	l	

7:13,16,20	prima 125:16	22:17,23 24:1,23	purely 66:15	railway 63:25	111:24 120:19,22
poor 31:4 130:4	primarily 5:4,25	25:12 88:3	purport 87:21 129:14	rainy 15:3	127:13,23 133:21
port 63:25	principle 57:9 59:7	productive 5:16	purports 123:9 128:24	raise 101:24 123:2	139:9
portion 15:8 22:8	102:5,7,22 103:2,3	professional 132:23	purpose 11:6 116:20	133:18,22 134:16	recorded 75:18,22
24:20	103:11,15,18,21	professionalisation	127:17 129:18	raised 1:14 62:20	records 72:3 74:5 76:5
posed 97:7	105:2,8,15 106:11	6:12	purposes 111:19	124:14 128:19	79:12,24 81:15
position 43:6 115:17	106:13 107:11,17	profitable 137:24	128:21	132:5 133:21 134:4	110:20 111:21
115:19 117:20	108:2,8,16,23 109:8	progress 5:3 6:17	pursuant 46:18 93:14	134:9,9,13	recourse 79:19 93:3
122:7 124:23	109:11 115:11	90:23,25	120:12	raising 139:20	red 119:13
125:17,20 126:11	116:6 117:19	progressed 24:5	pursue 134:2 137:24	rate 124:20	reduces 15:3
126:13 127:9,11	principles 102:15,18	prohibition 31:15,17	put 12:15 31:21 32:4	rather 7:6 12:1,3 35:4	refer 11:19 12:23 13:1
129:3 133:8,24	104:15	prohibits 81:24	42:25 57:19 63:11	45:12 94:7 123:18	22:6 80:22 107:12
134:17,20 139:1	printed 87:2,4	proper 83:3	63:13 75:21 83:19	127:8	107:14,14,16,17
positions 108:25 127:5	printing 87:20	properly 28:12 43:6	98:3 99:11 101:24	RDB 24:9 30:17 76:3	108:23
132:6	prints 87:5	property 58:14,17	104:22 108:6	76:24 107:1 108:11	reference 6:16 7:5
positive 41:12 42:2	prior 4:5 21:16 22:1	77:20,20 80:2,8,8	119:23 124:3	111:3	8:23 10:15 33:21
44:10,15 45:5 46:22	48:15 53:9 60:12	81:23,25 84:23	putting 58:6 70:13	RDB's 106:23 108:17	41:23 49:14,19
98:18 135:13	69:14,16 102:17	103:17 104:6,17	72:22 136:6	109:5 110:14,21	105:1 107:16
positively 46:24 91:4	108:14,24,24	proposal 1:11	p roceed 39:17	112:12	108:12
possess 75:1	132:11	proposals 104:11	1	re 3:15	referenced 3:11 4:4
possession 26:17	private 5:16,20 9:14	propose 80:14	0	reach 86:5 88:9	33:11 109:13
possible 44:8 129:2	77:20 81:23 90:8	proposed 3:22 48:20	QC 1:12 2:6	read 2:14 3:18,25 4:3	referencing 11:6
134:21 137:18	privatisation 5:5,21	proposition 127:1	qualification 129:7	4:3 8:18,21 13:9	102:20
post-hearing 138:9	6:1	propositions 47:21	qualifications 75:1	19:3,6 25:23 29:20	referred 10:8 75:11
139:18	privatise 5:10,12,15	55:19 82:9,20	qualified 119:15	29:24 30:4 56:6,9	99:17 110:11
potential 4:21 128:17	privatised 9:9 32:6,9	protecting 131:3	qualify 53:7 60:25	56:13 67:5 70:2	136:16
potentially 81:10	privatize 4:18	protection 38:9 80:23	quarry 68:23 69:14,16	83:19 87:25 89:11	referring 8:7 10:6,10
134:18	privileged 90:11	82:4	question 1:14 4:5 8:19	101:5,25 107:5	10:22 11:3,10,14
power 83:21 113:15	privy 120:20 129:18	protects 81:23	10:25 11:2 14:18	120:2	21:8 39:21 99:4
practical 7:7 27:20	129:24 137:10	protocol 28:6	16:3 18:10,24 19:5	reader 124:20	109:23 113:12
practice 12:13 43:4	problem 35:16 37:25	provide 18:17 38:8,16	20:19,25 22:18	reading 101:11 108:19	refers 3:21 8:25 100:4
47:8 50:12 60:22	131:21 133:7	62:9,13,13 81:4	25:16 31:3,4 33:7	ready 19:5 34:14	reflect 22:16
80:21 82:11,25 83:4	problems 1:23	90:23,24 92:13,23	34:5 44:23 45:24	110:1	reflected 57:11 58:12
83:6 93:22	procedural 3:15	92:25 93:15 113:17	50:25 52:15 53:4,8	real 85:25	58:13 59:14
practices 6:25,25	138:12	119:6 129:21,24	54:7 57:15 59:4	realise 6:22	Reform 90:11
11:20	procedure 28:4 74:6	provided 21:12 22:19	63:11 64:15 66:18	realities 7:7	refresh 32:14
practise 60:25 61:2	75:5 92:25 94:22	23:6,10,23 50:4	70:3 73:3 85:20	really 26:13 133:2	refusal 55:15
practitioner 90:8 96:6	procedures 27:21 28:5	64:8,18,20 66:7	86:11 87:23 96:25	136:23	regard 45:10 51:15
precedence 101:20	28:6 57:11 58:13	67:20 68:2,5,22	97:7 100:6,9,12,21	reason 62:15 80:6	82:4 117:20 139:6
preceding 86:19	72:13,25 73:6,12,15	69:17 72:14,18 73:1	100:25 105:14	84:24 109:3 116:4	regarding 59:3 98:7
precisely 124:13 126:8	73:24 75:17 95:20	73:16 79:11 82:13	110:4 111:11 112:6	118:6 125:20	100:12 109:6
predecessor 32:25	118:10	82:16 87:12 91:23	112:8 113:21	133:25	138:25
preferable 139:12	proceed 35:11 38:12	93:11 95:11,25	116:22 117:2	reasonable 22:25 23:6	regardless 11:17
preliminary 99:22	88:24 90:22 126:7	103:6,9 111:7,17,25	128:23 129:17	32:5	26:24 40:10,19
premise 100:25	126:10	113:5 119:7 129:19	130:4 133:5 135:12	reasonableness 124:5	100:10 131:2
premised 100:11	proceeded 121:12	130:11	questioned 33:1	reasonably 124:22	regards 48:5
preparation 66:10,16	127:6	provides 69:13 74:22	questioning 11:7 35:8	reasoning 109:5	register 81:5 84:8,9,10
66:19,23 67:4,14,15	proceeding 126:2,4	75:8 92:2 95:17	121:2	reasons 59:19,20	110:17 125:14
93:21 propored 49:21 61:22	proceedings 61:15	111:21 133:10	questions 3:7,11,12,13	74:25 92:13 137:10	registered 113:16,22
prepared 48:21 61:22	63:2 66:11 94:24,25	providing 90:20 129:4	3:14 3:1 15:13	reasserting 128:3	registrar 78:19 79:12
86:21 88:1 preparing 61:18 66:14	95:7 137:13	provision 52:5,16 54:5 81:23 91:3 98:16	17:25 18:2 20:8	recall 13:17,20 26:3,8	79:23 83:23,25 84:2
66:15 69:22	process 6:1 26:4,6,12	99:19 100:2 113:12	26:2 34:7 37:14	29:18 31:6 32:10,19 32:23 88:13 116:7	84:7 113:4,15,20,23
prescribed 50:6 51:14	26:20,23,23,23 27:4	provisions 47:20	54:21 64:25 83:8	receive 28:7 40:9,19	114:1 120:14,18,22 125:4,10,14 126:12
prescribed 50:6 51:14 presence 7:1 27:12	50:3 54:8,22 55:2,7	55:18 56:24 60:1	85:15,19 88:10	received 23:7 40:9,19 received 23:7 33:3	registrar's 76:5 121:4
present 8:11	55:10,16,20 56:5,8 56:22 57:1,8,8 58:1	68:19 70:10 76:12	89:22 97:9 127:18	60:21 62:18 133:22	124:15
present 8:11 presentation 3:9 48:6	58:9,12,16,24 59:3	77:9 79:14 82:2,8	135:1,5,6,9 138:1,3	receives 24:4,5	registration 84:6
89:17,20,25	59:6,7,11,14 65:17	82:19	quick 6:22 85:25	recognise 20:11	106:19,24 110:15
presented 104:11	80:20 82:10,21 83:6	public 93:2 95:18	quickly 7:4 18:15,18	recognised 5:2 7:16	110:22 112:13
120:21 134:7	92:19,21 93:5 95:25	102:6 104:15,22	18:20	12:13	121:14
136:22	processes 96:5	118:8 137:2,4	quite 16:4 32:11 82:25	recognition 6:17 7:10	registry 110:20
press 116:23	produced 1:23 21:21	publication 24:23	116:16 128:23	recollecting 115:24	112:22 113:5,15
presumably 130:15	24:19 120:10	68:7	129:2 131:4	recollection 13:18,22	120:10,15 126:13
prevent 13:24	134:10	publicly 24:17 104:1,7	quo 120:23	32:15 115:14,18	regular 22:23
previous 62:2 108:5	producing 23:25	publish 25:2	quote 116:3	116:2,8,12	regulation 96:4
previously 9:8	production 6:22 8:5	published 4:15 68:9	R	record 48:13 60:10	regulations 27:4 80:21
price 117:5,6	19:11,19 21:14 22:4	punished 14:13		63:5,14 108:11,12	regulator 51:9 53:23
_ ′		⁻	race 31:4	'	
	•	•	•	•	

					.
regulatory 60:12	99:15 107:4 108:14	108:2 122:11,18	ROBERT 2:19	R-015 74:1	sector-specific 92:22
63:19,23	128:1	123:12.15 133:22	RODERICK 2:4	R-015-ENG 121:10	92:24
reiterate 133:15	represented 114:15	resulted 120:18 132:8	role 61:7 66:11,13,15	R-018 49:1,19 50:13	see 2:10,12 3:8 4:24
rejected 59:25 74:10	representing 90:9	return 25:19 26:5	96:18 121:21 131:2	50:16	4:25 21:5,7 29:11
relate 29:13	119:11 121:20	returns 113:25	roll 61:11,16	R-106 50:14,15,18,20	29:16,18,24 30:3
related 115:24 118:3	128:25 132:14	reversion 102:23	room 34:16,23 38:20	R-111 98:23,23	32:17 34:22 36:19
131:25 132:2	represents 2:24 89:21	106:10,11 107:11	ROSE-MARIE 2:20	R-111 98:23,23 R-118 20:5	36:20 37:20 39:23
relates 35:1 36:10	Republic 95:16 118:7	107:18,22 108:2,8	ROSSI 2:18	R-243 60:4	
	-			R-243 60:4	45:8 48:15,16 50:24
69:10	120:13	108:16,23 109:8,11	RT 1:11		51:2 59:8 68:8
relating 82:2 84:9	request 28:17 88:13	122:18	rudimentary 11:22	S	70:11 78:17 85:23
114:8	108:5	revert 102:6 120:24	ruled 72:9	sake 127:19	89:8 101:8 102:12
relation 55:20 66:11	requested 29:2 55:10	reverted 71:17,20	rules 1:1 26:12 62:4	same 14:4,5 16:11	106:18,22 107:7,12
77:10 78:1 82:10	62:12 119:6	95:21 103:17,23	ruling 71:22 131:25	20:1 27:15 44:7	110:12,18 114:9
117:6 123:8 124:4	requesting 50:22	122:24	132:3	49:1 91:2 95:2	121:1 122:7 128:17
133:6,10 138:1	56:10 85:12	reverting 107:19	rulings 95:17 136:24	102:2 105:7 109:4	133:4 136:4,6
relationship 11:4	requests 105:9	review 65:17,23 69:21	Rwamasirabo 3:4	109:16 112:8 116:8	seeing 32:23 35:17
27:13 28:9,15 33:4	require 25:2,3 45:25	92:17	34:14 36:4,5,6,13	128:8,18	67:23 123:11,14
74:16	75:20 93:24	reviewed 64:9 65:6	36:16,18,20,22,25	SARAH 2:18	127:7
relevant 56:11 68:13	required 27:21 38:8	72:17 73:5,5,9,21	37:4,6,12,19,22	satisfactory 41:19	seek 93:2
relied 64:18 130:3	38:11,15 41:9,12,15	73:21 90:18	38:3 40:17 41:3	92:14	seem 1:22 122:10
relies 128:13	44:12 56:11 73:24	revisions 87:12	44:19 45:13,24	satisfied 77:15 84:3,18	seems 30:13 36:9
rely 109:12 128:24	75:17 79:20,22	revive 132:11	52:15 54:8,21 57:15	135:19	123:6 129:2 131:9
129:14 130:7	104:21 113:17	revoked 94:1	58:6,22 63:10 70:13	save 35:21 117:1	138:17
relying 110:6 129:22	125:1,9 126:22	re-application 65:18	70:23 72:22 73:13	saw 29:20 66:7 73:5,9	seen 13:10,16 29:10
129:23	requirement 5:19	94:7	80:13 82:19 83:7,17	82:14 85:8	66:4 85:7 98:21
rem 123:15	10:10 17:18 25:1	re-apply 94:4	85:7,20 86:14 87:12	saying 4:12 7:19 16:23	seizing 115:25
remain 68:25	46:6,22 58:13 84:18	Re-direct 3:6 83:10	Rwamasirabo's 39:1	17:24 27:19 80:11	sell 12:11 14:16 15:25
remained 53:2,6,20	94:4,7	re-examination 34:8	41:22 47:2,5 49:2	103:18 109:1 112:2	16:1,12 17:11 18:7
65:14,19 126:12	requirements 25:6	135:5	51:20 54:9,23 65:10	120:21	32:2
127:22	57:11,12 66:8 76:25	rhetorical 125:18,19	76:1,17 80:16 82:6	says 21:6,11 23:9,23	selling 13:15,21 17:16
remains 6:11 7:11	77:15,18 78:4,21,22	Richard 2:6 3:8 62:19	Rwanda 1:18 2:9,9	30:8 45:19 56:7,10	31:15,22
140:1	79:25 83:24,25 95:1	69:23 79:24 89:4	9:1,24 10:19 17:7	67:18 72:23 73:7	send 87:14,15
remember 31:2	111:19	RIEPA 30:16 32:22	17:18 18:11 19:13	79:1,10,18 80:6,11	sending 30:6
remind 133:17,25	requires 28:10 45:19	33:3,13	19:13 21:19 23:11	106:16 122:21	sense 9:20 15:23 16:15
remove 81:6	46:3,8,12 81:3,9,13	right 1:13,19,25 9:17	23:21 24:13 29:19	scale 4:22 8:6	16:18 17:2 52:10
rendered 94:19	113:22	13:5 15:12 16:16	30:19 31:9,14,20	scanning 29:25	87:20 100:3
renewal 69:17 70:1,4	research 39:18 90:24	18:1,21 20:14,20	33:20 37:16 43:10	scene 122:22,24	sensible 10:16 138:15
70:16 91:23 93:16	reserves 38:16 90:25	28:16 32:4 34:4	47:13 48:2,9,20	scope 67:11,16	138:17
renewed 69:15	resolution 137:21	38:1 40:15 43:13	49:22 50:25 51:4,12	screen 2:10 4:1 35:18	sent 58:4 86:25 115:4
repeal 68:2	resolve 97:1 136:15	47:4 48:19 52:23	52:1 56:4,8,22 57:6	36:7,17 37:20 57:19	sentence 7:21 8:25
repeat 16:3 31:17	resolved 122:10 133:2	53:1,1,5,5,13,14,17	58:8 60:13,18 61:1	63:9 89:5 110:7	19:2,7,9 39:14,16
36:11,14 37:5 39:9	resources 23:11,13,20	53:21 57:13 58:17	61:7,16 62:15 64:4	111:13,21	65:12 79:10 86:18
49:13 53:4 57:15	50:7 58:3 110:23	58:17,18 67:13	65:13,18 66:22 76:3	scroll 38:5,6 70:8	87:25 98:25 106:17
59:4,13 64:14,14	respect 5:18 12:23	69:17,25 70:4,16	91:10 95:6,16 102:6	99:24 110:3	106:19,20,21
66:18 99:25 119:22	44:12 59:11 69:4	73:18 77:16,20,20	102:23 103:17,22	scrolled 110:2	107:12,14 108:14
reply 50:7	70:7 73:19,19 74:2	79:6 80:2,7,8,9	104:5,21 110:24	season 15:2,3	115:4,5 119:22
report 22:22 23:4	78:5 94:10 118:9	84:22,23 86:1 87:5	113:16,22 114:12	seasonal 15:1	124:24
24:14 41:16 48:6	134:25	89:18 93:16 105:18	114:16,20 118:7	second 30:2 49:8	sentences 108:12
50:22 55:22 56:1,15	respective 109:7	106:1,4 107:16	120:13 128:1	56:15 57:3,17,24	separate 9:17
57:5 62:19 77:23,25	respond 7:7 56:14	108:4 109:16	Rwandan 6:11 7:11	69:13 70:20 74:19	separated 87:14
90:15 97:23,25	62:22	112:19 114:10	33:22 43:4,18 47:7	75:8 77:23,24 80:16	separately 86:19
98:10,13 101:21	responded 54:7 62:20	117:1 124:12	47:20 52:5,16 54:5	82:6,22 85:22 86:13	September 33:14
102:2 103:21,24	Respondent 1:19 2:5	132:23 134:21	55:2,5,16,19 56:12	87:9 88:7,20 97:23	105:5
107:24 110:15	35:4 99:15 128:8,11	135:15,16,20 140:1	56:24 59:6,10 71:24	98:24 102:25 103:8	sequentially 6:4
117:12 119:7	Respondent's 114:24	rights 10:21 12:16	72:14 76:8,12 77:9	103:22 106:17,20	series 3:15 79:22
122:16 129:9,25	responding 7:3 62:19	16:8 28:2 55:2,10	80:20 81:24 82:8,19	108:11 110:5	serve 134:17
reported 19:19 21:13	69:23	56:22 57:1 81:23	82:23 90:2 96:24,25	112:10 121:6	served 115:22 116:21
21:16 22:20 24:7,17	responds 78:1	91:25	98:14 104:4,16	seconds 38:22	set 23:3 60:10 61:5
reporting 23:15	response 50:9 58:19	right-hand 49:4 68:8	113:21 115:7,11	second-to-last 115:3	77:6 80:19 82:21
reports 13:9 38:16	58:21 59:18 130:14	rise 74:24 137:16	118:6 128:16	Secretary 1:22	83:24 106:22
86:16 90:23,25	responsibility 15:22	risk 127:16	133:10 136:18	section 20:9 25:20	sets 38:3 46:15 75:5
97:10 113:23	130:17,17	RM-001 43:12,14 99:8	Rwanda's 7:23 48:13	27:19 121:11	setting 90:5 96:4
represent 61:6	responsible 99:15	101:10	49:7 92:19	sector 4:14 5:14,18	settled 9:11,20
representation 112:25	rest 11:7 67:6 86:15	RM-002 74:18	R-009 135:25	10:9 15:1 42:15,16	Settlement 1:2
115:21 118:25	restrictions 31:21,25	RM-007 83:11 109:20	R-013 105:22 106:7	43:10 50:12 64:10	seven 75:9
127:24	32:1	RNRA 23:10,11,15,16	108:7	83:5 90:10	several 8:6 51:7,10
representative 2:15	result 47:17 86:25	23:24,24	R-014 71:23	sectors 5:16 31:21	57:25
*		,		500015 5.10 51.21	
				•	•

-b 04 16 111 22			-4 3 15 11	00-0-100-6-110-0	44 24.16.10
share 84:16 111:23	site 21:22	speak 2:16 37:7 65:1	stopped 15:11	99:2 100:6 110:9	test 24:16,18
132:7	sites 38:13	100:7 125:11	straightforward	123:23 124:10	testified 99:5
shared 22:2	sitting 34:21	128:24 133:4,9,9,15	91:15	139:23,24	testimony 26:3,8
shareholder 71:1 76:4	situation 62:14 128:10	speaker 38:21	stream 18:8	surprise 95:13	28:22 30:18 33:9
76:6 106:13 114:19	six 103:16 138:12,13	speaking 125:17 131:9	stress 126:18	suspending 108:15	66:4 67:7 83:19
114:19 116:14	138:14,16	specialising 63:22,22	strict 95:6	suspensive 43:21 44:3	87:13 88:8 101:24
122:11 137:17	size 86:24 138:9	specific 9:24 20:8	strikes 127:2	44:16 45:1,2,12,16	104:4,20,23 105:2,7
shareholders 71:17	skills 43:8	30:24 58:11 88:13	struck 119:20	45:18,19,25 46:3,9	105:24 106:2,9
84:13 107:19		88:18 97:9	studied 90:3		· ·
	slide 39:23 90:1,13			46:16,19,23 47:1	111:2,12 112:11
111:23 113:18	91:17 93:6 94:9,20	specifically 21:6 30:22	studies 48:7	91:8,12,13,16	113:21 115:10,20
114:16 115:8,12,15	95:23	specify 34:16	study 38:17 41:10,13	system 15:25 16:13	115:23 116:5,9,22
116:9 122:12,19,25	slightly 41:8 126:23	SPECIOZA 2:9	41:19 42:3 44:10,15	18:4 19:10,14,17	117:14 119:4
123:6,8 128:5 136:5	slips 139:7	spend 119:13	45:5,5 46:23 91:3	21:18 22:5,11,14,15	127:10 128:14
137:6,23	slower 99:10	spirit 80:5 84:21	91:18 92:6,9,10,13	23:15,25 24:1,7,9	text 3:25
shareholding 123:16	small 110:7	spoke 88:16 125:20	98:19 135:13	25:13 33:23 34:22	thank 1:13,20,21 2:18
128:13 132:6	smaller 87:6	spoken 125:5,10	subject 69:18 106:14	38:20 86:6	3:2 7:9 10:23 12:4
shareholdings 122:17	small-scale 6:24 7:2	STAFF 2:21	115:19		23:14 25:18 29:16
122:24 128:5	7:14,19 8:1,6,8	stakeholders 4:13	submission 56:10	T	34:7,9,11,11 35:6
shares 31:16,22 32:2	social 10:9,11	Stallard 1:23	submissions 139:17		37:9 38:7,25 43:15
·				tackle 123:19	· ·
71:6,13 80:10 84:23	society 10:10	stamp 114:7	submit 41:10 55:11	tag 15:25 16:12 21:22	44:9 47:6 50:19
94:14 95:21 107:19	sold 131:13	stand 73:9	79:23	tagged 17:18 21:22	54:20 55:25 70:9
107:22 117:4	solemnly 2:15 37:6	standard 80:21 82:11	submitted 41:13,16,18	tagging 18:4 19:10	83:7 85:16 88:23
120:24 122:9	89:12	82:24 83:3,6	60:6 66:6,8 78:20	23:15 24:1	89:15,23 96:15
sharpest 20:14	solicitation 30:24,25	standing 124:2,4	98:19 106:24	tags 13:15,21,25 14:16	97:18 98:1 106:8
short 6:23 49:8 54:17	some 2:25 7:13 9:10	Starck 71:13 94:15	subsequently 56:14	15:11 16:11 17:9,10	109:21 117:11
126:3 130:4	9:13,14 10:4 13:2,3	start 6:1 27:19 35:7	61:21	17:19,19,23,23 18:7	118:21 129:8
short-term 99:13	13:11,12,16 17:11	37:14 72:25	substances 81:10	18:19	135:21 138:4,6
102:13,16	21:1,11 27:23 28:12	started 5:5 21:19	substantial 6:14	take 1:5 18:16 26:15	140:1,3,4
show 98:5 102:3,20	30:18 34:25 35:16	22:12,13,14,18 23:8	substantive 87:22		their 4:22 8:1 10:5,5
109:22 116:21	36:10 37:1,14 54:21	30:16 60:17 72:13	101:22	26:17 32:14 38:22	11:12,18 12:12 14:2
shown 127:23	65:8 82:15 88:6	126:6	succeeded 33:2	54:1 58:14 74:13	14:6,24 15:4,6,7,10
shows 33:12 35:17	89:22 97:9 117:23	starts 27:7 106:19	successful 31:14	82:12 87:9 96:16	15:17,18,25 16:20
				97:4 104:14 109:25	
63:5,16 107:3	124:9 126:22 132:7	start[ed 73:15	sufficient 5:21 64:8,11	122:25 133:19,20	16:23,25 17:11,12
sic 82:25	135:7	state 60:21 81:19	64:11 86:16	136:23	17:22 18:14,17
side 39:3,3 49:4 98:3,3	somebody's 58:14	96:13 117:16	suggest 18:3 19:12	taken 17:10 42:18,22	21:14 22:22,23 25:4
108:6,7 109:19,19	somehow 124:8	131:12	34:24 51:17 116:2,3	58:18 82:18 92:24	25:6 27:11 28:11,13
111:20 123:10	someone 8:20 35:9	stated 29:21 78:11	139:10	95:6,7 98:9 127:6	28:14 31:16 32:2
sight 29:11	65:2 131:24	115:15 119:4	suggested 116:14	137:12	40:13,22 54:3 62:7
sign 62:18	something 19:21	126:11	131:17 138:14	takes 9:1 101:20	62:11 66:3 82:15
signature 86:15,17,19	88:19 112:17	statements 2:21 3:11	suggesting 134:19,20	taking 4:4 5:25 8:24	83:25 84:18 105:11
87:1 100:5	120:16 123:25	13:9 56:16 57:4,18	suggests 49:22 51:4	O	131:13 132:21
signed 8:12 32:22,24	130:25 134:16,19	57:24,25 58:1,4	summarised 21:1	16:2 18:2 22:6	137:7
33:18 62:17	sometimes 12:17,18	59:2,6 61:19,22	Summer 1:2	124:22 129:1,2	themselves 9:4 11:9
silence 49:25 50:1	somewhere 76:9	62:9,25 66:5,10,14	supplemental 6:7,9	132:10,11,15	thereof 94:11
				talk 102:13 106:9	
132:12	sorry 8:15 22:11 31:3	69:22 76:14 78:13	19:1 25:19 27:17	107:11 108:1 128:2	they'd 53:9,21 131:16
similar 69:19	36:1,16,22 37:19,24	86:14 108:24	32:19	talked 88:4,17 100:24	thing 16:17 17:2 87:16
simple 11:22	37:25 38:22,23	115:19 116:18,19	suppliers 28:14	107:19,22 114:25	92:21 93:4
simpler 105:14	43:13 44:23 47:5	127:10	support 2:21 42:25	127:21	things 5:9 11:20
simply 66:13 88:3	50:14,17,19,20	states 2:11,12,13,14	47:21 52:6,16 54:5	talking 8:10 9:3 19:10	think 1:11,23 2:8
92:1 109:4 134:16	55:25 58:22 62:2	2:15,16 48:2 78:17	55:11,19 56:25 76:8	22:5 79:19 88:12	14:15 19:15 32:21
134:18 136:19	64:16 70:3,11 77:24	107:2	82:9,20	98:6,8 102:15	33:12 38:2 40:17
simultaneously 21:24	81:2 99:24 118:15	static 87:2	supporting 95:9	108:14	47:4 50:17 51:8,8
since 21:19,23 23:20	119:22 122:3	statistics 25:10,11	supports 127:11 129:3		53:23 54:12 56:2
40:23 90:7 116:25	131:21 137:3	status 109:6,7 120:23	supposed 18:4 127:12	talks 4:17 98:2 110:17	57:25 58:5 59:13,17
126:13 139:20	sort 38:23	128:12,13	Supreme 74:2,11	111:16 117:4	63:10 67:19 68:18
				tell 14:20 15:14 19:4	
sincere 89:14	sought 65:2 72:4	stay 15:12	75:19,22 95:2,3	88:2,9 99:1 106:20	78:15,17 79:18 80:4
sir 2:12 4:10 5:8 6:20	94:22	staying 53:7	117:16 118:1,12	132:13	81:1,2 86:24,25
8:1,18 9:6 11:15	source 21:7 119:3,3	stemmed 52:11	120:3 121:3,7	telling 130:24	96:16 101:9 112:20
12:13 13:18 15:13	130:10	step 4:4 6:18	124:10,19 126:21	tend 7:4 8:2,3 11:21	113:3,9 116:12,20
16:3,17 17:13 18:11	sourced 21:12	STEVEN 2:3	130:19	tender 104:15,22	124:12 127:17,20
18:22 19:3 20:6,18	sources 21:10	still 7:11,23 14:4	sure 1:17 3:20 18:12	tends 15:1	135:4 137:9,24
23:13 24:22 26:1,21	space 7:17 86:16	35:19 43:13 52:14	18:25 20:10,21	term 4:5 8:22 32:7	thinking 32:18
32:14 46:11 99:23	Spalena 1:16 121:24	63:7,8 100:8,21	25:25 31:3,17 34:4		third 2:10 19:2,7
101:11 109:11	122:7,13 123:16	105:10 118:23	38:5,10,14,18 41:11	42:10	51:20 56:15,20 57:3
	125:25	stipulated 91:7,13	41:14,17,20,25	terms 15:14 45:13	57:17,24 65:11
112.9 110.22	143.43	_		47:14 50:3 73:24	
112:9 119:22 135:20	Spalonale 126.2	Stone 2.6.6			
135:20	Spalena's 126:3	Stone 2:6,6	42:11 54:15 60:19	98:8 108:5 121:20	74:13 76:17 98:25
	Spalena's 126:3 spanning 90:2	Stone 2:6,6 stop 15:22 17:6 53:24	42:11 54:15 60:19 74:3 86:11 97:11	98:8 108:5 121:20 terrain 9:24	THORNTON 2:13

thoroughly 128:11	117:10 128:4	ultimate 97:7 125:25	15:25 33:20 64:9	wasn't 13:23 16:2	we've 1:6,9,16 11:9,13
though 4:15 8:3 15:24	130:18,20 132:5,8	Umugwaneza 85:11		32:10 45:22 46:13	36:11 39:22 47:4
22:19 65:13 120:16	132:12	under 1:1 3:22 4:7	V	64:4 101:9 116:23	75:23 99:4 124:14
thought 37:2 62:21	transactions 128:18	12:6 13:6 16:12	v 1:17	125:18	125:6 126:1,4
112:5 116:4 126:5	132:1,2	18:6 19:22 20:24	vacuum 118:5,12	wasteful 11:23	127:21
133:25 134:13	transcribing 139:6	22:6 23:15 28:2	Vale 63:20,21	water 9:22 23:19	while 10:24 12:6 17:8
three 3:16 61:19,22	transcript 1:23 1:2	39:8,13,21,25 40:5	valid 52:9,14 53:15,20	WATKINS 2:22 2:1	126:17 133:24
70:11 74:8 84:12	67:1 116:3 138:25 139:14	40:8,14,18,25 41:8	65:19 117:7,8	34:21 35:13,19,25	whilst 53:2,6
94:18 104:25 139:10,11,15 140:1	transcripts 139:6	41:9,16,24 42:1 44:15,16 46:20	135:18	36:21 38:19,25 85:24 86:3 89:2	whil[e 53:7 whole 2:16 24:15 34:1
three-quarters 35:11	transfer 71:6,12 94:14	47:13 48:9,22 49:23	vanished 63:8	way 7:5 11:19 16:12	37:7 87:16 106:21
through 29:24,25 59:8	104:6,17,22 117:4,6	51:17 55:2,5,12,16	various 4:13 13:10	17:11 25:2 34:3	115:5
70:8 92:17 95:20	117:7,8 120:24	56:12 68:19,23 69:3	31:21 54:11 59:14 65:3 106:13	82:17 104:10 112:2	Williams 32:25 33:2
99:10 118:10	transfers 122:17	69:11 72:14 78:10	Vaughn 1:24	124:9 126:18,22,25	willing 30:21,22
119:23 121:23	transitional 68:19	80:20 81:16,24	verifiable 25:17	127:7 134:10	window 95:10
127:21 139:5	transmitted 110:10	82:22 91:2 92:23	version 3:22	ways 18:7 104:9	wish 27:1 117:17,21
throughout 30:19	treat 118:20	93:2,11 104:4,16	versions 1:19 41:7,9	weak 35:20	119:1,18 129:15
96:5	trend 10:7	114:7 118:6 122:5	41:12	Wednesday 1:7 1:1	130:8 131:6 140:2
time 1:2 3:23 4:9 5:1	Trevor 1:24	128:16	very 1:13 7:4 11:22,22	138:15	wishes 137:25
6:18,19,23 7:10,12	tribunal 1:22 2:23 3:7	underlying 117:9	11:23 14:3 18:2	week 139:11	withdrew 34:12 85:17
8:11,16 13:24 15:10	3:11,12,13,14 1:14	understand 4:12 5:8,8	21:20 25:11 29:13	weeks 138:12,13,14,16	138:7
19:25 20:1 21:19,24	34:6 35:22 36:9	5:18 16:3 17:5 31:3	34:9 35:20,20 58:11	139:10,11,15	witnesses 36:24 66:4
22:1,8 29:3 30:20	66:2 75:11 85:19	53:8 83:20 85:9	64:25 79:16,16,18	weight 77:19 128:21	96:22
31:16 35:7,9 44:7	89:17 93:8 96:20,20	87:8,10 89:16 91:18	85:16 86:4 95:6,10	well 7:15,18 13:11	WOLFENSTEIN 2:19
48:19 49:2 50:4,4,6 50:11,12 51:14 52:1	99:14,18,23 100:10 100:14,17,19,23	100:21 103:13	96:15,22,22 97:12	15:23 17:25 19:3,16 21:25 24:18 29:13	wonder 123:18 139:22
66:9 75:14 88:15	100:14,17,19,23	118:24 121:13 123:4,21 126:8,12	100:3 116:9,11,13	34:24 37:5 41:3	word 106:17 107:21
91:22 93:24 94:1	103:3,11 105:2,7	131:23 137:15	119:12,13 121:11	44:19 48:25 53:13	119:25
96:5 97:21 99:12	111:12 112:11	understanding 34:15	122:6,9 125:20	66:24 72:22 84:17	words 1:11 79:6
100:4 109:25 111:8	115:10 124:11	34:19 83:21 131:5	126:2,8 127:22 128:13,17 130:19	86:12 94:12 97:12	119:16
111:17 113:5,6	129:14,25 130:24	understood 13:25	130:21,25 134:7	100:3 104:13	work 10:1 11:9 14:21
114:20,25 117:1	133:17 134:7,13,25	15:24 16:2 26:11	137:18 138:4,4	105:13 109:18	15:3,7,7,18 18:4
119:13 120:17	135:9 139:5	30:10 31:17 32:1	139:14 140:3	112:5 118:21	worked 43:9 60:12
128:8	Tribunal's 115:18	114:11 125:24	vested 83:22	121:17 122:6,14,15	83:5
times 1:2,15 12:22	116:8	undertake 5:21	via 1:5	125:3 126:5 131:15	working 15:6 16:24
51:10	trigger 91:5	unequivocal 51:11	video 1:5 35:17	135:22 136:4	18:5 31:7,19 64:23
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10	troubled 118:24	unequivocally 131:5	video 1:5 35:17 view 1:15 2:4 21:9	137:23 138:4	126:18
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 tourism 5:14 towards 133:14	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13 track 19:23	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19 types 14:5 21:2	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1 17:14 23:16 27:16	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18 133:17	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24 98:5 127:15 139:25	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17 49:25 50:1,1 58:20
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 tourism 5:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13 track 19:23 tracked 19:14	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1 17:14 23:16 27:16 29:12	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24 98:5 127:15 139:25 we're 2:1 35:17 38:2	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:1,23 83:2 90:3
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 tourism 5:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13 tracked 19:23 tracked 19:14 Trade 2:14	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19 types 14:5 21:2 typing 87:23	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1 17:14 23:16 27:16 29:12 user-friendly 1:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18 133:17 wanted 8:23 20:20	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24 98:5 127:15 139:25 we're 2:1 35:17 38:2 38:19 86:3 130:23	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:1,23 83:2 90:3 90:12,24 91:1 131:13,13 132:19
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 tourism 5:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13 track 19:23 tracked 19:14	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19 types 14:5 21:2	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1 17:14 23:16 27:16 29:12	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18 133:17 wanted 8:23 20:20 25:4 31:13 33:6	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24 98:5 127:15 139:25 we're 2:1 35:17 38:2	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:1,23 83:2 90:3 90:12,24 91:1
timing 1:7 8:10 138:10 138:11 tired 20:15 title 20:12 77:16 titled 110:22 today 22:5 23:21 24:5 24:6 together 28:7 64:23 101:5 102:3 139:21 told 16:6 59:24,24 87:21,24 109:9 113:10 128:20 129:23 131:18,25 tolerated 15:21 TOMSON 2:6 tongue 139:7 tools 10:5 11:12,20,22 top 3:15 63:21 68:7 113:3 121:10,11 topic 54:13 119:5 127:19 total 24:20 50:1 touch 30:14 tourism 5:14 towards 133:14 traceability 21:18 traces 25:13 track 19:23 tracked 19:14 Trade 2:14	troubled 118:24 true 13:5 39:15,20,24 40:3,7 56:23 74:17 121:22 TRUMAN 1:11 Trust 90:5 truth 2:16,16,17 37:7 37:7,8 try 130:13 134:16 trying 31:4 32:17 73:13 85:24 100:8 111:11 112:9 118:24 123:18 124:25 127:18 134:12 turn 20:22 35:20 83:12,14 93:7 136:12 two 2:21 5:9 22:9 23:23 25:24 45:7 48:21 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:23 90:24 96:23 98:22 99:22 104:9 124:6 128:18 132:19 134:17 135:6 138:16 type 14:4 69:19 types 14:5 21:2 typing 87:23	unequivocally 131:5 unfair 67:19 unilaterally 59:24 unique 21:22 United 2:11,12,13,14 2:15,16 unlawful 71:9 94:18 unless 77:17 124:7 unofficial 27:7 unproductive 11:23 unqualified 51:11 unsafe 11:22 unsatisfactory 91:19 unsolicited 104:11 unstable 86:4 until 14:11 68:25 97:15 unusual 15:5 93:22 update 113:15 120:15 upheld 95:1,3 117:15 120:3 upholding 128:15 upwards 25:13 use 1:7 4:10 11:20,21 11:25 12:16,17,19 13:15 14:16 32:7 used 11:1,16 12:1 17:14 23:16 27:16 29:12 user-friendly 1:15	view 1:15 2:4 21:9 66:3 95:7 122:15 123:1 violated 55:9 56:22 violation 55:1,7,16 56:5,25 violations 55:20 visible 38:6 vis-à-vis 66:22 vitae 60:6 vocational 60:24 void 71:14 94:19 volume 21:21,23 voluntarily 27:1 W wait 2:24 59:23 waited 58:20 waiting 30:8,9 34:23 walk 10:4 11:12 want 1:17 20:10,19 21:7 25:25 31:23 43:12 50:20 60:25 74:14 99:12 102:18 110:9 126:18,24 129:6 131:18 133:17 wanted 8:23 20:20 25:4 31:13 33:6 84:22 86:1 87:18	137:23 138:4 139:14,25 140:1 went 14:15 17:4 30:17 were 9:8,9 11:3 12:4,8 12:8 14:6 15:8,12 15:16,16,19 16:24 17:10 19:11,22 21:3 22:20 26:11 29:18 30:21 32:6,8,9 42:1 51:15 58:2,4 61:7 62:25 63:2 68:11,13 69:3,21 73:4 74:5 74:10 75:21 85:13 87:17,23 91:15,22 93:10,14,17,19,25 96:1 99:1,5,14,18 102:15 106:14 112:6 113:12 115:15 117:16 118:4 119:11 121:14 122:8,23 126:17 128:20 131:10,24 134:1 137:6,12 weren't 14:16 15:11 we'll 35:11,12 41:4 43:11 50:18 97:24 98:5 127:15 139:25 we're 2:1 35:17 38:2 38:19 86:3 130:23	126:18 works 19:17 26:7,13 world 10:19 worrying 125:23 wouldn't 11:25 28:22 52:9,10 126:19 134:3 wrap 28:11 wrapping-up 26:22 writing 103:9 133:18 written 102:8,20 103:4,5 105:1,11 132:20 wrong 49:21 50:17 51:3,6,13,17,19 67:18,22 79:16,16 126:21 134:16,19 wrote 20:12,17 Y year 4:23 8:12 21:18 22:11 23:8 48:18,18 50:9 59:23 years 7:13 21:4,11 22:9 23:23,24 38:17 49:25 50:1,1 58:20 59:1,23 83:2 90:3 90:12,24 91:1 131:13,13 132:19

	ı	ı	ı	ı	,
Zarnacks 71:18 95:22	2.15 54:18	120:10,18 121:14	100:25 101:14		
107:23 114:8,15	2.2 38:8	126:11	67's 99:20		
117:17,20 118:2,4	2.3 38:11	3.11 83:9	69 101:6,16		
118:18 119:1,4,11	2.5 38:15 41:10,16	3.16 85:18	0, 101.0,10		
119:17 122:19,22	20 6:8,20 74:19 90:3	3.24 89:3	7		
	· ·				
122:23 128:1,25	115:2,7	3.25 89:24	7 25:20 47:3,20 48:25		
129:15 130:8 131:5	2001 90:4	3.41 97:14	49:1,11,15,21 51:3		
131:10,24 132:9,21	2004 33:11,14,20,25	30 4:23 38:22 54:14	51:12 52:19 60:5		
134:8 136:7	90:6	136:12	94:20		
zero 133:6	2005 90:12	30th 1:7 1:1	75 68:1		
zoom 1:5 8:20 29:11	2005-2010 32:7	30-year 5:6,23	77 43:17,18 44:17 45:3		
zoomed 76:11	2006 111:5	33 67:2 76:18	45:19,25 46:8,11		
	2007 60:15 68:11	34 76:18,23	91:9		
0	69:25 70:4 90:12	36 3:4	78 46:14,18 91:9		
02 107:3	93:14	360 34:22	76 40.14,18 91.9		
02 107:3	2008 50:5 59:15 67:25	360-degree 35:21			
	68:24 69:11 93:11	37 3:5	8		
1		37 3.3	8 3:13 95:23		
1 60:20 69:7,10 70:2	95:13 114:5 117:3		83 3:6		
70:11 84:5 90:19	2009 50:21 51:6 68:9	4	85 3:7		
125:24	2011 21:16,18 22:5,11	4 2:6,6 38:17 41:5,24	89 3:8		
1st 33:25	22:13 23:8,9 43:14	42:1 44:8,16 45:14			
1.07 36:3	43:18 47:24 102:10	47:14 50:22 90:23	9		
1.09 37:10	103:16	91:2,17 98:5,11,14	-		
1.40 54:16	2012 23:9 49:4 93:18	99:16 100:15,20	9 54:10,11,24,25 55:18		
	105:5,16 107:3	101:3,18 106:5	65:11,12		
10 55:4 65:16 72:2	108:15	108:7 109:13	90 3:9 26:15,18 28:25		
11 55:9	2014 13:14 55:12	4th 124:13 125:2,5	30:9		
112 3:11	59:15,18 68:16,20		97 3:10		
117 3:12	80:22,25 93:10	4.10 97:15			
118 68:1	110:12,16,19,24	4.23 97:16			
119 3:13 68:5	111:3,4 112:14	41 81:1			
12 54:10,11,24 55:14	· ·	45 99:9 122:15			
55:18	120:10,18 121:9,14	46 107:25			
12th 33:11,24	124:13 125:2,5	47 95:12 101:8,10			
12.00 1:3	126:11	117:13 119:1,15,23			
12.02 2:2	2015 29:9,15 60:12,17	122:15 129:7,10			
12.03 2:19 3:3	80:23	47-48 77:24			
13 65:21 81:21	2016 60:22	49 78:25			
13 05.21 81.21 13th 105:5,16	2017 61:8				
•	2019 61:11,15	5			
135 3:14	2020 62:1 97:25				
138 3:15	2021 1:7 1:1	5 39:2,5 41:21,23 67:1			
14 55:23 74:4,5 75:12	21 56:21	67:3 80:17 90:24			
14.2 74:19,22	212 113:4,9	93:6			
15 75:4 101:23	22 56:21 76:20 77:11	5-10 80:17,19 82:7			
151 95:16 118:8	77:11 78:1,14,16	5.2 62:4			
120:12	79:7,17 80:11 83:15	5.40 135:8			
17 72:8 76:2,11 97:24		5.50 140:5			
98:2,6,14	83:17,21 85:2	50 43:16 79:9			
18 19:2 61:12,16 102:2	109:20,21 110:14	52 68:17,18 70:2,20			
102:12 103:8 105:1	110:17,21 111:2,7	93:10			
18th 62:1	111:14,16 112:2	53 55:23 57:4,17,19,21			
19th 29:9,15	22nd 114:5 117:3	54 1:8 55:23 56:3			
1971 68:3,14 69:3	24 8:17	56 56:7 57:5,17,21			
93:15	24th 61:8	58 101:23 102:1,5,22			
1976 68:2	25 26:2,10 112:8,12,23	103:4,11,18 105:3			
1976 08:2 1995 90:4	25,000 1:10	103.4,11,10 103.3			
1773 70.4	26 26:3,10 27:18 80:22				
	81:1,3,18	6			
2	265 113:10	6 1:9 42:5 51:21 52:16			
2 3:1,2 1:8 38:3,6	27 80:22 81:1,13,13,18	80:23 81:22 94:9			
39:22 40:1,5,14	27th 97:25	136:6			
45:4 46:11 48:5	= 1 (11) 1 . 23	6th 68:9 108:15			
60:9 62:3 63:18		60 30:8 59:16,17			
69:6 75:12 84:5,5,8	3	66 83:14,16 99:24,25			
90:1,19,20 91:7	3 3:3 1:9 20:22 41:5	100:3,13,18 101:2			
101:5,15	44:8 61:24 84:5	100.3,13,18 101.2			
-	90:13,22				
2nd 47:24 103:16	3rd 110:12,19,24	67 83:15,16 99:8,9,23			
121:9	111:3,4 112:14	99:25 100:12,17,24			
	,				