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

Monday, 28th 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

-v-

GOVERNMENT OF RWANDA

Respondent

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

\_\_\_\_\_

# INDEX

PA	GE
Discussion re procedural matters	1
MR ANTHONY EHLERS (continued)	9
Cross-examination by MR COWLEY (continued)	9
Re-direct examination by MR HILL2	7
MR JOHN BOSCO NSENGIYUMA (called)2	9
Direct examination by MR HILL2	9
Cross-examination by MR COWLEY3	1
Re-direct examination by MR HILL7	8
MR EVODE IMENA (called)8	0
Direct examination by MR HILL8	1
Cross-examination by MR COWLEY8	2
Tribunal questions	8

Day 6 -- Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits

ICSID Case No. ARB/18/21

Monday, 28 June 2021

12:06 1	Monday, 28th June 2021	12:10 1	turned it over to him and his son, who speaks English,
2	(Transcript times are British Summer Time)	2	and his son and he went through it and whatever edits
3	(12.06 pm)	3	they had or changes they had before coming back to us
4	MR KAPLAN: Mr President, we are ready to begin Day 6.	4	were made.
5	(Pause)	5	So we were not in the active discussion in which he
6	THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, Mr Cowley and Mr Hill.	6	signed it; it was he and his son, at least, sitting down
7	(Pause)	7	and going over it.
8	The Tribunal has been debating the Claimants'	8	THE PRESIDENT: Well, what I particularly wanted to ask you
9	request to introduce an additional letter and the	9	about was the position of Mr Rwamasirabo, because we
10	Respondent's response to this, seeking in their turn to	10	have had put on the record a declaration from him, and
11	introduce a further letter should the Claimants' request	11	he declares, "I am independent of the parties, their
12	be granted. We would propose, subject to hearing any	12	counsel and the Tribunal". The Tribunal would just like
13	objection from counsel, that both of these letters	13	to know precisely what role he has been playing in these
14	should be placed on the record, without prejudice to the	14	proceedings, and the basis on which he is retained.
15	question of whether they are relevant.	15	MR COWLEY: We have not retained him, and I don't have any
16	I see Mr Hill nodding.	16	more information about it than that. Mr Rwamasirabo,
17	MR HILL: Yes, we're content with that. We're content.	17	for the purposes of Mr Bidega's witness statement and
18	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.	18	then later the conversation which I was involved in, the
19	MR COWLEY: Your Honour, may I ask for a slight modification	19	preparation for this hearing, going over the details of
20	of that? Can we ask that they put on the record subject	20	how it would happen, I know set up the discussion, you
21	to a discussion, if there's time, in this hearing as to	21	know, contacted Mr Bidega to bring him into the
22	the differences we perceive as to the grounds on which	22	discussion with us. I thought it was in his office, so
23	these two requests are made, such that one or both may	23	he was playing a facilitator to make sure the
24	be subject to being stricken; in other words, not	24	conversation could happen, and was there to answer any
25	a final decision to admit, and revisit the issue if	25	questions about the interpretation. We had to make sure
	Page 1		Page 3
12:08 1	there's a difference, but not take up that time right	12:11 1	he understood what we were saying, and Mr Rwamasirabo
2	now?	2	was there.
3	THE PRESIDENT: I'm not minded to do that. If they're	3	But it wasn't anything more than you know, in
4	placed on the record without prejudice to the question	4	that instance, it wasn't anything more than, for lack of
5	of whether they are relevant, if they're not relevant	5	a better term, an informal interpreter, making sure he
6	they will carry no weight whatsoever and it will be as	6	understood what we were telling him, timing, what we
7	if they were not on the record. But we can defer that	7	were doing, making sure he had copies of his witness
8	discussion to later.	8	statement. And we went through Mr Rwamasirabo's
9	But, Mr Cowley, there's one matter I would like	9	communication, I believe it was in his office, a Zoom
10	a little assistance with. As I understand what you told	10	meeting. So that's the role that I know he played with
11	me when Mr Bidega had ceased giving his evidence, his	11	this: a facilitator.
12	* *	12	THE PRESIDENT: Well, thank you. We'll leave that there for
13	Mr Rwamasirabo. Is that right?	13	the moment.
14	MR COWLEY: Mr Rwamasirabo assisted us in setting up	14	MR HILL: Mr President, could I just pick up on one part of
15	a discussion with him. I believe it was as	15	the answer from Mr Cowley, where he said that, as
16		16	I understood, his firm haven't retained Mr Rwamasirabo.
17	discussions with regard to the drafting of a witness	17	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
18	statement that they were in his office; if they were	18	MR HILL: We are still rather perplexed about whether he is
19		19	or is not being presented as essentially an expert
20	Mr Rwamasirabo, wherever they occurred.	20	witness in these proceedings. It seems to be becoming
21	He was present to help explain what we were saying	21	even more confusing as a result of that answer.  Lyonder if Mr Cowley could be clear whether be is
22	and explain to us what Mr Bidega was saying. But then we took to try to write it up, submit it to him so he	22 23	I wonder if Mr Cowley could be clear whether he is purporting to be an expert in these proceedings or not.
23 24	could understand it, and we were told by Mr Rwamasirabo	23	MR COWLEY: Shall I respond, your Honour?
25	that he read it to him, told him what it said, but then	25	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please.
23	and no read it to min, told min what it said, but then	23	The state of the s
	Page 2		Page 4

	NO CONTROL OF THE STATE OF THE	10.15	
12:13 1	MR COWLEY: The discussions happened long before Mr Hill	12:15 1	again. And we heard at that time that the Respondent
2	became involved, and they haven't changed because we've	2	, ,
3	never discussed any open issues. But the issue was	3	
4	raised initially by a challenge to us whether we could	4	opinion, but I guess they were still reserving the
5	submit the second witness statement of Mr Rwamasirabo,	5	argument as to what capacity he would be in.
6	and a position was taken that he would need to be	6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7	an expert; it wasn't accepted that we could submit the	7	question whether there's anything that hinges on the
8	witness statement.	8	
9	So we began a discussion that we disagreed. We	9	1 & C
10	explained our position. We did not believe we hadn't	10	1 1 6 7 6
11	retained him as an expert. He was not opining as to the	11	·
12	law; he was defending his initial statement as to what	12	
13	he did, what he analysed, and his work with the	13	
14	Claimants that did not go forward. He wasn't retained	14	,
15	to bring a case in Rwanda, so he wasn't hired in that	15	<b>3</b> , <b>3</b>
16	capacity. But he did review the file, and he's someone	16	
17	who has the practical experience of representing other	17	
18	concession holders.	18	
19	So that's how NRD came to initially contact him.	19	·
20	They did not go forward with him. And he provided	20	1 1 0
21 22	a witness statement as to what he had in his file with regard to NRD's application and his own experience as to	21 22	
23	how the concession process works. He's talking about		****
23	his practical experience.	23 24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
25	So we said he was a fact witness. And if challenged	25	,
23	50 we said he was a fact withess. And if chancinged	23	for anything more. We did not have him sit through the
	Page 5		Page 7
12:14 1	in terms of his statements as to what he does and how he	12:17 1	hearings and listen, as experts are allowed; we're not
2	works with concession holders and what they do, what	2	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.
2 3	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the	2 3	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.
2 3 4	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free	2 3 4	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but
2 3 4 5	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't	2 3 4 5	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.
2 3 4 5 6	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said:	2 3 4 5 6	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as
2 3 4 5 6 7	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.	2 3 4 5 6 7	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant. But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness statements.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker. So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant. But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness statements.  As it came to be, when we had the initial hearings in this case, there was no further excuse me, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker.  So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant.  But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to the Tribunal that some of it was evidence of law. So if one is trying to categorise his statement, it seems to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness statements.  As it came to be, when we had the initial hearings in this case, there was no further excuse me, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker.  So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant.  But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to the Tribunal that some of it was evidence of law. So if one is trying to categorise his statement, it seems to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness statements.  As it came to be, when we had the initial hearings in this case, there was no further excuse me, the scheduling hearings before this proceeding that was one of the open issues, because it was never discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker.  So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant.  But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to the Tribunal that some of it was evidence of law. So if one is trying to categorise his statement, it seems to the Tribunal that it is, at least in part, expert evidence of Rwandan law, and the Tribunal wouldn't wish
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	works with concession holders and what they do, what they expect, on an idea that he has misunderstood the law or doesn't appreciate the law, he's perfectly free to explain his understanding of the law, and he doesn't need to be an expert. And Respondent's counsel said: no, they disagree.  So we said, "Well, then we're prepared to engage him as an expert", and we gave them a statement that he was prepared to go forward in that capacity and we asked them, "Let's have a discussion. We think he can do what he's done just as a fact witness. If you disagree" we gave them the materials that they said were lacking for an expert. We said, "We can discuss you having more time, us going back and redoing, engaging him fully as an expert, to analyse the law more broadly than the narrow issues he discussed", and they never we never picked up the discussion, ever. So it was just left as an open issue, and we were waiting to see if they were going to go forward with a challenge to his witness statements.  As it came to be, when we had the initial hearings in this case, there was no further excuse me, the scheduling hearings before this proceeding that was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	proposing to have him make a presentation on his own.  We didn't ask for any of those things.  MR HILL: Well, I'm grateful for the clarification, but  I would just put down my marker in light of that.  Mr Cowley has confirmed he is put forward as a factual witness. We will be saying he doesn't really have any relevant, admissible factual evidence he can give. And he's not being tendered as an expert, and that would also mean he doesn't have any evidence on which he can really assist this Tribunal. I just put down that marker.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you've put down the marker.  So far as the Tribunal is concerned, we agreed that his evidence could be called because there was no issue as to that. When a witness gives evidence, there's always the opportunity for counsel to challenge the admissibility or the relevance of the evidence given. When we come to that evidence, then there may be challenges to it on the basis that it is irrelevant.  But having looked at the evidence, it did seem to the Tribunal that some of it was evidence of law. So if one is trying to categorise his statement, it seems to the Tribunal that it is, at least in part, expert

12:18	1	to shut that out on the technical ground that he's being
12.10		to shut that out on the technical ground that he's being

- 2 called as a witness of fact and not as a witness of law.
- 3 So let us proceed.
- 4 MR COWLEY: May I ask Mr Kaplan: is Mr Ehlers available now?
- 5 MR KAPLAN: Yes, Mr Ehlers is in the waiting room, and it
- 6 sounds like we're ready for him and to continue.
- 7 MR COWLEY: May I have just two minutes? Because when we
- 8 were informed he wasn't available, I brought up all the
- 9 exhibits on my laptop for the other witness. So let me
- just bring the right ones up.
- 11 THE PRESIDENT: Alright. Put your house in order. (Pause)
- 12 (12.20 pm)
- 13 MR ANTHONY EHLERS (continued)
- 14 MR COWLEY: Thank you for the opportunity to get the right
- exhibits up on my computer. I'm ready to go forward.
- 16 MR EHLERS: Good afternoon.
- 17 MR COWLEY: Good afternoon, Mr Ehlers.
- 18 (12.20 pm)
- 19 Cross-examination by MR COWLEY (continued)
- 20 Q. In 2011, shortly after being terminated by NRD's new
- 21 owners, you immediately began working on an application
- 22 to obtain one of their concessions out from under them;
- 23 correct?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. And the entity that you worked through, or under the

- 12:23 1 A. Not at all.
  - 2 O. You will agree that you did not respond to a public
  - 3 announcement that the ministry was accepting
  - 4 applications for a Nemba concession; correct?
  - 5 A. No, I didn't respond to a public announcement.
  - 6 Q. And the application that's attached to this cover
  - 7 letter, you prepared; correct?
  - 8 A. Yes, I submitted it.
  - Q. You prepared the application for the allocation of Nemba
  - 10 vast mining and exploration licence to MVM. You
  - 11 prepared that document; correct?
  - 12 A. Yes.
  - 13 Q. And to do so, you relied on the information, data and
  - documents on your laptop that you have been holding
  - since leaving NRD; correct?
  - 16 A. Yes, correct.
  - 17 Q. You admit that you knew it was NRD's information that
  - 18 you were using; correct?
  - 19 A. Yes.
  - 20 Q. In your supplemental witness statement -- if I could ask
  - 21 that FTI bring that up as well, and focus specifically
  - on paragraph 33.
  - 23 In this paragraph you explain, if I could draw your
  - 24 attention to the last sentence of the paragraph, that
  - you "accept that it may have been wrong" to use that

# Page 11

- 12:21 1 name of, was Mountain Valley Mining; is that correct?
  - 2 A. That's correct. It's an Australian company.
  - 3 Q. And the concession that you went after to try to get
  - 4 away from NRD is the Nemba concession; is that correct?
  - 5 A. That's correct.
  - 6 O. If I could ask FTI to bring up Exhibit C-181.
  - 7 As a result of the efforts you made with Mountain
  - 8 Valley Mining to pursue the Nemba -- excuse me, let me
  - 9 restate the question I started.
  - 10 As part of the efforts you made with Mountain Valley
  - 11 Mining to go after NRD's Nemba concession, you
  - submitted, on June 13th 2011, an application for that
  - 13 concession; correct?
  - 14 A. Correct.
  - 15 Q. Now, at this time the Ministry of Mines had not publicly
  - 16 announced that they were accepting applications from
  - 17 others for the award of the Nemba concession; correct?
  - 18 A. I'd heard very strong rumours, and I wanted to put us on
  - 19 the list.
  - 20 Q. In fact, you were creating the rumours; correct?
  - 21 A. I beg your pardon?
  - 22 Q. You were creating the rumours; correct?
  - 23 A. Sorry, you're breaking up. I was doing what?
  - 24 Q. You were creating the rumours that NRD was in trouble
  - with the Nemba concession; correct?
    - Page 10

- 12:25 1 information, to use NRD's information, for the purpose
  - 2 of submitting an application for a concession owned by
  - 3 NRD; you acknowledge that, right?
  - 4 A. Yes, I do.
  - 5 Q. But you justify it by saying you thought you were owed
  - 6 money, so it was appropriate; correct? (Pause)
  - 7 Mr Ehlers --
  - 8 A. Did you hear me?
  - 9 Q. I didn't hear any answer, so I'll ask the question
  - 10 again?
  - 11 A. I heard you.
  - 12 Q. Could I ask the question again, so it's clear what
  - 13 you're answering?
  - 14 A. Yes, sure, sure, sure.
  - 15 Q. You justify using the NRD data and information on your
  - laptop in order to pursue an application to get one of
  - 17 the concessions out from under NRD because you say you
  - were owed money by NRD and you felt aggrieved by how
  - 19 Mr Marshall treated you; correct?
  - 20 A. Yes, that's correct.
  - 21 Q. You admit that as of this time, as of June 2011, you
  - 22 hadn't filed a claim for unpaid wages in any court
  - 23 proceeding in Rwanda; correct?
  - 24 A. The -- my wages, or my salary, I never used -- I never
  - 25 had ever submitted an invoice; it was paid automatically

- 12:27 1 into my bank account. But by -- I'm not quite sure
  - 2 exactly when I started action against NRD, but it must
  - 3 be round -- it must be -- I'm sure I'd started the
  - 4 action long before that.
  - 5 Q. You'll agree that you don't present any evidence of
  - an action against NRD in your witness statements;
  - 7 correct?
  - 8 A. Yes. I don't have evidence of that.
  - 9 Q. You'll agree, won't you, that the value of whatever
  - wages weren't paid for a month or so, that you say the
  - money didn't go into your bank account, pales in
  - 12 comparison to the value of owning the licence rights to
  - the Nemba concession; don't you?
  - 14 A. Yes, that's correct.
  - 15 Q. And because your focus immediately upon being
  - 16 terminated -- and if I could ask FTI to close the
  - witness statement document and if you bring up C-181,
  - just so that the witness can look at it if he needs to
  - 19 refer to it. I don't have a specific question.
  - You'll agree that because your attention was turned,
  - almost immediately upon termination, to preparing that
  - document, C-181, the "Application for the Allocation of
  - 23 Nemba Vast Mining and Exploration Licence", that in
  - order to give that application any meaning, in order to
  - 25 get in line or put your name in, as you suggested
    - Page 13

- 12:31 1 Q. Mr Marshall wasn't even owner or engaged at that time in
  - 2 the sale transaction; correct?
  - 3 A. That's correct.
  - 4 Q. You oversaw the preparation of the November 2010
  - 5 application; correct?
  - 6 A. That's correct.
  - 7 Q. When you did that, you didn't say to the Ministry of
  - 8 Mines, "We concede that we're not entitled to licences
  - 9 going forward for these concessions", did you?
  - 10 A. Just repeat that, please. You broke up a bit.
  - 11 Q. Sure. Sorry.
  - When you were managing director of NRD, and
  - overseeing the submission of the November 2010
  - 14 application, you didn't communicate to the Ministry of
  - 15 Mines on behalf of NRD, "We concede that we're not
  - entitled to licences going forward", did you?
  - 17 A. No, I did not.
  - 18 Q. Your position was, as managing director of NRD, that the
  - 19 application you were submitting was sufficient to be
  - awarded the licences going forward for those five
  - 21 concessions; correct?
  - 22 A. No, that's not correct. The -- very soon after
  - 23 I submitted that application, I had a meeting with
  - 24 Dr Michael from OGMR, and he told me that NRD had not
  - done enough exploration and there was still a lot of

- 12:29 1 earlier, you needed to create vulnerability for NRD's
  - 2 continued holding of the Nemba concession; right?
  - $3\,$   $\,$  A. Sorry, I'm not following you. What do you mean by
  - 4 "vulnerability"?
  - 5 Q. You needed to create the rumours and questions about
  - 6 whether NRD was going to be able to hold the Nemba
  - 7 concession because you wanted to get it; correct?
  - 8 A. Yes, I wanted it, but I didn't have any need to create
  - 9 rumours.
  - 10 Q. Well, you'll agree, sir, that while you were managing --
  - 11 let's take a step back.
  - The status in June 2011 was that NRD had pending
  - with the Ministry of Mines an application for licences
  - 14 going forward in the Nemba concession and the four
  - others that NRD was originally awarded; correct?
  - 16 A. Correct.
  - 17 Q. That application was submitted in November 2010;
  - 18 correct?
  - 19 A. Correct.
  - 20 Q. At the time, in November 2010, you were the managing
  - 21 director of NRD; correct?
  - That's correct.
  - 23 Q. And you had no hint that you were going to be fired in
  - a few months; correct?
  - 25 A. Yes, correct.
- Page 14

- 12:32 1 work required.
  - 2 Q. And if that happened --
  - 3 A. Rather than --
  - 4 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't know you were still talking, sorry.
  - 5 A. Yes, there was a lot more work required and the
  - 6 environmental impact assessment had not been completed,
  - 7 if I remember correctly.
  - 8 Q. Well --
  - 9 A. So Dr Michael specifically asked me to finish the EIA.
  - 10 But the company had not done sufficient exploration,
  - 11 according to Dr Michael.
  - 12 Q. If that had happened -- well, strike the question, I'll
  - 13 start again
  - 14 At the time of this conversation you were still
  - managing director of NRD, you said; correct?
  - 16 A. That's correct.
  - 17 Q. You reported to the owner of the holding company, which
  - was a Starck subsidiary; correct?
  - 19 A. Correct.
  - 20 Q. So the people who were paying you were at Starck, and
  - 21 they expected you to carry out and protect their
  - 22 interests and their investment in Rwanda through NRD;
  - 23 correct? (Pause)
  - I believe we may have lost -- I'm sorry, sir, but if
  - you answered, it was all lost, in terms of the audio

- 12:34 1 transcript. So I'm going to ask the question again --
  - 2 A. Yes, it's correct. I was -- as MD, I was still looking
  - 3 after Starck's interests.
  - 4 Q. So you knew --
  - A. After my meeting with Dr Michael -- after my meeting 5
  - with Dr Michael, I immediately spoke to Starck and
  - explained to them that not sufficient exploration had
  - 8 been done.
  - 9 Q. You've not produced any document from your laptop
  - 10 supporting the idea that there were communications
  - 11 between you and Starck after November 10th 2010 in which
  - 12 you reported upon the so-called "discussion" with
  - 13 Dr Mike; correct?
  - 14 A. Yes, that laptop has been stolen a long time ago: it was
  - 15 stolen out of my car. So I don't have that information.
  - 16 But that type of communication would have been
  - 17 telephonic and in writing.
  - 18 Q. And you never produced a copy of the writing, from
  - 19 whatever source, in which you told Starck about
  - 20 a meeting you had with Dr Mike; correct?
  - 21 A. Yes, because I don't -- I don't have that information.
  - 22 I -- can I carry on?
  - 23 Q. Well, I have to ask another question.
  - 24 A. I think --
  - 25 Q. I'm sorry?

- 12:38 1 A. No. I can't remember exactly when we started the
  - environmental work. I can't remember. But yes --
  - 3 Q. But NRD didn't give you access --
  - 4 A. -- it was ... NRD did not give me access?
  - 5 Q. Sir, I just want to apologise for speaking over you and
  - try to explain it, in case it helps us to limit it.
  - 7 A. No, I'm listening. It's -- we are breaking up a bit.
  - Q. That's the problem. So if I do start talking over you,
  - I apologise. I will try to stop and have you pick back
  - 10 up what you were talking about. Just let me know.
  - 11 A. Sure.
  - 12. Q. You'll agree that you had no access to the Nemba
  - concession, after being terminated and before submitting
  - 14 the application to Mountain Valley Mining, to improve on
  - 15 any of the data or information that was included in the
  - November 2010 application for NRD; correct? 16
  - 17 A. That's correct.
  - 18 Q. But you thought that same data and information in
  - 19 June 2011 was good enough to get the Nemba concession
  - 20 awarded to you on behalf of Mountain Valley Mining?
  - 21 A. I think ... yes.
  - 22 Q. Isn't it true that your discussion --
  - 23 A. I hadn't --
  - 24 Q. I apologise.
  - 25 A. I'm listening.

# Page 19

- 12:36 1 A. Sure.
  - Q. I was going to ask another question and then we can go 2
  - 3
  - 4 A. Yes, sure. I'm listening.
  - 5 Q. You submitted the application on behalf of Mountain
  - 6 Valley Mining that's been marked C-181 based solely on
  - 7 the information on your laptop that you had to use for
  - 8 the NRD application in November 2010; correct?
  - 9 A. Correct.
  - 10 Q. So your testimony is that after submitting the
  - 11 application for NRD, you were told that the data
  - 12 provided did not show sufficient exploration; and yet
  - 13 you submitted the same data again in June 2011,
  - 14 expecting to receive the concession on behalf of another
  - 15 company. Correct?
  - 16 A. Yes, but I was -- we were prepared to do the exploration
  - 17 which was required.
  - Q. But you hadn't done any exploration between getting 18
  - 19 fired by Mr Marshall and submitting the June 2011
  - 20 application on behalf of Mountain Valley Mining;
  - 21 correct?
  - 22 A. That's correct. There was no way that I could go and
  - 23 explore or do drilling on that concession.
  - 24 Q. You couldn't go and do an environmental impact
  - 25 assessment on the Nemba concession either; correct?

14

- 12:39 1 Q. I think I cut off what you had to say, so I'm sorry,
  - 2 sir. But I don't think, if you did say something, it's
  - 3 recorded.
  - A. No, that's alright. If you carry on, I can add.
  - 5 Q. So isn't it true that your discussion with Dr Mike was
  - 6 not about things that needed to be improved on for NRD,
  - 7 but how you and he could work together so that the
  - 8 concession could be taken from NRD and given to
  - 9 a company you controlled?
  - 10 A. No, I never had any of that discussion of that nature
  - 11 with Dr Michael. I don't know who has met Dr Michael,
  - 12 but Dr Michael is a very, very honourable man, and
  - 13 Rwanda isn't a country where the head of geology would
  - be giving away tenders or be giving away concessions 15 based on some underhand dealings. Dr Michael -- that is
  - 16 not Dr Michael's character. And in Rwanda, if you had

  - 17 to do that, you would end up in jail very, very quick.
  - 18 It is a country with zero corruption, or perhaps one of
  - 19 the less corrupt countries in Africa.
  - 20 No, I never had any discussion of that nature with 21 Dr Michael.
  - 22 Q. You've seen the information and exhibits that were put 23
  - forward by Respondent, or at least you've seen some of 24 the exhibits and information that had been put forward
  - 25 by Respondent that relate to you, and you used some of

Page 20

12:41 1	them or referred to some of them in doing your witness	12:45 1	document, not your signature, not aware that any
12.41 1	statements in this case; correct?	12.43	cooperation agreement existed at all; correct?
3	A. Yes.	3	A. That's correct. It's a long time ago, and I couldn't
4	Q. And you've never seen from the Respondent any document	4	remember that we had an agreement in place.
5	from Dr Mike, internally or externally, to NRD or	5	Q. In fact, you do
6	someone else, memorialising a conversation he had with	6	A. What I do what I did say in my statement what
7	you about the things that needed to be improved upon	7	I did say in my statement is that Mr Marshall and I had
8	after the November 2010 submission of the application;	8	discussed it in November, and that's it. We had
9	correct?	9	discussed it. I couldn't remember signing a document.
10	•	10	Q. If I could ask that Mr Ehlers's supplemental witness
11	more documentation.	11	statement be brought up and paragraph 23.1 be focused
12	Q. You'll agree with me that, based on your work with	12	on.
13	Respondent to prepare your witness statements, it's fair	13	In fact, the first thing you said when informed of
14	to expect, if Rwanda actually had a document	14	the document we just looked at is in paragraph 23.1;
15	memorialising such a conversation from Dr Mike's side,	15	correct?
16	it would be part of your witness statement, wouldn't it?	16	A. Correct.
17	A. Could you repeat that, please?	17	Q. You said you never saw a written cooperation agreement
18	Q. You'll agree that based on working with the Respondent	18	at all before; correct?
19	to prepare your witness statements, you would have	19	A. That's correct.
20	expected, if there was a document confirming the	20	Q. You had discussions, but you didn't mean to say you had
21	discussion you say you had with Dr Mike after	21	discussions about a document in your answer just
22	November 10th, Respondent would have put it as	22	a moment ago, right? You meant to say in this witness
23	an exhibit to your witness statement; correct?	23	statement you didn't believe there was such a document
24	A. Well, I can't I can't say what they would have done.	24	ever prepared; isn't that correct?
25	But I didn't know any document like that. I still can't	25	A. That is correct. I couldn't remember a document being
	Page 21		Page 23
	1 450 21		1 450 23
12.42 1	remember a document like that	12.47 1	bosonore
12:43 1	remember a document like that.  Of If Leould ask if you scroll as I'm sorry it's the	12:47 1	prepared.  O And that's because you want very much to call
2	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the	2	Q. And that's because you want very much to call
2 3	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if	2 3	Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?
2 3 4	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li><li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not</li></ul>
2 3 4 5	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li><li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc",	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li><li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li><li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li><li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause)</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.</li> <li>So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.</li> <li>So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? </li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment.</li> <li>If you could scroll down so the witness can see.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? </li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? </li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? </li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment.</li> <li>If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up.</li> <li>So you're aware that the next thing that happened</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? </li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment.</li> <li>If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up.</li> <li>So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you?</li> <li>A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment.</li> <li>If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up.</li> <li>So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines. Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this? A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael. Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you? A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael. Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines. Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this? A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael. Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you? A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael. Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up. You were informed that as part of their submission,</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? </li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines. Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this? A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael. Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you? A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael. Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up. You were informed that as part of their submission, Claimants provided this document, a cooperation</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? A. Yes. I didn't remember that. But after I've seen this,</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see. So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to? A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines. Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this? A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael. Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you? A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael. Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up. You were informed that as part of their submission, Claimants provided this document, a cooperation agreement between BVG, when it was independent of NRD,</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? A. Yes. I didn't remember that. But after I've seen this, that's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you?</li> <li>A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up.  You were informed that as part of their submission, Claimants provided this document, a cooperation agreement between BVG, when it was independent of NRD, and NRD, from the 2010 time period; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? A. Yes. I didn't remember that. But after I've seen this, that's correct. Q. And as a result of seeing this, you went further to ask</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you?</li> <li>A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up.  You were informed that as part of their submission, Claimants provided this document, a cooperation agreement between BVG, when it was independent of NRD, and NRD, from the 2010 time period; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? A. Yes. I didn't remember that. But after I've seen this, that's correct. Q. And as a result of seeing this, you went further to ask to see the metadata, because you questioned the truth of</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. If I could ask, if you scroll I'm sorry, it's the document on the left. And because he's on an iPad, if we could make it just one page, so that it's big enough for him to see.  So this is the transmittal letter, sir. The "Cc", is that intended to read "[Head of]" well, you tell me: what does the "Cc" refer to? Who did you deliver the copy to?</li> <li>A. That "HoD" would have been the HoD in the Department of Geology and Mines.</li> <li>Q. And what did you understand that to refer to when you sent this?</li> <li>A. I would have understood it to refer to Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. You in fact worked with Dr Michael in preparing this application before it was sent, didn't you?</li> <li>A. No, I did not. No, I never worked with Dr Michael.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask that C-122 be brought up.  You were informed that as part of their submission, Claimants provided this document, a cooperation agreement between BVG, when it was independent of NRD, and NRD, from the 2010 time period; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And that's because you want very much to call Mr Marshall a liar, don't you?</li> <li>A. No, I have no reason to call him a liar. If he's not telling the truth, it will come out in his witness statement.</li> <li>Q. Then if I could ask that C-210 be brought up. (Pause) You were made aware, sir, that after you submitted your supplemental witness statement, the Claimants, in response, provided a copy of this email and its attachment. If you could scroll down so the witness can see. (Pause) Can I ask that the email be scrolled down, so that the attachment can be brought up. So you're aware that the next thing that happened relating to a cooperation agreement was that Claimants responded with a version of such an agreement that you signed and sent by email to Mr Marshall, asking him to countersign and send back; correct? A. Yes. I didn't remember that. But after I've seen this, that's correct. Q. And as a result of seeing this, you went further to ask</li> </ul>

- 12:50 1 Q. Yes. As a result of learning that this document was
  - 2 presented, you challenged whether this document, the
  - 3 email and its attachment, was legitimate, and you asked
  - 4 to review the metadata, the computer information about
  - 5 this document, didn't you?
  - 6 A. Yes, because I had no recollection of signing this
  - 7 document.
  - 8 Q. And you were --
  - 9 A. I had no recollection that we'd set out these points.
  - 10 Q. You were looking for another way to call Mr Marshall
  - 11 a liar: you were trying to challenge the veracity of
  - 12 what he represented; correct?
  - 13 A. No, I certainly wasn't doing that. I just didn't recall
  - signing this, I didn't recall this document. 14
  - 15 Q. And you --
  - 16 A. I think that's reasonable, to say -- if you don't recall
  - 17 it, you'd like to say: well, show me.
  - 18 Q. And Claimants did show you the metadata; correct?
  - 19 A. No, I didn't see any metadata. I saw this.
  - 20 Q. You know the Claimants provided metadata to the
  - 21 Respondent's counsel, don't you?
  - 22 A. Possibly they could have. I didn't see it.
  - 23 Q. You have not reviewed the metadata and have any
  - 24 challenge to the information in such metadata as to when
  - 25 this document was sent and by whom; correct?

- 12:53 1 cutting him off a little.
  - 2 MR COWLEY: I apologise. I'm just trying to speed up. And
  - 3 I agree, Mr Ehlers, I'm not trying to cut you off. So
  - 4 please, if I did prevent you from saying anything,
  - 5 please finish.
  - 6 A. No, and I understand: we've got time lag. I understand
  - 7 perfectly.
  - 8 Q. You'll agree, sir, given your role as managing director
  - and whose interests you were looking out for at the
  - 10 time, if BVG did not provide the \$100,000, you would
  - 11 have called them out on it and demanded that they
  - 12 perform, wouldn't you?
  - 13 A. Yes, I would have.
  - Q. And you've provided no such documentation in connection
  - 15 with your witness statements; correct?
  - 16 A. Correct.
  - 17 MR COWLEY: No further questions.
  - 18 (12.54 pm)
  - 19 Re-direct examination by MR HILL
  - 20 Q. Mr Ehlers, just on your last point, do you recall under
  - 21 the agreement that the \$100,000 was there as a loan to
  - 22 provide to NRD for purchasing equipment to be used for
  - 23 the work that NRD was to do on the Bisesero concession?
  - 24 A. That's correct.
  - 25 Q. Did NRD do work or not do work on the Bisesero

Page 27

- 12:51 1 A. Yes, I have not had access to that.
  - 2 Q. You'll agree, sir, that --
  - 3 A. I--
  - 4 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to speak over you. Please.
  - 5 A. No, no, sorry. I'm listening.
  - 6 Q. Okay. You'll agree, won't you, that in November 2010
  - you had a better memory of what discussions you were
  - 8 having with the then third party, BVG, and Mr Marshall
  - at that time than you do today; correct?
  - 10 A. Yes.
  - 11 Q. You were paying attention to this --
  - 12 A. Some things stick out in your memory, some don't.
  - 13 Q. I understand. I'm moving on, suggesting -- I want you
  - 14 to focus back on November 2010.
  - 15 This was something that you were focusing on getting
  - 16 done with Mr Marshall on behalf of Starck and NRD. You
  - 17 were involved; correct?
  - 18 A. That's correct.
  - 19 Q. Okay. So at that time you were aware better than you
  - 20 are today of what was agreed to and what was supposed to
  - 21 be done: correct?
  - 22 A. Yes --
  - 23 Q. And you'll agree, sir, that --
  - 24 MR HILL: If I just could ask Mr Cowley just to give him
  - a chance to give his answer, because there you are

Page 26

- 12:54 1 concession under this cooperation agreement?
  - 2 A. As far as I remember, we -- as far as I remember, NRD
  - 3 never did any work on Bisesero. If you look at the
  - 4 dates of these things, the company -- the company was 5
  - bought by Mr Marshall at the end of December, a month later, almost. So there was never any work done at
  - Bisesero that I remember.
  - 8 Q. So in those circumstances, do you think it would have
  - been necessary or not necessary to bother to chase for
  - 10 the \$100,000 for equipment for that work?
  - 11 A. Yes, the -- what I envisaged for that \$100,000 was more
  - 12 like site establishment. We had the equipment in NRD
  - 13 which we were not using fully, but we had to hire
  - 14 low-beds and trailers for transport, and we would have
  - 15 to establish ourselves on Bisesero. It was more like a site establishment I envisaged at Bisesero.
  - 17 MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Ehlers.
  - THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Mr Ehlers, for coming
  - 19 to assist us. You are now free to go.
  - 20 MR EHLERS: Thank you very much.
  - 2.1 (The witness withdrew)
  - 22 MR HILL: We now have Mr Nsengiyuma.
  - THE PRESIDENT: Yes. I understand he will be giving his
  - 24 evidence in French.

16

25 MR WATKINS: Just a reminder for everyone to choose the

12:56 1	proper interpretation channel: obviously English if	13:03 1	Now, under Rwandan law, the bailiff is expected to
2	you're a native English speaker.	2	leave the document with the secretariat of the company;
3	Would you like me to bring him in, Mr President?	3	there's no direct contact with the executives of the
4	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, please. (Pause)	4	company.
5	(12.59 pm)	5	MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma. Mr Cowley, who
6	MR JOHN BOSCO NSENGIYUMA (called)	6	represents the Claimants, will now ask you some
7	(Evidence interpreted)	7	questions.
8	THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, and thank you for coming to	8	MR NSENGIYUMA: Thank you.
9	give evidence today.	9	(1.04 pm)
10	MR NSENGIYUMA: Bonjour.	10	Cross-examination by MR COWLEY
11	THE PRESIDENT: You will see on the screen a déclaration de	10	Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, I'm sorry if I mispronounce your name
12	témoin: would you please read it?	12	during the course of this questioning. It won't be
13	MR NSENGIYUMA: (In English) Read it.	13	intentional, but I seem to unintentionally do that
14	THE PRESIDENT: On the screen in front of you, you see		a lot, and I apologise in advance.
15	a déclaration: could you please read it?	14	A. [No problem].
	MR NSENGIYUMA: Okay.	15	*
16	THE PRESIDENT: Aloud.	16	Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to maintain
17	MR NSENGIYUMA: (Interpreted) Witness statement: I solemnly	17	an accounting of the value of recoveries received after
18	-	18	seizure of property against debt being enforced;
19	swear on my honour and conscience to speak the truth,	19	correct?
20	the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.	20	A. That's correct.
21	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	21	Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to maintain
22	MR NSENGIYUMA: Thank you.	22	a log identifying all property seized or locked up for
23	(1.00 pm)	23	collection against a debt; correct?
24	Direct examination by MR HILL	24	A. It is true, it is correct.
25	Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, could you be shown paragraph 8 of your	25	Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to maintain
	Page 29		Page 31
	Ç		Ç
13:00 1	supplemental witness statement, your second witness	13:05 1	the security of property seized or locked up before it
13:00 1 2	supplemental witness statement, your second witness statement.	13:05 1 2	the security of property seized or locked up before it could be safely disposed of and credited against the
2	statement.	2	could be safely disposed of and credited against the
2 3	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you	2 3	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?
2 3 4	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?	2 3 4	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.
2 3 4 5	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second	2 3 4 5	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain
2 3 4 5 6	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.	2 3 4 5 6	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized
2 3 4 5 6 7	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag	2 3 4 5 6 7	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction;
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to Mr Marshall or to Ms Mruskovicova. Can you just give your evidence on that question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever there was an auction, there was the police were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to Mr Marshall or to Ms Mruskovicova. Can you just give your evidence on that question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever there was an auction, there was the police were involved, and I had to go to the police and explain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to Mr Marshall or to Ms Mruskovicova. Can you just give your evidence on that question?  A. I passed on my documents through the reception of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever there was an auction, there was the police were involved, and I had to go to the police and explain myself.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to Mr Marshall or to Ms Mruskovicova. Can you just give your evidence on that question?  A. I passed on my documents through the reception of the NRD office. They had a secretary there whose name was Barbara, and she would take in all the mail.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct too.</li> <li>Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever there was an auction, there was the police were involved, and I had to go to the police and explain myself.</li> <li>Q. In the situations where a professional bailiff in Rwanda seeks approval of a court or permission from a court to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	statement.  I understand you have a correction or amendment you would like to make to that paragraph?  A. Indeed. I would like to make a change on the second line.  I passed on my communications to the head of Spedag for her to pass them on to Mrs Zuzana Mruskovicova.  Ever since the first contact with Zuzana Mruskovicova, they had refused to speak to me directly, and every time I had to go through a third party who would then pass on my message, or Mrs Mruskovicova would go through a third party who then would pass on her message.  So there was no direct contact; there was always a third party in between. That was our work environment.  Q. You explain in your witness statement that you were executing on certain judgments. One of the questions that has come up in this case is whether or not you provided copies of those judgments to NRD or to Mr Marshall or to Ms Mruskovicova. Can you just give your evidence on that question?  A. I passed on my documents through the reception of the NRD office. They had a secretary there whose name was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	could be safely disposed of and credited against the debt; correct?  A. That's correct.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to obtain independent appraisals of value for the property seized before selling it; correct?  A. That's correct too.  Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to report back to the court as to the results of any court-ordered or permitted auction of seized assets to inform the court what was obtained or other results of the auction; correct?  A. Well, the bailiff does not report to the court. The law says that you have to report to the person who gave you your order, you have to provide the copy of the judgment, of the ruling; and should the person or the company disagree with what was done, well, that company or person can turn to court or to the police. And that was the case with Mr Marshall and Zuzana. Whenever there was an auction, there was the police were involved, and I had to go to the police and explain myself.  Q. In the situations where a professional bailiff in Rwanda

13:07 1 hold a specific auction of specific property, that 2 bailiff is then required to report back to that court as 3 to the results of that auction; correct? 4 A. No, no, the Rwandan law, when you have to seize 5 property, the property the mechanism is as follows: 6 the client comes with a copy of the ruling with 7 a command from the court. Now, there's a contract 8 between the person who provided a copy of the judgment 9 and the bailiff. 10 Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, I just would like you to focus on one 11 incident and one aspect only in my question. 12 I appreciate that there's more to the work of a bailiff 13 than collecting on a debt than I'm specifically asking 14 about now. But I asked you to focus only on one 15 instance, one circumstance that might come up, and that 16 is a situation where, while working to collect debt, 17 a bailiff in Rwanda, for some reason, asks for and 18 obtains permission of the court to hold a specific 19 auction. 20 In that instance, the bailiff is required to report 21 back to that court that gave the permission as to the 22 results of that auction; correct? 23 A. Well, the bailiff doesn't request authorisation from the 24 court. He simply publishes dispatches that is, 25 announcements on the media, in papers or on the	13:11 1 Now, other property was seized by the other bailiff, but 2 I myself only conducted two auctions. So there were the 3 minerals to MSA, and Mr Marshall's car. And other 4 bailiffs were involved in selling other things, but 5 I only conducted these two auctions. 6 Q. Mr Marshall's car was seized and auctioned in what year? 7 A. I'm afraid I don't recollect the year, but it must be in 8 the documents. 9 Q. You seized a number of other assets from NRD, including 10 trucks, heavy equipment, machine equipment; correct? 11 A. What I seized at a certain time, Mr Marshall lodged 12 a complaint with the Ministry of Justice claiming that 13 I was using forged or falsified court documents. And 14 the Minister of Justice at the time ordered me, in fact, 15 to put an end, to put a halt to what I was supposed to 16 do that is the execution against NRD and asked me 17 to leave that case. So I did so. And so when I left 18 the file, my bailiff colleagues took over the selfsame 19 case and they continued the work I was supposed to do. 20 Q. You're talking about the collection case from Mr Pascal; 21 correct? 22 A. Well, there were as many as 28 NRD employees who hadn't 23 been paid their wages. This was unlawful termination. 24 And so this entire group of NRD workers I think there 25 were 28 of them; the exact number is in the document
13:09 1 radio, and on the indicated dates he acts upon the 2 order. That's the way it works. 3 Q. A professional bailiff in Rwanda is required to provide 4 a written report to the judgment debtor as to the status 5 of all credits and all receipts obtained from the 6 seizure and sale of assets taken from that debtor; 7 correct? 8 A. Well, yes, to the debtor and the creditor. 9 Q. Now, you provided an initial witness statement in this 10 case. If I could ask that that be brought up and refer 11 to it at points. 12 Through the course of this witness statement you 13 discuss events relating to your seizure and auction of 14 minerals tagged in NRD's name at the entity called 15 Mineral Supply Africa in order to collect on a judgment 16 in favour of your then client, Pascal Rwakirenga, and 17 I'm sure I mispronounced his name. Is that correct? 18 A. Yes, I recollect the case. 19 Q. In collecting on that debt and if you'll permit me, 20 I would like to refer to that client of yours as 21 "Mr Pascal": I'll be less likely to mispronounce that. 22 In collecting on Mr Pascal's debt, you also seized 23 other assets of NRD beyond those minerals you referred 24 to in this witness statement; correct? 25 A. Well, there were only two auctions conducted by myself.	13:14 1 Pascal was just one of them. He was one of these terminated employees.  Q. I would like to focus on that case and that collection for that client.  You seized a number of assets in order to collect on behalf of Mr Pascal I'm not asking about the others yet correct?  A. Alright.  Q. And you say included among the assets you seized, collected for Mr Pascal, was Mr Marshall's car; correct?  A. Well, first there were the minerals, which were located at IPC. This was the first seizure. And indeed, it was Pascal who was able to benefit from the proceeds of that.  Q. My question was about the car. We talked about the minerals, and I said: other than the minerals, you seized other assets? You brought up Mr Marshall's car. I'm trying to confirm with you that you brought up Mr Marshall's car as another asset you seized in order to collect on behalf of Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, not as Mr Pascal. It was Mr Pascal and other past workers.  Q. Well, whose debt did you credit the sale price of the car against?  A. Well, part of it was indeed for Pascal.

13:16 1	Q. I appreciate. Let me walk through a little bit more	13:20 1	if it doesn't do so voluntarily, well, then the property
2	A. But for the minerals, that went all to Pascal.	2	is seized and auctioned off.
3	Q. Okay. I'm going to possibly return to that question	3	MR COWLEY: Mr President, is this a good time for the
4	about the distinction, but let me take it in order of	4	Tribunal to take a break?
5	your witness statement. It might be easier for you to	5	THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it is, because we only have
6	follow my questions if you have your own witness	6	the interpreter for the first three hours of this day.
7	statement to track along with.	7	So I would propose we continue until this witness is
8	Can I ask FTI to focus on paragraph 10.	8	finished before we break. Having regard to your
9	In this paragraph of your initial witness statement	9	estimate of the time you would need, I imagine that's
10	you discuss the first efforts to collect on behalf of	10	likely to be before 2 o'clock.
11	Mr Pascal; correct?	11	MR NSENGIYUMA: There's no problem on our side.
12	MR NSENGIYUMA: (Not interpreted).	12	MR COWLEY: Now, your witness statement cites in support
13	THE INTERPRETER: Apparently he didn't receive the	13	of your statement that you provided notice of the amount
14	translation. I'll start again.	14	to be paid, you cite to R-051, a document with the
15	MR NSENGIYUMA: [The translation in French.]	15	number R-051. Do you see that?
16	THE INTERPRETER: Apparently Mr Nsengiyuma didn't receive	16	A. I thought we saw the document just now, just before this
17	the translation. Can we try again? Can you ask the	17	one. It was a table, I believe that was it. Could we
18	question again, please?	18	see that again?
19	MR COWLEY: Oh, you asked me. I'm sorry. Of course.	19	Q. I'll go to R-051 in one second. But before we leave
20	Paragraph 10 of your witness statement, sir, is the	20	your witness statement, do you agree that you testified
21	discussion of your first efforts taken on behalf of	21	you left the notice about the amount owed for this debt
22	Mr Pascal to collect his alleged debt against NRD?	22	that had to be paid immediately or in order to avoid
23	A. That's correct, yes.	23	seizure of assets, that you provided it to the
24	Q. And in this paragraph well, to be clear now, because	24	administrative assistant you refer to in paragraph 10 as
25	I did bring up the topic of distinguishing between the	25	"Shema"? Do you see that?
23	I did offing up the topic of distinguishing between the	23	Shema? Do you see mat?
	Page 37		Page 39
13:18 1	two. At this time, whatever number of the other	13:22 1	If I could ask FTI to go back up to paragraph 10.
13:18 1 2	two. At this time, whatever number of the other clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes	13:22 1	If I could ask FTI to go back up to paragraph 10.  A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you
2	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes	2	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you
2 3	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at	2 3	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that
2 3 4	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting	2 3 4	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and
2 3 4 5	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?	2 3 4 5	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and
2 3 4 5 6	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking	2 3 4 5 6	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document.
2 3 4 5 6 7	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed.	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.  Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.  Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.  Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document.</li> <li>But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.  Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal  A. Shema was the secretary then.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document.</li> <li>But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document.</li> <li>But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document.</li> <li>But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051. That's the document you cite to, and say in your</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.  MR COWLEY: I note, Mr President, that I've gone past 8.15, and if memory serves, that was the time for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had to pay to avoid seizure of assets; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.  MR COWLEY: I note, Mr President, that I've gone past 8.15, and if memory serves, that was the time for the  A. If I may answer? When you pass on copies of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had to pay to avoid seizure of assets; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.  MR COWLEY: I note, Mr President, that I've gone past 8.15, and if memory serves, that was the time for the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had to pay to avoid seizure of assets; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask FTI to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.  MR COWLEY: I note, Mr President, that I've gone past 8.15, and if memory serves, that was the time for the  A. If I may answer? When you pass on copies of the judgment to NRD, the company is required or it's requested to pay, to come up and settle the debt. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had to pay to avoid seizure of assets; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask FTI to</li> <li>A. Well, I did give the document the document was left</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	clients you characterised sometimes as 26, sometimes as 28 in your documents that hadn't started yet at all. At this time, the only debt you were collecting against NRD was Mr Pascal; correct?  A. Well, you have to look at the year. Here we're looking at 2013. 2013 was indeed the first order I executed. But after 2013, other employees came forward.  Q. So we can agree that at the time referenced in paragraph 10, the only client you were working [for] to collect debt against NRD was Mr Pascal, and no one else at that time; correct?  A. That's correct: it was Pascal.  Q. And you say that you served notice of the debt you were going to collect on so that NRD could pay in order to avoid your seizing assets; you say that in paragraph 10, right?  MR NSENGIYUMA: [Hello? There is no translation.]  MR KAPLAN: The witness is not hearing the translation, the interpretation.  MR COWLEY: I note, Mr President, that I've gone past 8.15, and if memory serves, that was the time for the  A. If I may answer? When you pass on copies of the judgment to NRD, the company is required or it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Can I see the document that I yes. Usually when you are in contact with the company, well, the secretary receives the document noted. Now, it may happen that the secretary will not be certain, will hesitate, and will ask her boss to sign off, to sign the document. But it is for the reception office, whoever is there manning that office, to receive to acknowledge receipt of the document.</li> <li>Q. Rather than hypothetically, I'm asking specifically, because paragraph 10 of your witness statement is specific. Your testimony is that the notice that Mr Pascal</li> <li>A. Shema was the secretary then.</li> <li>Q. And you claim that the document identified as R-051 is what you gave Shema; do you agree with that?</li> <li>A. I know it was through Barbara.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask FTI to bring up R-051.  That's the document you cite to, and say in your witness statement at paragraph 10 you gave to Shema in order to provide notice to NRD as to the amount it had to pay to avoid seizure of assets; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask FTI to</li> </ul>

13:24 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	at the reception. I mean, Barbara took the document, and Barbara in turn placed the document with her boss, whose name was Shema. But it was Barbara who took the document and passed it on, but indeed it was Shema who signed the document, who signed not the document, but acknowledged receipt of the document.  Q. If I could ask FTI to scroll down, so that the witness can see the full document.  Do you see the full document that you cite to are these two pages?  A. That's correct.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that the document you've testified that you provided to the company for notice of your collection efforts of this claimant, Mr Pascal, did not attach any judgment in favour of Mr Pascal, just these two pages; correct?  A. Well, it says so. There's a reference to the judgment. There's a all the judgments and the rulings are referred to on that document.  Q. And you'll agree that you didn't give a copy of the judgment; you gave these two pages. That's your testimony; correct?  A. They were annexed, the documents. They only signed the first page, the cover page.  Q. But you didn't provide your copy of the notice that	13:28 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<ul> <li>Q. The document you put forward in support of your statement that you gave notice to the company, that Shema received notice, only includes these two pages. You did not provide a copy of a document that includes any judgment attached to these two pages; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, as soon as there's a command to pay, you give the original. And in the annex we indicate the rulings that are to be executed should the company, or the legal representative, disagree with what is written on the commandment to pay.</li> <li>Q. And</li> <li>A. And the company can produce a letter of protest, but that never happened.</li> <li>Q. And the reason, sir, there's no annex to the document designated R-051 is because there's no annex to the copy of the original in your files; correct?</li> <li>A. Well, the photocopies are always annexed. You say that, "I am to execute the ruling [so-and-so]", you attach you have to attach a copy of the rulings. Should the person who lost the case decline to execute, that person can challenge the accuracy of the ruling. But that was never challenged; that never happened.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that there is no copy of the judgments produced in support of your witness statement at paragraph 10?</li> </ul>
13:26 1	includes any attachment A. Well, everything was annexed.	13:30 1	Can we go back to the witness statement. I don't want him to be misled.
3	Q. Sir, you kept your own copy of what Shema signed;	3	A. I did say that well, in these documents you always
4	correct?	4	say that in the annex, the rulings are there. These
5	A. I keep the originals and I produced photocopies.	5	documents are annexed, just to prove that we're not
6	Q. And your testimony	6	fabricating this.
7	A. Because	7	Q. But they're not in the document you attached to your
8	Q. I'm sorry, I didn't mean to speak over you.	8	witness statement? That's all I'm asking you, sir. You
9	A. Go ahead.	9	can't agree with that?
10	Q. Your testimony, in paragraph 10 of your witness	10	Again, if I could ask FTI to bring up the witness
11 12	statement, is: this is a copy of what you left with Shema; correct? You said that.	11 12	statement, so he doesn't have to answer this question without seeing it. Thank you.
13	A. Yes, but every time	13	I can't tell if
14	MR HILL: That's not a fair characterisation could I just	14	A. No, automatically the rulings must have been annexed,
15	interrupt. That's not a fair characterisation of the	15	but you can be happy with producing just the two pages.
16	witness statement. If he's going to tell him what is in	16	But when you serve a demand, you produce a letter with
17	his witness statement, Mr Cowley must do so accurately.	17	the signature of the bailiff and an annex to that
18	There's no inconsistency between what the witness is	18	letter: you include the photocopies of the rulings
19	saying now and his witness statement.	19	themselves, the rulings that are to be executed.
20	MR COWLEY: I strongly object to the coaching. I have shown	20	Q. Sir, could I ask: when you prepared your original
21	the witness his statement. He's perfectly capable of	21	witness statement, you understood that one of its
22 23	answering this question. I believe it's fair.  Sorry, sir, we spoke over you. Do you have	22	purposes was to establish for this Tribunal that you
23	an answer?	23 24	complied with Rwandan law in everything you say you did to collect judgments against NRD?
25	A. On what question, sorry?	25	A. Well, yes, I executed according to the law. And
	Page 42	-	Page 44

13:33 1 Mr Marshall took me to court about ten at least ten times, and he never won. He never won any of his lawsuits.  4 Q. I'm going to ask you again my question, and I'm going to ask you to focus on what I'm saying is the purpose. I'd like to make sure we're in agreement.  7 You understood when you prepared your witness statement that your purpose one of your purposes was to explain to the Tribunal that you complied with Rwandan law in what you did to collect judgments against NRD?  12 A. Well, it is not for me to establish what they are doing.  What happens is in Rwanda, bailiffs are independent.  The bailiff stands in his office: when he receives a copy of a ruling, he then drafts a demand. And I don't have to well, unless I'm being sued to say that I didn't follow the procedure: well, then there's a lawsuit.  But in this particular case, the person who won the case went to the bailiff, the bailiff served a demand to pay, that is passed on to the company, and that's what I did here. It took these two pages, the two pages with the annex, the copies of the rulings, referred to on these two pages.  Q. Sir, your witness statement in paragraph 11, which then	13:37 1 give explanations in front of the police officer.  2 Q. You talk about all the various times that you did  3 recall, when writing your witness statement, that there  4 were challenges, and what you had to do to overcome  5 those challenges. But you don't say anything in your  6 witness statement about being drawn to the police  7 station following the auction of minerals in NRD's name  8 at MSA, sold to pay Mr Pascal's debt, do you?  9 A. Well, on the documents it's always the reference is  10 made to that. All you have to do is go through the  11 documents: you'll find the references.  12 Q. Sir, I asked you about your witness statement. Please  13 just answer the question I asked.  14 You'll agree you did not recite such fact of being  15 drawn to the police station after this mineral auction  16 in your witness statement; correct?  17 A. Maybe if you go to the bottom of the page  18 Q. FTI, please.  19 A there are the documents I drafted. (Pause)  Okay, very good.  21 THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, I overlapped a bit.  22 MR COWLEY: Please answer the question.  23 A. I said that each time I made my report, I wrote down at  the bottom of the page to whom it was addressed. Each  time, it was written at the bottom of the page on my  Page 47
13:35 1 goes on to the next page for a few more paragraphs, 2 describes the seizure of minerals at Mineral Supply 3 Africa in the name of NRD to collect on Mr Pascal's 4 judgment; correct? 5 A. That's correct. 6 Q. Please scroll down so that he can see the page. 7 Mr Pascal, I'm going to ask you: if, in order to 8 answer this question, you need to look further, at 9 further paragraphs above or below in your witness 10 statement, please say so and it will happen. 11 My question to you, sir, is: do you agree your 12 witness statement doesn't provide any evidence 13 whatsoever of your providing a statement to either 14 Mr Pascal or NRD as to the amount received at the 15 auction and how much was credited against his debt? 16 A. You're referring to the auction? 17 Q. Yes, sir. 18 A. Well, the report was drawn up, and immediately after the 19 auction, Marshall Mr Marshall [summoned] me to the 20 police station, and it all happened in front of me at 21 the police station to say how the auction went. 22 Q. Sir, that's not discussed in your witness statement, 23 is it? 24 A. Well, I wasn't asked. But Marshall dragged me to the 25 police station about ten times, and every time we had to	13:39 1 report; my report on the auction.  2 Q. Sir, I'm asking about your witness statement; do you understand that?  4 A. Yes, I do understand.  5 Q. Can you agree with me that your witness statement doesn't say [that] after the auction was held of the minerals at MSA, you were called to the police station and had to fill out such a report, does it?  9 A. As soon as the auction took place next to MSA, the next day Marshall initiated legal proceedings against me and I went to provide an explanation. In the report, it is said that that was done.  13 Q. Can I ask a question: are you able to read your witness statement written in English?  15 A. I speak French better than I speak English.  16 Q. But are you able to  17 A. If you read me in French, I will understand.  18 Q. But the interpreter can tell you in French what I'm saying in English, but I don't have a written translation of this witness statement to French. I'm just trying to establish: when I point to something in this witness statement written in English, are you able to read it?  24 A. No, not correctly. And I prefer in French: I understand the nuances. But I really don't speak English well.

13:41 1	MR COWLEY: I ask Respondent's counsel: is there a version	13:46 1	to see me and ask, "While you're executing the judgment
2	of this witness statement in French that was signed off	2	for Mr Rwakirenga, would you please handle our
3	on before or after the English version was prepared?	3	judgments?" And this is how the 26 people basically
4	MR HILL: I will need to take instructions. I can't answer	4	joined in to the group with Pascal Rwakirenga. So the
5	that now.	5	two actually were handled at the same time.
6	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley	6	Q. Sir, when using the phrase "finishing a client's case",
7	MR COWLEY: Yes.	7	by that, do you mean: collected their full debt and your
8	THE PRESIDENT: whether something is or is not in the	8	work is done?
9	witness statement is a matter of record: it's something	9	A. No.
10	that we can all see. It might shorten the	10	Q. When you use the phrase "finishing a client's case",
11	cross-examination if, instead of asking the witness to	11	what does it mean?
12	agree it's not in the witness statement, to ask, "Why	12	A. We enforce a judgment. And when there are cases that
13	did you not put this in your witness statement?"	13	are similar there's the case of Pascal Rwakirenga,
14	MR COWLEY: I appreciate that. I had wanted to confirm	14	
15	whether he could check	15	NRD; at the same time, the other employees are asking
16	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, well, it's taking a very, very long	16	for enforcement of a judgment against NRD the two
17	time, without any result.	17	cases get combined, get joined, and the enforcement done
18	MR COWLEY: Thank you, your Honour.	18	against the same person or company. So the objects were
19	Mr Nsengiyuma, can you explain why you did not	19	seized accordingly, and then they will be paid out
20	attach to your witness statement any report given to the	20	
21	creditor, Mr Pascal, or NRD, the debtor, as to the	21	So it's not that we completely complete one case and
22	results of the sale of minerals and how much debt, if	22	
23	any, remained owed to Mr Pascal?	23	similar, then we combine them, we join them.
24	A. This is in the final report.	24	Q. Sir, please appreciate that I'm not asking you to speak
25	Q. Can you explain why you didn't attach such a report to	25	about Mr Pascal's case and the other employees' case
23	Q. Can you explain why you didn't attach such a report to	23	about Wil Lascar's case and the other employees case
	Page 49		Page 51
13:43 1	your witness statements?	13:49 1	right now; I'm asking you how you use the term "complete
2	A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did,	2	the client's case".
2 3	A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about	2 3	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's
2 3 4	A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.	2 3 4	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment,
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li><li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li><li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up.</li> <li>Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads:</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624."</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. <ul> <li>Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads:</li> <li>"In early 2014 shortly after I had finished</li> <li>Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624."</li> <li>Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees'</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees' debts until after you had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis of a copy of the judgment. And there's information, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees' debts until after you had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case? A. No. I started Mr Rwakirenga that is Pascal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis of a copy of the judgment. And there's information, and NRD is informed as the process goes on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees' debts until after you had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case? A. No. I started Mr Rwakirenga that is Pascal Rwakirenga and along the way his colleagues received</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis of a copy of the judgment. And there's information, and NRD is informed as the process goes on.  Q. The group of additional creditors with related judgments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees' debts until after you had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case? A. No. I started Mr Rwakirenga that is Pascal</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis of a copy of the judgment. And there's information, and NRD is informed as the process goes on.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I gave a document of about 100 pages: everything I did, my work report. It's a very large document, about 100 pages long, and it's in there.</li> <li>Q. So do you agree that you gave all of the documents in your possession that related to your actions concerning the collection on behalf of Mr Pascal to the Respondent when preparing your witness statement?</li> <li>A. I gave the whole document. And everything that I did was in that document, but in my own language, Kinyarwandan. (Pause)</li> <li>Q. May I ask that paragraph 17 of the witness statement be brought up. Paragraph 17 of your witness statement, sir, reads: "In early 2014 shortly after I had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case, a group of 26 people, mostly former NRD employees, asked me to help them enforce judgments against NRD. The total amount owed to this group by NRD was RwF 85,761,624." Do you agree that it's your testimony that you did not start working to collect any of the other employees' debts until after you had finished Mr Rwakirenga's case? A. No. I started Mr Rwakirenga that is Pascal Rwakirenga and along the way his colleagues received</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the client's case".  When you use that term, by "completing a client's case", do you mean you have collected their judgment, there's no more work to be done?  A. With an auction, we had the whole amount was not covered; we had to continue with the seizures to reach the full amount. And that was not done by me; it was done by other bailiffs.  Q. And those other bailiffs would need to see a statement of how much was recovered at the auction and credited against the debt to know how much was left to be collected; correct?  A. The documents are available, or were available.  A bailiff, when he finishes with his work, then the bailiff who takes over, takes over where he left off.  When I enforced the judgment for Mr Rwakirenga, I was the second bailiff to step in. There had been a first bailiff who had sold something, and then I took over. Then a third bailiff carried on after me. And it's always on the basis of documents and on the basis of a copy of the judgment. And there's information, and NRD is informed as the process goes on.  Q. The group of additional creditors with related judgments

13:51	1	Mr Benzinge; correct?		
	2	A. I'm sorry, can you me		

- 2 A. I'm sorry, can you mention the name again? Including
- 3 whom? I didn't understand the name.
- 4 Q. Mr Benzinge.
- 5 A. He also brought his claim or the copy of the judgment to
- 6 be enforced against NRD.
- Q. If I could ask that the witness statement be scrolleddown to paragraph 20.
- 9 Sir, paragraph 20 of your witness statement says:
- 10 "On 9 June 2014 I wrote to NRD and made a formal
- demand that they pay Mr Benzinge the RwF 16.3 million
- they had been ordered to pay to him in the arbitration
- 13 proceedings."
- Do you recall saying that as part of your witness
- 15 statement?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And that cites to document R-063, your witness statement
- 18 cites to that in footnote 25. If I could ask that that
- 19 be shown to him.
- 20 Mr [Nsengiyuma], you agree that the document that
- 21 you put forward in your witness statement at the notice
- of Mr Benzinge's claim does not include a judgment?
- 23 A. It's marked -- you see the number of the document of
- 24 May 2nd 2014: that's the judgment that was being
- enforced. You see the reference ...

- 13:55 1 Q. Is that accurate? That's what you believed at that
  - 2 time: Mr Benzinge was liable for the debts owed to the
  - 3 other 25 clients on whose behalf you were collecting?
  - 4 A. I was enforcing the copies of the judgments of the
  - 5 workers that they held against NRD. And at that time
  - 6 Mr Benzinge was part of NRD, and NRD was to pay the
  - 7 amount of 16.3 million.
  - 8 Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, I'm asking you to focus on the statement
  - 9 that you served the demand relating to 25 other
  - 10 employees' debts on Mr Benzinge because, as
  - a shareholder, he was responsible for NRD debts. Was
  - 12 that your understanding as you took actions in
  - 13 June 2014?
  - 14 A. In June, Mr Benzinge was part of the board of NRD. When
  - 15 I was there at NRD's office, Barbara and Mr Benzinge
  - were there, they were together.
  - 17 Q. My question, sir, was: in June 2014, did you think
  - Mr Benzinge had to pay NRD's debts to your other
  - 19 25 clients?
  - 20 A. No, not Ben. NRD was to pay.
  - 21 Q. Please explain why it's included in your witness
  - statement that you considered Mr Benzinge liable for
  - NRD's debts, so you served a notice of the amount
  - demanded on Mr Benzinge on June 9th 2014.
  - 25 A. I gave it to the secretariat, the administrative

### Page 55

- 13:54 1 THE INTERPRETER: The interpreter's apologies: I didn't hear
  - 2 the number of the reference.
  - 3 MR COWLEY: Yes, I see it referred to in the document.
  - 4 I'm simply asking: do you recall that when you gave the
  - 5 document you called notice of Mr Benzinge's judgment,
  - 6 you did not give such document with a judgment attached
  - 7 to it?
  - 8 A. No, it's automatically annexed.
  - 9 Q. If I could ask you to go back --
  - 10 A. As soon as you say "judgment" and you reference it, it
  - is annexed. So if there is any possible challenge
  - subsequently. You cannot simply give the number of
  - 13 a judgment without actually showing the judgment; you
  - 14 have to show the judgment. And that's annexed, the
  - 15 photocopy is annexed.
  - 16 Q. If I could ask FTI to go back up to paragraph 20 of your
  - 17 witness statement. Your witness statement goes on:
  - "On [that] same day I also wrote to NRD and
  - 19 Mr Benzinge and made a formal demand for the amounts due
  - 20 to the 25 former NRD employees that I was also
  - 21 representing. I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge
  - as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD
  - and therefore liable for its debts."
  - 24 Do you see that?
  - 25 A. Yes, I do.

Page 54

- 13:58 1 assistant, the whole dossier stating that NRD had to pay
  - 2 all of the workers who had not been paid. And
  - 3 Mr Benzinge was a shareholder of NRD's. On the sheet of
  - 4 Rwanda Development Board, there are the officials of the
  - 5 company, and Mr Benzinge's name is amongst those names
  - 6 as a shareholder.
  - 7 Q. Why didn't you attach --
  - 8 THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, could I intervene. Can you give
  - 9 us some assistance as to how long you're going to be
  - with this witness? Because you've already substantially
  - 11 exceeded the estimate and I'm getting rather hungry.
  - 12 MR COWLEY: Yes, sir. I do believe it's going to be
  - 13 an hour. That's what I ask.
  - 14 THE PRESIDENT: Will we have interpreters available until
  - this witness is finished? Can you --
  - 16 MR KAPLAN: Mr President, I do believe we have the
  - interpreters for another hour. I can speak to them
  - 18 offline as to their availability.
  - $19\,\,$  THE PRESIDENT: Can you just enquire. Because if they are
  - able to stay longer, we can have some lunch.
  - 21  $\,$  THE INTERPRETER: Thank you. If we could have an offline
  - chat, that would be very useful. This is one of the
  - 23 interpreters speaking.
  - 24 MR KAPLAN: Yes. FTI, can you please place me in a breakout
  - room with the interpreters?

Page 56

17 (Pages 53 to 56)

14:00 1	MR WATKINS: Yes, certainly. Would everyone else like to go	14:37 1	Q. My question is simply: why is no copy of this notice
2	into the breakout room, or would you like to have	2	attached to your witness statement?
3	everyone stay here while you go into the breakout room	3	A. I gave three orders: the first to pay to Pascal, the
4	and have an offline discussion?	4	second one to pay Mr Benzinge, and the third order was
5	MR KAPLAN: I think just an offline discussion. We'll be	5	to pay the other employees. These are different orders
6	brief.	6	that are based on different copies of judgments: three
7	MR WATKINS: One moment.	7	orders to pay.
8	MR KAPLAN: Thank you.	8	Q. And that's your answer to my question?
9	(2.00 pm)	9	A. Yes.
10	(Pause)	10	Q. In the next paragraph if I could ask FTI to scroll to
11	(2.04 pm)	11	21. I address paragraph 21 not because I'm going to ask
12	MR KAPLAN: Thank you, members of the Tribunal. (Pause)	12	a lot of specific questions about it, but I want to make
13	Okay, I have conferred with the interpreters and	13	sure you're oriented in time. You say the next day
14	they have a hard stop of 3.30 London time, which will	14	I'm sorry, you say on June 11th 2014, you then seized
15	give a half-hour break plus one hour remaining for	15	minerals and equipment at NRD's Kigali office because
16	cross-examination. But it is a hard stop. We will have	16	payments of those debts had not been made. Do you
17	one of the interpreters leaving at 3.00, as was	17	recall giving that statement?
18	originally planned, and then there will be one	18	A. Yes.
19	interpreter who will remain solo for another half-hour,	19	Q. And by seizing the Kigali office, that meant that you
20	and she cannot exceed a half-hour solo simultaneous	20	locked it up and posted a security firm outside the
21	interpretation.	21	office to prevent others from getting in until you were
22	THE PRESIDENT: Very well. We will adjourn now until 2.30	22	able to sell the assets inside; correct?
23	London time. That will give one hour for this witness	23	A. That is correct.
24	to be completed, and the witness must be completed in	24	Q. And you recall that in the Kigali office when you seize
25	that hour.	25	it, there was both minerals and equipment?
	Page 57		Page 59
	Tage 37		1 age 37
14:05 1	MR COWLEY: Thank you.	14:40 1	A. Yes.
14:05 1	MR COWLEY: Thank you. (2.06 pm)	14:40 1 2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the</li></ul>
2	(2.06 pm)	2	Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the
2 3	(2.06 pm) (A short break)	2 3	Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the
2 3 4	(2.06 pm) (A short break) (2.35 pm)	2 3 4	Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness
2 3 4 5	(2.06 pm) (A short break) (2.35 pm) MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?	2 3 4 5	Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?
2 3 4 5 6	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li><li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li><li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(2.06 pm)  (A short break) (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here,  June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(2.35 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(2.35 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other employees attached anywhere to your witness statement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the events of the next day, June 12th 2014, in which you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other employees attached anywhere to your witness statement?  A. You have to read the order to pay that is referred to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the events of the next day, June 12th 2014, in which you describe similar actions, this time at the offices at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(2.06 pm)  (A short break)  (2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other employees attached anywhere to your witness statement?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the events of the next day, June 12th 2014, in which you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other employees attached anywhere to your witness statement?  A. You have to read the order to pay that is referred to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the events of the next day, June 12th 2014, in which you describe similar actions, this time at the offices at</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(2.35 pm)  MR COWLEY: May I proceed, your Honour?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 20 again be highlighted.  Mr Nsengiyuma, I want to draw your attention in paragraph 20 to the day that you're speaking to here, June 9th 2014. In this paragraph you explain serving notice on NRD for the debt to Mr Benzinge and you talk about serving notice on NRD and Mr Benzinge of the debt to 25 other clients. And if I could point out to you that in your witness statement you say:  "I sent the demand letter to Mr Benzinge as I understood that he was still a shareholder in NRD and therefore liable for its debts [and] I hand-delivered the second letter to the NRD office Barbara the secretary in the office accepted the document but refused to sign for it."  Why is no copy of a notice of debt owed to 25 other employees attached anywhere to your witness statement?  A. You have to read the order to pay that is referred to here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Why is no inventory of the minerals held within the Kigali office when you seized it, identifying the minerals and their weight, provided with your witness statement?</li> <li>A. In my basic document, those documents are included. Everything that was found in the office, including the tables and chairs, everything was inventoried in that report.</li> <li>Q. My question again is: why is that inventory not attached to your witness statement, if it really exists?</li> <li>A. As I have already told you, I gave a document about 100 pages long. And the particular document that you're referring to, which is a seizure report drafted by myself, was included in that 100-page document.</li> <li>Q. And the document you say exists, it's your position that it also includes an inventory of exactly what the equipment consisted of?</li> <li>A. The equipment that was seized and the mineral that was seized, then locked up in NRD's office.</li> <li>Q. If I could ask paragraph 22 to be brought up.  In paragraph 22 of your statement you discuss the events of the next day, June 12th 2014, in which you describe similar actions, this time at the offices at the Nemba concession. Do you recall providing testimony</li> </ul>

1.4.40			14.47.1	
14:42		about those events in your witness statement?	14:47 1	page, before or after, please let us know and they will
	2	A. Yes, I do.	2	turn to that page.
	3	Q. And you say again: after seizing which means locking	3	So the question, again, is: identify the document,
	4	up the Nemba offices, you posted security outside, so	4	by either footnote number or the title of the document,
	5	that the materials inside could be secure for sale later	5	that constitutes the inventory of minerals and equipment
	6	to assess against the debt; correct?	6	that you created when seizing the offices at the Nemba
	7	A. That is correct.	7	facility.
	8	Q. Why was no inventory of the minerals and equipment	8	A. Well, the thing is, you have to look up the reference
	9	seized at the Nemba offices attached to your witness	9	and then produce the corresponding document. The
	10	statement?	10	reports that I produced, both in the Kigali and the
	11	A. Everything is annexed, everything that I did is annexed.	11	Nemba office, it was handwritten on both occasions. And
	12	Q. So	12	so you just have to produce these documents: you'll find
	13	THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, could I intervene. You are	13	all the details that I did.
	14	asking this witness repeatedly why matters are not in	14	Q. Sir, I'm asking you to identify the reference in this
	15	his witness statement. If it is your intention to	15	witness statement, and we will call up that document
	16	invite the Tribunal to infer that matters not in his	16	number.
	17	witness statement, but spoken to, represent evidence	17	A. You'll find this at the bottom of the page. You just
	18	that is untrue, it would be fair to this witness to make	18	need to
	19	that plain to him.	19	Q. Can you find it, sir, please? And if you can't find it,
	20	MR COWLEY: Certainly.	20	just let me know, and I'll accept that answer to the
	21	Mr Nsengiyuma, if in fact you had created	21	question and move on.
	22	an inventory of the minerals and equipment that were	22	A. But the numbers are written there. All you have to do
	23	seized by your locking up the Nemba facility's offices,	23	is produce the document with the number on it, and then
	24	that document would have been attached to your witness	24	on that document you will see everything, black and
	25	statement; correct?	25	white.
		Page 61		Page 63
14:44	1	A. It is appended in the annex.	14:48 1	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask this one last time, sir, because
14:44	1 2	<ul><li>A. It is appended in the annex.</li><li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show</li></ul>	14:48 1 2	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask this one last time, sir, because I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists,
14:44		Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show		
14:44	2		2	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists,
14:44	2	Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote	2 3	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So
14:44	2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li><li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it</li></ul>	2 3 4	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me
14:44	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li><li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.
14:44	2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals." Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement? A. I recall this, yes. Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony,
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up. A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question. Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that. In paragraph 23, witness your statement says: "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals." Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement? A. I recall this, yes. Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment ago with regard to Kigali, and now paragraph 22, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.  Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is liable to secure the property they seized, so that it
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment ago with regard to Kigali, and now paragraph 22, which goes over these two pages. There are footnotes at the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.  Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is liable to secure the property they seized, so that it could be sold and credited against the debt?
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment ago with regard to Kigali, and now paragraph 22, which</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.  Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is liable to secure the property they seized, so that it
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment ago with regard to Kigali, and now paragraph 22, which goes over these two pages. There are footnotes at the bottom of each page. If you need to go on to any other</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.  Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is liable to secure the property they seized, so that it could be sold and credited against the debt?  A. That's correct, yes.
14:44	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Can you identify that, please? And if you could show him the whole page. Which footnote</li> <li>A. It's in the document that I submitted. That's where it is.</li> <li>Q. I'm asking you about the witness statement; I'm not asking you about what you gave to Respondent or their counsel. So when you say "submitted", I want to be very clear: are you using that term to refer to what you attached to your witness statement or what you gave to Respondent's counsel, or something different?</li> <li>A. In the witness statement, annexed are all of the documents that justify what I did, and the reports including the reports, reports on the seizures.</li> <li>Q. Can I ask you to identify, in the footnotes or by title, the document annexed to your witness statement that you say constitutes the inventory of the minerals and equipment seized at the Nemba facility's offices?</li> <li>A. Can I see the whole document?</li> <li>Q. Certainly. If you could make it side-by-side pages.  Mr Nsengiyuma, the controller will put up two pages at a time. We were talking about paragraph 21 a moment ago with regard to Kigali, and now paragraph 22, which goes over these two pages. There are footnotes at the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I want to be very clear: I don't believe it exists, I don't believe it is referenced. You say it is. So I'm asking you: since you believe it is, you tell me which document reference to have them call up.  A. At the bottom of the page, you have a number: you have the number of the document, you have the reference number. And then if you take that document, you'll have the answer to your question.  Q. May I ask that FTI controller please focus on paragraph 23, enlarge that.  In paragraph 23, witness your statement says:  "A day or so after I had been to Nemba and sealed the NRD offices with the minerals inside, I was told by the two RGL security guards that I had left on the site in Nemba, that NRD's employees had broken into the office and stolen the minerals."  Do you remember giving that testimony as part of a witness statement?  A. I recall this, yes.  Q. Do you also recall, at the beginning of your testimony, acknowledging that a professional bailiff in Rwanda is liable to secure the property they seized, so that it could be sold and credited against the debt?

Oay 6	Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits ICSID Case N	Io. ARB/18/21 Monday, 28 June 2021
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2	facility's offices contents existed, you don't want anyone to see it, because you are liable for the loss of those materials while they were under your control as seizing them?  A. When the two employees stole the minerals, we took them to the police station in Nemba and there was a record that we signed there.  Q. So you weren't there when anybody took the minerals or any equipment out of the Nemba facility, right?  A. Well, the next day a security guard called me and I lodged a complaint with the police.  Q. And you can't name anybody that you say stole those materials; correct? You can't identify them by name?  A. Well, in my record I wrote down the names.  Q. Excuse me?  A. In my record I wrote down the names.  Q. And that record, if it existed, would be attached to your witness statement to support your position that the people responsible for the theft are NRD employees, and not you for lapsed security; correct?  A. Yes, it's in the record. In fact, the name of the police station is also included in the record.  Q. If I could ask that we go back to paragraph 17. I'm	14:56 1 a whole list, a comprehensive list. When I was 2 summonsed by the police, I had to produce the list of 3 all the names, and indeed I produced the copies of the 4 rulings listing all the people who demanded payment from 5 NRD. This is just a small portion: the people who 6 actually came to the office to sign the contract with me 7 to execute the order. 8 Q. Sir, it's true, is it not, if you provided a list of 9 26 names, you kept a copy of it let me strike the 10 question. Let me ask it this way. 11 It's true, is it not, that you kept a copy of the 12 comprehensive list of names that you provided the police 13 that day; correct? 14 A. Yes, and in the document that I produced, the list is 15 included there as an annex. It is there. 16 Q. Well, you'll certainly agree with me, sir, that you're 17 capable of providing a copy of the document you provided 18 to the police; correct? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. The Shema Ernest that's identified as one of your 21 clients, is that the same Shema on whose behalf you say 22 you provided notice to NRD by giving Shema a copy that 23 was signed for? 24 A. Well, when I produced the letter, Shema was still 25 working for NRD at the time. But one or two years  Page 67
	statement you initially described the clients with debt against NRD as numbering 26, other than Mr Pascal.  Do you recall, if you could go down to footnote 20 do you see footnote 20 there? Yes, thank you. Do you recall that what you cited in support of identifying 26 employees with debts against NRD is document Exhibit R-066? Do you recall identifying that document in support of your identification of your 25 other clients?  A. We were at the police station, we gave all the names, we said everything that I was doing. Mr Marshall summoned	14:58 1 later, I don't remember exactly, but she was kicked 2 out or he was kicked out. He came to my office and 3 asked me to execute the ruling on his behalf. 4 Q. To be clear, it's the same Shema that you said accepted 5 notice of the claims of all 26 6 A. Yes, and he 7 Q creditors? I'm sorry, I spoke over you. I want to 8 just be clear. You're saying that the same Shema that 9 accepted notice of the debt owed to 26 creditors on 10 behalf of NRD is the Shema that's named in this 11 document; correct?

- me to the police station. The names, the phone numbers
- 12
- 13 of everybody who demanded to be paid by NRD, the list
- 14 was drawn up. The names and the phone numbers ...
- 15 Q. May I ask that R-066 be brought up, and if you can focus
- 16 on paragraph 1.1.
- 17 The document that you referred to as containing
- 18 names of 26 creditors that you provided notice of to NRD
- 19 actually only contains 7 names; isn't that correct?
- 20 A. Yes, the names that I listed there are the names of
- 21 those people who came to my office to sign a contract
- 22 with me to recover the amounts due to them.
- 23 Q. And those were the only names provided in this document;
- 24
- A. There are other names that I've not mentioned. There's

13

ruling in his favour. Now, there was one or two years' gap in between.

12 A. Well, when he signed the document -- at the time when he

was kicked out and he produced the copy of the ruling,

he came to my office to ask me in turn to execute the

received the notice, he was a NRD employee. But when he

Q. It's true, is it not, sir, that you had never paid any

of the creditors the value of the inventory that was

stolen from the Nemba facility's offices while they were

under your control, having seized that office; correct?

22 A. Can you repeat the question, please?

- 23 Q. Yes. Remember your testimony that after you seized the
- 24 Nemba facility's offices, you came back a couple of days
- 25 later to find that minerals were stolen; you blamed NRD

Page 68

15:01 1			
	1 3	15:06 1	you believe that was your instruction?
2		2	A. Yes, sir. These were my instructions.
3		3	Q. Now, you seized the office originally believing you were
4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	enforcing an arbitration award; correct?
5	•	5	A. Yes.
6	1 2	6	Q. And you understood turning the office over [in] the way
7	next day I took them to the police station; and when	7	you just described is inconsistent with what you read
8	they were taken to the police station, I was able to	8	the arbitration award to say, isn't it?
9	complete my work.	9	A. No, that's not the case. Mr Marshall had lodged
10	Q. Did you recover minerals, sir, and sell them for the	10	a complaint with the Ministry of Justice claiming that
11	debt?	11	I had been using forged documents or false rulings. The
12	A. No, I didn't sell anything from Nemba.	12	Ministry of Justice then sent me a letter suspending my
13	Q. And you didn't pay the value of those minerals to any of	13	functions vis-à-vis the NRD case: I was asked to desist
14	the creditors; correct?	14	from that case and no longer attempt to execute that
15	A. I didn't sell anything in Nemba, and it wasn't for me to	15	ruling.
16	pay anything. It should have been for the thieves to	16	Having received this order, this summons from the
17	pay it.	17	Ministry of Justice the cease-and-desist on execution on
18	Q. If I could ask that paragraph 27 of the witness	18	NRD, that was the end of my duty. So I returned the key
19		19	
20	In paragraph 27 of your witness statement you	20	
21	testify about a meeting at NRD's offices on June 25th	21	
22	that was arranged for the day before, and at this	22	to return the office to Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova,
23		23	among others?
24	were all present, among others. Do you recall providing	24	_
25		25	-
	-		
	Page 69		Page 71
15:03 1	A. Yes, I do.	15:08 1	I was using forged documents, on that basis the minister
2		2	ordered me to stop my activities against NRD and to
3		3	return the entire file to the Ministry of Justice. And
4		4	the keys were to be returned to the NRD executives, and
5		5	Bosco that is myself was left aside.
6		6	Q. Based on the arbitration award that you say you were
7			
8		/	acting consistent with, who did you believe the NRD
	O. Who gave you the histraction that created that duty?	7 8	acting consistent with, who did you believe the NRD executives to be?
9		8	executives to be?
9	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry	8	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read
10	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and	8	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the
10 11	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and	8 9 10 11	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed,
10 11 12	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry	8 9 10 11 12	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives
10 11 12 13	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the	8 9 10 11 12 13	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names,
10 11 12 13 14	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.
10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your
10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the
10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.  Q. To be clear, it's your testimony that you believe you	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with Ms Mruskovicova, Ben Benzinge and Marshall, we went
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.  Q. To be clear, it's your testimony that you believe you were instructed by the Ministry of Justice to open the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with Ms Mruskovicova, Ben Benzinge and Marshall, we went together to the offices of the Ministry of Justice, and
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.  Q. To be clear, it's your testimony that you believe you were instructed by the Ministry of Justice to open the door and give the keys, control of those offices,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with Ms Mruskovicova, Ben Benzinge and Marshall, we went together to the offices of the Ministry of Justice, and they said that, "On that date you have to report to the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.  Q. To be clear, it's your testimony that you believe you were instructed by the Ministry of Justice to open the door and give the keys, control of those offices,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with Ms Mruskovicova, Ben Benzinge and Marshall, we went together to the offices of the Ministry of Justice, and they said that, "On that date you have to report to the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Mr Marshall had lodged a complaint [with] the Ministry of Justice claiming that Bosco had closed the office and so they were not in a position to pay employees, and that Bosco was using forged documents, and the Ministry of Justice therefore asked me to produce all the documents and to re-open the door. They actually indicated the date at which I was supposed to report to NRD with officials from the Ministry of Justice, so that I should open the doors and so that Mr Marshall could go in and pay his employees.  I followed these instructions from the Ministry of Justice. And so we went to the NRD offices, I did open the door, and that's I completed my duties.  Q. To be clear, it's your testimony that you believe you were instructed by the Ministry of Justice to open the door and give the keys, control of those offices,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	executives to be?  A. I don't know who these executives were. You had to read the list of RDB, Rwanda Development Board. When the list of corporate officers of the company were listed, the Rwanda Development Board lists who the executives are, these corporate officers. There were names, including Ben Benzinge and others.  Q. I asked you who you determined it to be. Is it your testimony that when you were instructed to turn the offices back over to executives, you looked at the list of officers: it included Mr Benzinge, Mr Marshall and Ms Mruskovicova? Is that your testimony?  A. Well, we looked up the list of the shareholders of NRD at the Rwanda Development Board. We, together with Ms Mruskovicova, Ben Benzinge and Marshall, we went together to the offices of the Ministry of Justice, and they said that, "On that date you have to report to the

15:11 1 complete his dut	ties".
--------------------------	--------

- 2 On said day, I reported with the keys, I opened the
- doors, and that completed my duties, in the presence of
- 4 officials from the Ministry of Justice.
- 5 Q. Based on your review of the arbitration award that you
- 6 said you were enforcing and checking again yourself at
- 7 the RDB, you confirmed that Mr Benzinge was only a 15%
- 8 shareholder; correct?
- 9 A. Well, that wasn't my concern.
- 10 Q. You know that minority shareholders don't get keys to
- the offices and allowed to run the operations,
- 12 don't you?
- 13 A. Well, my instructions were simply to stop the execution
- in NRD. My instructions were to open the doors of NRD
- in the presence of officials from the Ministry of
- 16 Justice. Those were my instructions.
- We had had a meeting before. Minutes were drafted
- at the Ministry of Justice. And on the indicated date
- 19 at the indicated time, I duly reported to produce the
- 20 keys in the presence of officials from the Ministry of
- 21 Justice, and that completed my duty.
- 22 Q. When deciding how to turn the keys over to the people in
- 23 charge of NRD, did you take any action to reach out to
- the majority shareholders and ask them how they wish to
- secure their company?

- 15:15 1 RDB, the Rwanda Development Board, and they say clearly
  - who are the shareholders. And the shareholders, you had
  - 3 Marshall, you had Ben Benzinge, you had Zuzana, and
  - 4 there was somebody else, I don't recall who. And these
  - 5 were the shareholders of the company.
  - 6 Q. It's your testimony that you were told that by the RDB
  - 7 before June 25th 2014, and you're handing the keys back
  - 8 over to Mr Benzinge: you tried, you say, to Mr Marshall
  - 9 and Ms Mruskovicova, as well, but they, you say,
  - 10 wouldn't accept the keys and walked away. Is that your
  - 11 testimony?
  - 12 A. Yes, under the supervision of the Ministry of Justice.
  - 13 Marshall had suggested that Bosco should desist from the
  - 14 execution. The Ministry of Justice set me aside, and
  - made an appointment so that I should open the doors and
  - that the owners then take over. And from that time on,
  - 17 that completed my job.
  - 18 Q. Sir, I was just trying to get clear when you say: in
  - order to determine the shareholders of a company, you
  - 20 have to confirm with RDB. I'm asking you just simply to
  - 21 focus on this question: is it your testimony you did in
  - fact check with the RDB to get an answer to that
  - 23 question before turning keys back over to anyone on
  - 24 June 25th 2014?
  - 25 A. Yes, I did check.

### Page 75

- 15:13 1 A. Again, that was not my concern. There had been
  - 2 a meeting at the Ministry of Justice, in the presence of
  - 3 Marshall, Benzinge and Ms Mruskovicova, saying that on
  - 4 that date the doors would be opened; that Bosco --
  - 5 i.e. myself -- would open the door, would turn the keys,
  - 6 and go away. And it was not my concern to know who was
  - 7 a minority or majority shareholder; that was not my
  - 8 concern. My job was to open the doors and leave.
  - 9 Q. You agreed with me at the beginning of your testimony
  - 10 that part of your responsibilities as a professional
  - bailiff is to maintain the security of the assets you
  - seize. Do you recall agreeing that that's your
  - 13 obligation?
  - 14 A. I quite agree. 100%.
  - 15 Q. What was the Zarnacks' position about whether they would
  - 16 come to Rwanda or send a representative to take control
  - 17 and secure NRD?
  - 18 A. Can you repeat the question, please?
  - 19 Q. What was the Zarnacks' position [about] whether they
  - 20 were willing to come to Rwanda themselves or send
  - a representative to take control of NRD?
  - 22 A. Who are Zarnacks? I'm sorry. Who are Zarnacks?
  - 23 I don't know them.
  - 24 Q. Did you even read the arbitration award?
  - 25 A. Yes, I did. You have to look at who owned the company,

Page 74

- 15:17 1 Q. And you say your actions were consistent with the
  - 2 instructions of RDB?
  - 3 A. Well, RDB -- what instructions were RDB? RDB -- it is
  - 4 RDB's duty to say who is the shareholders of the
  - 5 company. They simply gave you the names: A, B, C and D.
  - 6 RDB produced the documents to the effect that the
  - shareholders were Marshall, Ben and the others, and it
  - 8 was not for me to challenge that document to RDB.
  - 9 THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, you have ten minutes, leaving
  - 10 Mr Hill three minutes for re-examination.
  - 11 MR COWLEY: Thank you.
  - 12 Can I ask that R-[77] be brought up. (Pause)
  - 13 At some point, Mr Nsengiyuma, you agree that the
  - 14 Ministry of Justice informed you [that] you were free to
  - 15 continue collecting on judgments against NRD; you
  - 16 testify to that, correct?
  - 17 A. Yes.
  - 18 Q. R-077 is a document -- looks like it's in English --
  - 19 that provides information about an auction in
  - 20 February 2015 in which a car seized from Mr Marshall was
  - 21 auctioned; correct?
  - 22 A. Yes, sold by Bosco.
  - 23 Q. So you were still trying to collect into 2015, and at
  - 24 this point you were going after the personal assets, the
  - 25 personal car of Mr Marshall; correct?

Page 76

22 (Pages 73 to 76)

15:19 1	A. No, not the assets of Mr Marshall; of NRD.	15:24 1	You recall you were asked some questions about
2	What should be noted: having given all of NRD's	2	whether or not there were judgments annexed to this
3	documents that is the copies of the judgments to	3	document; do you remember those questions?
4	the Ministry of Justice, these were checked. After	4	A. Yes, that question was put to me.
5	a period of two or three months, the minister came to	5	Q. Now, I'm going to ask you to look at the third paragraph
6	the conclusion that all the copies of the judgments that	6	of the document, which in French starts "Vu le jugement
7	I had used were appropriate, correct. And so he ordered	7	RSOC"
8	NRD, represented by Mr Marshall, to pay all the workers	8	Could you just explain what was said at the end of
9	who had these judgments in their favour; and if this	9	that paragraph, with the words "dont la copie est en
10		10	annexe"?
11	his work, my work.	11	A. NRD, through Mr Marshall, went to the courts and sued to
12		12	reverse the enforcement and the seizures that I had
13	* *	13	begun to undertake. The court asked him, "Have you paid
14		14	up the amounts owed to employees?" He answered that he
15	* *	15	had not. The court said, "Then we shall carry on with
16	3 6	16	enforcement".
17	Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you agree you never took action to seize	17	Q. Then if you just focus on my question, Mr Nsengiyuma.
18	any assets of Mr Benzinge, as shareholder of NRD, to pay	18	Where it says in this paragraph the closing words
19	your other clients' debts; correct?	19	"dont la copie est en annexe", what were you doing with
20	A. No, that is forbidden. You do not take the you do	20	this document and with the judgment?
21	not seize the belongings of the shareholders. The	21	A. Enforcement was underway. Mr Marshall brought
22		22	proceedings against me. The court decided that
23	assets. The car that Mr Marshall drove was registered	23	Marshall's claim and NRD's claim was groundless, so
24		24	automatically the enforcement that I had stopped could
25		25	resume. And for me to resume with the enforcement
	Page 77		Page 79
15:22 1	Ministry of Justice said you could continue to collect	15:27 1	procedure of the judgment, I had to append, I had to
15:22 1 2	Ministry of Justice said you could continue to collect debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and	15:27 1 2	procedure of the judgment, I had to append, I had to annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with
2	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and	2	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with
2 3	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again;	2 3	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD
2 3 4	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?	2 3 4	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could
2 3 4 5	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.	2 3 4 5	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.
2 3 4 5 6	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you	2 3 4 5	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.
2 3 4 5 6 7	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and	2 3 4 5 6 7	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume. MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma. THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave. (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.  THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 0'clock:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.  THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051, if that can be put up on the screen. And could I also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.  THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause) (3.31 pm)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051, if that can be put up on the screen. And could I also have it in the French as well, please, up on the screen,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now. THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause)  (3.31 pm)  MR EVODE IMENA (called)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051, if that can be put up on the screen. And could I also have it in the French as well, please, up on the screen, one beside each other.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.  THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause)  (3.31 pm)  MR EVODE IMENA (called)  THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Imena. On your screen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051, if that can be put up on the screen. And could I also have it in the French as well, please, up on the screen,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now. THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause)  (3.31 pm)  MR EVODE IMENA (called)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	debt against NRD, you'll agree you never went back and seized any of the concessions or their offices again; correct?  A. I sold the car that I had seized.  Q. Yes. Sir, that's not my question. You agree that you never went back to the concessions or the offices and seized those again; correct?  A. Well, there was what had already been seized, such as the car used by Mr Marshall, which I told when the authorisation came from the Ministry of Justice.  Q. You'll agree, sir, that someone instructed you not to seize any of the concessions again, to let whatever mining was going on there continue; won't you agree with that?  A. No. The bailiff receives no orders from anyone to conduct his work. The bailiff enforces the judgment.  MR COWLEY: I have no further questions.  (3.24 pm)  Re-direct examination by MR HILL  Q. Mr Nsengiyuma, you were asked about a document at R-051, if that can be put up on the screen. And could I also have it in the French as well, please, up on the screen, one beside each other.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	annex the judgment that authorised me to continue with the or to resume the enforcement, that said that NRD had not paid, and therefore the enforcement could resume.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Nsengiyuma.  THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much indeed for coming to assist us. You are now free to leave.  (The witness withdrew)  MR HILL: Mr President, the next witness is going to be Mr Imena.  THE PRESIDENT: Yes. (Pause)  MR COWLEY: Mr President, if I may ask while we have a moment, what's the preference in terms of the schedule for breaks from here?  THE PRESIDENT: I think we'll have the next half-hour break at 4.15, and there will be one final break of 15 minutes before we conclude at 7.00.  MR WATKINS: Okay, we are bringing the witness in now.  THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll have the break at 4 o'clock: that would balance the rest of the day better. (Pause)  (3.31 pm)  MR EVODE IMENA (called)  THE PRESIDENT: Good afternoon, Mr Imena. On your screen

15:31 1	repeat that aloud?	15:34 1	witness statement. I thought I was allowed to have
2	MR IMENA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience	2	them. But they can be taken away, if that's the
3	that I shall speak the truth, the whole truth and	3	instruction.
4	nothing but the truth.	4	MR HILL: I think he is permitted to have his witness
5	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.	5	statement.
6	MR HILL: Thank you.	6	THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
7	(3.31 pm)	7	MR COWLEY: There's no way I can take the time to try to
8	Direct examination by MR HILL	8	check what's on each page through Mr Imena and whether
9	Q. Mr Imena, did you work with Mr Dominique Bidega when you	9	there's other materials or information written there.
10	were at OGMR?	10	So I would certainly just request the courtesy to not
11	A. Yes.	11	leave any question about whether there's something more
12	Q. Do you recall Mr Bidega retiring from the OGMR?	12	on that version than on others. And as Respondent's
13	A. Yes, I remember.	13	counsel knows, we have been relying with all the
14	Q. What can you remember about the circumstances of	14	witnesses on pulling up and giving them an opportunity
15	Mr Bidega's retirement?	15	to review as much of their witness statements as they
16	A. So I remember he retired at the end of 2011. At that	16	need before answering questions about it.
17	time they were restructuring from OGMR, changing into	17	MR IMENA: So let me just bring them out of the room.
18	a new institution. And as I was working there, so we	18	THE PRESIDENT: That's a good idea.
19	were given some of those new positions: for instance,	19	MR IMENA: Okay. (Pause)
20	Bidega was given a new position as an officer in charge	20	MR COWLEY: Thank you, Mr Imena.
21	of inspection, and he was demoted from his previous role	21	MR IMENA: You're welcome.
22	as a director in charge of inspection and regulation.	22	MR COWLEY: I'm going to ask that the first witness
23	So at that time he was not feeling happy about that.	23	statement indeed be brought up, and paragraph 9 focused
24	And then he started showing signs that he's not happy	24	on.
25	with the decision made in September 2011 to change his	25	So I'm skipping over some prior paragraphs. To
	Page 81		Page 83
15.22 1	position because his solary was reduced and he was	15.26 1	orient you in personable prior to this you provide your
15:32 1	position, because his salary was reduced and he was	15:36 1	orient you, in paragraphs prior to this you provide your
2	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork,	2	background, professional background, including your time
2 3	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform	2 3	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how
2 3 4	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy,	2 3 4	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used
2 3 4 5	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the	2 3 4 5	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how
2 3 4 5 6	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.	2 3 4 5 6	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?
2 3 4 5 6 7	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents	2 3 4 5 6 7	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers or any previously prepared materials away and held	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?  A. Can you repeat, please, your question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers or any previously prepared materials away and held safely for Mr Imena.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?  A. Can you repeat, please, your question?  Q. Yes. The reference to being "familiar with the file",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers or any previously prepared materials away and held	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?  A. Can you repeat, please, your question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers or any previously prepared materials away and held safely for Mr Imena.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?  A. Can you repeat, please, your question?  Q. Yes. The reference to being "familiar with the file",
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	given a position that would require a lot of fieldwork, and his health situation was not allowing him to perform fieldwork. So he showed signs that he was not happy, and he ended up being given a retirement or quitting the institution at the end of the year.  MR HILL: Thank you, Mr Imena. Now, Mr Cowley represents the Claimants and he's going to ask you some questions now.  MR IMENA: Okay.  (3.33 pm)  Cross-examination by MR COWLEY  Q. Good afternoon, Mr Imena.  A. Good afternoon, sir.  Q. Please let me know if I saw correctly: to my eye, it appeared that you may have carried papers with you into the exam room, and that may be on the table in front of you. Is that accurate?  A. I have these papers, as well as my witness statement.  MR COWLEY: May I ask that any papers if there's someone else in the room from the Respondent, or someone could go into the room from the Respondent and take any papers or any previously prepared materials away and held safely for Mr Imena.  MR IMENA: There's no one in this room. I have my printed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	background, professional background, including your time with the am I pronouncing this correctly, is this how you pronounce it the agency, the ministry that's used as an acronym here, I pronounce "MINIRENA". Is that how you pronounce it?  A. Yes.  Q. So you provide some background about your time with MINIRENA and the positions you hold. And I'm picking up at paragraph 9, and there's two time periods covered.  First, you mention "shortly after [you] were appointed in February 2013". You've already explained in prior paragraphs that that's when you were appointed the minister.  Then you go in the next sentence backwards in time, and that's what I want to focus on. You say that:  "[You were] already familiar with the file as in May 2012 I had been asked to evaluate NRD's application for new five year licences made in November 2010"  You referenced "file" there. Do you recall what you're referring to is the NRD relationship with MINIRENA?  A. Can you repeat, please, your question?  Q. Yes. The reference to being "familiar with the file", you're talking about NRD's file in that paragraph,

#### 15:38 1 right?

- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Who asked you in 2012 to review the NRD November 2010
- 5 A. I was asked that by my superiors, my supervisors at
- Rwanda Natural Resources Authority, Geology and Mines 6
- 7 Department.
- 8 Q. And by name, who asked you?
- 9 A. I think at that time it was Mr Francis Kayumba.
- 10 Q. And when you were asked to review it, what were you told
- 11 to review it for, what purpose?
- 12 A. It was to make an assessment of the application file and
- 13 give recommendations as a geologist.
- 14 Q. I'd like to be clear about the reference to "file".
- 15 Literally, are you referring to a file that consolidated
- 16 all of whatever, within MINIRENA, was considered to be
- 17 the important materials to hold together in some form of
- 18 filing system, so a physical file; or is that an offhand
- 19 reference referring to any and all documents, wherever
- 20 found in the computer system, but not all together in
- 21 one place?
- 22 A. There were documents on hard copies and there were
- documents on soft copies. 23
- 24 Q. And that means on the computer system?
- 25 A. Yes.

9

#### Page 85

- 15:41 1 A. I'm sorry, I don't remember if it was hard file or soft

  - 3 O. Who was it circulated to?
  - 4 A. The report I made was circulated to Francis and
  - 5 copies --
  - 6 Q. I'm sorry, I asked a poor question. And it would be
  - rude to interrupt, but I want to make sure my question
  - 8 aligns with your answer, and I think I asked a poor
  - 9 question. So let me start again.
    - Who was -- is it fair for me to call him
  - 11 "Dr Michael": you'll understand who I'm referring to?
  - 12 A. Yes.

10

- 13 Q. Your supervisor. So who was Dr Michael's assessment
- 14 that predated yours, who was that circulated to?
- 15 A. I don't remember. But I got a copy of that assessment.
- 16 I don't remember all the people who had access to that
- 17 assessment.
- 18 O. Was it provided to NRD?
- 19 A. I don't remember. I don't think it's appropriate to
- 20 speculate.
- 21 Q. When was it created?
- 22 A. The report of Dr Michael was created before my May 2012
- report. I don't -- right now, I don't remember the
- 24
- 25 Q. Is it attached to your witness statement in any way? Do

# Page 87

- 15:40 1 Q. Now, when you were told to make an assessment of the
  - 2010 application at this time, were you told assessment
  - 3 of that application had already started by some previous
  - 4 person or persons?
  - 5 A. Yes, it was a file that had been at the ministry since
  - 6 some years, but there were additional documents that
  - 7 were brought in. So I had to make an assessment of all
  - 8 the information that was available to me at that time.
  - Q. Well, obviously the relationship with NRD, including in 10
  - document form, predates, goes back in time before the 11 November 2010 application itself. So I'm not referring
  - 12 to the fact that there were prior materials before that
  - 13 application.
  - 14 But to ask my question again, and perhaps be
  - 15 clearer, when you were asked to make an assessment of
  - 16 the November 2010 application, were you told whether one
  - 17 or more assessments of that application had already been
  - 18 started by others?
  - 19 A. Yes, my supervisor at that time had already made
  - 20 an assessment. He was called Dr Michael Biryabarema.
  - 21 He had already made an assessment.
  - 22 Q. Was that in writing?
  - 23 A. Yes, it was in writing.
  - 24 Q. Was it part of the hard file or only the soft file,
  - 25 internal computer files?

Page 86

- 15:43 1 you recall discussing it and referring to it in any of
  - your witness statements?
  - 3 A. That report is referred to in my May 2012 report.
  - Q. And is it attached to it?
  - 5 A. I would need to check if it is attached to it.
  - O. Did it come to a conclusion, Dr Michael's assessment?
  - 7 A. Dr Michael's report, yes, made some conclusions.
  - 8 Q. Did any information in the file state whether his
  - 9 conclusions were communicated to NRD?
  - 10 A. I'm sorry, I don't remember.
  - 11 Q. Did you rely on -- and by that, I mean did you copy --
  - 12 any of Dr Michael's work product in his assessment when
  - 13 you created your own?
  - 14 A. I relied on information provided in his report, as well
  - 15 as information from other reports.
  - Q. Well, let's identify those for a moment. Did you look 16
  - 17 at the November 2010 application, did you read that in
  - 18
  - 19 A. Yes.
  - 20 Q. What are the reports, if any, beyond the November 2010
  - 21 and Dr Michael's assessment --
  - 22 A. There was another report that was submitted by NRD: it
  - 23 was a summarised investment plan for the year 2012 to
  - 24 2017. That report I think was submitted by NRD in July.
  - Q. Of what year?

Page 88

25 (Pages 85 to 88)

15:45 1	A. In July 2011.	15:49 1	for short term.
2		2	-
3	, ,	3	,
4	•	4	£ 1
5		5	
6		6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7	j ,	7	
8	~	8	
9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	9	1
10	•	10	•
11		11	, 8
12		12	•
13	11 2	13	
14	·	14	•
15	**	15	
16		16	
17	~	17	
18		18	
19	•	19	•
20	7	20	E
21		21	E i
22	•	22	<u> </u>
23	11 00	23	2
24		24	
25	applications during the time period where there wasn't	25	Q. And within the total number during this privatisation
	Page 89		Page 91
15:47 1	communication back to NRD about its application?	15:51 1	period will you agree with me that some subset were
15:47 1 2	communication back to NRD about its application?  A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're	15:51 1	1 , 3 &
2	A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're	2	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term
2 3	A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and	2 3	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?
2 3 4	A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?	2 3 4	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?
2	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession holders with limited-term four- or five-year</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that time.
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession holders with limited-term four- or five-year exploratory licences that were issued for various mining</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that time.  Q. Okay. And just to be clear, we're talking about
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 22 23	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession holders with limited-term four- or five-year exploratory licences that were issued for various mining concessions; correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 20 21 22 23	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that time.  Q. Okay. And just to be clear, we're talking about 2005/2006?
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession holders with limited-term four- or five-year exploratory licences that were issued for various mining concessions; correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, there were many different licences that were issued</li> </ul>	22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that time.  Q. Okay. And just to be clear, we're talking about 2005/2006?  A. Yes.
22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. So if I heard properly, your question is you're asking if there were communications between MINIRENA and applicants between 2010 and 2012?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. Yes, MINIRENA had been communicating with concession applicants, concession holders during that period of time.</li> <li>Q. So you'll agree that as of November 2010, when NRD submitted its application, there were other initial concession holders, short-term concession holders, whose licences were coming to the end, and that applied for continued or long-term or short-term, but some new licence to continue with the concession; you'll agree with that, correct?</li> <li>A. I didn't get the answer the question properly. But for instance, I remember Bisesero concession was being treated around that time, 2010.</li> <li>Q. And I want to ask about all of them. So let me ask a broader question.  There were a number of initial-term concession holders with limited-term four- or five-year exploratory licences that were issued for various mining concessions; correct?</li> </ul>	22 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	treated as, and perhaps sometimes called by, the term "large-scale mining concessions"?  A. Can you repeat, please?  Q. So you mentioned the fact that there was privatisation of mines, mining concessions, that began in 2005, and that there was some wide number of licences and discussions that went forward after that. So I want to figure a way to come to language that we're both understanding or agree that refers to a particular subset. That's the purpose of my question, and really nothing more.  So within that time period where initial privatisation of mining concessions occurred, was there some subset of such concessions that were treated as "large-scale mining concessions", and looked at and referred to either with that term or another that meant the same thing?  A. No. At that time companies were given short-term licences to conduct both mining and exploration. There were no large-scale concession licences given at that time.  Q. Okay. And just to be clear, we're talking about 2005/2006?

15:53		15:56 1	a concession at the end of the four years. I, like you,
2	,	2	would like to have an idea of a ballpark figure of how
3		3	many applicants we're talking about.
4		4	MR COWLEY: Sir, I was asking a poor question if my
5		5	reference to the concessions in other words, that
(	e e	6	a licence was actually issued was part of my
	•	7	question. I wasn't trying to make it part of my
8	•	8	question. So a poor question asked twice. I'm sorry
9 10	1	9 10	for that. THE PRESIDENT: That's alright.
1:		11	MR COWLEY: But let me try again.
12		12	The number of potential large-scale mining
13	•	13	concessions, because they met the different definition
14		14	of the size, should they be issued, has that number
1:		15	remained constant since 2008?
10		16	A. You are comparing since 2008 to today or 2008 to 2010?
1′		17	Q. Just: has it remained constant? If it hasn't remained
18		18	constant, then I'll try to sharpen my question. But if
19		19	it doesn't need sharpening, I'm just trying to get to
20		20	the key part of this line, is just: what's the
2:		21	approximate number we're talking about?
22		22	So, again, with apologies for repeating the question
23		23	over and over again, has the number of potential
24	and some of them were applying for other mining	24	large-scale mining concessions, because they would, if
25	licences. But in that period of time, no one was	25	issued, meet the size definition of the 2008 statute,
	Page 93		Page 95
	1 age 93		1 age 73
1 15.22 1	given just after the 2008 law, no one was given	15.57 1	has that number been constant since 2008, or have there
15:55 1	given just after the 2008 law, no one was given a concession licence.	15:57 1	has that number been constant since 2008, or have there been new potential large-scale mining concessions that
2	a concession licence.	2	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that
	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then		been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in
2 3	<ul><li>a concession licence.</li><li>Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get</li></ul>	2 3	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?
2 3 4	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly	2 3 4	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in
2 3 4 5	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly	2 3 4 5	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and
2 3 4 5 6	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the	2 3 4 5 6	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was
2 3 4 5 6 7	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the	2 3 4 5 6 7	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008 Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.  I understood him to say that there are a number of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.  Q. That's fine. I just want to as of 2016, you said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.  I understood him to say that there are a number of applicants who had obtained four-year licences with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.  Q. That's fine. I just want to as of 2016, you said three or four had been issued. How many other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.  I understood him to say that there are a number of applicants who had obtained four-year licences with a view to applying at the end of the four years for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.  Q. That's fine. I just want to as of 2016, you said three or four had been issued. How many other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.  I understood him to say that there are a number of applicants who had obtained four-year licences with a view to applying at the end of the four years for a concession, and that not one of those was granted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.  Q. That's fine. I just want to as of 2016, you said three or four had been issued. How many other independent mines had applicants made a request for a large-scale mining concession, but it hadn't been yet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a concession licence.  Q. My question is a little different, and I apologise then if I asked it poorly. But I'm simply trying to get a sense of the number, as best we can, of similarly situated mining concessions. I want to refer to the similarly situated ones and sort of exclude from my questions applicability of my questions to all the others.  So I'm just going to stick with it from the point of view of just seeing if we can reach agreement as to the subset of mining concessions over the years that fall within a similar category.  So in 2008 you agreed with me that there came to be a defined term "large-scale mining concessions". And my question is  A. Yes.  Q the number of concessions that met that defined term in 2008, has that number increased since 2008?  THE PRESIDENT: Mr Cowley, I don't understand this witness to have said that anyone had such a concession.  I understood him to say that there are a number of applicants who had obtained four-year licences with a view to applying at the end of the four years for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	been new potential large-scale mining concessions that have come online or become available at some point in time, so the number changed?  A. So I will try to answer what I remember properly, and that was the time when I was a minister. So when I was a minister, we issued a few like, three to four, if I'm correct large-scale mining licences, and that was around 2015 and beginning of 2016.  So what I was saying is that between 2008 and 2014, there's no company that was given what we called the "concession licence" under the 2008  Q. I understand that, and I'm not trying we're going to be getting into it. Different purpose, and I don't mean to cut off the questioning because we'll get back to it.  But you said as of 2016, when you left, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been granted by MINIRENA?  A. That is what I remember when I was still there. But since 2016, the number has increased, because the mining board has issued other licences.  Q. That's fine. I just want to as of 2016, you said three or four had been issued. How many other independent mines had applicants made a request for

15:59 1	allowed as of the time you left in 2016?	16:03 1	others, but at least those are the ones I remember.
2	So there were three or four that were allowed, and	2	MR COWLEY: Thank you.
3	I'm not asking about the number of applicants because	3	Mr President, I've gone, I think, a few minutes past
4	they would need more than one for a mine. But how many	4	the stated
5	other potential mining concessions were subject to	5	THE PRESIDENT: Yes, I think we'll break for half an hour.
6	applications that hadn't been decided as of 2016,	6	MR COWLEY: Thank you.
7	large-scale?	7	(4.04 pm)
8	A. If I got properly your question, I would say that the	8	(Adjourned until 4.34 pm)
9	cases I remember, companies that applied for mining	9	(4.35 pm)
10	licences that might be considered as large-scale, and	10	THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Let us continue.
11	didn't get them, we can include NRD, we can include	11	MR COWLEY: Thank you. Before I start, Mr President, please
12	Rwanda Minerals and Mining, we can include Roka Rwanda,	12	let me know what the preferred time is for the break.
13	we can include Trans Africa. So those are the ones	13	THE PRESIDENT: Well, around about 6 o'clock.
14	I'm just remembering for the moment.	14	MR COWLEY: Thank you.
15	Q. And those were all for different potential concessions,	15	Mr Imena if we could focus again back at R-040,
16	or were any overlapping?	16	please, FTI this analysis, how long did it take you?
17	A. Can you repeat, please?	17	How long did you work on this?
18	Q. Yes. Those are all for if they all received	18	A. It can take a few days.
19	concessions, would they all have different mining	19	Q. And when you were done, what did you do with it? What
20	concessions, or were any of those applicants for the	20	happened with this document?
21	same concession, or potential concession?	21	A. I sent it to my supervisor and copied it to other
22	A. It was on different areas, different concessions.	22	colleagues. My supervisor was Francis Kayumba.
23	Q. Okay. I appreciate that.	23	Q. And the other colleagues? If there's many of them, just
24	So of the potential eight that you can recall,	24	tell me that there's a number.
25	you've now identified four that you recall not being	25	A. They include Dr Mike Biryabarema. They include
	Page 97		Page 99
	, and the second		, and the second
16:01 1	awarded as of the time you left. What were the three or	16:36 1	Alison George. She was the coordinator of a project
16:01 1 2	awarded as of the time you left. What were the three or four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as	16:36 1 2	Alison George. She was the coordinator of a project that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues,
2	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question,	2	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.
2 3	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?	2 3	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing
2 3 4	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the	2 3 4	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted,
2 3 4 5 6 7	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just ask you to name them.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result of this evaluation?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just ask you to name them.  A. Yes. If I remember properly, there was Musha, Musha	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result of this evaluation?  A. So I can't give any information. I was not part of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just ask you to name them.  A. Yes. If I remember properly, there was Musha, Musha mine; Nunga(?) mine, that was a joint licence; there was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result of this evaluation?  A. So I can't give any information. I was not part of those meetings, if they have happened.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just ask you to name them.  A. Yes. If I remember properly, there was Musha, Musha mine; Nunga(?) mine, that was a joint licence; there was Rutongo mine; there was Nyakabingo mine, and so those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result of this evaluation?  A. So I can't give any information. I was not part of those meetings, if they have happened.  Q. So you've heard others talk about the fact that it went
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	four large-scale mining concessions that had issued as of your departure from MINIRENA in 2016?  A. So if for maybe the clarity of my question, a large-scale mine is determined on the basis of the reserves of the deposits that were identified: the reserves, the investment plan and the production plan. So it's not the ministry that was the one to determine that this will be a large-scale mine; it was the work and the outcome of the work by the applicant that will help the ministry determine if this mine falls in which category.  So for the ministry, the basis was to issue an exploration licence, and then you conduct your studies and you came up and you say, "I'm applying for this type of licence".  Q. Thank you. Mr Imena, the three or four that you said as you recalled, at the time you left your position with MINIRENA, your position as minister, three or four large-scale mining concessions had been issued. I just ask you to name them.  A. Yes. If I remember properly, there was Musha, Musha mine; Nunga(?) mine, that was a joint licence; there was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that was working in the ministry. And other colleagues, such as Peter Martin Niyigena, Celse Gabinema, who were working with me.  Q. Is there a reason why there's no documentation showing how this document was treated, how it was transmitted, what was done with it, attached to your witness statement?  A. What I remember is that Francis received it and he gave a comment on it, and Alison George gave it to the minister, as well as the permanent secretary.  Q. Was there some sort of process whereby an action was taken or decided not to be taken as a result of your submission of this evaluation marked R-040?  A. Apart from the comment I received from Francis Kayumba and the note from Alison George, the rest was beyond my role.  Q. Do you know if at any point before it was given to the minister there was some meeting of those within OGMR or otherwise to discuss and agree on any action as a result of this evaluation?  A. So I can't give any information. I was not part of those meetings, if they have happened.

- 16:38 1 the transmittals of this document up to the minister at
  - 2 that time; correct?
  - 3 A. At that time my job was just to give it to my
  - 4 supervisors, and they will do whatever was in their
  - 5 capacity.
  - 6 Q. But eventually you became minister in 2013; correct?
  - 7 A. You are right.
  - 8 Q. And at that time the file was a little bit larger than
  - 9 it was in 2012, right?
  - 10 A. Can you repeat, please?
  - 11 Q. Yes. The NRD file in 2013 was a little bit larger than
  - it was in May 2012, right?
  - 13 A. You are right, because there are documents that were
  - submitted by NRD after my report.
  - 15 Q. And this report, this evaluation is part of the file as
  - of 2013, when you take over as minister, right?
  - 17 A. This report is an internal document. You see that it is
  - 18 stamped "Confidential". So it was, yes, part of the
  - information we had in the ministry.
  - 20 Q. I'm sorry, I just want to be clear. Are you suggesting
  - 21 that that means something different than what you
  - referred to before as being part of the "file"?
  - 23 A. From my side?
  - 24 Q. They're your references. So I'm just asking: earlier in
  - your testimony, we were using the phrase "in the file".

- 16:42 1 agreed upon or voted on as a result of it?
  - 2 A. If I got your question properly, after I submitted this
  - 3 evaluation report, if there has been any meeting, I was
  - 4 not part of it. But if you're asking if my report maybe
  - 5 contributed to any decision taken by the ministry, yes,
  - 6 I can guess so, because I was asked by my supervisors to
  - 7 write this report: they might have read it and maybe
  - 8 have considered some of the conclusions that I was
  - 9 suggesting.
  - 10 Q. That's fine. I just wanted to be clear as to whether
  - there was any other information you could give me.
  - 12 As I understand it, you weren't any part of any
  - 13 further meeting or discussion, other than to know that
  - 14 you transmitted it once you had the initial comments.
  - 15 And when you became minister, you didn't learn of some
  - meeting and specific action as a result of this
  - evaluation, but you guess somebody did something with
  - it. Is that accurate?
  - 19 A. It's accurate.
  - 20 Q. Now, in R-040 on page 2, if I could ask FTI to scroll
  - down a bit to the "Budget" section, 3.
  - 22 It says here, it summarises very quickly here, that
  - 23 the original budget for equipment and working capital
  - for the 2007 to 2011 time period was \$39.5 million; do
  - 25 you see that?

# Page 103

- $16:40 \quad 1$  You just said something a little bit different about the
  - 2 ministry's records.
  - 3 I'm asking you whether this evaluation, how it was
  - 4 held, was that something other than being part of the
  - 5 "file" that you referred to earlier in your testimony?
  - 6 A. This evaluation, yes, was part of the NRD file that we
  - 7 had at the Department of Mines and at the ministry.
  - 8 Q. But because it was stamped "Confidential", that means
  - 9 that the intention was not to show it to NRD; correct?
  - 10 A. Yes.
  - 11 Q. When you took over as minister, did you observe at that
  - time whether the file contained any explanation of what
  - action, if anything, occurred as a result of your
  - transmittal of this evaluation report?
  - 15 A. Yes, between May, when my report was submitted to my
  - supervisors, and February the following year, 2013,
  - 17 there had been several communications between the
  - 18 ministry and NRD.
  - 19 Q. I'm sorry, with regard to R-040, the document that's up
  - on the screen, your evaluation.
  - 21 A. Yes.
  - 22 Q. When you obtained access to the full file as minister,
  - at that time did you make a determination of whether any
  - 24 action was taken within the ministry with regard to
  - 25 this? Was a meeting held to discuss it? Was an action

Page 102

- 16:44 1 A. I see it, sir.
  - 2 Q. Then at the next page, 3 of 4, you comment on that by
  - 3 saying that they "only invested 30% of [that] initial
  - 4 budget"; correct?
  - 5 A. I see that as well.
  - 6 Q. Now, did you review the whole November 2010 application
  - 7 before making that summary?
  - 8 A. Yes.
  - 9 Q. If I could ask that C-035 be brought up, and page 8
  - 10 focused on. The "Achievements in Research" section or
  - part, if that could be highlighted and enlarged.
  - What NRD said in its application is, in reviewing
  - 13 its own information about the original request to obtain
  - the four-year licence for the five concessions, that
  - 15 \$39.5 million number posed expenditures over a five-year
  - 16 period, 2007 to 2011; correct?
  - 17 A. Yes.
  - 18 Q. So in order to get into a 2011 portion of such a budget,
  - 19 another concession and extension, something else had to
  - 20 go beyond the period of the four-year licence that was
  - 21 being discussed, right?
  - 22 A. Can you repeat your question, please?
  - 23 Q. Yes. To spend five years of a budget on the mining
  - 24 concessions, something beyond the initial four-year
  - concession had to be extended to NRD; correct?

- 16:46 1 A. No, that's not what I am reading. They are saying, if
  - 2 I'm reading it properly, that the proposed volume of
  - 3 investment for five years is that amount of \$39 million.
  - 4 If I got your question properly.
  - 5 Q. Right. They're saying that the initial proposed
  - 6 investment in working capital and equipment covered
  - 7 a five-year period to spend that money; correct?
  - 8 A. You are right.
  - 9 Q. And they had a four-year exploratory licence; correct?
  - 10 A. You are right.
  - 11 Q. So in order to spend any money in year 5, they were
  - counting on or budgeting in the expectation that they
  - would have some additional licence past the first
  - 14 four years; correct?
  - 15 A. If I recall it properly, they got a contract in 2006,
  - but they got their licence in 2007. And that's why they
  - 17 budgeted for 2007 to 2011.
  - 18 Q. In fact, aren't you aware that the November 2010
  - application was at the end of the four-year term that
  - 20 began in 2006?
  - 21 A. For the contracts, yes. And the licence ended in 2011.
  - 22 Q. So in order to exercise that licence into the next year,
  - they had to extend the contract: they had to have some
  - 24 further right to mine at that concession to get into
  - 25 that fifth year. Correct?

- 16:49 1 The information you had in NRD's November 2010
  - 2 application talked about what they had done through that
  - 3 date in 2010; correct?
  - 4 A. No. The information I used in my report was up to
  - 5 July 2011.
  - 6 Q. Okay. We'll get there in a moment. I have a question
  - about that. But before we leave this line, so I don't
  - 8 bounce around, I just want to point out that in NRD's
  - 9 application about its own four-year initial contract:
    - "The original business plan [it said] included
  - 11 investment in the applied-for mines of Nyakabingo and
  - 12 Gifurwe ..."

10

- Do you see that?
- 14 A. I see that.
- 15 Q. Did you review the file to determine if that's accurate,
- 6 that the \$39.5 million also included projected spendings
- 17 on those two mines?
- 18 A. That's what they say.
- 19 Q. Did you confirm it? You had the file: you were
- 20 reviewing it, right?
- 21 A. I reviewed what I had in hand, and what they are saying
- is they were also projecting to invest in those mines.
- 23 Q. I'm just trying to clarify with you, sir: did you
- confirm that yourself by reviewing the file from 2006?
- 25 A. Excuse me, can you repeat, please?

Page 107

- 16:47 1 A. They had to apply for a new licence or a new contract.
  - Q. But the budgeted number that you wanted to hold them to
  - 3 included the expectation of spending money in the fifth
  - 4 year; right?
  - 5 A. That's the budget they proposed. It's not the ministry
  - 6 that proposed this budget.
  - 7 Q. I understand. But you're doing the calculation about
  - 8 what percentage they spent and what they projected as of
  - 9 2010's application. So I'm just focusing on what you
  - 10 did and what you looked at.
  - So you took the \$39.5 million and counted it all,
  - 12 and assessed how much they spent as a percentage against
  - 13 it. The --
  - 14 A. I assessed what? Can I respond, please?
  - 15 Q. I said -- the question was -- I hadn't finished it. But
  - $\,$  16  $\,$   $\,$  what I said in the question was: you assessed how much
  - they had spent as a percentage of that \$39.5 million
  - 18 number, right?
  - 19 A. They were supposed to spend this amount within
  - 20 five years, but I made my assessment after six years.
  - 21 So they were given one more year, more than what they
  - 22 expected initially.
  - 23 Q. The information you had in the November 2010 licence
  - 24 talked about what they had spent -- excuse me, licence
  - 25 application -- sorry.

Page 106

- 16:50 1 Q. Yes.
  - 2 A. I'm not getting your question properly.
  - 3 Q. Did you confirm this representation that the budget
  - 4 providing for \$39.5 million of anticipated expenses,
  - 5 when submitted back in 2006, included projected expenses
  - 6 for the mines Nyakabingo and Gifurwe, in addition to the
  - 7 other NRD concessions?
  - 8 A. You are right.
  - 9 Q. Okay. So what did you do -- when you determined, to
  - 10 report up through the ministry, what percentage of the
  - projected spendings were actually spent through, you
  - say, to July 2011, what did you do to back out of the
  - 13 \$39.5 million figure all the projected expenditures for
  - 14 those two mines?
  - 15 A. So if I'm getting it right, they had this budget
  - proposed for five years for in total. If we add these
  - two mines, that would be seven mines. And I was just
  - highlighting that for five mines, they only invested
  - about 30%, and that is a claimed investment. They
  - 20 claimed to have invested about 30% in the five mines
  - 21 they got.
  - 22 Q. When calculating 30%, you took the number that you say
  - you thought they claimed in July 2011 and determined
  - 24 what fraction that was of \$39.5 million; correct?
  - 25 A. If the people who are helping us with the technology and

Page 108

30 (Pages 105 to 108)

16:52	1	display of documents can show us, I think this 30% is
-------	---	---

- 2 around the \$12 million, \$12 million-and-something, that
- 3 they were saying that they had invested. So \$12 million
- 4 was around 30% of the 35 -- \$39 million. That was,
- 5 I think, where I got that figure from.
- 6 Q. But in reporting up through the ministry to others that
- 7 were going to take action on this, what percentage of
- 8 the initial projected expenses were actually spent, it
- 9 wasn't fair to hold against them not spending any
- 10 portion of the budget for two mines that they never
- 11 obtained, was it?
- 12 A. Can you repeat, please? I didn't get your question,
- 13
- Q. I'll try to break it down and make it smaller and 14
- 15 quicker, hopefully.
- 16 You just explained how you took the number that they
- 17 claimed having spent and that you applied it against the
- 18 \$39.5 million working capital investment projected, and
- 19 you came up with about 30% as a figure. You agree that
- 20 you did not go into the budget, that total \$39.5 million
- 21 from 2006, and break out all the budgeted expenses for
- 22 the two mines that were not part of the NRD concessions
- 23 ultimately issued; correct? Or, excuse me, the NRD
- 24 contract that was ultimately issued. Correct?
- 25 A. So, yes, I didn't have the break down. I just took the

- 16:57 1 This portion of your evaluation of the November 2010
  - 2 application section on the exploration that had been
  - 3 done uses the language:
  - 4 "NRD did only some significant preliminary
  - 5 exploration work, but failed to realize the objective of
  - 6 delineating the resources and evaluating the reserves."
  - What did that mean, "did only some significant 8
    - preliminary exploration work"?
  - 9 A. It means that they did surficial and superficial work.
  - 10 They visited the concessions, they identified the type
  - 11 of minerals that can be mined from those concessions,
  - 12 but they didn't conduct estimation of the deposits and
  - 13 the reserves in all the deposits.
  - 14 Q. Do you acknowledge that, based on your review of the
  - 15 November 2010 application, there is reference to
  - "preliminary exploration work" that you're willing to 16
  - 17 characterise as "significant", but that's only a limited
  - 18 amount?
  - 19 A. Can you repeat, please?
  - 20 Q. Are you willing to agree that on your first evaluation
  - 21 of the November 2010 application, you acknowledged that
  - 22 it did refer to some "significant preliminary
  - 23 exploration work", although you say it wasn't a lot, it
  - 24 wasn't enough, but some of what they were able to point
  - 25 to, you did consider "significant" at that time;

# Page 111

- 16:54 1 39 figure, \$39 million figure.
  - 2 Q. Well, the breakdown was in the original budget, when
  - 3 they gave you an estimate in 2006, with "you" being the
  - 4 ministry; correct?
  - 5 A. Sorry, in 2006, I -- the documents I used to make my
  - 6 evaluation, in them there's not a breakdown of
  - 7 investment submitted in 2006. So I didn't have access
  - 8 to that document while making my report.
  - 9 Q. Okay. So you couldn't break out the \$39.5 million
  - 10 specifically to account only for the projected expenses
  - 11 on the mines that were part of the contract. But
  - 12 wouldn't it have been fair to inform those in the
  - 13 ministry who were going to read this, when you said
  - 14 spending only 30% of the projected figure was not
  - 15 enough, wouldn't it have been fair to tell them that
  - 16 they never actually projected to spend 39.5 on only
  - 17 these five mines?
  - 18 A. Yes, that information would have been helpful.
  - 19 Q. Why did you choose not to pass it on?
  - 20 A. I maybe forgot to explain it.
  - 21 Q. On page 3, further down, within 3.2.1, in two sections,
  - 22 two small-sentence paragraphs above 3.2.2, if I could
  - 23 draw attention to the NRD -- I'm sorry, my mistake.
  - 24 I apologise. First I need to ask to call up R-040, and
  - 25 the "NRD did only" portion of 3.2.1.
    - Page 110

- 16:58 1 correct?
  - A. Yes, you're right: "significant ... exploratory work" --
  - 3 "preliminary exploratory work".
  - 4 Q. Then you go on to say, in the next sentence:
  - 5 "Details on this are provided in the assessment by
  - 6 the DDG RNRA/GMD."
  - 7 A. Yes.
  - 8 Q. So first of all, when you say "Details on this", now
  - you're referring to the "preliminary exploration work"
  - 10 that's referred to above: you're saying the details of
  - 11 that work, what it consisted of, are in this other
  - 12 assessment; correct?
  - A. Yes, details on the "significant preliminary exploration
  - work", yes, they are provided in that report. 14
  - 15 Q. Now, was that report attached to this evaluation when
  - you submitted it?
  - 17 A. I don't remember.
  - Q. Is that other report that's referenced, the analysis
  - 19 that you say Dr Mike did before you?
  - 20 A. This one, when I mean "DDG", that is Deputy Director
  - 21 General, Rwanda Natural Resources Authority, Geology and
  - 22 Mines Department. That is Dr Michael. So here I'm
  - 23 referring to Dr Michael's report.
  - 24 Q. Now, I may have asked it this way before. And I just
  - 25 wanted, having now looked at where you referenced it and

- 17:00 1 how you referenced it -- have you attached anywhere to
  - 2 your witness statements that Dr Michael report that
  - 3 preceded yours?
  - 4 A. There's a report that was done by Dr Michael in
  - 5 April 2011, if I am correct. I don't remember if it is
  - 6 attached to my witness statement, but it can be asked to
  - 7 our lawyers and they can share it with you. A report
  - 8 produced by Dr Michael in April 2011, and that's the one
  - 9 I'm referring to.
  - 10 So if it was not attached to my assessment report,
  - it's because the people I was reporting to, they even
  - include Dr Michael. So I didn't have to share to
  - 13 Dr Michael a report that he produced himself.
  - 14 Q. Now that you remember a specific date about Dr Michael's
  - analysis and that it was in writing, can I ask how you
  - have a sharper memory of that now? Is it just based on
  - seeing this, or some other information obtained during
  - 18 the break?
  - 19 A. No, this is -- as you're asking me questions, my memory
  - 20 is getting refreshed.
  - 21 Q. Now that you recall it better, at least in terms of the
  - date, are you able to recall the answer to another
  - 23 question I asked earlier: based on your review of
  - 24 Dr Michael's prior evaluation, were you able to
  - 25 determine whether it was shared with NRD at any time?

- 17:04 1 statement anywhere that you recall?
  - 2 A. While preparing this hearing, I tried to search for that
  - 3 report. Unfortunately I didn't find it.
  - 4 Q. And you were looking in the materials attached to your
  - 5 witness statements; correct?
  - 6 A. I looked at the materials attached to my witness
  - 7 statement, and unfortunately I didn't find it.
  - 8 Q. And you looked at all the documents produced by
  - 9 Respondent for this hearing, even if they weren't
  - 10 attached to your witness statements, to look for it;
  - 11 correct?
  - 12 A. Unfortunately, yes. I tried to look for that report,
  - 3 but I was not successful in getting a copy of it.
  - 4 Q. And you looked at the Claimants' submitted exhibits for
  - 15 this hearing also to search for that report, to see if
  - it was there; correct?
  - 17 A. No, I didn't have time to go through all the documents
  - sent by the Claimants.
  - 19 Q. How about the exhibit numbers for the hearing: did you
  - at least go through those, looking for this report?
  - 21~ A. I went through the documents that were attached to my
  - witness statement, and I couldn't, unfortunately.
  - $23\,$   $\,$  Q. Yes. No, we asked that. I'm just trying to get clarity
  - 24 on one last piece.
  - You said you didn't have time to review all the

### Page 115

- 17:02 1 A. I don't remember. And I was not in a capacity, as
  - a geologist, to be the one to share documents in 2012 to
  - 3 NRD.
  - 4 Q. I understand that's a further comment on a prior
  - 5 question, right. But did you understand my current
  - 6 question is whether what you now recall of Dr Michael's
  - 7 report, did it indicate on its face -- or otherwise was
  - 8 it indicated to you -- whether it was shared with NRD?
  - 9 A. I don't remember. I would need to check again.
  - 10 Q. Was it stamped "Confidential" that you recall?
  - 11 A. I don't remember.
  - 12 Q. If I could ask that -- I'm sorry -- yes, page 4, there's
  - a section 4, "Work Plan and budget for 2012 2017". It
  - 14 says:
  - 15 "NRD intends to invest \$ 9,960,000 for the 2012 to
  - 16 2017 period."
  - 17 And then it goes on to talk about some other aspects
  - 18 of that.
  - 19 Please say again: where did you get that number?
  - $20\,$   $\,$  A. If you can go to the main source of information I used,
  - you will find that there was a report produced by NRD
  - for their investment plan for the years 2012 to 2017.
  - So I got the information from that report.
  - 24 Q. Okay. I can't go there, so I'm going to ask this
  - 25 question: is that report attached to your witness

Page 114

- 17:06 1 documents produced by Claimants in the case. I just
  - 2 want to be clear: did you have time and did you review
  - 3 the documents that Claimants put forward as exhibits in
  - 4 this case, this hearing, so the C-[some number]
  - 5 documents, did you review that looking for this report?
  - 6 A. At least -- yes, I reviewed all the documents that I had
  - 7 access to and I was not able to find that specific
  - 8 report I'm referring to.
  - 9 Q. You'll agree that that number and that time period is
  - 10 not referenced in the November 2010 NRD application,
  - 11 right?
  - 12 A. I would need to check. But this number I'm referring to
  - 13 is 2012 to 2017.
  - 14 Q. Right.
  - 15 A. And trying to look at it, I remember that I got it from
  - that document I'm referring to on paragraph 0 of this
  - 17 report.
  - 18 Q. Okay. If I could ask that C-035 be brought up.
  - 19 MR IMENA: Excuse me, can I just be given one second to
  - switch on the light of the room where I'm sitting?
  - 21 MR COWLEY: Of course.
  - 22 MR IMENA: Okay, thank you.
  - 23 MR COWLEY: Now, you said you would need to check the
  - 24 document. I'm going to try to assist, and then if
  - 25 I can't, I'll step out of the way, and you can tell me

17:07 1	what you think would work for your checking.	17:11 1	A. Yes.
2	But the best way I know to find things in this	2	Q. That all of the figures here purport to project over
3	document is to look at the index first. So if I could	3	an earlier time period?
4	ask FTI to go to pages, I think, 2 and 3. So there's	4	A. It's 2011 to 2015, you are right.
5	the index, and I guess it goes on to hold up one	5	Q. Okay. So do you agree, going back to R-040, your number
6	second. I'll get ahead of you and see where it ends.	6	in the projected time period which it covers, that
7	It goes through 2, 3 and 4. So we'll turn to 4 when we	7	number in that projected time period didn't come from
8	have a second.	8	the November 2010 application itself, right?
		9	
9	But in terms of the future projections, I would draw		A. The number I'm referring to comes from a report of
10	your attention to start at the "Proposed Activity	10	July 2011; it's not coming from this report. But
11	Plan[s]" and "Proposed Business Plan" following it, so 6	11	unfortunately, I tried to find that report: I couldn't.
12	and 7. Do you see there that all of the time periods	12	Q. Fair enough. I'm not asking you to repeat that. I'm
13	covered by the various projections and details, all of	13	just trying to address the fact that you said earlier
14	the time periods are different than the 2012 to 2017	14	you would need to check the November 2010 application to
15	time period referenced in your evaluation? It's one	15	know if it was also in there. That's the reason I did
16	year earlier, the five-year projection; correct?	16	this. I wasn't asking to repeat the other statements
17	A. I'm sorry, I didn't get your question properly.	17	you made.
18	Q. I'm sorry. Let me just	18	If I could ask now that C-207 be brought up, and
19	If you look back up at the page 3, do you see	19	page 2. So do you see that this is I'll make
20	there's "Proposed Activity Plan[s]" near the bottom of	20	a representation to you that there's a number of emails
21	section 6? 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6. That seems to be	21	and attachments to emails all together collected as one
22	a discussion in summary of the various aspects of the	22	electronic document. So what I'm looking at is just one
23	activity plans for 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?	23	example. But there's an exchange by email of what's
24	A. Yes, I see that.	24	behind it as a document.
25	Q. Then if you go to section 7, the "Proposed Business	25	Do you see the "Article4: Capital investment" in
	Page 117		Page 119
17:09 1	Plan", how much money is going to be spent on those	17:13 1	this document?
17:09 1 2	Plan", how much money is going to be spent on those activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout	17:13 1 2	this document? A. I see it.
	Plan", how much money is going to be spent on those activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the		
2	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the	2	A. I see it. Q. It says:
2 3	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout	2 3	A. I see it.
2 3 4	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see	2 3 4	A. I see it. Q. It says: "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period
2 3 4 5	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?	2 3 4 5	A. I see it. Q. It says: "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."
2 3 4 5 6	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those	2 3 4 5	A. I see it. Q. It says:  "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."  Do you see that?  A. I see that.
2 3 4 5 6 7	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. I see it. Q. It says:  "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."  Do you see that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and I can confirm it or not confirm it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.     Now, in C-207, if I could ask we go to page 93,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and I can confirm it or not confirm it.  Q. So all I'm asking you is: do you agree that whatever the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.     Now, in C-207, if I could ask we go to page 93, I think there's another example there later.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and I can confirm it or not confirm it.  Q. So all I'm asking you is: do you agree that whatever the figures are that are reported there, they're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.     Now, in C-207, if I could ask we go to page 93, I think there's another example there later.     Now, in this later email and I'll show you, if</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and I can confirm it or not confirm it.  Q. So all I'm asking you is: do you agree that whatever the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.     Now, in C-207, if I could ask we go to page 93, I think there's another example there later.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	activities, you have a similar individual-year breakout and then the summaries are below it, [and] the individual year breakouts are 2011 to 2015. Do you see that?  A. I see that.  Q. Now, [if] you think you need to look at any of those individual pages, either in the individual years or in the subsequent pages to confirm, if you think you need to do that, tell me. But I would like to ask the question first, to see if you even need to.  Do you agree that the November 2010 application could not provide a figure such as 9.96, as projected over 2012 to 2017, because it simply didn't project anything over that specific time period?  A. Sorry, I didn't get properly your question that you want me to confirm. First, I don't remember the figures on each of those years. And if you can agree with me, this plan was submitted, I think, ten years/eleven years ago, so I can't remember all the figures in my mind. So can you just tell me what you would like me to confirm, and I can confirm it or not confirm it.  Q. So all I'm asking you is: do you agree that whatever the figures are that are reported there, they're not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. I see it.</li> <li>Q. It says:     "The company plan to invest 9.960.000USD in period of 5 years."     Do you see that?</li> <li>A. I see that.</li> <li>Q. And that number is the same number as in your R-040; correct?</li> <li>A. Can we go back to that? But yes, it is 9 million-something. If it is 9.96, I'm not I don't remember, yes. But I talked about 9-point-something million in</li> <li>Q. If you do it quickly, that's fine. Could I ask that [R]-40 be don't put this down, just make it one document on the left side of the page, bring up [R]-40 on the right. The</li> <li>A. Yes, I see that.</li> <li>Q. Right. So</li> <li>A. 9.96.</li> <li>Q. Okay.     Now, in C-207, if I could ask we go to page 93, I think there's another example there later.     Now, in this later email and I'll show you, if</li> </ul>

17.14 1			
17:14 1	scroll up and show you that it's a similar document, in	17:18 1	A. I am aware.
2	terms of what it is that we're looking at, and that it's	2	Q. And if that were the source of the number and phrase
3	also similarly attached to an email as the opening	3	about the period it covered, that would mean your
4	document in this exhibit that I showed you.	4	evaluation wasn't actually prepared in May 2012; it
5	But if you look at specifically page 93 now of this	5	would have to be sometime after January 2013 that it was
6	draft contract, there's, under "Article 4", a little bit	6	created. Isn't that true?
7	more updated language. And do you see there it uses the	7	A. You are not saying the truth. Can I explain?
8	same phrase:	8	Q. I'm just asking my question to you, sir, is: if the
9	"The company plan to invest 9,960,000 USD in	9	January 2013 document was the source, that would mean
10	a period of 5 years"	10	your evaluation would have to be created after it; isn't
11	And gives the specific "2012 - 2017". And that's	11	that
12	essentially what aligns with, in a full reference, your	12	A. No.
13	evaluation; correct?	13	MR HILL: Mr Cowley has been given the metadata for this
14	A. \$9.96 million: it's the same, it's the same number.	14	document. It's one of the documents he asked for the
15	Q. And over the same reference time period, all in one	15	metadata for, and he got it. He doesn't have a basis
16	sentence?	16	for the questions he's just put. It's inconsistent with
17	A. Yes, "2012 - 2017", correct.	17	the data he has now been provided with.
18	Q. I'll suggest to you: of all the exhibits that the	18	MR COWLEY: Counsel for Rwanda is aware, presumably, having
19	parties have put in for this hearing, this is the only	19	litigated in the current age, where metadata is
20	document C-207 contained the only documents with that	20	a constant source of discussion, that documents could be
21	projected number over that projected time period	21	amended, and metadata is no different. Metadata is
22	preceding your evaluation of the application for the	22	computerised documents, computerised data. To produce
23	renewal of NRD's exploration in mining licences, if in	23	metadata does not come with a guarantee that nothing
24	fact the date that that was prepared was May 2012.	24	within that metadata itself could have been changed. So
25	Was it your	25	counsel is making a factual representation that he's
	D 101		D. 100
	Page 121		Page 123
17:16 1	A. I didn't get the question properly.	17:20 1	simply not capable of making.
2	Q. Okay. Looking at R-040 again.	2	I do have the metadata, I know what it says, and I'm
3	A. Yes.	3	not pointing to it to suggest anything. But suggesting
4	Q. And I'm asking FTI to bring up the first page of R-040.	4	that it says something and means something I think is
5			
	DO VOII see the date is May 8th 2012/	5	
	Do you see the date is May 8th 2012?  A. You are right.	5	inappropriate to this witness.
6 7	A. You are right.	6	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?
6 7	<ul><li>A. You are right.</li><li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li></ul>	6 7	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.
6 7 8	<ul><li>A. You are right.</li><li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>	6 7 8	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.
6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number</li> </ul>	6 7 8	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give
6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> <li>My question to you is: isn't it true that you know</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> <li>My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> <li>My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> <li>My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source? A. No.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain.</li> <li>My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Isn't it true that you also know that the next time in</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.  Did you participate in the production of documents
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source? A. No. Q. Isn't it true that you also know that the next time in the record that amount over that time period is included</li></ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.  Did you participate in the production of documents on behalf of the Respondent in this case?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source? A. No. Q. Isn't it true that you also know that the next time in the record that amount over that time period is included as a phrase is part of the January 2013 amended</li></ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.  Did you participate in the production of documents on behalf of the Respondent in this case?  A. Yes, I participated: I made a witness statement.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source? A. No. Q. Isn't it true that you also know that the next time in the record that amount over that time period is included as a phrase is part of the January 2013 amended application that NRD submitted to the ministry? Are you aware of that? </li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.  Did you participate in the production of documents on behalf of the Respondent in this case?  A. Yes, I participated: I made a witness statement.  Q. A little bit different. Are you aware that beyond producing your own statement and attaching things to it,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. You are right.</li> <li>Q. If that is the accurate date of this document</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q I will suggest to you that the only document in the record provided for this hearing that uses the number and the time period that's included in your evaluation that we've seen is what we just looked at: C-207, the draft contracts that are part of that email chain. My question to you is: isn't it true that you know that? That after reviewing all of the exhibits and materials, you found there isn't that phrase and that number for that time period in the actual record, and that's what caused you to reference some other document not in the record as your source? A. No. Q. Isn't it true that you also know that the next time in the record that amount over that time period is included as a phrase is part of the January 2013 amended application that NRD submitted to the ministry? Are you</li></ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	inappropriate to this witness.  MR IMENA: Sorry, am I allowed to give an explanation?  THE PRESIDENT: Yes, you are.  MR COWLEY: If you answer my last question, yes.  MR IMENA: I think the purpose of this hearing is to find the truth. So can you please someone from your send someone from your side, he gets to my email, I will give him full access to my email, and he will find out himself that that email was shared on May 8th 2012. So you can send whoever he wants: he will get or she will get access to my email for the purpose of finding out the truth. And I would be happy to do that.  MR COWLEY: Mr Imena, if I could stick with the topic. And I'm not trying to do this in an antagonistic or argumentative way, but you've raised now a topic that I'd like to question you about specifically.  Did you participate in the production of documents on behalf of the Respondent in this case?  A. Yes, I participated: I made a witness statement.  Q. A little bit different. Are you aware that beyond

- ICSID Case No. ARB/18/21 Monday, 28 June 2021 17:21 1 17:24 1 A. I was using that, yes, for the ministry work. I was that there was another part of this process in which 2 both sides ask each other to go and look for documents using that email. 3 and voluntarily give them to each other? 3 Q. And when you were appointed minister, you began using 4 A. Yes, I tried also to share with our lawyers the maximum a ministry address email account; is that correct? 5 of information I had. And I'm telling you, sir, that 5 A. Yes, I began using a specific Government of Rwanda 6 I would be pleased to share with you the access to my address. I no longer have access to that one, but 7 computer and to my email, so that you can check for you. 7 I have access to my Yahoo address. 8 Q. Right. I'm getting there, sir. I'm just trying to make 8 Q. Mr Imena, I just have some just brief specific questions 9 about the process, just so it's clear what happened 10 10 already. So is it also true that during the period while you 11 11 You were out, you were no longer minister, you were were minister, some communications where you were 12 no longer working --12 conducting government business, you use the Yahoo email 13 A. Alright. I'm no longer minister since October 2016. 13 account address, either alone or also with the ministry 14 email address, both on one document? Did that happen 14 Q. The question I'm trying to ask, sir, is: you were no 15 longer within MINIRENA in any capacity at the time that 15 from time to time? 16 the parties asked each other to produce documents; do 16 A. Can you repeat your questions -- your question, please? 17 you recall that? Q. Yes. Even after 2013 and becoming appointed as 18 A. Yes, I recall. 18 minister, some of your communications in that capacity 19 19 Q. Okay. Nevertheless, you participated by making your still included your Yahoo email account address, whether 20 20 personal information available; is that correct? alone or with your government address; some of those 21 21 A. I tried my best, and I'm still willing to do so. emails wound up in your Yahoo account too. Correct? Q. Sir, I'm just asking questions, because I don't -- it's A. Yes, before creating my -- because I'm not the one who 23 not that I purport to know these questions. These are 23 created it. Before the IT people created my government 24 legitimately questions I don't know the answer to. I'm 24 email, I used my Yahoo, and then I think I also created 25 25 a Gmail account. So there had been a transition. And not suggesting anything by them, just asking you for Page 125 Page 127 17:23 1 information. 17:26 1 there were people who didn't know my new government 2 The reference to email, I just want to be clear on 2 account, so those continued to contact me through the 3 and specific. You had, while you were with MINIRENA, 3 Yahoo for a short period of time. And then I informed 4 4 a government, a ministry account; correct? them gradually that now I have a new, official account, 5 5 A. So if I'm allowed just to explain it quickly, I have my and that's the one I'm using. 6 personal email that I run for maybe the last 20 years. 6 Q. Sir, was the Gmail account also used from time to time 7 7 I was using it until I was appointed minister of state for your government work? 8 in February 2016. Now, before February 2016, I was 8 A. I don't remember. 9 9 primarily using my Yahoo account, and I still have Q. Okay. 10 access to that account. 10 Now, when it came time for the government to produce 11 Now, the dates --11 documents, were the Yahoo email account and Gmail 12 Q. May I just ask you to focus on --12 account fully searched for all documents that someone 13 was looking for to be produced in this case? 13 A. Yes, please. 14 Q. I think you may have made a mistake in the date. And 14 A. Yes, they were searched.
  - 15 rather than have you go all the way on and ask you
  - 16 again, I just want to point out to you: you said you
  - 17 became Minister of Mining in February 2016. Is that
  - 18 what you meant, or did you mean to say --
  - A. Oh, no, no. That was a mistake in explaining. I became 19
  - 20 minister in February 2013.
  - 21 Q. Thank you.
  - 22 A. Yes.
  - 23 Q. So prior to February 2013, when doing work for the
  - 24 ministry, you used your personal Yahoo email account and
  - 25 nothing else; correct?

- 15 Q. Who did that? Did you do that yourself, or did someone

- 16 else do it?
- A. I did the search, and that's where I found this May 2012 17
- 18 report. So I sent the report that our lawyer is
- 19 referring to you to our team of lawyers from my Yahoo
- 20 account. And now, because you are questioning its
- 21 production date, I'm inviting you to get access to my
- 22 Yahoo account, so that you check it yourself and your
- 23
- 24 Q. Sir, I'm just asking some questions. If we could stick
- 25 with the questions. I'm not trying to make this

Page 128

35 (Pages 125 to 128)

17:28 1 a belaboured exercise. I just want to be clear as to what happened.  3 At the time those email accounts were searched by you looking for documents, did you come up with the search terms yourself or did someone provide them you? Were you following instructions and going the a list of things that were supposed to be searching for or did you just look on your own for what you though was relevant?  10 A. So I just put on "NRD" as a keyword for searching then the tools of the internet helped me search in my email account.  13 Q. Okay. And last question on this: in addition to the email accounts that were searched as you just descrit did you also have paper documents, files at home, perhaps electronic storage at home, that contained of documents that went beyond just the email accounts contained some of your work while you were with M on them?  20 A. I also searched my computer and found some of the documents that I had, and I shared everything that I at that moment with our team of lawyers.  Q. Alright. I very much appreciate the explanation.  Now I would like to go back to R-040 and then as the specific questions about this, given the context	de else's computer, so it had to be produced from the version you found on your own?  A. So I produced it and copied it to several of my colleagues, the ones that I mentioned. Now, the document you are showing me might come from either the one I sent to our lawyers or the one my colleagues might have shared to our team of lawyers.  Q. I'm not asking about what you did with it when you found it. I just want to be clear about what you understood.  Did you learn that when you found it on your computer and in your email account, that your copy of it was the only copy found and produced in this case, so ther so you had to turn it over so we could get it: it wasn't found in Respondent's files otherwise?  MINIRENA  A. So if I can explain it again, if I'm allowed.  This document was produced in 2012, shared to my colleagues. So now the one you are showing me might either come from the one I sent to our team of lawyers or from my colleagues, who might have shared it to our team of lawyers.
Page 129	Page 131
17:29 1 that you've now described.  2 R-040, if I understood you correctly and that my question do I have it correct that you said y found R-040 in your files in one of your email act only?  6 A. So at least what I remember is that I found it from emails that it shows that I sent it to Francis Kayu Q. So you found it in searching your personal email accounts that you just described, right?  10 A. Okay, that's where one of the areas. It's only email account and in my computer.  12 Q. So the document itself was also stored on your of and you found that too; is that what you're saying.  A. I'm the one who created it, sir. I'm the one who this. So (overspeaking)  16 Q. I'm just asking  17 A my computer.  18 Q. I'm just trying to ask questions so I understand of you're saying.  You found it in two places: you found it on the Yahoo or Gmail system stored with emails  22 A. Yes.  23 Q and you found it as a document on your own correct?  A. You are correct.	yersion you found on your system or if it was found by someone else; you wouldn't have any way to know that.  That's what you're saying; correct?  A. This one you are highlighting to me was produced by me. This is correct. And the information I'm reading is correct to what I found in my email and in my computer system. So whatever is written here is correct with me.  O. Okay. And looking back at the time, May 2012, when you were asked to do this project and submitted, as you've already explained, what you did, based on the practices of you and your colleagues within MINIRENA, if it was circulated to others at that time, it would remain in the NRD file and accessible in Respondent's records at the time of this case; correct?  A. So let me explain again.  When you will check the email I shared to my colleagues, I think none of them was using a government email. Because here it's not like in the US. We are progressing gradually with IT. In 2012, most of the people in the ministry and in the Natural Resources

- 17:34 1 But I didn't properly get your question.
  - 2 Q. Okay. And I'm not hiding anything from you in my
  - 3 question: I don't have an email. I don't have it. So
  - 4 I would ask you and direct you to it if I did.
  - 5 So to be clear, you remember saying that this was
  - 6 also sent on -- after you sent it to your supervisor,
  - 7 and also Dr Mike, it was sent on eventually to the
  - 8 minister; do you recall that testimony?
  - 9 A. Yes, Alison George shared it to the Minister of
  - 10 Natural Resources, Mr Kamanzi.
  - 11 Q. Now, the minister at that time, just like you later, had
  - a government email account to use as a formal email
  - 13 account address; correct?
  - 14 A. In 2012, had he a government email? I don't remember.
  - 15 But we can check for that.
  - 16 Q. Okay. Last attempt with this question.
  - Whoever received it up the chain from you, it was
  - 18 your expectation, based on the practices and policies at
  - 19 the time, that it would be retained within the NRD file,
  - as you've described it in your testimony, available to
  - anybody else in MINIRENA to look at in the future, if
  - 22 others up the chain that you've described received it
  - from you; correct?
  - 24 A. I don't know what you are calling the "NRD file". The
  - NRD file that I know is the one we're having for this

Page 133

- 17:37 1 Q. Okay. Can you please pronounce -- are you familiar with
  - the name in the "Cc" line?
  - 3 A. Yes, I'm familiar with the name. It's pronounced --
  - 4 this is email of Mr Clement Habiyambere.
  - 5 Q. And I'm going to say "Mr Clement" to refer to him.
  - 6 A. Clement, yes.
  - 7 Q. I don't mean to be disrespectful, but I'm going to get
  - 8 it wrong either way, I think.
  - 9 So Mr Clement was an employee of MINIRENA as of
  - 10 December 13th 2011, correct?
  - 11 A. No. Mr Clement was an employee of Natural Resources
  - 12 Authority, not ministry MINIRENA.
  - 13 Q. And just very briefly, the Natural Resources Authority,
  - 14 was that department or authority involved in the mining
  - industry in any way?
  - 16 A. Yes, I will just be quick. There was the ministry
  - 17 itself: it was called Ministry of Natural Resources,
  - MINIRENA. And there was an agency called Rwanda Natural
  - 19 Resources Authority, and in that agency there were
  - 20 several departments, including a department in charge of
  - 21 mining.
  - 22 So Clement was an employee of the agency, Rwanda
  - 23 Natural Resources Authority. But before joining the
  - agency, he used to work for the OGMR, which was the
  - 25 authority in charge of mining.

Page 135

- 17:36 1 arbitration. But what I can tell you is that I shared
  - 2 it to several people, and they might have shared it to
  - 3 other people.
  - 4 Q. If I could ask FTI, on document C-207 -- I guess you
  - 5 have to bring that back up. Yes, I'm sorry, it's the
  - 6 document on the right. If you could go to page 89 of 98
  - 7 in the PDF pages, and if you can enlarge at the top.
  - 8 So just to orient you, I don't want to hide anything
  - 9 from you, but before we move up, I want you to see that
  - this is an email exchange between Mr Marshall
  - originally, and then there's a response on top of that
  - 12 email from Mr Bidega. This is now the highlighted top
  - portion, the response.
  - Do you understand that, or do you want to reduce it
  - and see the chain again? You see that there's two
  - emails on top of each other?
  - 17 A. I see.
  - 18 Q. Alright. So Mr Marshall send back an email and gets
  - this response: they're attached together?
  - 20 A. Yes, I see.
  - 21 Q. Okay. Now, if I could highlight again at the top:
  - 22 Mr Bidega's response has a copy, has a "Cc".
  - 23 A. Yes.
  - 24 Q. Up in the address lines, please.
  - 25 A. Yes.

Page 134

- 17:39 1 Q. And when was that? When did he work there?
  - 2 A. OGMR was -- he joined OGMR, I think, shortly after its
  - 3 creation, or even he was involved in the task team that
  - 4 was there when it was created.
  - 5 Q. And I apologise, I don't know that date. So just,
  - 6 please: when was he an employee of OGMR?
  - 7 A. Let's say at least before I joined it. So it is
  - 8 anything before 2008. So he was there before me.
  - 9 Q. And when did he move over to the Natural Resources
  - 10 Authority?
  - 11 A. When OGMR was restructured and changed into the Geology
  - 12 and Mines Department of Rwanda Natural Resources
  - 13 Authority. That is in 2011.
  - 14 Q. As of December 13th 2011, was he with OGMR or was he
  - with the Natural Resources Authority agency? Or are you
  - saying you don't know: it could be one or the other?
  - 17 A. December 2011, we were shifting from OGMR into RNRA,
  - 18 Natural Resources Authority, GMD. So I think at that
  - 19 time he was already at Geology and Mines Department.
  - 20 Q. Okay. And was he a lawyer?
  - 21 A. Yes, he was. At least at OGMR he was serving as the
  - 22 legal affairs advisor, legal affairs officer; I don't
  - 23 remember properly the position.
  - 24 Q. And when he moved over to Natural Resources Authority,
  - 25 is it your understanding that he continued to work in

Page 136

17:41 1	a capacity that was involved in some way in mining	17:45 1	not an application for a long-term licence."
2	, ε	2	Do you see that?
3	A. I would say that he was what I remember: he was part	3	A. I see. I see that.
4	of a pool of lawyers or people trained in legal affairs.	4	Q. I'm sorry, one second. I lost the notation of the next
5	And because he was one of the few with mining	5	exhibit. I'll pick that up. (Pause)
6	experience, he was most of the time involved in mining	6	May I ask that document R-118 be pulled up, please.
7	legal issues.	7	Mr Imena
8	Q. It's fair to say that Mr Bidega knew Mr Clement	8	A. Yes.
9	A. Yes. I think they even had been together in a training	9	Q if you recall this document, it won't require us to
10	in France; I think, if I recall it properly. So they	10	toggle back and forth with the other. I will be happy
11		11	to, if you don't recall this document and need
12		12	orientation for my questions. But for purposes of my
13		13	questions right now, I'd like to start by finding that
14		14	answer out.
15		15	Do you recognise this document? Do you know what
16		16	it is?
17		17	A. "August 12, 2014". I don't remember exactly this
18		18	document.
19		19	Q. I will bring it up on my own screen for a moment so
20	·	20	I can see it in a size that I can read.
21		20	So perhaps it's best if on one side of the screen,
22		22	this document perhaps the right side, because I think
23	*	23	it's later in time, and if you could bring back up R-040
24		23	and put it on the left side.
		25	Now, R-040 is a document we just went over various
25	Q. And you're aware, are you not, sir, that no one reached	23	Now, K-040 is a document we just went over various
	Page 137		Page 139
17:43 1	out to Mr Bidega after he copied Mr Clement on this	17:47 1	sections of, and it's a four-page document. If I could
17:43 1 2	-	17:47 1 2	sections of, and it's a four-page document. If I could draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll
	email and told him that this email was somehow		
2	email and told him that this email was somehow	2	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll
2 3	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?	2 3	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.
2 3 4	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry	2 3 4	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was
2 3 4 5	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry	2 3 4 5	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting
2 3 4 5 6	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and	2 3 4 5 6	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as
2 3 4 5 6 7	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD, right?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh memory of this, if you've seen it before I'm happy to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD, right?  A. Yes. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh memory of this, if you've seen it before I'm happy to let you look through page by page. But I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD, right?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. " was only an application for further five-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh memory of this, if you've seen it before I'm happy to let you look through page by page. But I'm going to suggest to you that to answer this question or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD, right?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. " was only an application for further five-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh memory of this, if you've seen it before I'm happy to let you look through page by page. But I'm going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	email and told him that this email was somehow inappropriate; correct?  A. I don't remember. I don't remember.  Q. You are aware, sir, that no one from the ministry reached out to Mr Marshall or NRD and said this was an inappropriate communication between him and Mr Bidega; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. And that goes for the other groups as well: you never heard of anyone from OGMR or anyone from Natural Resources Authority reaching out to NRD or Mr Marshall to complain that this was somehow an inappropriate communication; correct?  A. I don't remember.  Q. If I could ask that the first witness statement be brought back up and paragraph 12 be focused on. If we look within paragraph 12, the third sentence, do you see there it's saying that:  "In fact, its November 2010 Application"  You understand that you're referring here to NRD, right?  A. Yes. Yes.  Q. " was only an application for further five-year	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	draw your attention to the last page of R-118, you'll see that it's a seven-page document.  Sir, do you recall that in August 2014 someone was asked to undertake an update assessment of NRD, starting with or based upon your evaluation that's been marked as R-040?  A. Can are you asking me if someone made an evaluation in August 2014 about NRD's fine?  Q. I'm asking whether someone was asked to update or work with your evaluation that's R-040 and add more information.  A. Sorry, I'm not getting your question properly.  Q. Okay, never mind. I take it if you recalled such an event or project, it wouldn't be such a hard question. So I would ask then just to help me by going through specific sections.  For the purposes of the last question, however, from your witness statement, there's one portion I'd like to draw your attention to first that's right in the middle.  Because I'm getting the sense that you have a fresh memory of this, if you've seen it before I'm happy to let you look through page by page. But I'm going to suggest to you that to answer this question or

17:49 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	on them before you answer any questions about it?  A. Yes, there's this document, R-040, I think it's the one that I produced. Now there's another one exhibited.  Q. Yes.  A. So I would like to read it.  THE PRESIDENT: Well, in that case I suggest we have a 15-minute break now and resume at 6.05 English time.  MR COWLEY: Thank you.  MR IMENA: Thank you.  (5.50 pm)  (A short break)  (6.07 pm)  MR COWLEY: Before we return to that document  Mr President, I'm sorry, may I continue?  Before we return to that document, sir, I realised during the break that I left open a couple of questions that I thought I had answers to, but I don't.  Earlier I asked you some questions about a number of large-scale mining concession holders that were issued before you left, and then you talked about the names that you gave us. And what I've left open unintentionally was: other than large-scale	18:10 1 Q. And the other question I started to ask, but I didn't 2 get a response and I have to return to and I didn't 3 get a response because I diverted. So to return to what 4 we were talking about with regard to the applications or 5 applicants for concessions while you were with the 6 ministry. 7 Was there ever a document or a computer program, 8 a computer system, spreadsheet, that listed all 9 applicants for concessions and tracked where each was in 10 the process, showed what was done, what the ultimate 11 decisions were or what open questions there were in 12 their application process? 13 A. I don't remember. 14 Q. So you don't remember having such a tool available to 15 you at any time, to see them all and where they stood? 16 A. You are asking for which period, please? 17 Q. Prior to your leaving the ministry prior to you 18 leaving MINIRENA, excuse me. 19 A. Yes, me prior to leaving MINIRENA, we had a cadastre 20 system. It was an online system. So that was the 21 system we had at that time. 22 Q. Say it again, please? Sorry. 23 A. A mining cadastre system. 24 Q. And did that system allow you to pull up on your 25 computer screen all of the applicants, to see and
18:08 1	Mr Imena, other than the large-scale mining	18:11 1 compare as to where they stood in the process of their
18.08 1	concession holders that you identified having been	2 applications?
3	issued prior to your leaving (Pause) how many other	3 A. In the data fed into that system, you can have the list
4	concessions were awarded to applicants prior to your	4 of licences that were issued, those that have expired.
5	leaving MINIRENA?	5 Q. But I'm asking specifically about the summary of all the
6	A. I don't remember the number, the exact number.	6 names in one place, that you could see them together and
7	Q. Do you recall an approximate number of how many other	7 where they stood. So, in other words, could you call up
8 9	concession holders had issued A. Licences. Mining licences and exploration licences.	8 on a screen and see: this application was granted, this 9 application was denied, this application is in a process
10		application was defined, this application is in a process  where we're waiting for the following thing; all of the
10	than large-scale mining concession holders already	11 applications in one place?
12		12 A. I was not the one running that computer system, but we
13		had the mining cadastre system which was in charge of
14		14 that.
15	•	15 Q. Thank you. Now if we could go back and pull up R-118.
16		16 MR McCARTHY: Sorry to intervene. This is Mr McCarthy on
17		behalf of the Respondent. We've lost Mr Hill. So
18		18 I wonder if we could have a little break until we get
19 20		<ul><li>19 him back.</li><li>20 THE PRESIDENT: That seems reasonable. We'll have a short</li></ul>
20	applicants, excluding the large-scale mining concession	21 break.
22		22 MR WATKINS: Mr President, would you like us to put everyone
23	A. I don't remember the number, as I said.	back into their breakout rooms?
24	Q. Is it more than ten?	24 THE PRESIDENT: Not particularly. We'll just sit peacefully
25	A. I don't remember.	and wait for Mr Hill to return.
	Page 142	Page 144

10.10 1	ACD WATERING AND A STATE OF THE	10.01 1	
18:13 1	MR WATKINS: Understood.	18:21 1	A. So I am not seeing the author, the name of the one who
2	(6.13 pm)	2	wrote the document. I don't see the one he's addressing
3	(Pause)	3	to. So I can't recall.
4	(6.15 pm)	4	Q. Have you seen this document before today?
5	MR HILL: Mr President, I apologise for that. We have	5	A. I don't remember.
6	a problem with our system in chambers. But we are back	6	Q. You do recall the circumstances of NRD's operation of
7	on through a mobile phone connection, which I think will	7	its mining concessions in August 2014, don't you?
8	be sufficient for us to listen to the cross-examination	8	A. What I remember is so, after reading it, I agree with
9	of Mr Imena.	9	the recommendations and the findings given in the
10	THE PRESIDENT: Very well. Thank you very much, Mr Hill.	10	document. So the document might have been produced
11	We'll carry on then, please.	11	maybe by someone at the ministry or at Rwanda Natural
12	MR HILL: Thank you.	12	Resources Authority.
13	MR COWLEY: To the FTI system operator, if we could close	13	Q. Do you recall the circumstances of NRD's operations at
14	R-040 now. Because when we left, the witness said he	14	the mining concessions in August 2014, where things
15	needed to review this document. So I'd like to open it	15	stood?
16	two pages at a time, so he can see it.	16	A. August 2014, I recall that around that time we have had
17	Mr Imena, R-118 is a seven-page document, as	17	the 2014 law; and after the 2014 law, NRD was asked to
18	I mentioned before. I'm going to give you the	18	re-apply for its licences. So that was the context in
19	opportunity you asked for: you said you needed to read	19	2014. That is what I recall.
	it to understand whether it's something you're familiar		
20 21	with, so please do. And when you need to go on to	20 21	Q. Was NRD being provided tags so that mining operations could be conducted and it could lawfully sell the
	•		•
22	page 3, please say so.	22	resulting minerals as of August 2014?
23	I have specific questions about specific entries.	23	A. There was there's a point in time when we banned NRD
24	So I will give you an opportunity to read the material	24	to continue receiving tags. The date is explained in my
25	I'm questioning you about.	25	witness statement. I don't remember the exact date.
	Page 145		Page 147
	•		•
18:16 1	A. Yes.	18:23 1	But that happened.
18:16 1 2	<ul><li>A. Yes.</li><li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li></ul>	18:23 1 2	But that happened.  Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to
2	Q. Please keep that in mind.	2	Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to
2 3	<ul><li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li><li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)</li></ul>	2 3	Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li><li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)</li><li>Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)</li></ul>	2 3 4	Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?
2 3 4 5	<ul><li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li><li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)</li><li>Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)</li><li>Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)</li></ul>	2 3 4 5	Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining
2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li><li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)</li><li>Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)</li><li>Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)</li><li>Yes, please, 7. (Pause)</li></ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li><li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to]</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)</li> <li>Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)</li> <li>Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)</li> <li>Yes, please, 7. (Pause)</li> <li>Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul><li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li><li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul><li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li><li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li><li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.</li> <li>During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.</li> <li>Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. According to the title, it's assessment of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in MINIRENA, but you don't actually recall someone working</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. According to the title, it's assessment of the performance of NRD.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in MINIRENA, but you don't actually recall someone working on this document? Is that your testimony?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. According to the title, it's assessment of the performance of NRD.</li> <li>Q. That is the title. But do you recall why this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in MINIRENA, but you don't actually recall someone working on this document? Is that your testimony?</li> <li>A. This document is not signed. I don't see the name of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. According to the title, it's assessment of the performance of NRD.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in MINIRENA, but you don't actually recall someone working on this document? Is that your testimony?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Please keep that in mind.</li> <li>A. You can go to page 3. (Pause)     Yes, page 4, please. (Pause)     Page 5, please. Yes, and 6. (Pause)     Yes, please, 7. (Pause)     Yes? Sorry, I can't hear you.</li> <li>Q. My apologies.     Having read the document, are you now able to say you recall the creation of this document and its purposes?</li> <li>A. Can you repeat your question, please?</li> <li>Q. When was the document marked R-118 created?</li> <li>A. Looking at the first page, I think it is in 2014.</li> <li>Q. It says on the first page, if we bring it up,     "August 12, 2014". Do you recall it being created at that time?</li> <li>A. I don't remember.</li> <li>Q. Why was it created?</li> <li>A. Why was this document created?</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. According to the title, it's assessment of the performance of NRD.</li> <li>Q. That is the title. But do you recall why this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. During the period when tags were not provided to NRD to operate mines and sell minerals, would there have been any reason to evaluate its performance as a mining operator?</li> <li>A. We had very good reason to ban NRD to continue [to] access tags.</li> <li>Q. That's not my question, sir. I just want to focus you on the question.  During the period when the ban was in place, was there any reason that you can recall why an assessment of its performance would be begun at that point in time?</li> <li>A. During the period when we banned NRD to access tags, they didn't have a licence. So we had good reasons to continue making assessment of their performance.</li> <li>Q. I'll return to the chronology briefly, but I want to focus first on this document.  Although you say that since you agree with certain things, it could be something from the MINIRENA is it accurate for me to say that you recognise that it was a document that might have been worked on by someone in MINIRENA, but you don't actually recall someone working on this document? Is that your testimony?</li> <li>A. This document is not signed. I don't see the name of</li> </ul>

## 18:25 1 information than that.

- 2 Q. Page 6, the various sections that are broken up here in
- 3 the assessment of the performance, then lead to
- 4 section 4, "Application for Long Term License". Do you
- 5 see that?
- 6 A. I see that.
- 7 Q. And in this assessment it states:
- 8 "On 29th November 2010 NRD Rwanda Ltd sent a letter
- 9 of request for an extension of Mining and exploration
- 10 license (Special licence) for ..."
- And then it names the five concessions:
- "... On 2nd August 2011, The Ministry of Natural
- Resources extended operations for a period of six ...
- months to allow for negotiations. On 2nd February 2012,
- and on 13th September 2012, the Licence was extended on
- the two occasions ..."
- ine two occasions ...
- 17 And it then goes on to describe the same statement
- of the projected expense, the same period of time that's
- in your earlier assessment. Do you see all that?
- 20 A. I see it.
- 21 Q. And that's characterised in this report as the
- "Application for [a] Long Term License"; correct?
- 23 A. NRD applied in 2010. Their application was deemed
- 24 non-satisfactory. The ministry informed them that they
- 25 didn't comply with their contractual obligations.

## Page 149

- 18:28 1 Q. Then it is accurate in the rest of the first paragraph
  - 2 as to when extensions of licences were issued by the
  - 3 ministry; correct?
  - 4 A. The ministry issued an extension, you are correct.
  - 5 Q. And just like you, the author here recognises the amount
  - 6 that NRD was proposing to spend over the period of the
  - 7 licence that it was applying for; correct?
  - 8 A. NRD presented a plan for investment: that's the one
  - 9 I mentioned in my 2012 report.
  - 10 Q. Well, you can agree with me then that that information
  - 11 is accurate. What was submitted and what was extended,
  - 12 as it's described in this report, is accurate; correct?
  - 13 A. What I can agree is that there's a figure that was
  - presented by NRD, and that is what I know.
  - 15 Q. Okay. The author -- someone who had worked on this, and
  - whoever reviewed it or commented on it before it became
  - in this form, they took those same facts that you
  - describe, recognising when things happen, and the
  - 19 characterisation, the way it's described as events,
  - that's the application process for a long-term licence
  - 21 by NRD: that's what -- this report characterises that.
  - 22 Can you agree with that?
  - 23 A. No.
  - 24 Q. You don't agree that it even uses that language; you
  - won't agree with that?

## Page 151

- 18:26 1 Minister Kamanzi informed NRD on several occasions;
  - 2 I also informed NRD of their non-compliance on several
  - 3 occasions. And I see that this report is again
  - 4 highlighting that NRD did not fulfil its obligations.
  - 5 Q. Can I have an answer to my question? Let me break it
  - down a little bit, so that we can focus and move
    - a little quicker, hopefully.
  - 8 The statements, the dates and what happened on those
  - 9 dates, those are accurate: that's your understanding of
  - what was done on those dates; correct?
  - 11 A. I'm not the one who wrote this report, sir.
  - 12 Q. Can I ask you of your memory, please. You do recall --
  - 13 A. NRD applied in 2010 for extension of their exploration
  - 14 licence and grant of short-term mining licences. That
  - application was not successful because NRD didn't fulfil
  - its obligations. That is what I remember.
  - 17 Q. Right. Mr Imena, you do recall the date of the initial
  - application was on or about November 29th 2010; correct?
  - 19 A. The initial application was 2009. I didn't get the
  - 20 question.

7

- 21 Q. The application submitted by NRD for an extension of
- 22 mining and exploration licence for Rutsiro, Sebeya,
- 23 Giciye, Nemba and Mara concessions was submitted on
- November 29th 2010; correct?
- 25 A. Yes, it was submitted in 2010.

Page 150

- 18:30 1 A. That is to be asked to the one who made that statement.
  - 2 Q. Well --
  - 3 A. But if I can be allowed to add on, NRD made
  - 4 an application in January 2013 for a so-called
  - 5 "long-term licence", but that application of
  - 6 January 2013 was not satisfactory because it was just
  - 7 a kind of copy-and-paste of the 2010 application.
  - 8 Q. And you'll agree it's not mentioned here; right?
  - 9 A. It's mentioned in my witness statement, and that's what
  - 10 I'm mentioning to you.
  - 11 Q. Sir, please focus on my question.
  - 12 A. Yes, sir.
  - 13 Q. You'll agree it's not mentioned in this assessment of
  - 14 performance; correct?
  - 15 A. It's not mentioned.
  - 16 Q. So without reference to that, the author, and anybody
  - who reviewed it before it was put in this form,
  - characterised these events as the application for
  - a long-term licence for NRD; correct?
  - 20 A. No.
  - 21 Q. Okay. You do know that Mr Marshall repeatedly told you,
  - any time he communicated with you, that he considered
  - these events that are mentioned here as the application
  - for a long-term licence, and he wanted to negotiate such
  - 25 terms; you'll agree with that, won't you?

Page 152

## 18:32 1 18:35 1 A. I don't agree. Can I explain? whoever was working on it believed that to be true, Mr Marshall applied for extension of exploration are you? 3 licence. That application came with application for 3 A. RDB -- no, sorry. NRD submitted a long-term application 4 mining licence, short-term. That application was deemed 4 in 2013, but that application was not approved. Then 5 5 non-satisfactory. Mr Marshall was informed. down the line, NRD continued to ask, to request for 6 He then applied in 2013 for long-term licence. The 6 long-term licences. But the ministry continued to 7 government, through the ministry and through the Rwanda inform NRD that our position is: short-term licences, if 8 8 Development Board, told him that his application is not 9 satisfactory. But because we wanted to give him chances Q. And that's your answer to my question, right? 10 to see if he can perform, he was invited to negotiate 10 A. Yes. Yes, sir. 11 for one concession, and possibly two concessions, and he Q. As of August 2014, where in the process for the 12 refused to that offer. 12 application for a licence did the assessment of 13 13 So this is what I can confirm. performance fall? 14 Q. Is it actually your testimony that Mr Marshall did not 14 A. Can you repeat, please? 15 take the position with the ministry, in communications 15 Q. Yes. This document is called an "Assessment of ... 16 16 with you and others that worked for you, that when Performance". 17 submitting the November 29th 2010 application, NRD's 17 A. Yes. 18 intention was to obtain a long-term licence? Are you 18 Q. It's dated "August 12, 2014". As of that date, where in 19 19 saying Mr Marshall didn't say that? the process for an applicant seeking a licence to 20 A. It was very clear in the 2010 application that they were 20 operate a mine, where in that process did MINIRENA's 21 21 applying for five years. assessment of its performance fall? 22 Q. Isn't it true the reason that this document in 2014 uses 22 A. NRD was still occupying -- if I may use that 23 the same reference to the application process that began 23 terminology -- the concessions, or the mining areas at 24 on November 29th 2010 as an application for a long-term 24 that time. So it is obvious that an assessment of 25 licence, isn't it true that it was because Mr Marshall, 25 performance can be conducted at any moment, on any area. Page 153 Page 155 18:33 1 in his communications with people in the ministry, OGMR, Q. Did MINIRENA conduct assessments of performances by the 2 in talking about that application, suggested he intended other short-term licence holders who applied for 3 to get a long-term licence, and they, in responding to 3 concessions after their initial term expired? 4 A. Assessments of performance were conducted at any moment him, said they understood that was the purpose? That 5 was the characterisation prior to this lawsuit, 5 it was deemed necessary by MINIRENA. 6 wasn't it? 6 Q. Okay. So in terms of the process for deciding whether 7 7 A. No. or not to grant a licence that was being applied for by 8 Q. You will agree with me that there was no one within the 8 a short-term licence-holder seeking to extend it, please tell me when the ministry performed its assessment of 9 ministry that would have a reason for calling these 10 performance. What did it do before then, what did it do 10 events an application for a long-term licence by NRD, 11 other than that's what they truthfully believed it was, 11 after then in the process? 12 12 A. When an application is received at the ministry, there's in this report? A. NRD was clearly informed that if it wants to proceed 13 an evaluation that is made on that application. That is 13 14 14 with its application, it is invited to negotiate for normal. But at any moment, [if] either the Natural 15 short-term licences. There are letters from RDB and 15 Resources Authority or the Minister of Natural Resources 16 there are letters from MINIRENA to confirm that. 16 would deem it necessary, it can conduct an assessment. 17 Q. I'll try one more time, sir. I'm asking you recognising 17 Q. Sir, if an application for a licence extending beyond 18 the initial short-term licence by any applicant for 18 that you say you don't know who the author is. So 19 I'm asking you what is therefore an open question as to 19 mining operations was submitted, won't you agree that 20 the application itself would first be analysed and 20 anybody who could have been working on this within 21 21 MINIRENA. determined whether the application failed to qualify, 22 22 and therefore would not proceed, before doing the work You're not aware of anyone who was working on the 23 23 involved in an assessment of performance? NRD file in August 2014 having a purpose or reason for 24 24 characterising the November 29th 2010 application as A. Everything can be done in order to collect the maximum

25

25

an application for a long-term licence, other than

Page 154

information that will inform the ministry towards making

Page 156

18:39 1 a decision.  2 Q. But what was done? What was the practice? What was the policy? How were all the mining operation licence applicants treated, in terms of a process? After submitting the application, what came next, and where in that process did an assessment of performance fall for everyone?  8 A. What was normal is that an application is received, there's an evaluation conducted, and that evaluation comprises any activity that will lead the ministry to gather all the information so that a decision is taken on the application.  13 So there would be maybe an evaluating committee, a committee visiting the sites, discussions with the applicants. So all are part of the process of evaluating the application.  14 Q. Would you agree with me that means that as of August 14th 2012, MINIRENA considered NRD's application for a long-term licence pending and under consideration, but not already rejected?  21 A. The I think we issued a final notice that the application was rejected, I think it was in 2015, if I remember properly. So between 2010 to 2015, we were still giving NRD all the chances possible to see if they	18:43 1 evaluating the resources and reserves, that the major objective wasn't immediate industrialisation; correct?  3 A. The major objective in the contract signed by NRD was to immediately start industrialisation and also conduct exploration, evaluate the reserves, submit a feasibility study. So it is clear in their contract. The fact that it is mentioned as such in this report doesn't take away the major objectives as stated in the signed contract.  9 Q. Well, doesn't pure logic and business sense dictate that they can't all be given equal weight immediately after signing the initial exploration licence? Because if you immediately industrialise, without assessing reserves and resources, you're setting everyone up for failure by pouring money into something with no idea what you want to do and how you want to do it.  16 A. These mines for instance, the Nemba mine had been discovered in the '40s or the 1930s. So it was an already-existing mine, with infrastructure on site.  19 So to immediately move on with industrialisation, it was very logic[al], and that is what NRD signed in its contract.  20 You're not suggesting that the shareholders and entities behind NRD, when they originally obtained a contract in 2006, were the same parties that from the 1940s, as you
25 can come to the table and negotiate an agreement for Page 157	25 say, had started mining efforts, before the government Page 159
18:41 1 mining.  2 Q. If I can ask you to look at the second page of R-118 and  3 "Fulfilment of Obligations". There, under section 3.1,  4 called "Exploration", is the sentence:  5 "It should be understood that the major objective of  6 these hybrid permits was to delineate the resources and  7 evaluate the reserves in the license areas."  8 Do you see that?  9 A. Yes, I see that.  10 Q. And the hybrid permit is the initial exploration licence  11 period; correct?  12 A. Can you repeat, please?  13 Q. The hybrid permit is the initial exploration licence  14 period where exploration and analysis, feasibility  15 studies, those actions are being conducted, for  16 an applicant who believes it may want to apply for  17 a concession?  18 A. You are right.  19 Q. Okay. It's true, is it not, that  20 THE PRESIDENT: Sorry. Am I right that the word "hybrid"  21 reflects the fact that they are at the same time allowed  22 to mine, while they're exploring?  23 A. You are right, sir. You are right.  MR COWLEY: You agree with this statement that the major  25 objective at that time period was delineating and	18:45 1 took over?  2 A. I didn't get the question well, sorry.  3 Q. NRD in 2006 is not the same entity as whatever private 4 enterprise or government agency was behind the 5 initiation of mining in the 1940s, was it?  6 A. No, it wasn't.  7 Q. So they didn't have the information on which the 8 infrastructure that you say was at the facility was 9 built, what their expectations were, such that they 10 could immediately industrialise it; correct? 11 A. I was not there in 2006 when they signed it, but I think 12 there's a good reason NRD in 2006 planned and signed and 13 agreed to immediately start industrialisation. So they 14 have a good reason. 15 Q. Well, there are five concessions, and you've mentioned 16 one that had anything predating NRD's obtaining 17 a concession. The concessions in the western part of 18 the state had nothing; correct? 19 A. Not at all. It's not correct, what you are saying. 20 It's not correct, what you are saying, not at all 21 correct. 22 Q. Don't you know when you're assessing NRD in 2012, you 23 say you began, that it's completely unfair to suggest, 24 just because the words in the initial contract said 25 "immediately industrialise", to actually believe  Page 160

18:46 1 someone, upon taking the initial four-year licence, 2 would pour money into industrialising with plants and 3 automatic equipment, and whatever else might go into it 4 eventually to extract all the minerals profitably, to do 5 it immediately on day one, that that's very unfair; 6 don't you know that? 7 A. I don't agree. The government had a plan when it 8 privatised the mines. The plan was to change and 9 modernise the activities in the country, and that 10 required a lot of investment, fresh money. So that's 11 why the government invited people, investors, to come 12 and develop this sector. And the government believed in 13 NRD, and NRD pledged to invest about \$40 million in 14 modernising the operations. 15 So we were very disappointed in the fact that people 16 who were thought to be very experienced in mining failed 17 to implement the plan that they draw themselves. 18 Q. FTI, if I could ask you to turn to the next page, 3.2. 19 Under "Production", it does reference the language 20 of the contract you're referring to. You'll agree with 21 me that the author, and whoever reviewed this at the 22 time before this document came in this form, did not use 23 the same weighty concept of the "major objective" of the 24 hybrid agreement being industrial exploitation 25 immediately; that's not how that's characterised there,	18:50 1 in the next phase they should have spent much more than 40. So that's why we know that this investment is gradual. They should have started with the 40 and then proceeded with much more investment.  Unfortunately, most of the investment was just from retains from minerals they sold from the concession, not fresh money from the outside.  Q. Let's stick with those two points. In 2006, when NRD's founders were applying and they put out their budget, what were the policy, practices and guidelines of MINIRENA, what did they say about what the amount to be invested in each mine had to be for every applicant? A. We, for instance, had the policy in 2010 to invest an estimate of about USD \$3 million in exploration for an area the size of 7 kilometres squared. Q. I asked you about 2006, when the contract was signed and people used the language, not at the end. When people signed up and made the projections, what did MINIRENA say was the amount that each applicant would be held to equally of investment? A. MINIRENA, when they signed this contract in 2006, they were happy with the \$40 million pledged. So it means it was okay with the policy of 2006. Q. Isn't it true that MINIRENA had no such minimum equally applicable to all applicants for a short-term
18:48 1 correct?  2 A. No, what I'm reading is that, "NRD was expected to proceed immediately to industrial exploitation", and that is what we were expecting.  5 Q. And you can agree with me that the authors of this used the same description that this term excuse me. They did not ascribe to this term of the contract the characterisation that it was a "major objective" of the contract, did they?  10 A. This is the interpretation of the author. But at the	18:52 1 exploratory licence?  2 A. I don't remember what was the situation on that fact in 2006.  4 Q. I'm sorry, I did speak over you at the beginning. Can  5 I ask you to repeat at least the beginning of that prior answer, and I'll do that by repeating the question.  7 A. Yes, please.  8 Q. In 2006, what did MINIRENA say was its policy that applied equally to every applicant for a short-term exploratory licence on investment: that there was
ministry level, the interpretation was that proceeding to industrialisation of the mine is key to the plan of NRD.  Q. And proceeding could be gradual, because industrialisation of Rwanda's mining industry was always intended to be a gradual process, was it not?  A. It's gradual everywhere in the world.  Q. And true of Rwanda; correct? So when Rwanda was looking at its short-term exploratory contracts with applicants such as NRD, when it was interpreting the "immediately to industrialise" provision, it reasonably understood that that means effectively it would be gradual, it would be over time; correct?  A. You are right. It was you are very right. These \$40 millions had to be spent within four years, and then	a minimum amount, a specific amount total, or that they just left everybody free to say the number that they wanted and they set no parameters?  A. I don't remember the policy that was there in 2006, I was not working yet for MINIRENA.  Q. Right. But you inherited this contract and you looked in this file and you made an assessment of what to do with it. So you had to look back at 2006 if you were actually going to interpret what NRD was supposed to do. Your only way to do that is to learn what it was told the contract meant when it signed it, right?  A. I don't remember the policy in 2006 about minimum investment.  Q. How about whether you looked into it? When you wrote your 2012 assessment, for example, two years before
Page 162	Page 164

Day 6 -- Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits

ICSID Case No. ARB/18/21

18:53 1	this, did you contact the people who were involved in	18:57 1	world, and including Rwanda, that progress towards
2	issuing the licence within the agency to find out from	2	industrialisation is actually gradual; it's not
3	their communications, oral or written or email, what was	3	immediate anywhere?
4	said, what was told, before you went to your superiors	4	A. I totally agree. But this 40 million for four years was
5	and said, "This was the contract expectations when they	5	just one phase in the process to full industrial, and
6	signed it"?	6	they failed to succeed with phase 1.
7	A. In 2012, first the first thing I read, I read the	7	Q. I would like to stick with this point though, sir,
8	contracts. And the contract was the basis on which	8	before you tell me that there's others to consider.
9	everything would be built. After reading that, I read	9	Because this is assessing performance, you assessed
10	the investment plan, the assessments done by my	10	performance two years earlier, and you're both referring
11	colleague or my supervisor at that time, and then I made	11	to contracts.
12	my own assessment. I didn't have to go further than	12	I'm trying to determine: when you were doing it,
13	what was signed in the contract.	13	when you were reaching conclusions and passing them on,
14	Q. You were looking at making assessments of other	14	didn't you actually recognise that it can't mean
15	applicants at that time, not just NRD; correct?	15	immediate industrialisation in 2006; it has to mean over
16	A. It might have happened.	16	time? So there's the language and there's the what it
17	Q. Did you notice that they had different numbers for	17	must mean and how it's going to be applied. Didn't you
18	proposed investment, for example?	18	recognise that?
19	A. I don't think I don't remember. But what I remember	19	A. I recognised that NRD did some good preliminary
20	is that NRD signed for \$40 million and invested much,	20	exploratory work. So if you want me to tell you that
21	much less than their pledge.	21	I recognise what they did, yes, I did recognise that
22	Q. To be clear, when reporting to your superiors in 2012	22	they did a good preliminary work. But they were
23 24	what the contract required and what the expectations were, you actually didn't communicate with anyone within	23	supposed to do a reserve calculation and a feasibility study, and unfortunately they didn't.
25	MINIRENA about what their expectations that were	24 25	Q. I'm not asking about those things. Please, I don't mean
23	MINIKENA about what their expectations that were	23	Q. Thi not asking about those things. Flease, I don't mean
	Page 165		Page 167
18:55 1	communicated to NRD were, did you?	18:58 1	to cut you off, but I am trying to push for time to
18:55 1 2	communicated to NRD were, did you?  A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?	18:58 1 2	to cut you off, but I am trying to push for time to actually cover what my questions are.
18:55 1 2 3	A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?	18:58 1 2 3	actually cover what my questions are.
2		2	
2 3	<ul><li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li><li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what</li></ul>	2 3	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li><li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it,</li></ul>	2 3 4	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?  Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?	2 3 4 5 6 7	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> <li>Q. With all due respect, sir, haven't we just discussed</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached 7 o'clock in this country, 8 o'clock, I think, where you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> <li>Q. With all due respect, sir, haven't we just discussed somewhat of an ambiguity or tension between the language</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached 7 o'clock in this country, 8 o'clock, I think, where you are, and that's time to adjourn.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> <li>Q. With all due respect, sir, haven't we just discussed somewhat of an ambiguity or tension between the language in the contract, "to proceed immediately to industrial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached 7 o'clock in this country, 8 o'clock, I think, where you are, and that's time to adjourn.  Could I make one statement of housekeeping. I asked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> <li>Q. With all due respect, sir, haven't we just discussed somewhat of an ambiguity or tension between the language</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached 7 o'clock in this country, 8 o'clock, I think, where you are, and that's time to adjourn.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. All sorry, can you repeat, please?</li> <li>Q. Yes. When you wrote your assessment in 2012 about what the contract required and how you assessed NRD met it, you did not first ask anyone who was involved in issuing that contract with NRD in 2006 what they actually communicated their expectations to be?</li> <li>A. I discussed with Dr Michael, who was my supervisor, I got his report and I used it as a tool. I was not there in 2006, but the senior person in my department at that time was Dr Michael, and I got his report.</li> <li>Q. Is it your testimony that his report says that he actually analysed and obtained the information about the representations made to NRD about contract expectations when they were signed?</li> <li>A. The contract expectations are very clear in the contracts: proceeding to industrial mining, conduct exploration, conduct a feasibility study and provide reports, two years. So that was the baseline for my evaluation. And what I saw, by the way, is that NRD failed on all those points.</li> <li>Q. With all due respect, sir, haven't we just discussed somewhat of an ambiguity or tension between the language in the contract, "to proceed immediately to industrial</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	actually cover what my questions are.  So you gave me your answer, as much as you're going to give it, as to whether you recognise the distinction between the literal language with regards to industrial exploitation, and the reality of how long it takes.  My next question is: in that process of looking at that element that's the element we're on right now did you go further and look into what the policy that was announced and communicated to investors in Rwanda's mining industry in 2006 was? Did you hold up your expectations against what was communicated to see if they were consistent before passing on an assessment?  A. I can repeat again; I think, unfortunately, it would be the same answer.  My assessment was first based on the contract that was signed. So I looked at what was the were the conditions in the contract and made an assessment, and it came with the findings that I have been highlighting again. If you allow, I can highlight them again.  THE PRESIDENT: Not this evening, because we've reached 7 o'clock in this country, 8 o'clock, I think, where you are, and that's time to adjourn.  Could I make one statement of housekeeping. I asked

Monday, 28 June 2021

19:00	1 assistance in getting the data in a user-friendly form	
	on our laptops. We haven't yet received that. If we	
	3 could have it before we sit the day after tomorrow,	
	4 which will be our last day and we'll allow	
	5 a reasonable time, so we could come in an hour before we	
	6 sat in order to make sure we get what we need that	
	7 would be most helpful.	
	8 MR KAPLAN: Mr President, perhaps I can speak with the	
	9 assistant to the Tribunal, if she's available, after we	
	10 end today.	
	11 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, thank you.	
	12 MR KAPLAN: Thank you.	
	13 THE PRESIDENT: Okay.	
	I must ask you, Mr Imena: over the adjournment until	
	tomorrow, please do not discuss this case with anybody.	
	16 MR IMENA: Yes, sir.	
	17 THE PRESIDENT: That's one of our rules.	
	Thank you very much. We'll adjourn until midday	
	19 tomorrow.	
	20 (7.01 pm)	
	21 (The hearing adjourned until 12.00 noon the following day) 22	
	22 23	
	24	
	25	
•	25	
	Page 169	

	ı	ı	ı	ı	
A	109:8 110:16 123:4	against 13:2,6 31:18	aloud 29:17 81:1	168:15	37:1 49:14 51:24
	148:22 153:14	31:23 32:2 35:16	already 56:10 60:12	answered 16:25 79:14	97:23 129:23
Aaronson 2:7,7,8,8	160:25 164:19	36:24 37:22 38:5,11	78:9 84:12,17 86:3	answering 12:13	appropriate 12:6 77:7
<b>able</b> 14:6 36:13 48:13	165:24 166:6,13	44:24 45:10 46:15	86:17,19,21 125:10	42:22 83:16	87:19
48:16,22 56:20	167:2,14 168:2	48:10 50:18 51:14	132:12 136:19	answers 141:19	approval 32:25
59:22 69:8 111:24					
113:22,24 116:7	add 20:4 108:16	51:16,18 52:12,25	142:11,22 157:20	antagonistic 124:18	approved 155:4
146:9	140:11 152:3	53:6 55:5 61:6	already-existing	<b>ANTHONY</b> 3:4 9:13	approximate 95:21
above 46:9 110:22	added 93:20	64:24 66:2,6 72:2	159:18	anticipated 108:4	142:7
112:10	addition 108:6 129:13	76:15 78:2 79:22	<b>alright</b> 9:11 20:4 36:8	anybody 65:9,13	<b>April</b> 113:5,8
accept 11:25 63:20	additional 1:9 52:24	106:12 109:9,17	95:10 125:13	131:3,3 133:21	arbitration 1:1,1
75:10	86:6 93:20 105:13	168:12	129:23 134:18	152:16 154:20	53:12 71:4,8,21
accepted 5:7 58:20	address 59:11 119:13	age 123:19	although 111:23	169:15	72:6 73:5 74:24
68:4,9	127:4,6,7,13,14,19	agency 84:4 135:18,19	148:18	anyone 65:3 75:23	134:1
accepting 10:16 11:3	127:20 133:13	135:22,24 136:15	always 8:17 30:14	78:16 89:11 94:21	ARB/18/21 1:4
	134:24	160:4 165:2	43:17 44:3 47:9	137:14,22 138:11	area 155:25 163:15
access 19:3,4,12 26:1	addressed 47:24	aggrieved 12:18	52:21 93:21 162:15	138:11 154:22	areas 97:22 130:10
87:16 102:22 110:7	addressing 147:2	ago 17:14 23:3,22	ambiguity 166:23	165:24 166:5	155:23 158:7
116:7 124:12,15	adjourn 57:22 168:23		amended 122:23		
125:6 126:10 127:6		62:23 118:19		anything 4:3,4 7:7,10	argument 7:5
127:7 128:21	169:18	agree 11:2 13:5,9,20	123:21	7:14,25 27:4 47:5	argumentative 124:19
131:24 148:7,13	adjourned 99:8	14:10 19:12 21:12	amendment 30:3	69:12,15,16 102:13	around 89:20 90:18
accessible 132:15	169:21	21:18 26:2,6,23	among 36:9 69:24	118:15 124:3	91:4,14 93:10 96:9
according 16:11 44:25	adjournment 169:14	27:3,8 38:9 39:20	70:2 71:23	125:25 133:2 134:8	99:13 107:8 109:2,4
146:22	administrative 39:24	40:16 41:12,20	amongst 56:5	136:8 160:16	147:16 166:25
accordingly 51:19	55:25	43:23 44:9 46:11	amount 39:13,21	anywhere 58:23 113:1	arranged 69:22
account 13:1,11	admissibility 8:18	47:14 48:5 49:12	40:21 46:14 50:18	115:1 131:2 167:3	Article 121:6
110:10 126:4,9,10	admissible 8:8	50:5,20 53:20 67:16	52:6,8 55:7,23	Apart 100:15	Article4 119:25
126:24 127:4,13,19	admit 1:25 11:17	69:3 74:14 76:13	105:3 106:19	apologies 54:1 95:22	ascribe 162:7
	12:21	77:17,25 78:2,6,12	111:18 122:22	146:8	aside 72:5 75:14
127:21,25 128:2,4,6	advance 31:14	78:14 90:9,14 92:1	151:5 163:11,19	apologise 19:5,9,24	asked 6:10 16:9 25:3
128:11,12,20,22	advisor 136:22	92:10 100:20	164:11,11	27:2 31:14 94:3	33:14 35:16 37:19
129:12 130:11	affairs 136:22,22	109:19 111:20	amounts 54:19 66:22	110:24 136:5 145:5	46:24 47:12,13
131:14 133:12,13	137:4	116:9 118:12,18,23	77:16 79:14	Apparently 37:13,16	50:17 68:3 70:13
accounting 31:17			analyse 6:16		
accounts 129:3,14,17	afraid 35:7	119:5 137:16 147:8		APPEARANCES 2:1	71:13 72:15 78:21
130:4,9	Africa 20:19 34:15	148:18 151:10,13	analysed 5:13 156:20	appeared 82:16	79:1,13 84:18 85:3
accuracy 43:21	46:3 97:13	151:22,24,25 152:8	166:13	append 80:1	85:5,8,10 86:15
accurate 55:1 82:18	after 9:20 10:3,11	152:13,25 153:1	analysis 99:16 112:18	appended 62:1	87:6,8 89:5 94:4
103:18,19 107:15	15:22 17:3,5,5,11	154:8 156:19	113:15 158:14	applicability 94:8	95:8 103:6 112:24
122:7 148:20 150:9	18:10 19:13 21:8,21	157:17 158:24	ANNA 2:23	applicable 163:25	113:6,23 115:23
151:1,11,12	24:8,20 31:17 38:8	161:7,20 162:5	annex 43:7,14,15 44:4	applicant 98:10	123:14 125:16
accurately 42:17	46:18 47:15 48:6	167:4	44:17 45:23 62:1	155:19 156:18	132:11 140:5,10
Achievements 104:10	49:3 50:15,22 52:20	agreed 8:14 26:20	67:15 80:2	158:16 163:12,19	141:20 145:19
acknowledge 12:3	61:3 63:1 64:13	70:4 74:9 94:14	annexe 79:10,19	164:9	147:17 152:1
Ü	68:23 76:24 77:4,12	103:1 160:13	annexed 41:23 42:2	applicants 90:4,7	163:16 168:24
40:8 111:14	77:25 84:11 89:15	agreeing 74:12	43:17 44:5,14 54:8	94:23 95:3 96:24	asking 7:24 24:18
acknowledged 41:6	92:8 93:16 94:1	agreement 22:21 23:2	54:11,14,15 61:11	97:3,20 142:4,21	33:13 36:6 40:10
111:21	101:14 103:2	23:4,17 24:16,17	61:11 62:12,16 79:2	143:5,9,25 157:4,15	44:8 48:2 49:11
acknowledging 64:22	106:20 122:15	27:21 28:1 45:6	Anne-Marie 1:23	162:19 163:25	51:14,15,24 52:1
acknowledgment	123:5,10 127:17	94:11 157:25	announced 10:16	165:15	54:4 55:8 61:14
166:25	133:6 136:2 138:1	161:24	168:10		62:6.7 63:14 64:4
acronym 84:5	147:8,17 156:3,11			applications 10:16	,
acting 72:7		ahead 42:9 117:6	announcement 11:3,5	11:4 89:18,20,23,25	75:20 90:3 95:4
action 13:2,4,6 73:23	157:4 159:10 165:9	ALASTAIR 2:6	announcements 33:25	97:6 143:4 144:2,11	97:3 101:24 102:3
77:17 100:12,20	169:3,9	ALEX 1:22	another 17:23 18:2,14	applied 90:12 97:9	103:4 113:19
102:13,24,25	afternoon 9:16,17	aligns 87:8 121:12	25:10 36:19 56:17	109:17 149:23	118:23 119:12,16
103:16 109:7	80:24 82:13,14	Alison 100:1,10,16	57:19 88:22 92:17	150:13 153:2,6	122:4 123:8 125:22
actions 50:6 55:12	again 7:1,20 12:10,12	133:9	104:19 113:22	156:2,7 164:9	125:25 128:24
60:24 76:1 158:15	16:13 17:1 18:13	alleged 37:22	120:23 125:1 141:5	167:17	130:16 131:11
active 3:5	37:14,17,18 39:18	<b>allocation</b> 11:9 13:22	answer 3:24 4:15,21	applied-for 107:11	140:8,10 142:10
activities 72:2 118:2	44:10 45:4 53:2	allow 143:24 149:14	7:6,8 12:9 23:21	apply 91:5 106:1	143:16 144:5
161:9	58:8 60:10 61:3	168:20 169:4	26:25 38:23 42:24	158:16	154:17,19 167:25
activity 117:10,20,23	63:3 73:6 74:1 78:3	allowed 8:1 73:11	44:11 46:8 47:13,22	applying 93:24 94:24	asks 33:17
157:10	78:8,13 86:14 87:9	83:1 97:1,2 124:6	49:4 59:8 63:20	98:15 151:7 153:21	aspect 33:11
	95:11,22,23 99:15	126:5 131:18 152:3	64:9 75:22 87:8	163:9	aspects 114:17 117:22
acts 34:1	114:9,19 122:2	158:21	90:16 96:5 113:22	appointed 84:12,13	assess 61:6
actual 122:17	126:16 131:18	allowing 82:3	120:25 124:8	126:7 127:3,17	assessed 106:12,14,16
actually 7:11 21:14	132:17 134:15,21	almost 13:21 28:6	125:24 139:14	appointment 75:15	166:4 167:9
51:5 54:13 66:19	143:22 150:3	alone 127:13,20	140:24 141:3 150:5	appraisals 32:6	assessing 159:12
67:6 70:14 95:6	168:14,20,20	along 7:9 37:7 50:24	155:9 164:6 168:3	appreciate 6:4 33:12	160:22 167:9
100:25 108:11	100.17,20,20	arong 1.7 31.1 30.24	133.7 104.0 100.3	appreciate 0.4 33.12	100.22 107.7

assessment 16:6 18:25
85:12 86:1,2,7,15
86:20,21 87:13,15
87:17 88:6,12,21
89:3,6 106:20 112:5
112:12 113:10
140:5 146:22,25
148:11,15 149:3,7
148:11,13 149:3,7
149:19 152:13
155:12,15,21,24
155.12,15,21,24
156:9,16,23 157:6
164:17,25 165:12
166.2 169.12 16 19
166:3 168:13,16,18
assessments 86:17
156:1,4 165:10,14
asset 36:19 77:24
assets 32:11 34:6,23
35:9 36:5,9,17
38:16 39:23 40:22
59:22 74:11 76:24
77:1,18,22,23
assist 8:11 28:19 80:8
116:24
assistance 2:10,12
56:9 169:1
assistant 2:23 39:24
56:1 169:9
assisted 2:14
attach 41:15 43:18,19
49:20,25 56:7
attached 11:6 43:5
44:7 54:6 58:23
59:2 60:10 61:9,24
62:10 65:18 87:25
88:4,5 100:7 112:15
112.1 6 10 114.25
113:1,6,10 114:25
115:4,6,10,21 121:3
134:19
attaching 124:25
attachment 24:11,14
25:3 42:1
attachments 119:21
attempt 71:14 133:16
attention 11:24 13:20
26:11 58:9 110:23
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 <b>auction</b> 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 <b>auction</b> 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 <b>auction</b> 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15 152:16 154:18
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15 152:16 154:18 161:21 162:10
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15 152:16 154:18 161:21 162:10 authorisation 33:23
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15 152:16 154:18 161:21 162:10 authorisation 33:23 78:11
26:11 58:9 110:23 117:10 140:2,20 auction 32:11,12,21 33:1,3,19,22 34:13 46:15,16,19,21 47:7 47:15 48:1,6,9 52:6 52:11 76:19 auctioned 35:6 39:2 76:21 77:15 auctions 34:25 35:2,5 audio 16:25 August 139:17 140:4 140:9 146:16,25 147:7,14,16,22 149:12 154:23 155:11,18 157:18 Australian 10:2 author 147:1 151:5,15 152:16 154:18 161:21 162:10 authorisation 33:23

authority 85:6 112:21
132:23 135:12,13
135:14,19,23,25
136:10,13,15,18,24
137:15,23 138:12
147:12 156:15
authors 162:5
automatic 161:3
automatically 12:25
44:14 54:8 79:24
availability 56:18
available 9:4,8 52:14
52:14 56:14 86:8
96:3 125:20 133:20
143:14 169:9
avoid 38:16 39:22
40:22
award 10:17 71:4,8,21
72:6 73:5 74:24
awarded 14:15 15:20
19:20 98:1 142:4,13
aware 22:25 23:1 24:8
24:15 26:19 105:18
122:25 123:1,18 124:24 137:25
124:24 137:25
138:5 154:22
away 10:4 20:14,14
74:6 75:10 82:23
83:2 159:7
B
<b>B</b> 1:22 76:5
back 3:3 6:15 14:11
19:9 24:19 26:14
22.10 22.2 21 40.1

<b>B</b> 1:22 76:5
back 3:3 6:15 14:11
19:9 24:19 26:14
32:10 33:2,21 40:1
44:1 54:9,16 58:8
65:24 68:24 72:17
75:7,23 77:25 78:2
78:7 86:10 89:12
90:1 96:15 99:15
108:5,12 117:19
119:5 120:10
129:24 132:10
134:5,18 138:17
139:10,23 144:15
144:19,23 145:6
164:18
background 84:2,2,8
backwards 84:15
bailiff 31:1,16,21,25
32:5,9,14,24 33:2,9
33:12,17,20,23 34:3
35:1,18 44:17 45:14
45:20,20 52:15,16
52:18,19,20 64:22
74:11 77:22 78:16
78:17
bailiffs 35:4 45:13
52:9,10
balance 80:21
ballpark 95:2
<b>ban</b> 148:6,10
bank 13:1,11
<b>banned</b> 147:23 148:13
<b>Barbara</b> 1:12 30:25
40:17 41:1,2,3
55:15 58:19

Ierits ICSID Case N	
based 18:6 20:15	16:24 23:23
21:12,18 59:6 72:6	42:22 56:12,
73:5 111:14 113:16	64:3,4 70:22
113:23 132:12	72:7 160:25
133:18 140:6	believed 55:1 1
168:16	155:1 161:12
baseline 166:19	believes 158:16
basic 60:6	believing 71:3
basically 51:3	belongings 77:
basis 3:14 8:20 52:21	below 46:9 118
52:21 71:24 72:1	Ben 55:20 72:1
98:5,13 123:15	75:3 76:7
165:8	<b>benefit</b> 36:13
Bay 1:15 2:4	Benzinge 53:1,
became 5:2 101:6	54:19,21 55:
103:15 126:17,19	55:14,15,18,
151:16	56:3 58:12,1
become 96:3	59:4 69:23 7
becoming 4:20 127:17	72:14,18,22
<b>before</b> 1:10 3:3 5:1	74:3 75:3,8 7
6:24 13:4 19:13	Benzinge's 53:
22:16 23:18 32:1,7	56:5
39:8,10,16,19 49:3	beside 78:24
63:1 69:22 73:17	best 94:5 117:2
75:7,23 80:18 83:16	139:21
86:10,12 87:22	better 4:5 26:7
89:10 99:11 100:18	48:15 80:21
101:22 104:7 107:7	between 17:11
112:19,24 120:25	22:21 30:15
126:8 127:22,23	37:25 42:18
134:9 135:23 136:7	90:3,4 96:10
136:8,8 140:22	102:17 134:1
141:3,15,17,22	138:7 157:23
145:18 147:4	166:23 168:5
151:16 152:17	beyond 34:23 8
156:10,22 159:25	100:16 104:2
161:22 164:25	124:24 129:1
165:4 167:8 168:13	156:17
169:3,5 <b>beg</b> 10:21	Bidega 2:11,22 81:9,12,20 1
began 5:9 9:21 92:6	137:8,12,13
105:20 127:3,5	Bidega's 3:17 8
153:23 160:23	134:22
begin 1:4	BIDWELL 1:1
beginning 64:21 74:9	big 22:4
96:9 164:4,5 168:25	Biryabarema 8
begun 79:13 148:12	99:25
behalf 1:24 15:15 18:5	Bisesero 27:23.
18:14,20 19:20	28:3,7,15,16
26:16 36:6,20 37:10	bit 15:10 19:7
37:21 50:7 55:3	47:21 101:8,
67:21 68:3,10	102:1 103:21
124:22 144:17	124:24 150:6
behind 119:24 159:23	black 63:24
160:4	blamed 68:25
being 1:24 4:19 7:8	board 2:9 55:1
8:9 9:1,20 13:15	72:10,12,21
19:13 23:25 31:18	96:21 153:8
45:16 47:6,14 53:24	Bonjour 29:10
82:5 84:24 89:5	Bosco 3:7 29:6
90:17 97:25 101:22	70:12 72:5,2
102:4 104:21 110:3	75:13 76:22
146:16 147:20 156:7 158:15	boss 40:6 41:2
1.10:7 1.38:1.3	1113 /3 50

ompany LLC -v- K	republic of Kwaliu
ARB/18/21	
16:24 23:23 39:17	bother 28:9
42:22 56:12,16 64:2	<b>bottom</b> 47:17,24,25
64:3,4 70:22 71:1	62:25 63:17 64:6
72:7 160:25	117:20
elieved 55:1 154:11	bought 28:5
155:1 161:12	bounce 107:8
elieves 158:16	break 39:4,8 57:15
	· ·
elieving 71:3	58:3 80:16,17,20
elongings 77:21	99:5,12 109:14,21
elow 46:9 118:3	109:25 110:9
en 55:20 72:14,22	113:18 141:9,13,13
75:3 76:7	144:18,21 150:5
enefit 36:13	breakdown 110:2,6
enzinge 53:1,4,11	breaking 10:23 19:7
54:19,21 55:2,6,10	breakout 56:24 57:2,
55:14,15,18,22,24	118:2 144:23
56:3 58:12,13,16	breakouts 118:4
59:4 69:23 70:5,25	breaks 80:15
72:14,18,22 73:7	<b>brief</b> 57:6 125:8
74:3 75:3,8 77:18	<b>briefly</b> 135:13 148:16
enzinge's 53:22 54:5	bring 3:21 5:15 9:10
56:5	10:6 11:21 13:17
eside 78:24	29:3 37:25 40:18
est 94:5 117:2 125:21	44:10 83:17 120:10
139:21	122:4 134:5 139:19
etter 4:5 26:7,19	139:23 146:15
48:15 80:21 113:21	bringing 65:25 80:19
	0 0
etween 17:11 18:18	British 1:2
22:21 30:15 33:8	broader 90:20
37:25 42:18 68:17	broadly 6:16
90:3,4 96:10 102:15	BRODSKY 2:22
102:17 134:10	broke 15:10
138:7 157:23	broken 64:16 149:2
166:23 168:5	brought 9:8 22:18
eyond 34:23 88:20	23:11 24:7,14 34:1
100:16 104:20,24	36:17,18 50:13 53:
· ·	
124:24 129:17	58:8 60:21 66:15
156:17	76:12 79:21 83:23
idega 2:11,22 3:21	86:7 104:9 116:18
81:9,12,20 134:12	119:18 138:17
137:8,12,13 138:1,8	BRYAN 2:3
idega's 3:17 81:15	budget 103:21,23
134:22	104:4,18,23 106:5.
IDWELL 1:11	108:3,15 109:10,20
g 22:4	110:2 114:13 163:
iryabarema 86:20	budgeted 105:17
99:25	106:2 109:21
isesero 27:23,25	budgeting 105:12
28:3,7,15,16 90:17	Buildings 2:6,6
t 15:10 19:7 37:1	<b>built</b> 160:9 165:9
47:21 101:8,11	BURNHAM 2:18
102:1 103:21 121:6	business 107:10
124:24 150:6	117:11,25 127:12
ack 63:24	159:9
amed 68:25	BVG 22:21 26:8 27:1
oard 2:9 55:14 56:4	2 , 0 22,21 20,0 27,1
72:10,12,21 75:1	C
96:21 153:8	C 76:5 116:4
onjour 29:10	cadastre 143:19,23
osco 3:7 29:6 70:10	144:13
70:12 72:5,25 74:4	calculating 108:22
75:13 76:22 77:10	calculation 106:7

```
27:11 29:6 34:14
                           48:7 54:5 65:11
                           80:23 86:20 92:2
                           93:2 96:11 135:17
                           135:18 155:15
                           158:4
                        calling 133:24 154:9
                        came 5:19 6:22 38:8
                           50:25 66:21 67:6
                           68:2,15,24 77:5,15
                   8
                           78:11 94:14 98:15
                           109:19 128:10
                           153:3 157:5 161:22
                           168:19
                        capable 42:21 67:17
                           124:1
                         capacity 5:16 6:10 7:5
                           101:5 114:1 125:15
                           127:18 137:1
                         capital 103:23 105:6
                           109:18 119:25
                        car 17:15 35:3,6 36:10
                           36:15,17,19,24
                           76:20,25 77:13,14
                           77:23 78:5,10
                         carried 52:20 82:16
                        carry 2:6 16:21 17:22
                           20:4 79:15 145:11
                         case 1:4 5:15 6:23
                           19:6 21:2 30:19
                           32:20 34:10,18
                           35:17,19,20 36:3
                           43:20 45:19,20
                           50:16,22 51:6,10,13
                           51:21,25,25 52:2,4
                   10
                           71:9,13,14 116:1,4
                           124:22 128:13
                           131:1,15 132:16
                           141:8 169:15
                        cases 51:12,17 97:9
                        categorise 8:23
                         category 94:13 98:12
                         CATHERINE 2:14
                         caused 122:18
                        Cc 22:6,8 134:22
                           135:2
                        ceased 2:11
                        cease-and-desist
                           71:17
                         Celse 100:3
                         Centre 1:2
                        certain 30:18 35:11
                           40:5 148:18
                         certainly 25:13 57:1
                           61:20 62:20 67:16
                   10
                           83:10
                         CHABINSKA 2:24
                         chain 122:13 133:17
                           133:22 134:15
                        chairs 60:8
                        challenge 5:4 6:20
                           8:17 25:11,24 43:21
calculation 106:7
                           54:11 76:8
  167:23
                         challenged 5:25 25:2
call 24:2,4 25:10 63:15
                           43:22
  64:5 87:10 93:3
                         challenges 8:20 47:4,5
  110:24 144:7
                         chambers 145:6
called 3:7,11 8:15 9:2
```

both 1:13,23 59:25

125:2 127:14

167:10

63:10,11 92:9,20

156:7 158:15

belaboured 129:1

believe 2:15 4:9 5:10

161:24

chance 26:25	153:20 159:6	communications	91:3,18,20,23 92:3	context 129:25
chances 153:9 157:24	165:22 166:16	17:10 30:7 90:3	92:6,14,15,16 93:2	continuation 9
change 30:5 81:25	clearer 86:15	102:17 127:11,18	93:6,17,20 94:6,12	continue 9:6 39
91:14 161:8	clearly 75:1 154:13	153:15 154:1 165:3	94:15,18 95:5,13,24	76:15 77:10
changed 5:2 96:4	Clement 135:4,5,6,9	companies 91:21	96:2,17 97:5,15,19	80:2 90:14 9
123:24 136:11	135:11,22 137:8,12	92:19 97:9	97:20,22 98:2,20	99:10 141:16
changes 3:3	137:17 138:1	company 1:16 10:2	104:14,24 108:7	147:24 148:6
changing 81:17	client 33:6 34:16,20	16:10,17 18:15 20:9	109:22 111:10,11	continued 3:4,
hannel 29:1	36:4 38:10	28:4,4 31:2,4 32:18	142:4,13 143:5,9	9:19 14:2 35
CHAPIN 2:16	clients 38:2 55:3,19	32:18 38:24 40:3	147:7,14 149:11	90:13 91:9 1
character 20:16	58:14 66:1,9 67:21 77:19	41:13 43:2,8,12	150:23 153:11	136:25 155:5
<b>characterisation</b> 42:14,15 151:19	, , , , , ,	45:21 51:18 56:5 72:11 73:25 74:25	155:23 156:3 160:15,17	contract 33:7 (
154:5 162:8	client's 51:6,10 52:2,3 close 13:16 51:22	75:5,19 76:5 77:22	conclude 80:18	67:6 105:15. 106:1 107:9
characterise 111:17	145:13	96:11 120:4 121:9	conclusion 77:6 88:6	110:11 121:
characterised 38:2	closed 70:10	compare 144:1	conclusions 88:7,9	159:6,8,21,2
149:21 152:18	closing 79:18	comparing 95:16	103:8 167:13	160:24 161:
161:25	coaching 42:20	comparison 13:12	conditions 168:18	162:7,9 163
characterises 151:21	COFFEE 2:15	complain 138:13	conduct 78:17 92:20	164:16,21 1
characterising 154:24	colleague 165:11	complaint 35:12 65:12	98:14 111:12 156:1	165:13,23 10
charge 73:23 81:20,22	colleagues 35:18	70:9 71:10,25	156:16 159:4	166:14,16,2
135:20,25 144:13	50:24 99:22,23	complete 51:21 52:1	166:17,18	168:16,18
<b>chart</b> 91:10	100:2 131:7,9,20,22	69:9 73:1	<b>conducted</b> 34:25 35:2	contracts 105:
chase 28:9	132:13,19	completed 16:6 57:24	35:5 147:21 155:25	122:13 137:
chat 56:22	collect 33:16 34:15	57:24 70:21 73:3,21	156:4 157:9 158:15	162:19 165:
check 49:15 75:22,25	36:5,20 37:10,22	75:17	conducting 127:12	166:17 167:
83:8 88:5 91:13,23	38:11,15 44:24	completely 51:21	conference 1:5	contractual 14
114:9 116:12,23	45:10 46:3 50:21	160:23	conferred 57:13	contributed 10
119:14 125:7	76:23 78:1 156:24	completing 52:3	Confidential 101:18	control 65:4 6
128:22 132:18,24	collected 36:10 51:7	complied 44:23 45:9	102:8 114:10	70:24 74:16
133:15	52:4,13 119:21	comply 149:25 comprehensive 67:1	confirm 36:18 49:14	controlled 20:9 controller 62:2
checked 77:4 checking 73:6 117:1	<b>collecting</b> 33:13 34:19 34:22 38:4 55:3	67:12	75:20 107:19,24 108:3 118:9,17,21	controller 62:2
choose 28:25 110:19	76:15	comprises 157:10	118:22,22 153:13	16:14 21:6,1
chronology 148:16	collection 31:23 35:20	computer 9:15 25:4	154:16	cooperation 22
circulated 87:3,4,14	36:3 41:14 50:7	85:20,24 86:25	confirmed 8:6 73:7	23:2,17 24:1
132:14	COLLEEN 2:23	125:7 129:20	confirming 21:20	coordinator 10
circumstance 33:15	combine 51:23	130:11,12,17,23	confusing 4:21	copie 79:9,19
circumstances 28:8	combined 51:17	131:4,14 132:8	connection 27:14	copied 99:21 1
81:14 147:6,13	come 8:19 24:5 30:19	143:7,8,25 144:12	145:7	137:12 138:
cite 39:14 40:19 41:9	33:15 38:25 74:16	computerised 123:22	conscience 29:19 81:2	copies 4:7 30:2
cited 66:5	74:20 88:6 92:9	123:22	consider 111:25 167:8	45:23 55:4 5
cites 39:12 53:17,18	93:7 96:3 119:7	concede 15:8,15	consideration 157:19	67:3 77:3,6
claim 12:22 40:15	123:23 129:4 131:8	concept 161:23	considered 55:22	85:23 87:5
53:5,22 79:23,23	131:21 157:25	concern 7:2 73:9 74:1	71:21 85:16 97:10	copy 17:18 22:
claimant 41:14	161:11 169:5	74:6,8	103:8 152:22	32:16 33:6,8
Claimants 1:17 2:2	comes 7:15 33:6 119:9	concerned 8:14	157:18	41:25 42:3,1
1:8,11 5:14 22:20	coming 3:3 28:18 29:8	concerning 50:6	consisted 60:18	43:15,19,23
24:9,16 25:18,20 31:6 82:8 115:14,18	78:25 80:7 90:12 91:4 93:9 119:10	<b>concession</b> 5:18,23 6:2 10:3,4,11,13,17,25	112:11 consistent 72:7 76:1	50:25 52:22 58:22 59:1 6
116:1,3	command 33:7 43:6	11:4 12:2 13:13	168:13	67:17,22 68
claimed 108:19,20,23	commandment 43:10	14:2,7,14 18:14,23	consolidated 85:15	87:15 88:11
109:17	comment 100:10,15	18:25 19:13,19 20:8	constant 93:21 95:15	131:14,15 1
claiming 35:12 70:10	104:2 114:4	27:23 28:1 60:25	95:17,18 96:1	copy-and-pas
71:10,25	commented 151:16	89:17,21,24 90:6,7	123:20	corporate 72:
claims 2:11,12,14 68:5	comments 103:14	90:11,11,14,17,21	constitutes 62:17 63:5	correction 30:
clarification 8:4	committee 157:13,14	91:8 92:21 93:4	Consulting 2:22,22	correctly 16:7
clarify 107:23	communicate 15:14	94:2,21,25 95:1	contact 5:19 30:9,14	82:15 84:3
clarity 98:4 115:23	165:24	96:12,25 97:21,21	31:3 40:3 128:2	corresponding
CLAUDE 2:19	communicated 88:9	104:19,25 105:24	165:1	corrupt 20:19
clear 4:22 12:12 37:24	152:22 166:1,7	141:21 142:2,8,10	contacted 3:21	corruption 20
62:9 64:2 68:4,8	168:10,12	142:11,15,16,21	contained 102:12	counsel 1:13 3
70:22 75:18 85:14	communicating 90:6	153:11 158:17	121:20 129:16,18	8:17 25:21
92:23 101:20	communication 4:9	160:17 163:6	containing 66:17	62:8,11 83:
103:10 116:2 125:9	17:16 89:4,7,9,12	concessions 9:22	contains 66:19	123:18,25
126:2 127:9 129:1	90:1 137:14 138:7	12:17 15:9,21 20:14	content 1:17,17 141:1	counted 106:1
131:12 133:5	138:14	78:3,7,13 90:24	contents 65:2	countersign 2

147:18 counting 105:12 1:9 countries 20:19 9:7 52:7 **country** 20:13,18 78:1,14 161:9 168:22 1:5 couple 68:24 141:18 course 31:12 34:12 6,15 37:19 116:21 5 9:13 court 12:22 32:10,12 32:14,19,25,25 33:2 :19 28:2 33:7,18,21,24 35:13 45:1 79:13,15,22 5,6 6:21 courtesy 83:10 **courts** 79:11 23 109:24 court-ordered 32:10 6 159:3 cover 11:6 41:24 3 168:2 covered 52:7 84:10 20 16,21 105:6 117:13 123:3 55:5,8 covers 119:6 66:4,6 Cowley 2:3 3:5,9,13 1:6,19 2:9,14 3:15 4:15,22,24 5:1 8:6 21 9:4,7,14,17,19 26:24 27:2,17 31:5 31:10 37:19 38:21 39:3,12 42:17,20 11 47:22 49:1,6,7,14 9:25 3:5 49:18 54:3 56:8,12 3:21 58:1,5,7 61:13,20 ,21 76:9,11 78:18 80:13 82:7,12,20 83:7,20 21 64:10 83:22 94:20 95:4,11 3:18,24 99:2,6,11,14 116:21 116:23 123:13,18 2:20 124:8,17 141:10,15 6 28:1 145:13 158:24 00:1 create 14:1,5,8 89:5 created 61:21 63:6 31:6 70:8 87:21,22 88:13 123:6,10 127:23,23 0 38:23 127:24 130:14 136:4 146:13,16,19 9:6 85:22 146:20 creating 10:20,22,24 9 24:10 127:22 41:20 creation 136:3 146:10 1 43:4 **credit** 36:23 45:15 credited 32:2 46:15 53:5 52:11 64:24 7:9,11 creditor 34:8 49:21 :14 creditors 52:24 66:18 115:13 68:7,9,19 69:5,14 34:22 credits 34:5 e 152:7 cross-examination 3:5 3:9,13 7:16 9:19 1,13 31:10 49:11 57:16 48:24 82:12 145:8 30:2 cross-examined 7:16 63:9 current 114:5 123:19 cut 20:1 27:3 96:15 :18 168:1 :12 6:6 cutting 27:1 9:1 C-035 104:9 116:18 3 C-122 22:18 C-181 10:6 13:17,22 18:6 C-207 119:18 120:22 1:19

121:20 122:12	defined 93:1,1,18	43:9	doors 70:17 73:3,14	<b>Ehlers</b> 3:4 9:4,5,13,16	enlarged 104:11
134:4	94:15,18	disagreed 5:9	74:4,8 75:15	9:17 12:7 27:3,20	enough 15:25 19:19
C-210 24:7	<b>definition</b> 93:17 95:13	disappointed 161:15	dossier 56:1	28:17,18,20	22:4 110:15 111:24
	95:25	discovered 159:17	down 3:6 8:5,12,13	Ehlers's 23:10	119:12
<u>D</u>	delineate 158:6 delineating 111:6	<b>discuss</b> 6:14 34:13 37:10 60:22 100:20	24:12,13 41:7 46:6 47:23 53:8 65:15,17	EIA 16:9 eight 97:24	enquire 56:19 enterprise 160:4
D 76:5 DALEY 2:12	158:25	102:25 169:15	66:3 103:21 109:14	either 18:25 46:13	entire 35:24 72:3
DANIEL 2:7	deliver 22:8	discussed 5:3 6:17,25	109:25 110:21	63:4 91:4,9 92:17	entities 159:22
DANIELLE 2:8	demand 44:16 45:15	23:8,9 46:22 104:21	120:15 150:6 155:5	118:8 127:13 131:8	entitled 15:8,16
data 11:13 12:15	45:20 53:11 54:19	166:8,22	<b>Dr</b> 15:24 16:9,11 17:5	131:21 135:8	entity 9:25 34:14
18:11,13 19:15,18	54:21 55:9 58:16 demanded 27:11	discussing 88:1 discussion 3:3 1:21	17:6,13,20 20:5,11 20:11,12,15,16,21	137:15 156:14 electronic 119:22	160:3 entries 145:23
123:17,22 144:3 169:1	55:24 66:13 67:4	2:8,15 3:5,20,22 5:9	21:5,15,21 22:14,15	129:16	environment 30:16
date 70:15 72:24	demoted 81:21	6:11,18 7:18,21	22:17 86:20 87:11	element 168:8,8	environmental 16:6
73:18 74:4 87:24	denied 144:9	17:12 19:22 20:5,10	87:13,22 88:6,7,12	ELIZA 2:18	18:24 19:2
107:3 113:14,22	department 2:15,16	20:20 21:10,21	88:21 99:25 112:19	else's 131:3,4	envisaged 28:11,16
121:24 122:5,7	22:10 85:7 102:7	37:21 57:4,5 103:13	112:22,23 113:2,4,8	email 24:10,13,18,24	equal 159:10
126:14 128:21	112:22 135:14,20 136:12,19 166:10	117:22 123:20 discussions 2:17 5:1	113:12,13,14,24 114:6 133:7 166:8	25:3 119:23 120:24 121:3 122:13	<b>equally</b> 70:25 163:20 163:24 164:9
136:5 147:24,25 150:17 155:18	departments 135:20	23:20,21 26:7 89:17	166:11	124:11,12,13,15	equipment 27:22
dated 155:18	departure 98:3	89:24 92:8 157:14	draft 121:6 122:13	125:7 126:2,6,24	28:10,12 35:10,10
dates 28:4 34:1 126:11	deposits 98:6 111:12	dispatches 33:24	drafted 47:19 60:14	127:2,4,12,14,19,24	59:15,25 60:18,19
150:8,9,10	111:13	display 109:1	73:17	128:11 129:3,12,14	61:8,22 62:18 63:5
<b>DAVID</b> 2:22	Deputy 112:20	disposed 32:2	drafting 2:17	129:17 130:4,8,11	65:10 103:23 105:6
day 1:4 39:6 48:10	describe 60:24 149:17	<b>Dispute</b> 2:13,14 <b>Disputes</b> 1:2 2:12	drafts 45:15	131:3,14 132:8,18	161:3
54:18 58:10 59:13	151:18 described 52:25 66:1	disrespectful 135:7	dragged 46:24 draw 11:23 58:9	132:20,24 133:3,12 133:12,14 134:10	Ernest 67:20 essentially 4:19
60:23 64:13 65:11	71:7 129:14 130:1,9	distinction 37:4 168:4	110:23 117:9 140:2	134:12,18 135:4	121:12
67:13 69:7,22 73:2 80:21 161:5 169:3,4	133:20,22 151:12	distinguishing 37:25	140:20 161:17	137:18,23 138:2,2	est 79:9,19
169:21	151:19	diverted 143:3	drawn 46:18 47:6,15	165:3	establish 28:15 44:22
days 68:24 99:18	describes 46:2	documentation 21:11	66:14	emails 119:20,21	45:12 48:21
<b>DDG</b> 112:6,20	description 162:6	27:14 100:5	drilling 18:23	127:21 130:7,21	establishment 28:12
<b>de</b> 29:11	designated 43:15	documents 11:14	drove 77:23	132:24 134:16	28:16
dealings 20:15	designation 7:8 desist 71:13 75:13	30:23 35:8,13 38:3 41:23 44:3,5 47:9	<b>Duane</b> 2:3,3 <b>due</b> 54:19 66:22	<b>employee</b> 68:13 135:9 135:11,22 136:6	estimate 39:9 56:11 110:3 163:14
debating 1:8	details 3:19 63:13	47:11,19 50:5 52:14	166:22	employees 35:22 36:2	estimation 111:12
<b>debt</b> 31:18,23 32:3 33:13,16 34:19,22	112:5,8,10,13	52:21 60:6 62:13	DUFFIELD 2:8	38:8 50:17,21 51:15	evaluate 84:18 148:4
36:23 37:22 38:4,11	117:13	63:12 70:12,14	duly 73:19	51:25 54:20 55:10	158:7 159:5
38:14,25 39:21	determination 102:23	71:11 72:1 76:6	DUNCAN 2:7	58:23 59:5 64:16	evaluating 111:6
46:15 47:8 49:22	<b>determine</b> 75:19 98:8	77:3 85:19,22,23	during 31:12 89:18,25	65:6,20 66:6 69:1,6	157:13,16 159:1
51:7 52:12 58:12,13	98:11 107:15	86:6 91:14 101:13	90:7 91:25 113:17	70:11,18 79:14	evaluation 100:14,21
58:22 61:6 64:24	113:25 167:12 determined 72:15	109:1 110:5 114:2 115:8,17,21 116:1,3	127:10 141:18 148:2,10,13	en 79:9,19 end 7:2 20:17 28:5	101:15 102:3,6,14 102:20 103:3,17
66:1 68:9 69:11	98:5 108:9,23	116:5,6 121:20	<b>DUSHIMIMANA</b> 2:9	35:15 71:18 79:8	110:6 111:1,20
78:2 <b>debtor</b> 34:4,6,8 49:21	156:21	123:14,20,22	duties 70:21 73:1,3	81:16 82:6 90:12	112:15 113:24
debts 50:22 54:23	develop 161:12	124:21 125:2,16	duty 70:3,8 71:18	93:10 94:24 95:1	117:15 121:13,22
55:2,10,11,18,23	Development 56:4	128:11,12 129:4,15	73:21 76:4	105:19 163:17	122:11 123:4,10
58:18 59:16 66:6	72:10,12,21 75:1	129:17,21	déclaration 29:11,15	169:10	140:6,8,11 156:13
77:19	153:8	DOHMANN 1:12		ended 71:19 82:5	157:9,9 166:20
December 28:5	dictate 159:9 difference 2:1	<b>doing</b> 4:7 10:23 21:1 25:13 45:12 66:11	<u>E</u>	105:21 ends 117:6	even 4:21 15:1 74:24 113:11 115:9
135:10 136:14,17 <b>decided</b> 79:22 97:6	differences 1:22 91:12	79:19 106:7 126:23	each 47:23,24 62:25	enforce 50:17 51:12	118:11 127:17
100:13	different 59:5,6 62:11	156:22 167:12	78:24 83:8 91:7 118:18 125:2,3,16	enforced 31:18 52:17	136:3 137:9 151:24
deciding 73:22 156:6	90:25 94:3 95:13	Dominique 81:9	134:16 137:11	53:6,25	evening 168:21
decision 1:25 81:25	96:14 97:15,19,22	done 6:12 15:25 16:10	143:9 163:12,19	enforcement 51:14,16	event 140:15
103:5 157:1,11	97:22 101:21 102:1	17:8 18:18 21:24	earlier 14:1 101:24	51:17 79:12,16,21	events 34:13 60:23
decisions 143:11	117:14 123:21	26:16,21 28:6 32:18	102:5 113:23	79:24,25 80:3,4	61:1 151:19 152:18
declaration 3:10	124:24 165:17 differently 93:18	48:12 51:8,17 52:5 52:8,9 77:10 99:19	117:16 119:3,13	enforces 78:17 enforcing 55:4 71:4	152:23 154:10 eventually 101:6
80:25	direct 3:8,12 29:24	100:7 107:2 111:3	141:20 149:19 167:10	73:6	133:7 161:4
declare 81:2 declares 3:11	30:14 31:3 81:8	113:4 143:10	167:10 early 50:15	engage 6:8 89:23	ever 6:18 7:18 12:25
decline 43:20	133:4	146:25 150:10	easier 37:5	engaged 15:1	23:24 30:9 89:11
deem 156:16	directly 30:10	156:24 157:2	edits 3:2	engaging 6:15	91:7,10 93:19 143:7
deemed 149:23 153:4	director 14:21 15:12	165:10	effect 76:6	English 3:1 29:1,2,13	every 30:10 42:13
156:5	15:18 16:15 27:8	DONNA 2:16	effectively 162:22	48:14,15,19,22,25	46:25 163:12 164:9
defending 5:12	81:22 112:20 disagree 6:7,12 32:18	<b>dont</b> 79:9,19 <b>door</b> 70:14,21,24 74:5	efforts 10:7,10 37:10	49:3 76:18 141:9 enlarge 64:11 134:7	<b>everybody</b> 66:13 164:12
defer 2:7	uisagi CC 0.7,12 32.10	<b>4001</b> /0.17,21,24 /4.3	37:21 41:14 159:25	cinarge 07.11 134./	107.12
	<u> </u>				

23:5,13 35:14 47:14 61:21 65:22 75:22 86:12 92:5 100:24 105:18 119:13 121:24 138:20

Day 0	ricaring on
evervoi	ne 28:25 57:1,3
	22 157:7
159:	
	ning 42:2 44:23
	,9 60:7,8 61:11 1 63:24 66:11
	21 156:24
165:	
	here 162:17
	ce 2:11 8:8,10 ,16,18,19,21,22
	13:5,8 28:24
29:7	9 30:22 46:12
61:1	7
	E 3:11 80:23
	5:25 91:22 6 147:25
	13:2 19:1
	7 68:1 139:17
exam 8	
	ation 3:6,8,10
	7:24 27:19 4 78:20 81:8
	e 119:23
_	23 164:25
165:	
exceed	57:20 e <b>d</b> 56:11
	ge 119:23
134:	0
exclude	
	<b>ng</b> 142:21 6:23 10:8 65:16
	24 107:25
	23 116:19
	18 162:6
	43:18,20 67:7 ,15 71:14
	ed 38:7 43:8
44:19	9,25
executi	ng 30:18 51:1 on 35:16 71:17
	on 35:16 71:17 3 75:14
	ves 31:3 72:4,8
	,12,17
	e 105:22 129:1
	10:6 21:23 115:19 121:4
139::	113:19 121:4
	ed 141:5
	s 9:9,15 20:22
	4 115:14 116:3
	18 122:15 23:2 65:2,18
	0:11,16 64:2
	6:3 21:14
. <u>.</u>	tion 105:12
	3 133:18
	tions 160:9 5,23,25 166:7
166:	14,16 168:12
expecte	d 16:21 21:20
	106:22 162:2
_	ng 18:14 162:4 itures 104:15
108:	
expense	e 149:18
1	

Jurisdiction and the
expenses 108:4,5 109:8,21 110:10
<b>experience</b> 5:17,22,24 137:6
experienced 161:16
<b>expert</b> 4:19,23 5:7,11 6:6,9,14,16 7:8 8:9
8:24 <b>experts</b> 8:1
expired 93:23 144:4
156:3 <b>explain</b> 2:21,22 6:5
11:23 19:6 30:17 32:22 45:9 49:19,25
55:21 58:11 79:8
89:11 110:20 123:7 126:5 131:18
132:17 153:1 explained 5:10 17:7
84:12 109:16
132:12 147:24 <b>explaining</b> 126:19
<b>explanation</b> 48:11 102:12 124:6
129:23
explanations 47:1 exploitation 161:24
162:3 166:25 168:6 exploration 11:10
13:23 15:25 16:10
17:7 18:12,16,18 92:20 98:14 111:2,5
111:8,16,23 112:9 112:13 121:23
142:9 149:9 150:13
150:22 153:2 158:4 158:10,13,14 159:5
159:11 163:14 166:18
exploratory 90:23
93:9 105:9 112:2,3 162:19 164:1,10
167:20 <b>explore</b> 18:23
exploring 158:22
extend 105:23 156:8 extended 104:25
149:13,15 151:11 <b>extending</b> 156:17
extension 104:19
149:9 150:13,21 151:4 153:2
extensions 151:2 externally 21:5
extract 161:4
<b>eye</b> 82:15
F

F
fabricating 44:6
face 114:7
facilitator 3:23 4:11
facility 63:7 65:10
160:8
facility's 61:23 62:18
65:2 68:20,24
fact 5:25 6:12 7:15,23
9:2 10:20 22:15

121:24 138:20 158:21 159:6
161:15 164:2
101:13 104:2 foots 151:17
facts 151:17
<b>factual</b> 8:7,8 123:25 <b>failed</b> 111:5 156:21
161:16 166:21
167:6
107.0 foilure 150:13
<b>failure</b> 159:13 <b>fair</b> 21:13 42:14,15,22
61:18 87:10 109:9
110:12,15 119:12
132:1 137:8,13
faked 24:24
fall 94:12 155:13,21
157:6
falls 98:11
false 71:11
falsified 35:13
familiar 84:17 24
135:1 3 145:20
familiar 84:17,24 135:1,3 145:20 far 8:14 28:2,2
fashion 91:5
favour 34:16 41:15
50:25 68:16 77:9
feasibility 158:14
159:5 166:18
167:23
<b>February</b> 76:20 84:12 102:16 126:8,8,17
126:20,23 149:14
fed 144:3
feeling 81:23
felt 12:18
<b>FERGUSON</b> 2:23 <b>few</b> 14:24 46:1 96:7
00.2 19 127.5
99:3,18 137:5 <b>fieldwork</b> 82:2,4
fifth 105:25 106:3
figure 92:9 95:2
108:13 109:5,19
110:1,1,14 118:13
118:25 151:13
figures 118:17,20,24
119:2
file 5:16,21 7:23 35:18
72:3 84:17,20,24,25
85:12,14,15,18 86:5
86:24,24 87:1,2
88:8 89:2 101:8,11
101:15,22,25 102:5 102:6,12,22 107:15
107:19,24 132:15
133:19,24,25
154:23 164:17
filed 12:22
files 43:16 86:25
120.15 120.4
129:15 130:4 131:17
131:17
131:17 <b>filing</b> 85:18
131:17 <b>filing</b> 85:18 <b>fill</b> 48:8
131:17 filing 85:18 fill 48:8 final 1:25 49:24 80:17
131:17 <b>filing</b> 85:18 <b>fill</b> 48:8
131:17 filing 85:18 fill 48:8 final 1:25 49:24 80:17

Company LLC -v- R o. ARB/18/21	Republic
<b>find</b> 47:11 63:12,17,19	formal
63:19 68:25 114:21	133:1
115:3,7 116:7 117:2	former
119:11 124:9,12	91:17
132:25 165:2 <b>finding</b> 124:15 139:13	forth 13
findings 147:9 168:19	forward 6:20
fine 96:22 103:10	14:14
120:14 140:9	18:3
finish 16:9 27:5	43:1
finished 39:8 50:15,22	116:3
56:15 106:15	found 6
finishes 52:15	122:1
finishing 51:6,10	129:2
fired 14:23 18:19	130:2
<b>firm</b> 4:16 59:20 <b>first</b> 23:13 30:9 36:11	131:5 132:3
36:12 37:10,21 38:7	founder
39:6 41:24 52:19	four 14
58:7 59:3 83:22	94:24
84:11 105:13	96:23
110:24 111:20	98:17
112:8 117:3 118:11	162:2
118:17 122:4	four-pa
138:16 140:20	four-ye
146:14,15 148:17	104:1
151:1 156:20 165:7	105:1
165:7 166:5 168:16 <b>fit</b> 93:7	France
five 15:20 84:19	Francis
104:14,23 105:3	99:22
106:20 108:16,18	130:7
108:20 110:17	free 6:4
149:11 153:21	80:8
160:15	French
five-year 90:22 104:15	48:15
105:7 117:16 138:24	49:2 French
focus 11:21 13:15	2:18,
26:14 33:10,14 36:3	fresh 14
37:8 45:5 55:8	163:7
64:10 66:15 75:21	front 29
79:17 84:16 99:15	82:17
126:12 148:8,17	FTI 2:2
150:6 152:11	11:21
<b>focused</b> 23:11 69:19 83:23 104:10	40:1, 44:10
138:17	56:24
focusing 26:15 91:11	99:16
106:9	122:4
follow 37:6 45:17	161:1
followed 70:19	fulfil 15
<b>following</b> 14:3 47:7	Fulfilm
102:16 117:11	full 41:8
129:6 144:10	88:18
169:21 <b>follows</b> 33:5	121:1 167:5
footnote 53:18 62:3	fully 6:
63:4 66:4,4	128:1
footnotes 62:15,24	function
forbidden 77:20	further
forged 35:13 70:12	24:22
71:11,21 72:1	78:18
forgot 110:20	105:2
<b>form</b> 85:17 86:10 151:17 152:17	114:4 165:1
161:22 169:1	future 1
101.22 107.1	

	1
formal 53:10 54:19	
133:12 <b>former</b> 50:17 54:20	
91:17,20	
forth 139:10	
<b>forward</b> 5:14,20 6:10 6:20 7:12 8:6 9:15	
14:14 15:9,16,20 18:3 20:23,24 38:8	
18:3 20:23,24 38:8 43:1 53:21 92:8	
116:3	
<b>found</b> 60:7 85:20 122:16 128:17	
129:20 130:4,6,8,13	
130:20,20,23 131:2 131:5,11,13,15,17	
132:3,3,8	
founders 163:9	
<b>four</b> 14:14 90:22 94:24 95:1 96:7,17	
94:24 95:1 96:7,17 96:23 97:2,25 98:2	
98:17,19 105:14 162:25 167:4	
four-page 140:1	
<b>four-year</b> 94:23 104:14,20,24 105:9	
105:19 107:9 161:1	
fraction 108:24 France 137:10	
Francis 85:9 87:4	
99:22 100:9,15	
130:7 <b>free</b> 6:4 28:19 76:14	
80:8 164:12	
French 28:24 37:15 48:15,17,18,20,24	
49:2 78:23,25 79:6	
French-English 2:18 2:18,19	
fresh 140:21 161:10	
163:7 <b>front</b> 29:14 46:20 47:1	
82:17	
<b>FTI</b> 2:22,22 10:6 11:21 13:16 37:8	
40:1,18,24 41:7	
44:10 47:18 54:16	
56:24 59:10 64:10 99:16 103:20 117:4	
122:4 134:4 145:13	
161:18 <b>fulfil</b> 150:4,15	
Fulfilment 158:3	
<b>full</b> 41:8,9 51:7 52:8 88:18 102:22	
121:12 124:12	
167:5	
<b>fully</b> 6:15 28:13 128:12	
functions 71:13,19	
<b>further</b> 1:11 6:23 24:22 27:17 46:8,9	
78:18 103:13	
105:24 110:21 114:4 138:24	
165:12 168:9	
<b>future</b> 117:9 133:21	

G
Gabinema 100:3
<b>gap</b> 68:17
gather 157:11
gave 6:9,13 32:15 33:21 40:16,20
41:21 43:2 50:2,5,9
54:4 55:25 59:3
60:12 62:7,10 66:10
70:8 76:5 100:9,10 110:3 141:23 168:3
General 112:21
geologist 85:13 114:2
geology 20:13 22:11
85:6 112:21 136:11 136:19
George 100:1,10,16
133:9
Georgina 1:24
gets 124:11 134:18 getting 18:18 26:15
56:11 59:21 96:14
108:2,15 113:20
115:13 127:8
140:13,21 169:1 GIBSON 2:14
Giciye 150:23
Gifurwe 107:12 108:6
give 8:9 13:24 19:3,4
26:24,25 29:9 30:21 40:25 41:20 43:6
47:1 54:6,12 56:8
57:15,23 70:24
85:13 91:5 100:22 101:3 103:11 124:6
124:11 125:3
145:18,24 148:25
153:9 168:4 given 8:18 20:8 27:8
49:20 77:2 81:19,20
82:2,5 92:19,21
94:1,1 96:11 100:18
106:21 116:19 123:13 129:25
147:9 159:10
gives 8:16 121:11
<b>giving</b> 2:11 20:14,14 28:23 59:17 64:18
67:22 83:14 157:24
Gmail 127:25 128:6
128:11 130:21
<b>GMD</b> 136:18 <b>go</b> 5:14,20 6:10,20
7:12 9:15 10:11
13:11 18:2,22,24
28:19 30:11,12 32:22 39:19 40:1
42:9 44:1 47:10,17
54:9,16 57:1,3
62:25 65:24 66:3
70:17 74:6 82:22 84:15 104:20
109:20 112:4
114:20,24 115:17
115:20 117:4,25 120:10,22 125:2
126:15 129:24

134:6 144:15 145:21 146:3 161:3 165:12 168:9 goes 46:1 52:23 54:17 62:24 86:10 114:17 117:5,7 138:10 149:17 going 3:7,19 6:15,20 14:6,14,23 15:9,16 15:20 17:1 18:2 37:3 38:15 42:16 45:4,4 46:7 56:9,12 59:11 64:1 76:24 78:14 79:5 80:10 82:8 83:22 94:10 96:13 109:7 110:13 114:24 116:24 118:1 119:5 129:6 135:5,7 140:16,23 140:25 145:18 164:19 167:17 168:3 good 1:6 9:16,17 19:19 29:8 39:3
47:20 80:24 82:13
82:14 83:18 148:6
148:14 160:12,14 167:19,22
government 1:18 2:9
91:15,18,20 126:4 127:5,12,20,23
128:1,7,10 132:19
133:12,14 153:7 159:25 160:4 161:7
161:11,12
<b>gradual</b> 162:14,16,17 162:22 163:3 167:2
gradually 128:4
132:21 grant 150:14 156:7
<b>granted</b> 1:12 91:21,23 94:25 96:17 142:16
142:18,20 144:8
grateful 8:4 GROSH 2:11
ground 9:1
groundless 79:23 grounds 1:22
group 1:15 2:4 35:24
50:16,19 51:4 52:24 groups 138:10
guarantee 123:23
guard 65:11 guards 64:15
guess 7:4 103:6,17
117:5 134:4 guidelines 163:10
H

H
Habiyambere 135:4
Hage 2:7,7,8,8
half 99:5
half-hour 57:15,19,20
80:16
halt 35:15
hand 107:21

Bay View Group
Jurisdiction and the
handing 75:7
handle 51:2
handled 51:5
handwritten 63:11 hand-delivered 58:18
happen 3:20,24 40:4
46:10 127:14
151:18
<b>happened</b> 5:1 16:2,12 24:15 43:13,22
46:20 99:20 100:23
125:9 129:2 148:1
150:8 165:16
happens 45:13
happy 7:22 44:15 81:23,24 82:4
124:16 139:10
140:22 163:22
hard 57:14,16 85:22
86:24 87:1 140:15
HARRISON 2:3
<b>having</b> 6:14 8:21 26:8 39:8 68:21 71:16
77:2 109:17 112:25
123:18 133:25
142:2 143:14 146:9
154:23
head 20:13 22:7 30:7
health 82:3 hear 12:8,9 54:1 146:7
heard 7:1,6 10:18
12:11 90:2 100:24
138:11
hearing 1:8 1:12,21
3:19 38:19 115:2,9 115:15,19 116:4
121:19 122:10
124:9 169:21
hearings 6:22,24 8:1
heavy 35:10
held 48:6 55:5 60:2 82:23 91:19 102:4
102:25 163:20
Hello 38:18
help 2:21 50:17 98:11
140:16
helped 129:11
<b>helpful</b> 110:18 169:7 <b>helping</b> 108:25
helps 19:6
her 30:8,13 40:6 41:2
hesitate 40:5
hide 134:8 137:14
hiding 133:2
<b>highlight</b> 134:21 168:20
highlighted 58:8
104:11 134:12
highlighting 108:18
132:6 150:4 168:19
<b>Hill</b> 2:6 3:6,8,10,12 1:6,16,17 4:14,18
5:1 7:6 8:4 26:24
27:19 28:17,22
29:24 31:5 42:14
49:4 76:10 78:20 80:6,10 81:6,8 82:7
80:0,10 81:6,8 82:7

Ierits ICSID Case N	Compar No. ARB
83:4 123:13 144:17	98:17
144:25 145:5,10,12	116:22
<b>him</b> 2:15,23,25,25 3:1	125:8
3:10,15,21 4:6 5:11	142:1
5:19,20 6:8,15 7:2,3	150:17
7:8,14,25 8:2 9:6	immedia
22:5 24:4,18 26:24	167:3,
27:1 29:3 42:16	immedia
44:2 53:12,19 61:19	13:15,
62:3 79:13 82:3	46:18
87:10 94:22 124:12	159:19
135:5 138:2,7	160:25
144:19 153:8,9	162:3,
154:4	impact 1
himself 113:13 124:13	impleme
hinges 7:7,13	importar
hint 14:23	improve
hire 28:13	improve
hired 5:15	inapprop
<b>HoD</b> 22:10,10	138:3,
<b>hold</b> 14:6 33:1,18 84:9	incident
85:17 106:2 109:9	include 4
117:5 168:11	97:11,
holder 91:8	99:25,
holders 5:18 6:2 89:17	included
89:21,24 90:7,11,11	52:25
90:22 91:2 141:21	65:23
142:2,8,10,11,22	106:3
156:2	108:5
holding 11:14 14:2	127:19
16:17 home 129:15,16	includes 60:17
	00.17
HON 1-11	including
HON 1:11 honour 1:19 4:24	including
honour 1:19 4:24	60:7 6
<b>honour</b> 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5	60:7 6 84:2 8
<b>honour</b> 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2	60:7 6: 84:2 8 135:20
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist
<b>honour</b> 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2	60:7 6: 84:2 8 135:20
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increase indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist increased increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 3 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist increased increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicated 73:18, individual
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist increased indeed 3 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicated 73:18, individua 118:4,
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist increased indeed 3 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicated 73:18, individual
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 hours 39:6 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18 95:2 159:14	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18 95:2 159:14 identification 66:8	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist increased indeed 3 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicated 73:18, individual
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18 95:2 159:14 identification 66:8 identified 40:15 67:20	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated individua individua industria 162:3 167:5
honour 1:19 4:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated indic
honour 1:19 4:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 3 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated 73:18, individua 118:4, individua industria 162:3 167:5 industria 159:2,
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18 95:2 159:14 identification 66:8 identified 40:15 67:20 97:25 98:6 111:10 142:2,12,22 identify 62:2,15 63:3	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicated individua intividua industria 162:3 167:5 industria
honour 1:19 4:24	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist inconsist 123:16 increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicate indicate indicated 73:18, individua industria 162:3 167:5 industria 159:2, 162:12
honour 1:19 4:24 29:19 49:18 58:5 81:2 honourable 20:12 hopefully 109:15 150:7 Hotmail 132:23 hour 56:13,17 57:15 57:23,25 99:5 169:5 house 9:11 housekeeping 168:24 hungry 56:11 hybrid 158:6,10,13,20 161:24 hypothetically 40:10  I ICSID 2:23,24 idea 6:3 17:10 83:18 95:2 159:14 identification 66:8 identified 40:15 67:20 97:25 98:6 111:10 142:2,12,22 identify 62:2,15 63:3	60:7 6 84:2 8 135:20 inconsist inconsist inconsist inconsist increased indeed 30 38:7 4 83:23 independ 22:21 96:24 index 3:1 indicated 73:18, individua industria 162:3 167:5 industria 159:2, 162:12 industria

o. ARB/18/21	серивнс
98:17 99:15 116:19	informal
116:22 124:6,9,17	informal
125:8 139:7 141:11	11:13,
142:1 145:9,17	17:15,
150:17 169:14,16	19:18
immediate 159:2	25:24
167:3,15	83:9 8
immediately 9:21	88:15
13:15,21 17:6 39:22 46:18 159:4,10,12 159:19 160:10,13 160:25 161:5,25 162:3,20 166:24 impact 16:6 18:24 implement 161:17 important 85:17	101:19 104:13 107:1, 113:1' 125:5, 132:7 140:13
improve 19:14	157:1
improved 20:6 21:7	166:1:
inappropriate 124:5	informed
138:3,7,13	23:13
incident 33:11	89:14
include 44:18 53:22	150:1,
97:11,11,12,13	154:1:
99:25,25 113:12	infrastru
included 19:15 36:9	160:8
52:25 55:21 60:6,15	inherited
65:23 67:15 72:18	initial 2:
106:3 107:10,16	34:9 3
108:5 122:11,22	91:3,8
127:19	103:14
includes 42:1 43:3,4	105:5
60:17	150:17
including 35:9 53:2	158:10
60:7 62:14 72:14	160:24
84:2 86:9 91:18	initially
135:20 167:1	106:22
inconsistency 42:18	initial-te
inconsistent 71:7	initiated
123:16	initiation
increased 94:19 96:20	inside 59
indeed 30:5 36:12,25	64:14
38:7 41:4 67:3 80:7 83:23 independent 3:11 22:21 32:6 45:13 96:24 index 3:1 117:3,5 indicate 43:7 114:7 indicated 34:1 70:15 73:18,19 114:8	inspection instance 81:19 163:13 instead 4 institution 72:16 instruction
individual 77:22	83:3
118:4,8,8	instructi
individual-year 118:2	70:19
industrial 161:24	73:16
162:3 166:17,24	intend 7
167:5 168:5	intended
industrialisation	154:2
159:2,4,19 160:13	intends
162:12,15 167:2,15 industrialise 159:12 160:10,25 162:21 industrialising 161:2 industry 135:15 162:15 168:11 infer 61:16 inform 32:11 110:12	intention 153:13 intention interests 27:9 intern 2: internal internal
155:7 156:25	Internat

T.	Monday, 20 June 202
informal 4:5	2:12,13
information 3:16	internet 129:11
11:13,17 12:1,1,15	interpret 164:19
17:15,21 18:7 19:15	interpretation 3:25
19:18 20:22,24 25:4	29:1 38:20 57:21
25:24 52:22 76:19	162:10,11 interpreted 29:7,18
83:9 86:8 88:8,14 88:15 100:22	37:12
101:19 103:11	interpreter 2:18,18,19
104:13 106:23	2:19,20 4:5 37:13
107:1,4 110:18	37:16 39:6 47:21
113:17 114:20,23	48:18 54:1 56:21
125:5,20 126:1	57:19
132:7 137:24 140:12 149:1	interpreters 2:17 56:14,17,23,25
151:10 156:25	57:13,17
157:11 160:7	interpreter's 54:1
166:13	interpreting 162:20
informed 9:8 22:19	interrupt 42:15 87:7
23:13 52:23 76:14	intervene 56:8 61:13
89:14 128:3 149:24	144:16
150:1,2 153:5 154:13	introduce 1:9,11
infrastructure 159:18	inventoried 60:8 inventory 60:2,10,17
160:8	61:8,22 62:17 63:5
inherited 164:16	65:1 68:19 69:4
initial 2:16 5:12 6:22	invest 107:22 114:15
34:9 37:9 90:10	120:4 121:9 161:13
91:3,8 92:13 93:9	163:13
103:14 104:3,24 105:5 107:9 109:8	invested 104:3 108:18 108:20 109:3
150:17,19 156:3,18	163:12 165:20
158:10,13 159:11	investment 1:2 2:12
160:24 161:1	2:13,14 16:22 88:23
initially 5:4,19 66:1	98:7 105:3,6 107:11
106:22	108:19 109:18
initial-term 90:21	110:7 114:22
initiated 48:10	119:25 151:8
initiation 160:5 inside 59:22 61:5	161:10 163:2,4,5,20 164:10,23 165:10
64:14	165:18
inspection 81:21,22	investors 91:17
instance 4:4 33:15,20	161:11 168:10
81:19 90:17 159:16	invite 61:16
163:13	invited 7:20 91:17
instead 49:11 institution 81:18 82:6	153:10 154:14 161:11
instructed 70:23	inviting 128:21
72:16 78:12	invoice 12:25
instruction 70:8 71:1	involved 3:18 5:2
83:3	26:17 32:22 35:4
instructions 49:4	135:14 136:3 137:1
70:19 71:2 73:13,14 73:16 76:2,3 129:6	137:6 156:23 165:1 166:5
intend 7:14,17	iPad 22:3
intended 7:18 22:7	IPC 36:12
154:2 162:16	irrelevant 8:20
<b>intends</b> 114:15	issue 1:25 5:3 6:19
intention 61:15 102:9	8:15 98:13
153:18	issued 90:23,25 93:8
intentional 31:13 interests 16:22 17:3	93:23 95:6,14,25 96:7,21,23 98:2,20
27:9	109:23,24 141:21
intern 2:24	142:3,8 144:4 151:2
internal 86:25 101:17	151:4 157:21
internally 21:5	issues 5:3 6:17,25
International 1:2 2:11	137:7

imagine 39:9

Imena 3:11 80:11,23

83:17,19,20,21

80:24 81:2,9 82:7

82:10,13,24,25 83:8

		I	I		
<b>issuing</b> 165:2 166:5	keyword 129:10	lawyers 113:7 125:4	156:18 157:3,19	logic 159:9	maintain 31:16,21,25
IZABELA 2:24	KG 1:11	128:19 129:22	158:10,13 159:11	logic[al 159:20	74:11
i.e 74:5	kicked 68:1,2,14	131:9,10,21,23	161:1 164:1,10	<b>London</b> 57:14,23	major 158:5,24 159:1
	Kigali 59:15,19,24	137:4	165:2	long 5:1 13:4 17:14	159:3,8 161:23
J	60:3 62:23 63:10	<b>le</b> 79:6	licences 14:13 15:8,16	23:3 49:16 50:4	162:8
<b>J</b> 1:11	kilometres 163:15	lead 149:3 157:10	15:20 84:19 90:12	56:9 60:13 99:16,17	majority 73:24 74:7
jail 20:17	kind 152:7	learn 103:15 131:13	90:23,25 92:7,20,21	149:4,22 168:6	make 3:23,25 8:2 22:4
JAMES 2:22	Kinyarwandan 50:11	137:22 164:20	93:22,25 94:23 96:8	longer 56:20 71:14	30:4,5 45:6 59:12
January 122:23 123:5	Kinyarwandan-Eng	learning 25:1	96:21 97:10 121:23	125:11,12,13,15	61:18 62:20 85:12
123:9 152:4,6	2:19,20	least 3:6 8:24 20:23	137:2 138:25 142:9	127:6	86:1,7,15 87:7 95:7
<b>JEAN</b> 2:19	knew 11:17 17:4	45:1 99:1 113:21	142:9,9,18,20 144:4	long-term 90:13 139:1	102:23 109:14
<b>job</b> 74:8 75:17 101:3	137:8,11	115:20 116:6 130:6	147:18 150:14	142:18,20 151:20	110:5 119:19
<b>JOHN</b> 2:12 3:7 29:6	know 3:13,20,21 4:3	136:7,21 164:5	151:2 154:15 155:6	152:5,19,24 153:6	120:15 127:8
join 51:23	4:10 16:4 19:10	leave 4:12 7:22 31:2	155:7	153:18,24 154:3,10	128:25 168:24
joined 51:4,17 136:2,7	20:11 21:25 25:20	35:17 39:19 74:8	licence-holder 156:8	154:25 155:3,6	169:6
<b>joining</b> 135:23	40:17 52:12 63:1,20	80:8 83:11 107:7	license 149:4,10,22	157:19	making 4:5,7 104:7
<b>joint</b> 98:23	72:9 73:10 74:6,23	leaving 7:3 11:15	158:7	look 13:18 28:3 38:6	110:8 123:25 124:1
Joseph 2:7,7,8,8	82:15 99:12 100:18	57:17 76:9 142:3,5	<b>light</b> 8:5 116:20	46:8 63:8 74:25	125:19 148:15
<b>JR</b> 1:11	103:13 117:2	142:13,16,22	like 2:9 3:12 7:15,23	79:5 88:16 115:10	156:25 165:14
judgment 32:17 33:8	119:15 122:14,21	143:17,18,19	9:6 21:25 22:1	115:12 116:15	man 20:12
34:4,15 38:24 41:15	124:2 125:23,24	left 6:18 22:3 35:17	25:17 28:12,15 29:3	117:3,19 118:7	managing 14:10,20
41:17,21 43:5 46:4	128:1 132:2,4	39:21 40:25 42:11	30:4,5 33:10 34:20	121:5 125:2 129:8	15:12,18 16:15 27:8
51:1,12,14,16 52:4	133:24,25 136:5,16	52:12,16 64:15 72:5	36:3 45:6 57:1,2	133:21 138:18	manning 40:8
52:17,22 53:5,22,24	139:15 151:14	96:16 97:1 98:1,18	76:18 85:14 95:1,2	140:23 158:2	many 35:22 90:25
54:5,6,10,13,13,14	152:21 154:18	120:16 139:24	96:7 118:10,21	164:18 168:9	91:3 93:12 95:3
78:17 79:20 80:1,2	160:22 161:6 163:2	141:18,22,23	120:25 124:20	looked 8:21 23:14	96:23 97:4 99:23
judgments 30:18,20	knows 83:13	145:14 164:12	129:24 132:20	72:17,20 92:16	142:3,7,18,20
41:18 43:23 44:24		legal 43:8 48:10	133:11 139:13	106:10 112:25	Mara 150:23
45:10 50:18,25 51:3	L	136:22,22 137:4,7	140:19 141:7 144:22 145:15	115:6,8,14 122:12 164:16,24 168:17	marked 18:6 53:23
52:24 55:4 59:6	la 79:9,19	legitimate 25:3	151:5 167:7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100:14 140:6 146:13
76:15 77:3,6,9,16	lack 4:4	legitimately 125:24 less 20:19 34:21	likely 34:21 39:10	looking 17:2 25:10 27:9 38:6 115:4,20	marker 8:5,12,13
79:2	lacking 6:13	165:21	limit 19:6	116:5 119:22 121:2	Marshall 2:4 12:19
jugement 79:6	lag 27:6	let 9:3,9 10:8 19:10	limited 111:17	122:2 128:13 129:4	15:1 18:19 23:7
July 88:24 89:1 107:5	language 50:10 92:9	37:1,4 63:1,20 67:9	limited-term 90:22	132:10 146:14	24:3,18 25:10 26:8
108:12,23 119:10 <b>June</b> 1:7 1:1 10:12	111:3 121:7 151:24 161:19 163:17	67:10 78:13 82:15	line 13:25 30:6 95:20	162:18 165:14	26:16 28:5 30:21
12:21 14:12 18:13	166:23 167:16	83:17 87:9 90:19	107:7 135:2 155:5	168:7	32:20 35:11 45:1
18:19 19:19 53:10	168:5	93:16 95:11 99:10	lines 134:24	looks 76:18	46:19,19,24 48:10
55:13,14,17,24	lapsed 65:21	99:12 117:18	LISA 2:11	LORD 1:11	66:11 69:23 70:9,17
58:11 59:14 60:23	laptop 9:9 11:14 12:16	132:17 140:23	<b>list</b> 10:19 66:13 67:1,1	loss 65:3	70:25 71:9,22,25
69:21 75:7,24	17:9,14 18:7 168:25	142:18 150:5	67:2,8,12,14 72:10	lost 16:24,25 43:20	72:18,22 74:3 75:3
Jurisdiction 1:8	laptops 169:2	letter 1:9,11 11:7 22:6	72:11,17,20 129:7	139:4 144:17	75:8,13 76:7,20,25
Justice 2:15,16 35:12	large 50:3 91:2,11	43:12 44:16,18	144:3	lot 15:25 16:5 31:14	77:1,8,14,23 78:10
35:14 70:10,13,16	larger 101:8,11	54:21 58:16,19	listed 66:20 72:11	59:12 82:2 111:23	79:11,21 134:10,18
70:20,23 71:10,12	large-scale 92:3,16,21	67:24 71:12 77:12	143:8	161:10	138:6,12 152:21
71:17,20,24 72:3,23	93:2,6,17,20 94:15	149:8	listen 8:1 145:8	LOUTFI 2:23	153:2,5,14,19,25
73:4,16,18,21 74:2	95:12,24 96:2,8,17	letters 1:13 154:15,16	listening 18:4 19:7,25	low-beds 28:14	Marshall's 35:3,6
75:12,14 76:14 77:4	96:25 97:7,10 98:2	let's 6:11 14:11 88:16	26:5	Ltd 149:8	36:10,17,19 79:23
78:1,11	98:5,9,20 141:21,24	136:7 163:8	listing 67:4	LUCY 2:8	Martin 100:3
justify 12:5,15 62:13	142:1,11,21	level 162:11	lists 72:12	lunch 56:20	material 145:24
	last 11:24 27:20 64:1	liable 54:23 55:2,22	literal 168:5		materials 6:13 61:5
K	115:24 124:8 126:6	58:18 64:23 65:3	Literally 85:15	M	65:4,14 82:23 83:9
KABIBI 2:9	129:13 133:16	liar 24:3,4 25:11	litigated 123:19	machine 35:10	85:17 86:12 115:4,6
Kamanzi 133:10	140:2,18 169:4	licence 11:10 13:12,23	little 2:10 27:1 37:1	made 1:23 3:4 10:7,10	122:16
150:1	later 2:8 3:18 28:6	90:14 91:2,3,8 93:4	94:3 101:8,11 102:1	24:8 47:10,23 53:10	matter 1:1 2:9 49:9
Kaplan 1:22 1:4 9:4,5	61:5 68:1,25 120:23	93:9 94:2 95:6	121:6 124:24	54:19 59:16 75:15	70:5
38:19 56:16,24 57:5	120:24 133:11	96:12 98:14,16,23	144:18 150:6,7	81:25 84:19 86:19	matters 3:3 61:14,16
57:8,12 169:8,12	139:23	104:14,20 105:9,13	LLC 1:15,16 2:4	86:21 87:4 88:7	maximum 125:4 156:24
Kayumba 85:9 99:22	law 5:12 6:4,4,5,16	105:16,21,22 106:1	LLP 2:3,3,7,7,8,8	96:24 106:20	may 1:19,23 8:19 9:4
100:15 130:7	8:22,25 9:2 31:1	106:23,24 139:1	loan 27:21	119:17 124:23	
keep 42:5 146:2	32:14 33:4 44:23,25	142:16 148:14 149:10,15 150:14	located 36:11 locked 31:22 32:1	126:14 140:8 152:1	9:7 11:25 16:24 38:23 40:4 50:12
kept 42:3 67:9,11	45:10 93:3,5 94:1	150:22 151:7,20	59:20 60:20	152:3 156:13	53:24 58:5,7 64:10
key 71:18 95:20	147:17,17	152:5,19,24 153:3,4	locking 61:3,23	163:18 164:17	66:15 80:13 82:16
162:12	lawfully 147:21	153:6,18,25 154:3	lodged 35:11 65:12	165:11 166:14	82:17,20 84:18
keys 70:24 72:4,25	lawsuit 45:18 154:5 lawsuits 45:3	154:10,25 155:12	70:9 71:9,25	168:18 mail 30:25	87:22 88:3 89:10,13
73:2,10,20,22 74:5	lawsuits 45:3	155:19 156:2,7,17	log 31:22	main 30:25 main 114:20	89:19 101:12
75:7,10,23	144 ye1 120.16 130.20	, . , .		1114111 117.4U	
	1	I	I	1	1

102:15 112:24	MICHELLE 2:7	96:2,8,17,20,25	mistake 110:23 126:14	N	96:2 106:1,1 128:1
121:24 122:5 123:4	midday 169:18	97:5,9,12,19 98:2	126:19		128:4
124:13 126:12,14	middle 140:20	98:20 104:23	misunderstood 6:3	name 10:1 13:25 30:24 31:11 34:14	next 24:15 46:1 48:9,9
128:17 132:10	might 33:15 37:5	121:23 126:17	mobile 145:7	30:24 31:11 34:14 34:17 41:3 46:3	59:10,13 60:23
139:6 141:16	49:10 89:20 97:10	135:14,21,25 137:1	modernise 161:9	47:7 53:2,3 56:5	65:11 69:7 80:10,16
155:22 158:16	98:25 103:7 131:8,9	137:2,5,6 141:21	modernising 161:14	65:13,14,22 85:8	84:15 104:2 105:22
maybe 47:17 80:20	131:20,22 134:2	142:1,9,11,21	modification 1:19	98:21 135:2,3 147:1	112:4 122:21 139:4
98:4 103:4,7 110:20	147:10 148:21	143:23 144:13	moment 4:13 23:22	148:24	157:5 161:18 163:1
126:6 147:11	161:3 165:16	147:7,14,20 148:4	57:7 62:22 78:25	named 68:10	168:7
157:13	Mike 17:13,20 20:5	149:9 150:14,22	80:14 88:16 97:14	names 56:5 65:15,17	NICOLE 2:13
McCARTHY 2:7	21:5,21 99:25	153:4 155:23	98:25 107:6 129:22	66:10,12,14,18,19	Niyigena 100:3
144:16,16	112:19 133:7	156:19 157:3 158:1	139:19 155:25	66:20,20,23,25 67:3	nodding 1:16
McGowan 1:24	Mike's 21:15	159:25 160:5	156:4,14	67:9,12 72:13 76:5	none 132:19
MD 17:2	million 53:11 55:7	161:16 162:15	Monday 1:7 1:1	141:22 144:6	non-compliance 150:2
mean 8:10 14:3 23:20	103:24 104:15	166:17 168:11	money 12:6,18 13:11	149:11	non-satisfactory 149:24 153:5
26:4 41:1 42:8 51:7 51:11 52:4 88:11	105:3 106:11,17 107:16 108:4,13,24	MINIRENA 84:5,9 84:22 85:16 89:11	105:7,11 106:3 118:1 159:14 161:2	NARCISSE 2:9	noon 169:21
96:14 111:7 112:20	109:2,3,4,18,20	89:23 90:3,6 91:7	161:10 163:7	narrow 6:17	normal 156:14 157:8
123:3,9 126:18	110:1,9 120:13	96:18 98:3,19	month 13:10 28:5	native 29:2	notation 139:4
135:7 167:14,15,17	121:14 161:13	125:15 126:3	months 14:24 77:5	Natural 85:6 112:21	note 38:21 100:16
167:25	163:14,22 165:20	129:18 132:13	149:14	132:22 133:10	noted 40:4 77:2
meaning 13:24	167:4	133:21 135:9,12,18	more 3:16 4:3,4,21	135:11,13,17,18,23	nothing 7:9,13 29:20
means 61:3 85:24	millions 162:25	142:5 143:18,19	6:14,16 7:10,14,25	136:9,12,15,18,24 137:15,22 138:11	81:4 92:12 123:23
101:21 102:8 111:9	million-and-somethi	148:19,22 154:16	16:5 21:11 28:11,15	147:11 149:12	126:25 160:18
124:4 157:17	109:2	154:21 156:1,5	33:12 37:1 46:1	156:14,15	notice 38:14 39:13,21
162:22 163:22	million-something	157:18 163:11,19	52:5 83:11 86:17	nature 20:10,20	40:12,21 41:13,25
meant 23:22 59:19	120:11	163:21,24 164:8,15	92:12 93:14 97:4	near 117:20	43:2,3 53:21 54:5
92:17 126:18	mind 118:20 140:14	165:25	106:21,21 121:7	necessary 28:9,9	55:23 58:12,13,22
164:21	146:2	MINIRENA's 155:20	140:11 142:24	156:5,16	59:1 66:18 67:22
mechanism 33:5	minded 2:3	minister 35:14 72:1	148:25 154:17	need 5:6 6:6 14:8 39:9	68:5,9,13 157:21
media 33:25	mine 97:4 98:5,9,11	77:5,12 84:14 89:14	163:1,4	46:8 49:4 52:10	165:17
meet 95:25	98:23,23,24,24	96:6,7 98:19 100:11	morning 1:6 29:8	62:25 63:18 83:16	November 14:17,20
meeting 4:10 15:23	105:24 142:15	100:19 101:1,6,16	Morris 2:3,3	88:5 95:19 97:4	15:4,13 17:11 18:8
17:5,5,20 69:21,23	155:20 158:22	102:11,22 103:15	most 132:21 137:6	110:24 114:9	19:16 21:8,22 23:8
69:25 73:17 74:2 100:19 102:25	159:16,18 162:12 163:12	125:11,13 126:7,17 126:20 127:3,11,18	163:5 169:7 <b>mostly</b> 50:16	116:12,23 118:7,9	26:6,14 84:19 85:3 86:11,16 88:17,20
103:3,13,16	mined 111:11	133:8,9,11 142:14	<b>Mountain</b> 10:1,7,10	118:11 119:14	89:12,19 90:9 104:6
meetings 100:23	mineral 34:15 46:2	150:1 156:15	18:5,20 19:14,20	139:11 145:21	105:18 106:23
members 57:12	47:15 60:19	ministry 10:15 11:3	move 63:21 134:9	169:6	107:1 111:1,15,21
memorialising 21:6,15	minerals 34:14,23	14:13 15:7,14 35:12	136:9 150:6 159:19	needed 14:1,5 20:6	116:10 118:12
memory 26:7,12 38:22	35:3 36:11,16,16	70:9,12,16,19,23	moved 136:24	21:7 145:15,19 <b>NEEDLE</b> 2:8	119:8,14 138:20
113:16,19 140:22	37:2 46:2 47:7 48:7	71:10,12,17,20,24	moving 26:13	needs 13:18	149:8 150:18,24
150:12	49:22 59:15,25 60:2	72:3,23 73:4,15,18	Mruskovicova 30:8,9	negotiate 152:24	153:17,24 154:24
mention 53:2 84:11	60:4 61:8,22 62:17	73:20 74:2 75:12,14	30:12,21 69:23	153:10 154:14	NRD's 5:22 9:20
mentioned 66:25 92:5	63:5 64:14,17 65:6	76:14 77:4 78:1,11	70:25 71:22 72:19	157:25	10:11 11:17 12:1
131:7 145:18 151:9	65:9 68:25 69:6,10	84:4 86:5 98:8,11	72:22 74:3 75:9	negotiations 149:14	14:1 34:14 47:7
152:8,9,13,15,23	69:13 97:12 111:11	98:13 100:2 101:19	MSA 35:3 47:8 48:7,9	Nemba 10:4,8,11,17	55:15,18,23 56:3
159:7 160:15	147:22 148:3 161:4	102:7,18,24 103:5	much 24:2 28:18,20	10:25 11:4,9 13:13	59:15 60:20 64:16
mentioning 152:10	163:6	106:5 108:10 109:6	46:15 49:22 52:11	13:23 14:2,6,14	69:21 77:2,14 79:23
Merits 1:8	mines 10:15 14:13	110:4,13 122:24	52:12 80:7 83:15	18:25 19:12,19	84:18,25 107:1,8
message 30:12,13 met 20:11 94:18 95:13	15:8,15 22:11 85:6	126:4,24 127:1,4,13	106:12,16 118:1	60:25 61:4,9,23	121:23 140:9 147:6
met 20:11 94:18 95:13 166:4	91:11 92:6 96:24 102:7 107:11,17,22	132:22 135:12,16 135:17 138:5	129:23 145:10 163:1,4 165:20,21	62:18 63:6,11 64:13	147:13 153:17 157:18 160:16
metadata 24:23 25:4	108:6,14,17,17,18	142:17 143:6,17	168:3 169:18	64:16 65:1,7,10	163:8
25:18,19,20,23,24	108:20 109:10,22	147:11 149:12,24	MUGENZI 2:19	68:20,24 69:2,12,15	Nsengiyuma 3:7 28:22
123:13,15,19,21,21	110:11,17 112:22	151:3,4 153:7,15	MUKARUTABANA	150:23 159:16	29:6,10,13,16,18,22
123:23,24 124:2	136:12,19 148:3	154:1,9 155:6 156:9	2:20	never 5:3 6:17,17,25	29:25 31:5,8,11
Michael 2:15 15:24	159:16 161:8	156:12,25 157:10	Musha 98:22,22	7:18,20 12:24,24	33:10 37:12,15,16
16:9,11 17:5,6	MINIJUST 2:9	162:11	must 13:2,3 35:7	17:18 20:10,20 21:4 22:17 23:17 28:3,6	38:18 39:11 49:19
20:11,11,12,15,21	minimum 163:24	ministry's 102:2	42:17 44:14 57:24	43:13,22,22 45:2,2	53:20 55:8 58:9
22:14,15,17 86:20	164:11,22	minority 73:10 74:7	77:13 167:17	68:18 69:3 77:17,25	61:21 62:21 76:13
87:11,22 112:22	mining 2:9 10:1,8,11	minutes 9:7 73:17	169:14	78:2,7 109:10	77:17 78:21,25
113:2,4,8,12,13	11:10 13:23 18:6,20	76:9,10 80:17 99:3	MVM 11:10	110:16 137:19,24	79:17 80:6
166:8,11	19:14,20 78:14	misled 44:2	myself 32:23 34:25	138:10 140:14	nuances 48:25
Michael's 20:16 87:13	90:23 92:3,6,14,16	mispronounce 31:11	35:2 60:15 72:5	Nevertheless 125:19	number 35:9,25 36:5
88:6,7,12,21 112:23	92:20 93:6,17,20,24	34:21	74:5	new 9:20 81:18,19,20	38:1 39:15 53:23
113:14,24 114:6	94:6,12,15 95:12,24	mispronounced 34:17		84:19 90:13 93:20	54:2,12 63:4,16,23
L					

	T	Т			
64:6,7,8 90:21 91:6	officers 72:11,13,18	98:25 99:1 131:7	112:11,18 113:17	owners 9:21 75:16	particular 45:19
91:22,24,25 92:7	offices 60:24 61:4,9,23	138:25	114:17 119:16	owning 13:12	60:13 92:10
		online 96:3 143:20		o'clock 39:10 80:20	
93:7,13,15 94:5,18	62:18 63:6 64:14		122:18 125:2,3,16		particularly 3:8
94:19,22 95:12,14	65:2 68:20,24 69:21	only 33:11,14 34:25	129:16 132:23	99:13 168:22,22	144:24
95:21,23 96:1,4,20	70:20,24 72:17,23	35:2,5 38:4,10 39:5	134:3,16 136:16		parties 3:11 121:19
97:3 99:24 104:15	72:25 73:11 78:3,7	41:23 43:3 66:19,23	137:11 138:10	P	125:16 159:24
106:2,18 108:22	official 128:4	70:3 73:7 86:24	139:10 141:1,2,24	page 3:2 22:4 41:24,24	party 2:10 26:8 30:11
109:16 114:19	officials 56:4 70:16	89:22 104:3 108:18	142:1,3,7,10,12,18	46:1,6 47:17,24,25	30:13,15
116:4,9,12 119:5,7	73:4,15,20	110:10,14,16,25	143:1 144:7 154:11	62:3,25 63:1,2,17	Pascal 34:16,21 35:20
119:9,20 120:8,8	offline 56:18,21 57:4,5	111:4,7,17 121:19	154:25 156:2	64:6 83:8 103:20	36:1,6,10,13,20,21
121:14,21 122:10	OGMR 15:24 81:10	121:20 122:9 130:5	165:14		36:21,25 37:2,11,22
122:17 123:2	81:12,17 100:19	130:10 131:15	others 10:17 14:15	104:2,9 110:21	38:5,11,13 40:13
				114:12 117:19	' '
141:20 142:6,6,7,23	135:24 136:2,2,6,11	138:24 164:20	36:6 59:21 69:24	119:19 120:16,22	41:14,15 46:7,14
164:12	136:14,17,21	open 5:3 6:19,25 70:3	71:23 72:14 76:7	121:5 122:4 134:6	49:21,23 50:7,23
numbering 66:2	137:15 138:11	70:17,20,23 73:14	83:12 86:18 94:9	140:2,23,23 145:22	51:4,13 59:3 66:2
numbers 63:22 66:12	154:1	74:5,8 75:15 141:18	99:1 100:24 109:6	146:3,4,5,14,15	Pascal's 34:22 46:3
66:14 115:19	<b>Oh</b> 37:19 126:19	141:23 143:11	132:14 133:22	149:2 158:2 161:18	47:8 51:25
165:17	okay 26:6,19 29:16	145:15 154:19	153:16 167:8	pages 41:10,16,21	pass 30:8,11,13 38:23
Nunga 98:23	37:3 47:20 57:13	opened 73:2 74:4	otherwise 100:20	43:3,5 44:15 45:22	110:19
Nyakabingo 98:24	64:1 80:19 82:10	opening 121:3	114:7 131:17	45:22,24 50:2,4	passed 30:7,23 41:4
107:11 108:6	83:19 92:23 93:5,16	operate 148:3 155:20	ourselves 28:15		45:21
107.11 100.0	97:23 107:6 108:9	operation 147:6 157:3	out 9:1,22 12:17 16:21	60:13 62:20,21,24	passing 167:13 168:13
		_	17:15 24:5 25:9	117:4 118:8,9 134:7	
<u> </u>	110:9 114:24	operations 73:11		141:2 145:16	past 36:21 38:21 99:3
<b>object</b> 42:20	116:18,22 119:5	147:13,20 149:13	26:12 27:9,11 48:8	paid 12:25 13:10	105:13
objection 1:13	120:21 122:2	156:19 161:14	51:19 58:14 65:10	35:23 39:14,22	Pause 1:5,7 9:11 12:6
<b>objective</b> 111:5 158:5	125:19 128:9	operator 145:13 148:5	68:2,2,14 73:23	51:19 56:2 66:13	16:23 24:7,13 29:4
158:25 159:2,3	129:13 130:10	opining 5:11	83:17 107:8 108:12	68:18 79:13 80:4	47:19 50:11 57:10
161:23 162:8	131:1 132:10 133:2	opinion 7:4	109:21 110:9	pales 13:11	57:12 76:12 80:12
objectives 159:8	133:16 134:21	opportunity 8:17 9:14	116:25 124:12,15	paper 129:15	80:21 83:19 139:5
objects 51:18	135:1 136:20	83:14 145:19,24	125:11 126:16	papers 33:25 82:16,19	141:25 142:3 145:3
•	140:14 151:15	oral 165:3	138:1,6,12 139:14	82:20,22	146:3,4,5,6
obligation 74:13	152:21 156:6	order 9:11 12:16	163:9 165:2		pay 38:15,25 40:22
obligations 149:25	158:19 163:23	13:24,24 32:16 34:2	outcome 98:10	paragraph 11:22,23	43:6,10 45:21 47:8
150:4,16 158:3				11:24 23:11,14	· ·
observe 102:11	169:13	34:15 36:5,19 37:4	outside 59:20 61:4	29:25 30:4 37:8,9	53:11,12 55:6,18,20
OBSERVERS 2:10	once 103:14	38:7,15 39:22 40:21	163:7	37:20,24 38:10,16	56:1 58:24 59:3,4,5
obtain 9:22 32:5	one 1:23 2:9 4:14 6:25	46:7 58:24 59:4	over 3:1,7,19 19:5,8	39:24 40:1,11,20	59:7 69:13,16,17
104:13 153:18	8:23 9:22 12:16	67:7 71:16 75:19	26:4 35:18 42:8,23	42:10 43:25 45:25	70:11,18 77:8,13,14
<b>obtained</b> 32:12 34:5	20:18 22:4 30:18	77:15 104:18	52:16,16,20 62:24	50:12,14 53:8,9	77:15,18
94:23 102:22	33:10,11,14,15 36:1	105:11,22 156:24	68:7 71:6 72:17	54:16 58:8,10,11	paying 16:20 26:11
109:11 113:17	36:1 38:11 39:17,19	169:6	73:22 75:8,16,23	59:10,11 60:21,22	payment 67:4 69:3
159:23 166:13	44:21 45:8 51:21	ordered 35:14 53:12	83:25 91:17 94:12	62:22,23 64:11,12	payments 59:16
obtaining 160:16	56:22 57:7,15,17,18	72:2 77:7	95:23,23 101:16		PC 1:11
	57:23 59:4 64:1	orders 59:3,5,7 78:16	102:11 104:15	65:24 66:16 69:18	<b>PDF</b> 134:7
obtains 33:18	67:20,25 68:17	orient 84:1 134:8	118:14,15,25 119:2	69:20 79:5,9,18	peacefully 144:24
obvious 155:24	78:24 80:17 82:25	orientation 139:12	121:15,21 122:22	83:23 84:10,25	pending 14:12 157:19
obviously 29:1 86:9			-	116:16 138:17,18	
occasions 63:11 89:15	85:21 86:16 93:25	oriented 59:13	131:16 136:9,24	151:1	people 16:20 50:16
149:16 150:1,3	94:1,25 97:4 98:8	original 43:7,16 44:20	139:25 151:6 160:1	paragraphs 46:1,9	51:3 65:20 66:21
occupying 155:22	106:21 112:20	103:23 104:13	162:23 164:4	83:25 84:1,13	67:4,5 73:22 87:16
occurred 2:20 92:14	113:8 114:2 115:24	107:10 110:2	167:15 169:14	110:22	108:25 113:11
102:13	116:19 117:5,15	138:25	overcome 47:4	paralegal 2:23	127:23 128:1
October 125:13	119:21,22 120:15	originally 14:15 57:18	overlapped 47:21	parameters 164:13	132:22 134:2,3
off 20:1 27:1,3 39:2	121:15 123:14	71:3 134:11 159:23	overlapping 97:16	pardon 10:21	137:4 154:1 161:11
40:6 49:2 52:16	127:6,14,22 128:5	originals 42:5	oversaw 15:4	part 4:14 8:24 10:10	161:15 163:17,18
96:15 168:1	130:4,10,14,14	other 1:24 5:17 7:23	overseeing 15:13	21:16 22:19 36:25	165:1
	131:9,9,20,21,24	9:9 32:12 34:23	overspeaking 130:15		perceive 1:22
offer 153:12	132:6 133:25	35:1,1,3,4,9 36:16	owed 12:5,18 39:21	53:14 55:6,14 64:18	percentage 106:8,12
offhand 85:18			49:23 50:18 55:2	74:10 86:24 95:6,7	106:17 108:10
office 2:11,12,13,14	136:16 137:5,25	36:17,21 38:1,8	58:22 68:9 77:16	95:20 100:22	
2:18,19 3:22 4:9	138:5 139:4,21	50:21 51:15,25 52:9		101:15,18,22 102:4	109:7
30:24 40:7,8 45:14	140:19 141:4,5	52:10 55:3,9,18	79:14	102:6 103:4,12	perfectly 6:4 27:7
55:15 58:19,20	144:6,11,12 147:1,2	58:14,22 59:5 62:25	own 5:22 8:2 37:6	104:11 109:22	42:21
59:15,19,21,24 60:3	148:25 150:11	66:2,9,25 70:2	42:3 50:10 88:13	110:11 122:13,23	perform 27:12 82:3
60:7,20 63:11 64:17	151:8 152:1 153:11	77:19 78:24 83:9	104:13 107:9	125:1 137:3 157:15	153:10
66:21 67:6 68:2,15	154:8,17 160:16	88:15 89:17,21	124:25 129:8	160:17	performance 146:23
68:21 70:4,10 71:3	161:5 167:5 168:24	90:10 93:24 95:5	130:23 131:5	participate 100:25	146:25 148:4,12,15
71:6,22	169:17	96:21,23 97:5 99:21	139:19 165:12	124:21	149:3 152:14
officer 47:1 81:20	ones 9:10 89:22 91:12	99:23 100:2 102:4	owned 12:2 74:25	participated 124:23	155:13,16,21,25
136:22	91:18 94:7 97:13	103:11,13 108:7	owner 15:1 16:17	125:19	156:4,10,23 157:6
130.44	1	1		140.17	1

167:9,10 performances 156:1	
performed 156:9	
perhaps 20:18 86:14	
92:2 129:16 139:21	
139:22 169:8	
period 22:22 77:5	
89:18,25 90:7 92:1 92:13 93:8,25	
103:24 104:16,20	
105:7 114:16 116:9	
117:15 118:15,25	
119:3,6,7 120:4	
121:10,15,21	
122:11,17,22 123:3	
127:10 128:3	
143:16 148:2,10,13 149:13,18 151:6	
158:11,14,25	
periods 84:10 117:12	
117:14	
permanent 100:11	
permission 32:25	
33:18,21	
<b>permit</b> 34:19 158:10 158:13	
permits 158:6	
permitted 32:11 83:4	
perplexed 4:18	
person 32:15,17,19	
33:8 43:20,20 45:19	)
51:18 86:4 166:10	
personal 76:24,25 77:24 125:20 126:6	
126:24 130:8	
persons 86:4	
Peter 100:3	
phase 93:9 163:1	
167:5,6	
PHILLIPS 1:11	
phone 66:12,14 145:7	
photocopies 42:5	
<b>photocopies</b> 42:5 43:17 44:18	
photocopies 42:5	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:25 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19 120:4 121:9 151:8	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19 120:4 121:9 151:8 161:7,8,17 162:12	5
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19 120:4 121:9 151:8 161:7,8,17 162:12	
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19 120:4 121:9 151:8 161:7,8,17 162:12 165:10 planned 57:18 160:12	
photocopies 42:5 43:17 44:18 photocopy 54:15 phrase 51:6,10 101:2: 121:8 122:16,23 123:2 physical 85:18 pick 4:14 19:9 139:5 picked 6:18 7:20 89:2 picking 84:9 piece 115:24 place 23:4 48:9 56:24 85:21 144:6,11 148:10 placed 1:14 2:4 41:2 places 130:20 plain 61:19 plan 88:23 98:7,7 107:10 114:13,22 117:11 118:1,19 120:4 121:9 151:8 161:7,8,17 162:12	

Jurisdiction and the N
Plan[s 117:11,20 played 4:10 playing 3:13,23 please 4:25 15:10 21:17 24:25 26:4
27:4,5 29:4,12,15 37:18 46:6,10 47:12 47:18,22 51:2,24 55:21 56:24 62:2 63:1,19 64:10 68:22 74:18 78:23 80:25
82:15 84:23 92:4 97:17 99:11,16 101:10 104:22 106:14 107:25 109:12 111:19 114:19 124:10
126:13 127:16 131:25 134:24 135:1 136:6 139:6 143:16,22 145:11 145:21,22 146:2,4,5 146:6,12 150:12
152:11 155:14 156:8 158:12 164:7 166:2 167:25 169:15 pleased 125:6 pledge 165:21
pledged 161:13 163:22 plus 57:15 pm 1:3 9:12,18 27:18 29:5,23 31:9 57:9
57:11 58:2,4 78:19 80:22 81:7 82:11 99:7,8,9 141:12,14 145:2,4 169:20 <b>point</b> 27:20 48:21
58:14 76:13,24 94:10 96:3 100:18 107:8 111:24 126:16 147:23 148:12 167:7 <b>pointing</b> 124:3
points 25:9 34:11 163:8 166:21 police 32:19,21,22 46:20,21,25 47:1,6 47:15 48:7 65:7,12 65:23 66:10,12 67:2 67:12,18 69:7,8
policies 133:18 policy 157:3 163:10 163:13,23 164:8,14 164:22 168:9 pool 137:4 poor 87:6,8 95:4,8
poorly 94:4 portion 67:5 104:18 109:10 110:25 111:1 134:13 140:19 posed 104:15
posed 104.13 position 3:9 5:6,10 7:3 15:18 60:16 65:19 70:11 74:15,19

erits	ICSIE	Case N
81:2 98:1 142 155 position posses possib 37:3 posted potent 96:2 pour 1 pourin praction praction praction praction praction predat predat predat prefer	20 82:1,2 19 136:2 :13 153: :7 ons 81:1! sion 50: le 54:11 ly 7:3 2: 8 153:11 1 59:20 6 ial 95:12	2 98:18 3 15 9 84:9 6 157:24 5:22 61:4 2,23 5,21,24 4 12 10 3 :22 4 0) :16 41:2 :14 2 :2:4 11:4,8 12:3,9 :19,15:4 :19 6:8,10 3:16
82:2 prepai	20 45:7 4 23 121:2 <b>ring</b> 13:2 3 115:2	
presen 74:2 presen	ice 73:3, 2 it 2:21 1	
69:2 presen presen	24 i <b>tation</b> 8 i <b>ted</b> 4:19	3:2
Presid 3:8 8:13 29:3 49:6 56:1 61:1 80:1 81:5 95:1 141 144 158 169 presur prever	:8,14 ent 1:4,4 :12,14,3 9:11 28 3,4,8,11,2 21 38:21 5,8,16 56 6,6,19 57 13 76:9 8 12,13,16 5 83:6,18 10 99:3,5 13 124:7 :24 145: :20 168: :8,11,13 nably 1: nt 27:4 5 us 81:21 usly 82:	17,25 8:18,23 14,17 39:3,5 6:8,14 2:22 58:6 80:7,10 2:0,24 8 94:20 5,10,11 141:8 20,22 5,10 21 1,17 23:18 9:21 1 86:3

```
price 36:23
primarily 126:9
printed 82:25
prior 83:25 84:1,13
  86:12 89:5 113:24
  114:4 126:23 142:3
  142:4,13,16,22
  143:17,17,19 154:5
  164:5
private 91:16 160:3
privatisation 91:16,25
  92:5.14
privatised 161:8
problem 19:8 31:15
  39:11 141:25 145:6
procedural 3:3
procedure 45:17 80:1
proceed 9:3 58:5
   154:13 156:22
  162:3 166:24
proceeded 163:4
proceeding 6:24 12:23
  162:11,14 166:17
proceedings 3:14 4:20
  4:23 48:10 53:13
  79:22
proceeds 36:13
process 5:23 52:23
  91:9 100:12 125:1,9
  143:10,12 144:1,9
  151:20 153:23
  155:11.19.20 156:6
  156:11 157:4,6,15
  162:16 167:5 168:7
produce 43:12 44:16
  63:9,12,23 67:2
  70:13 73:19 123:22
  125:16 128:10
produced 1:23 17:9
  17:18 42:5 43:24
  63:10 67:3.14.24
  68:14 76:6 113:8.13
  114:21 115:8 116:1
  128:13 131:1,4,6,15
  131:19,24 132:6
  141:5 147:10
producing 44:15
  124:25
product 88:12
production 98:7
  124:21 128:21
  161:19
professional 31:16,21
  31:25 32:5,9,24
  34:3 64:22 74:10
  84:2
profitably 161:4
program 143:7
programme 91:16
progress 167:1
progressing 132:21
progressively 51:20
  51:20
project 100:1 118:14
  119:2 132:11
  140:15
```

```
107:16 108:5,11,13
   109:8,18 110:10,14
  110:16 118:13
  119:6,7 121:21,21
   149:18
projecting 107:22
  118:25
projection 117:16
projections 117:9,13
  163:18
pronounce 84:4,5,6
  135:1
pronounced 135:3
pronouncing 84:3
proper 29:1
properly 90:2,16
  93:22 96:5 97:8
  98:22 103:2 105:2,4
  105:15 108:2
  117:17 118:16
   122:1 133:1 136:23
  137:10 140:13
  157:23
property 31:18,22
  32:1,6 33:1,5,5 35:1
  39:1 64:23
propose 1:12 39:7
proposed 105:2,5
   106:5,6 108:16
   117:10,11,20,25
  165:18
proposing 7:10,12 8:2
  151:6
protect 16:21
protest 43:12
prove 44:5
provide 27:10,22
  32:16 34:3 40:21
  41:25 43:4 46:12
  48:11 84:1,8 118:13
  129:5 166:18
provided 5:20 18:12
  22:20 24:10 25:20
  27:14 30:20 33:8
  34:9 39:13,23 41:13
  60:4 66:18.23 67:8
  67:12,17,22 69:3
  87:18 88:14 112:5
  112:14 122:10
  123:17 147:20
  148:2
provides 76:19
providing 46:13 60:25
  67:17 69:24 108:4
provision 162:21
public 11:2,5 132:24
publicly 10:15
publishes 33:24
pull 143:24 144:15
pulled 139:6
pulling 83:14
purchasing 27:22
pure 159:9
purport 119:2 125:23
purporting 4:23
purpose 12:1 45:5,8
  85:11 92:11 96:14
```

1	Tonday, 20 June 202
	124:9,15 154:4,23 <b>purposes</b> 3:17 44:22
	45:8 139:12 140:18
	146:11 <b>pursue</b> 10:8 12:16
	push 168:1
	<b>put</b> 1:20 3:10 8:5,6,11
	8:13 9:11 10:18
	13:25 20:22,24 21:22 35:15,15 43:1
	49:13 53:21 62:21
	78:22 79:4 116:3
	120:15 121:19
	123:16 129:10
	139:24 144:22 152:17 163:9
	putting 7:2
ļ	parting / .2
	Q
	QC 1:12 2:6
	qualify 156:21
	questioned 24:23 questioning 31:12
	questioning 31.12

QC 1:12 2:6
qualify 156:21
questioned 24:23
questioning 31:12
96:15 128:20
145:25
questions 3:14 3:25
14:5 27:17 30:18
31:7 37:6 59:12
78:18 79:1,3 82:8
83:16 94:8,8 113:19
123:16 125:8,22,23
125:24 127:16
128:24,25 129:25
130:18 139:12,13
140:25 141:3,18,20
143:11 145:23
168:2
quick 20:17 135:16
quicker 109:15 150:7
quickly 103:22 120:14
126:5
quite 13:1 74:14
quitting 82:5

quite 13:1 74:14					
quitting 82:5					
•					
R					
<b>R</b> 69:19 76:12 120:15					
120:16					
radio 34:1					
raised 5:4 124:19					
rather 4:18 16:3 40:10					
56:11 126:15					
<b>RDB</b> 72:10 73:7 75:1					
75:6,20,22 76:2,3,3					
76:3,6,8 154:15					
155:3					
<b>RDB's</b> 76:4					
re 3:3					
reach 52:7 73:23					
94:11					
reached 137:25 138:6					
168:21					
reaching 138:12					
167:13					

read 2:25 22:7 29:12

29:13,15 48:13,17

48:23 58:24 71:7

72:9 74:24 88:17

projected 106:8

103:7 110:13	3:10 49:9 65:7,15	95:15,17,17	63:10 88:15,20	restructured 136:11	<b>Roka</b> 97:12
139:20 141:7	65:17,18,22,23	remaining 57:15	166:19	restructuring 81:17	role 3:13 4:10 27:8
145:19,24 146:9	122:10,17,19,22	remember 16:7 19:1,2	represent 61:17	result 4:21 10:7 24:22	81:21 100:17
165:7,7,9	recorded 20:3 91:7	22:1 23:4,9,25	representation 108:3	25:1 49:17 100:13	room 9:5 56:25 57:2,3
reading 105:1,2 132:7	records 102:2 132:15	24:20 28:2,2,7	119:20 123:25	100:20 102:13	82:17,21,22,25
147:8 162:2 165:9	recover 66:22 69:10	64:18 68:1,23 69:1	representations	103:1.16	83:17 116:20
reads 50:14	recovered 52:11	79:3 81:13,14,16	166:14	resulting 147:22	rooms 144:23
ready 1:4 9:6,15	recoveries 31:17	87:1,15,16,19,23	representative 2:15	results 32:10,12 33:3	ROSE-MARIE 2:20
realised 141:17	redoing 6:15	88:10 89:9,16 90:17	43:9 74:16,21	33:22 49:22	ROSSI 2:18
reality 168:6	reduce 134:14	91:6,22 93:13,15	represented 25:12	resume 79:25,25 80:3	round 13:3
realize 111:5	reduced 69:19 82:1	96:5,19 97:9 98:22	77:8	80:5 141:9	RSOC 79:7
really 8:7,11 48:25	refer 13:19 22:8,12,14	98:25 99:1 100:9	representing 5:17	retained 3:14,15 4:16	RT 1:11
60:11 92:11	34:10,20 39:24 62:9	112:17 113:5.14	54:21	5:11,14 133:19	rude 87:7
reason 24:4 33:17	94:6 111:22 135:5	114:1,9,11 116:15	represents 31:6 82:7	retains 163:6	rules 1:1 169:17
43:14 100:5 119:15	reference 41:17 47:9	118:17,20 120:12	request 1:9,11 33:23	retired 81:16	ruling 32:17 33:6
148:4,6,11 153:22	53:25 54:2,10 63:8	128:8 130:6 133:5	83:10 96:24 104:13	retirement 81:15 82:5	43:18,21 45:15 68:3
154:9,23 160:12,14	63:14 64:5,7 84:24	133:14 136:23	149:9 155:5	retiring 81:12	68:14,16 71:15
reasonable 25:16	85:14,19 95:5	137:3 138:4,4,9,15	requested 38:25	return 37:3 71:22	rulings 41:18 43:7,19
144:20 169:5	111:15 121:12,15	139:17 142:6,23,25	requests 1:23	72:3,25 141:15,17	44:4,14,18,19 45:23
reasonably 162:21	122:18 126:2	143:13,14 146:18	require 82:2 139:9	143:2,3 144:25	67:4 71:11
reasons 148:14	152:16 153:23	147:5,8,25 150:16	140:25	148:16	rumours 10:18,20,22
recall 25:13,14,16	161:19	157:23 164:2,14,22	required 16:1,5 18:17	returned 71:18 72:4	10:24 14:5,9
27:20 47:3 53:14	referenced 38:9 64:3	165:19,19	31:16,21,25 32:5,9	reverse 79:12	run 73:11 126:6
54:4 59:17,24 60:25	84:20 112:18,25	remembering 97:14	33:2,20 34:3 38:24	review 5:16 25:4 73:5	running 144:12
64:20,21 66:3,5,7	113:1 116:10	remind 65:25	161:10 165:23	83:15 85:3,10,11	Rutongo 98:24
69:24 70:6 74:12	117:15	reminder 28:25	166:4	104:6 107:15	Rutsiro 150:22
75:4 79:1 81:12	references 47:11	renewal 121:23	Research 104:10	111:14 113:23	Rwakirenga 34:16
84:20 88:1 97:24,25	101:24	repeat 15:10 21:17	reserve 167:23	115:25 116:2,5	50:23,24 51:2,4,13
105:15 113:21,22	referred 21:1 34:23	24:25 68:22 74:18	reserves 98:6,7 111:6	145:15	52:17
114:6,10 115:1	41:19 45:23 54:3	81:1 84:23 92:4	111:13 158:7 159:1	reviewed 25:23	Rwakirenga's 50:16
125:17,18 133:8	58:24 66:17 88:3	97:17 101:10	159:5,12	107:21 116:6	50:22
137:10 139:9,11	92:17 93:6 101:22	104:22 107:25	reserving 7:4	151:16 152:17	Rwamasirabo 2:13,14
140:4 142:7 146:10	102:5 112:10	109:12 111:19	resolve 141:25	161:21	2:20,24 3:9,16 4:1
146:16,24 147:3,6	referring 46:16 60:14	119:12,16 127:16	resources 85:6 111:6	reviewing 104:12	4:16 5:5
147:13,16,19	84:21 85:15,19	146:12 155:14	112:21 132:22	107:20,24 122:15	Rwamasirabo's 4:8
148:11,22 150:12	86:11 87:11 88:1	158:12 164:5 166:2	133:10 135:11,13	revisit 1:25	Rwanda 1:18 2:9,9
150:17	89:22 112:9,23	168:14	135:17,19,23 136:9	re-apply 147:18	5:15 12:23 16:22
recalled 98:18 140:14	113:9 116:8,12,16	repeated 142:12	136:12,15,18,24	Re-direct 3:6,10 27:19	20:13,16 21:14
receipt 40:9 41:6	119:9 128:19	repeatedly 61:14	137:15,23 138:12	78:20	31:16,21,25 32:5,9
receipts 34:5	138:21 161:20	152:21	147:12 149:13	re-examination 76:10	32:24 33:17 34:3
receive 18:14 37:13,16	167:10	repeating 95:22 164:6	156:15,15 158:6	re-open 70:14	45:13 56:4 64:22
40:8	refers 92:10	report 32:9,14,15 33:2	159:1,13	<b>RGL</b> 64:15	72:10,12,21 74:16
received 31:17 43:3	reflects 158:21	33:20 34:4 46:18	respect 166:22	RICHARD 2:6	74:20 75:1 85:6
46:14 50:24 68:13	refreshed 113:20	47:23 48:1,1,8,11	respond 4:24 11:2,5	right 2:1,13 9:10,14	97:12,12 112:21
71:16 77:12 97:18	refused 30:10 58:21	49:20,24,25 50:3	106:14	12:3 14:2 23:22	123:18 127:5
100:9,15 133:17,22	77:14 153:12	60:9,14 70:15 72:24	responded 24:17	24:24 38:17 52:1	135:18,22 136:12
137:17 156:12	regard 2:17 5:22 39:8	87:4,22,23 88:3,3,7	Respondent 1:19 2:5	65:10 85:1 87:23	147:11 149:8 153:7
157:8 169:2	62:23 102:19,24	88:14,22,24 101:14	7:1 20:23,25 21:4	91:22 93:11 101:7,9	162:18,18 167:1
receives 40:4 45:14	143:4	101:15,17 102:14	21:13,18,22 22:24	101:12,13,16	Rwandan 8:25 31:1
78:16	regards 168:5	102:15 103:3,4,7	50:7 62:7 82:21,22	104:21 105:5,8,10	33:4 44:23 45:10
receiving 147:24	registered 77:23	107:4 108:10 110:8	115:9 124:22 131:3	105:24 106:4,18	Rwanda's 162:15
reception 30:23 40:7	regulation 81:22	112:14,15,18,23	144:17	107:20 108:8,15	168:10 <b>PE</b> 50:10 52:11
41:1	rejected 157:20,22	113:2,4,7,10,13	Respondent's 1:10 6:6	112:2 114:5 116:11	RwF 50:19 53:11
recite 47:14	relate 20:25	114:7,21,23,25	25:21 49:1 62:11	116:14 119:4,8	<b>R-040</b> 99:15 100:14
recognise 137:13	related 50:6 52:24	115:3,12,15,20	83:12 131:17 132:15	120:17,19 122:6	102:19 103:20
139:15 148:20	relating 24:16 34:13	116:5,8,17 119:9,10		127:8 130:9 134:6	110:24 119:5 120:8
167:14,18,21,21 168:4	55:9	119:11 128:18,18	responding 154:3	138:22 139:13,22	122:2,4 129:24 130:2,4 132:2
recognised 167:19	relationship 84:21 86:9	137:17,21 149:21	response 1:10 7:21 24:10 134:11,13,19	140:20 142:15 150:17 152:8 155:9	130:2,4 132:2
recognises 151:5	relevance 8:18	150:3,11 151:9,12 151:21 154:12	134:22 143:2,3	158:18,20,23,23	139:23,25 140:7,11
recognising 151:18	relevant 1:15 2:5,5 8:8	159:7 166:9,11,12	responsibilities 74:10	162:24,24 164:16	<b>R-051</b> 39:14,15,19
154:17	129:9	reported 16:17 17:12	responsible 55:11	164:21 168:8	40:15,18 43:15
recollect 34:18 35:7	relied 11:13 88:14	73:2,19 118:24	65:20	rights 13:12	78:21
recollection 25:6,9	rely 88:11	137:22	rest 80:21 100:16	RNRA 136:17	<b>R-063</b> 53:17
recommendations	relying 83:13	reporting 109:6	151:1	RNRA/GMD 112:6	<b>R-066</b> 66:7,15
85:13 147:9	remain 57:19 132:14	113:11 165:22	restart 142:19	ROBERT 2:19	R-000 00.7,13 R-077 76:18
record 1:14,20 2:4,7	remained 49:23 93:21	reports 62:13,14,14	restate 10:9	RODERICK 2:4	R-118 139:6 140:2
	17.23 73.21				

Day 0 Hearing on Jurisdiction and the Merits Testib Case No. ARD/10/21 Wionday, 20 June 202					
144:15 145:17	111:2 114:13	147:21 148:3	163:25 164:9	169:16	15:11 16:4,4,24
146:13 158:2	117:21,25 149:4	selling 32:7 35:4	show 18:12 25:17,18	sit 7:25 144:24 169:3	17:25 20:1 22:2
140.13 130.2	158:3	send 24:19 74:16,20	54:14 62:2 102:9	site 28:12,16 64:15	26:4,5 31:11 37:19
S	sections 110:21 140:1	124:10,14 134:18	109:1 120:24 121:1	159:18	42:8,23,25 47:21
safely 32:2 82:24	140:17 149:2	senior 166:10	showed 82:4 121:4	sites 157:14	53:2 59:14 68:7
salary 12:24 82:1	sector 161:12	sense 94:5 140:21	143:10	sitting 3:6 116:20	74:22 87:1,6 88:10
sale 15:2 34:6 36:23	secure 61:5 64:23	159:9	showing 54:13 81:24	situated 94:6,7	93:13 95:8 101:20
49:22 61:5	73:25 74:17	sent 22:13,16 24:18	100:5 131:8,20	situation 33:16 82:3	102:19 106:25
same 18:13 19:18 51:5	security 32:1 59:20	25:25 54:21 58:16	shown 29:25 42:20	164:2	109:13 110:5,23
51:15,18,20 54:18	61:4 64:15 65:11,21	71:12 99:21 115:18	53:19	situations 32:24	114:12 117:17,18
67:21 68:4,8 89:18	74:11	128:18 130:7 131:9	shows 130:7	six 106:20 149:13	118:16 124:6 134:5
92:18 97:21 120:8	see 1:16 6:19 21:10	131:21 133:6,6,7	<b>shut</b> 9:1	size 95:14,25 139:20	139:4 140:13
121:8,14,14,15	22:5 24:12,23 25:19	149:8	side 21:15 39:11 89:7	163:15	141:16 143:22
149:17,18 151:17	25:22 29:11,14	sentence 11:24 84:15	89:9 101:23 120:16	skipping 83:25	144:16 146:7 155:3
153:23 158:21	39:15,18,25 40:2	112:4 121:16	124:11 139:21,22	slight 1:19	158:20 160:2 164:4
159:24 160:3	41:8,9 46:6 49:10	138:18 158:4	139:24	small 67:5 91:12	166:2
161:23 162:6	51:1 52:10 53:23,25	September 81:25	sides 125:2	smaller 93:18 109:14	sort 94:7 100:12
168:15	54:3,24 62:19 63:24	149:15	side-by-side 62:20	small-sentence 110:22	sounds 9:6
<b>SARAH</b> 2:18	65:3 66:4 80:25	serve 44:16	sign 40:6,6 58:21	soft 85:23 86:24 87:1	source 17:19 114:20
sat 169:6	100:25 101:17	served 38:14 45:20	66:21 67:6	sold 47:8 52:19 64:24	122:19 123:2,9,20
satisfactory 152:6	103:25 104:1,5	55:9,23	signature 23:1 44:17	76:22 77:13 78:5	so-and-so 43:18
153:9	107:13,14 115:15	serves 38:22	signed 3:6 24:18 41:5	163:6	so-called 17:12 152:4
saw 23:17 25:19 39:16	117:6,12,19,23,24	serving 58:11,13	41:5,23 42:3 49:2 65:8 67:23 68:12	solely 18:6 solemnly 29:18 81:2	SPALENA 1:16
82:15 166:20	118:4,6,11 119:19	136:21			speak 26:4 29:19
saying 2:21,22 4:1 8:7	119:25 120:2,6,7,18	set 2:19 3:20 25:9	148:24 159:3,8,20	solo 57:19,20	30:10 42:8 48:15,15
12:5 27:4 42:19	121:7 122:5 134:9 134:15,15,17,20	75:14 164:13 setting 2:14 159:13	160:11,12 163:16 163:18,21 164:21	some 8:22 20:15,23,25 21:1 26:12,12 31:6	48:25 51:24 56:17 81:3 164:4 169:8
45:5 48:19 53:14		setting 2:14 139:13 settle 38:25	165:6,13,20 166:15	33:17 56:9,20 76:13	speaker 29:2
68:8 71:20 74:3	138:18 139:2,3,3,20 140:3 141:2 143:15	Settlement 1:2	168:17	79:1 81:19 82:8	speaking 19:5 56:23
96:10 104:3 105:1,5	143:25 144:6,8	seven 108:17	significant 111:4,7,17	83:25 84:8 85:17	58:10
107:21 109:3	145:16 147:2	seven-page 140:3	111:22,25 112:2,13	86:3,6 88:7 90:13	speaks 3:1
112:10 123:7	148:24 149:5,6,19	145:17	signing 23:9 25:6,14	91:5,13 92:1,7,15	Special 149:10
130:13,19 132:5	149:20 150:3	several 89:14 102:17	159:11	93:24 96:3 100:12	specific 13:19 33:1,1
133:5 136:16	153:10 157:24	131:6 134:2 135:20	signs 81:24 82:4	100:19 103:8,15	33:18 40:12 59:12
138:19 153:19 160:19,20	158:8,9 168:12	150:1,2	similar 51:13,23 60:24	105:13,23 111:4,7	103:16 113:14
says 32:15 41:17 53:9	seeing 24:22 44:12	share 113:7,12 114:2	94:13 118:2 121:1	111:22,24 113:17	116:7 118:15
64:12 70:2 79:18	94:11 113:17	125:4,6	similarly 94:5,7 121:3	114:17 116:4	121:11 125:8 126:3
103:22 114:14	137:12 147:1	shared 113:25 114:8	simply 7:13,20 33:24	122:18 125:8	127:5 129:25
120:3 124:2,4	seeking 1:10 155:19	124:13 129:21	54:4,12 59:1 73:13	127:11,18,20	140:17 145:23,23
146:15 166:12	156:8	131:10,19,22	75:20 76:5 94:4	128:24 129:18,20	164:11
schedule 80:14	seeks 32:25	132:18,25 133:9	118:14 124:1	137:1 138:25	specifically 11:21 16:9
scheduling 6:24	seem 8:21 31:13	134:1,2	simultaneous 57:20	141:20 167:19	33:13 40:10 110:10
screen 29:11,14 78:22	seems 4:20 8:23	shareholder 54:22	since 11:15 30:9 64:4	168:25	121:5 124:20
78:23 80:24 102:20	117:21 144:20	55:11 56:3,6 58:17	86:5 94:19 95:15,16	somebody 75:4 103:17	142:10 144:5
139:19,21 143:25	seen 20:22,23 21:4	73:8 74:7 77:18	96:1,20 125:13	somehow 138:2,13	SPECIOZA 2:9
144:8	24:20 91:10 122:12	shareholders 72:20	148:18	someone 5:16 21:6	speculate 87:20
scroll 22:2 24:12 41:7	140:22 147:4	73:10,24 75:2,2,5	sir 14:10 16:24 19:5	78:12 82:20,21	Spedag 30:7
46:6 59:10 103:20	seize 33:4 74:12 77:17	75:19 76:4,7 77:21	20:2 22:6 24:8 26:2	124:10,11 128:12	speed 27:2
121:1	77:21 78:13	159:22	26:23 27:8 37:20	128:15 129:5 132:4	spend 104:23 105:7,11
scrolled 24:13 53:7	seized 31:22 32:1,6,11	sharpen 95:18 sharpening 95:19	41:12 42:3,23 43:14	140:4,8,10 147:11	106:19 110:16
sealed 64:13	34:22 35:1,6,9,11	sharper 113:16	44:8,20 45:25 46:11	148:21,22 151:15 161:1	151:6 <b>spending</b> 106:3 109:9
search 115:2,15	36:5,9,17,19 39:2 51:19 59:14,24 60:3	sheet 56:3	46:17,22 47:12 48:2 50:14 51:6,24 53:9	something 20:2 26:15	110:14
128:17 129:5,11	60:19,20 61:9,23	Shema 39:25 40:14,16	55:17 56:12 63:14	48:21 49:8,9 52:19	spendings 107:16
searched 128:12,14	62:18 64:23 68:21	40:20 41:3,4 42:3	63:19 64:1 65:1	62:11 83:11 91:10	108:11
129:3,14,20	68:23 71:3 76:20	42:12 43:3 67:20,21	67:8,16 68:18 69:10	93:15 101:21 102:1	spent 106:8,12,17,24
searching 129:7,10 130:8	77:15 78:3,5,8,9	67:22,24 68:4,8,10	70:7 71:2 75:18	102:4 103:17	108:11 109:8,17
Sebeya 150:22	seizes 77:22	shifting 136:17	78:6,12 82:14 95:4	104:19,24 124:4,4	118:1 162:25 163:1
second 5:5 30:1,5	seizing 38:16 59:19	short 58:3 91:1 128:3	104:1 107:23 123:8	140:25 145:20	spoke 17:6 42:23 68:7
39:19 51:22 52:18	61:3 63:6 65:5	141:13 144:20	125:5,14,22 127:8	148:19 159:14	spoken 61:17
58:19 59:4 116:19	seizure 31:18 34:6,13	shorten 49:10	128:6,24 130:14	sometime 123:5	spreadsheet 143:8
117:6,8 139:4 158:2	36:12 39:23 40:22	shortly 9:20 50:15	137:25 138:5 140:4	sometimes 38:2,2 92:2	squared 163:15
secretariat 31:2 55:25	46:2 60:14 69:5	84:11 136:2	141:17 148:8	somewhat 166:23	STAFF 2:21
secretary 1:22 30:24	seizures 52:7 62:14	short-term 90:11,13	150:11 152:11,12	son 3:1,2,6	Stallard 1:23
40:3,5,14 58:20	79:12	91:2,8 92:19 150:14	154:17 155:10	soon 15:22 43:6 48:9	stamped 101:18 102:8
100:11	selfsame 35:18	153:4 154:15 155:7	156:17 158:23	54:10	114:10
section 103:21 104:10	sell 59:22 69:10,12,15	156:2,8,18 162:19	166:22 167:7	sorry 10:23 14:3	stands 45:14
L					

Starck 16:18,20 17:6	22:19 100:14	35:19 70:15 106:19	term 4:5 52:1,3 62:9	57:5 80:16 83:4	tracking 91:10
17:11,19 26:16	submit 2:23 5:5,7	129:7 164:19	91:1,4 92:2,17 93:1	85:9 87:8,19 88:24	Trade 2:14
Starck's 17:3	159:5	167:23	93:5,7 94:15,18	91:13,13 99:3,5	trailers 28:14
start 16:13 19:8 37:14	submitted 7:11 10:12	sure 3:23,25 4:5,7	105:19 149:4,22	109:1,5 117:1,4	trained 137:4
50:21 51:22 87:9	11:8 12:25 14:17	12:14,14,14 13:1,3	156:3 162:6,7	118:7,9,19 120:23	training 137:9
99:11 117:10	15:23 18:5,13 24:8	15:11 18:1,4 19:11	terminated 9:20 13:16	124:4,9 126:14	Trans 97:13
139:13 159:4	62:4,8 88:22,24	34:17 45:6 59:13	19:13 36:2	127:24 132:1,19	transaction 15:2
160:13	89:23 90:10 101:14	87:7 169:6	termination 13:21	135:8 136:2,18	transcript 1:23 1:2
started 10:9 13:2,3	102:15 103:2 108:5	surficial 111:9	35:23	137:9,10 139:22	17:1
19:1 38:3 50:23	110:7 112:16	suspected 7:9	terminology 155:23	141:4 145:7 146:14	transition 127:25
81:24 86:3,18 89:2	115:14 118:19	suspending 71:12	terms 6:1 16:25 80:14	157:21,22 160:11	translation 37:14,15
91:15 143:1 159:25	122:24 132:11	swear 29:19	113:21 117:9 121:2	165:19 168:14,22	37:17 38:18,19
163:3	150:21,23,25	switch 116:20	129:5 152:25 156:6	third 2:10 26:8 30:11	48:20
starting 140:5	151:11 155:3	system 85:18,20,24	157:4	30:12,15 52:20 59:4	transmittal 22:6
starts 79:6	156:19	130:21 132:3,9,24	testified 39:20 41:12	79:5 138:18	102:14
state 88:8 126:7	submitting 12:2 15:19	143:8,20,20,21,23	testify 7:3,15,23 69:21	THORNTON 2:13	transmittals 101:1
160:18	18:10,19 19:13	143:24 144:3,12,13	76:16	though 167:7	transmitted 100:6
stated 99:4 159:8	153:17 157:5	145:6,13	testifying 7:13	thought 3:22 12:5	103:14
statements 6:1,21	subsequent 118:9		testimony 18:10 40:12	19:18 39:16 83:1 108:23 129:8	transport 28:14
7:11,23 13:6 21:2	subsequently 54:12		41:22 42:6,10 50:20		treated 12:19 90:18
21:13,19 27:15 50:1 83:15 88:2 113:2	<b>subset</b> 92:1,11,15 93:2 93:6 94:12	table 39:17 82:17	60:25 64:18,21	141:19 161:16 <b>three</b> 39:6 59:3,6	92:2,15 100:6 157:4 <b>Trevor</b> 1:24
115:5,10 119:16	93:6 94:12 subsidiary 16:18	157:25	68:23 69:1,25 70:2 70:6,22 72:16,19	76:10 77:5 96:7,16	Tribunal 1:22 2:23
150:8	substantially 56:10	tables 60:8	74:9 75:6,11,21	96:23 97:2 98:1,17	3:14 1:8 3:12,12
states 2:11,12,13,14	sub-group 93:21	tagged 34:14	101:25 102:5 132:2	98:19	8:11,14,22,24,25
2:15,16 149:7	succeed 167:6	tags 147:20,24 148:2,7	133:8,20 148:23	through 3:2 4:8 7:25	39:4 44:22 45:9
stating 56:1	successful 115:13	148:13	153:14 166:12	9:25 16:22 30:11,12	57:12 61:16 169:9
stating 50:1 station 46:20,21,25	150:15	take 2:1 14:11 30:25	thank 4:12 9:14 28:17	30:23 34:12 37:1	tried 75:8 115:2,12
47:7,15 48:7 65:7	sued 45:16 79:11	37:4 39:4 49:4 64:8	28:18,20 29:8,21,22	40:17 47:10 79:11	119:11 125:4,21
65:23 66:10,12 69:7	sufficient 15:19 16:10	73:23 74:16,21 75:16 77:20 82:22	31:5,8 44:12 49:18	83:8 107:2 108:10	trouble 10:24
69:8	17:7 18:12 145:8	83:7 91:17 99:16,18	56:21 57:8,12 58:1	108:11 109:6	trucks 35:10
status 14:12 34:4	suggest 121:18 122:9	101:16 109:7	66:4 76:11 80:6,7	115:17,20,21 117:7	true 7:9 19:22 20:5
statute 93:1 95:25	124:3 140:24 141:8	140:14 153:15	81:5,6 82:7 83:20	128:2 129:6 140:17	31:24 65:1 67:8,11
stay 56:20 57:3	160:23	159:7	98:17 99:2,6,10,11	140:23 145:7 153:7	68:18 122:14,21
step 14:11 52:18	suggested 13:25 75:13	taken 5:6 20:8 34:6	99:14 116:22	153:7	123:6 127:10
116:25	154:2	37:21 69:8 83:2	126:21 141:10,11	times 1:2 45:2 46:25	153:22,25 155:1
STEVEN 2:3	suggesting 26:13	100:13,13 102:24	144:15 145:10,12	47:2	158:19 162:18
stick 26:12 94:10	101:20 103:9 124:3	103:5 157:11	169:11,12,18	timing 4:6	163:24
124:17 128:24	125:25 159:22	takes 52:16,16 168:6	theft 65:20	title 62:15 63:4 146:22	TRUMAN 1:11
				146:24	<b>truth</b> 24:5,23 29:19,20
163:8 167:7	summaries 118:3	taking 49:16 161:1	their 1:10 3:11 9:22		
163:8 167:7 <b>still</b> 4:18 7:4 15:25	summarised 88:23	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24	16:21,22 22:19	today 26:9,20 29:9	29:20 81:3,3,4
163:8 167:7 <b>still</b> 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7	95:16 147:4 169:10	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16
163:8 167:7 <b>still</b> 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 <b>trying</b> 7:12 8:23 25:11
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 <b>trying</b> 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summons 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 <b>truthfully</b> 154:11 <b>try</b> 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 <b>trying</b> 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4.14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strongl 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tool 143:14 166:9 tool 34:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18 167:24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervision 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12 43:1,24 65:19 66:5	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20 telling 4:6 24:5 125:5	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18 167:25	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11 totally 167:4	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23 twice 95:8
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18 167:24 subject 1:12,20,24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12 43:1,24 65:19 66:5 66:8	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20 telling 4:6 24:5 125:5 ten 45:1,1 46:25 76:9	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18 167:25 think 6:11 17:24 19:21	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11 totally 167:4 towards 156:25 167:1	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23 twice 95:8 two 1:23 9:7 34:25
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18 167:24 subject 1:12,20,24 97:5	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12 43:1,24 65:19 66:5 66:8 supporting 17:10	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20 telling 4:6 24:5 125:5 ten 45:1,1 46:25 76:9 118:19 142:24 tendered 8:9 tenders 20:14	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18 167:25 think 6:11 17:24 19:21 20:1,2 25:16 28:8	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11 totally 167:4 towards 156:25 167:1 track 37:7	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23 twice 95:8 two 1:23 9:7 34:25 35:2,5 38:1 41:10
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18 167:24 subject 1:12,20,24	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12 43:1,24 65:19 66:5 66:8	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20 telling 4:6 24:5 125:5 ten 45:1,1 46:25 76:9 118:19 142:24 tendered 8:9	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18 167:25 think 6:11 17:24 19:21	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11 totally 167:4 towards 156:25 167:1	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23 twice 95:8 two 1:23 9:7 34:25
163:8 167:7 still 4:18 7:4 15:25 16:4,14 17:2 21:25 54:22 58:17 67:24 76:23 96:19 125:21 126:9 127:19 155:22 157:24 stole 65:6,13 69:6 stolen 17:14,15 64:17 68:20,25 69:4 Stone 2:6,6 stood 143:15 144:1,7 147:15 stop 19:9 57:14,16 72:2 73:13 142:19 stopped 79:24 storage 129:16 stored 130:12,21 stricken 1:24 strike 7:12 16:12 67:9 strong 10:18 strongly 42:20 studies 98:15 158:15 study 159:6 166:18 167:24 subject 1:12,20,24 97:5	summarised 88:23 summarises 103:22 summary 91:10 104:7 117:22 144:5 Summer 1:2 summoned 46:19 66:11 summons 71:16 summonsed 67:2 superficial 111:9 superiors 85:5 165:4 165:22 supervision 75:12 137:19 supervisor 86:19 87:13 99:21,22 133:6 165:11 166:8 supervisors 85:5 101:4 102:16 103:6 supplemental 11:20 23:10 24:9 30:1 Supply 34:15 46:2 support 2:21 39:12 43:1,24 65:19 66:5 66:8 supporting 17:10	talk 47:2 58:12 100:24 114:17 talked 36:15 106:24 107:2 120:12 137:19 141:22 talking 5:23 16:4 19:8 19:10 35:20 62:22 84:25 92:23 95:3,21 137:21 143:4 154:2 task 136:3 team 128:19,23 129:22 131:10,21 131:23 136:3 technical 9:1 141:25 technology 108:25 telephonic 17:17 tell 22:7 42:16 44:13 48:18 64:4 99:24 110:15 116:25 118:10,21 134:1 156:9 167:8,20 telling 4:6 24:5 125:5 ten 45:1,1 46:25 76:9 118:19 142:24 tendered 8:9 tenders 20:14	16:21,22 22:19 35:23 50:25 51:7 52:4 56:18 60:4 62:7 73:25 77:9 78:3 83:15 89:15,18 89:24 93:9 101:4 105:16 114:22 132:23 143:12 144:1,23 148:15 149:23,25 150:2,13 156:3 159:6 160:9 163:9 165:3,21,25 166:7 themselves 44:19 74:20 161:17 thieves 69:16 thing 23:13 24:15 63:8 92:18 144:10 165:7 things 8:3 20:6 21:7 26:12 28:4 35:4 70:2 117:2 124:25 129:7 147:14 148:19 151:18 167:25 think 6:11 17:24 19:21 20:1,2 25:16 28:8	95:16 147:4 169:10 together 20:7 55:16 72:21,23 85:17,20 119:21 134:19 137:9 144:6 toggle 139:10 told 2:10,24,25 15:24 17:19 18:11 60:12 64:14 70:3 71:20 75:6 77:13 78:10 85:10 86:1,2,16 138:2 152:21 153:8 164:20 165:4 tomorrow 169:3,15,19 TOMSON 2:6 tool 143:14 166:9 tools 129:11 top 134:7,11,12,16,21 topic 37:25 124:17,19 total 50:18 91:25 108:16 109:20 164:11 totally 167:4 towards 156:25 167:1 track 37:7	29:20 81:3,3,4 123:7 124:10,16 truthfully 154:11 try 2:23 10:3 19:6,9 37:17 83:7 95:11,18 96:5 109:14 116:24 154:17 trying 7:12 8:23 25:11 27:2,3 36:18 48:21 75:18 76:23 94:4 95:7,19 96:13 107:23 115:23 116:15 119:13 124:18 125:14 127:8 128:25 130:18 137:14 167:12 168:1 turn 1:10 32:19 41:2 63:2 68:15 72:16 73:22 74:5 117:7 131:16 161:18 turned 3:1 13:20 turning 71:6 75:23 twice 95:8 two 1:23 9:7 34:25 35:2,5 38:1 41:10

Day 6 Treating on Jurisdiction and the Metris Testib Case 110. 7 Meb/10/21					
44.15 45:22 22 24	ungtugam 100:25	wo gog 10,00 04 10,10	120,10 141.0	worked 0.05 00:15 17	<b>\$2</b> 162.14
44:15 45:22,22,24	upstream 100:25	wages 12:22,24 13:10	138:10 141:8	worked 9:25 22:15,17	<b>\$3</b> 163:14
51:5,16 62:21,24	USD 121:9 163:14	35:23	145:10 151:10	22:24 148:21	<b>\$39</b> 105:3 109:4 110:1
64:15 65:6 67:25	use 11:25 12:1 18:7	wait 144:25	152:2 159:9 160:2	151:15 153:16	<b>\$39.5</b> 103:24 104:15
68:17 77:5 84:10	51:10 52:1,3 127:12	waiting 6:19 9:5	160:15	workers 35:24 36:22	106:11,17 107:16
107:17 108:14,17	133:12 155:22	144:10	went 3:2 4:8 10:3	55:5 56:2 77:8	108:4,13,24 109:18
109:10,22 110:21	161:22	walk 37:1	24:22 37:2 45:20	working 9:21 21:18	109:20 110:9
110:22 130:20	used 12:24 20:25	walked 75:10	46:21 48:11 70:20	33:16 38:10 50:21	<b>\$40</b> 161:13 162:25
134:15 145:16	27:22 77:7 78:10	want 19:5 24:2 26:13	72:22 77:25 78:2,7	67:25 81:18 100:2,4	163:22 165:20
149:16 153:11	84:4 107:4 110:5	44:2 58:9 59:12	79:11 92:8 100:24	103:23 105:6	<b>\$9.96</b> 121:14
163:8 164:25	114:20 126:24	62:8 64:2 65:2 68:7	115:21 129:17	109:18 125:12	
166:19 167:10	127:24 128:6	70:4 84:16 87:7	139:25 165:4	148:22 154:20,22	0
type 17:16 98:16	135:24 162:5	90:19 92:8 94:6	weren't 7:10,11 13:10	155:1 164:15	<b>0</b> 116:16
111:10	163:17 166:9	96:22 101:20 107:8	65:9 103:12 115:9	works 5:23 6:2 34:2	
témoin 29:12	useful 56:22	116:2 118:16 126:2	western 160:17	world 162:17 167:1	1
	user-friendly 169:1	126:16 129:1	we'll 4:12 57:5 80:16	wouldn't 8:25 21:16	1 3:3 167:6
U	uses 111:3 121:7	131:12,24 134:8,9	80:20 96:15 99:5	27:12 75:10 110:12	1.00 29:23
ultimate 143:10	122:10 151:24	134:14 148:8,16	107:6 117:7 144:20	110:15 132:4	
ultimately 109:23,24	153:22	158:16 159:14,15	144:24 145:11	140:15	<b>1.04</b> 31:9
unclear 7:19	using 11:18 12:15	167:20	169:4,18	wound 127:21	<b>1.1</b> 66:16
under 1:1 9:22,25	28:13 35:13 51:6	wanted 3:8 10:18 14:7	we're 1:17,17 6:8 7:22	write 2:23 103:7	<b>10</b> 37:8,20 38:10,16
12:17 27:20 28:1	62:9 70:12 71:11	14:8 49:14 103:10	7:24 8:1 9:6 15:8,15	writing 17:17,18 47:3	39:24 40:1,11,20
31:1 65:4 68:21	72:1 101:25 126:7,9	106:2 112:25	38:6 44:5 45:6 92:9	86:22,23 113:15	42:10 43:25 93:14
69:4 75:12 77:16	127:1,2,3,5 128:5	152:24 153:9	92:23 95:3,21 96:13	written 23:17 34:4	10th 17:11 21:22
96:12 121:6 137:19	132:19,23	164:13	121:2 133:25	43:9 47:25 48:14,19	<b>100</b> 50:2,4 60:13
157:19 158:3	Usually 40:2	wants 124:14 154:13	144:10 168:8	48:22 63:22 83:9	<b>100%</b> 74:14
161:19		wasn't 2:16 4:3,4 5:7	we've 5:2 7:19 27:6	132:9 165:3	<b>100-page</b> 60:15
underhand 20:15	V	5:14,15 9:8 15:1	122:12 144:17	wrong 11:25 135:8	11 45:25
	v 1:17	25:13 46:24 69:15	168:21	wrote 47:23 53:10	11th 59:14
understand 2:10,16	Valley 10:1,8,10 18:6	73:9 89:25 95:7	whatsoever 2:6 46:13	54:18 65:15,17	<b>12</b> 138:17,18 139:17
2:24 22:12 26:13 27:6,6 28:23 30:3	18:20 19:14,20	109:9 111:23,24	while 14:10 33:16	130:14 147:2	146:16 155:18
,		119:16 123:4 131:2	51:1 57:3 65:4	148:25 150:11	<b>12th</b> 60:23
48:3,4,17,24 53:3	value 13:9,12 31:17	131:16 154:6 159:2	68:20 69:4 80:13	164:24 166:3	<b>12.00</b> 169:21
87:11 94:20 96:13	32:6 68:19 69:4,13	160:6	110:8 115:2 126:3	101.21 100.5	<b>12.06</b> 1:3
103:12 106:7 114:4	variations 138:25	WATKINS 2:22	127:10 129:18	Y	<b>12.20</b> 9:12,18
114:5 130:18 132:1	various 47:2 90:23	28:25 57:1,7 80:19	143:5 158:22		<b>12.54</b> 27:18
134:14 138:21	91:20,21 117:13,22	144:22 145:1	white 63:25	Yahoo 126:9,24 127:7	<b>12.59</b> 29:5
145:20	139:25 149:2	way 18:22 25:10 34:2	whole 29:20 50:9 52:6	127:12,19,21,24	<b>13th</b> 10:12 135:10
understanding 6:5	vast 11:10 13:23	50:24 67:10 71:6	56:1 62:3,19 67:1	128:3,11,19,22	136:14 149:15
55:12 89:3 92:10	Vaughn 1:24	83:7 87:25 92:9	81:3 104:6	130:21 132:23	<b>14th</b> 157:18
131:2 136:25 150:9	vehicle 77:24	93:16 112:24	wide 92:7	year 35:6,7 38:6 82:6	<b>15</b> 80:17
understood 4:1,6,16	veracity 25:11	116:25 117:2	willing 74:20 111:16	84:19 88:23,25	<b>15%</b> 73:7
22:14 44:21 45:7	verbal 21:10	124:19 126:15	111:20 125:21	102:16 105:11,22	<b>15-minute</b> 141:9
54:22 58:17 71:6	version 24:17 49:1,3	132:4 135:8,15	wish 8:25 73:24	105:25 106:4,21	<b>158</b> 3:14
94:22 130:2 131:12	83:12 131:5 132:3	137:1 151:19	withdrew 28:21 80:9	117:16 118:4	<b>16.3</b> 53:11 55:7
145:1 154:4 158:5	very 10:18 15:22	164:20 166:20	witnesses 7:24 83:14	years 67:25 68:17	<b>17</b> 50:12,14 65:24
162:21	20:12,12,17,17 24:2	weight 2:6 60:4		86:6 94:12,24 95:1	<b>1930s</b> 159:17
undertake 79:13	28:18,20 47:20	159:10	WOLFENSTEIN 2:19	104:23 105:3,14	<b>1940s</b> 159:24 160:5
140:5	49:16,16 50:3 56:22	weighty 161:23	won 45:2,2,19	106:20,20 108:16	
underway 79:21	57:22 62:8 64:2	welcome 83:21	wonder 4:22 144:18	114:22 118:8,18,19	2
unfair 160:23 161:5	80:7 91:12 103:22	well 3:8 4:12 6:8 8:4	word 158:20	120:5 121:10 126:6	<b>2</b> 39:10 103:20 117:4,7
unfortunately 91:6	129:23 135:13	11:21 14:10 16:8,12	words 1:24 79:9,18	142:15 153:21	119:19
115:3,7,12,22	145:10,10 148:6	17:23 21:24 22:7	95:5 144:7 160:24	162:25 164:25	2nd 53:24 149:12,14
119:11 163:5	153:20 159:20	25:17 32:14,18	work 5:13 16:1,5 19:2	166:19 167:4,10	<b>2.00</b> 57:9
167:24 168:14	161:5,15,16 162:24	33:23 34:8,25 35:22	20:7 21:12 27:23,25	years/eleven 118:19	<b>2.04</b> 57:11
unintentionally 31:13	166:16 169:18	36:11,21,23,25	27:25 28:3,6,10		<b>2.06</b> 58:2
141:24	<b>via</b> 1:5			Z	<b>2.30</b> 57:22
United 2:11,12,13,14	Video 1:5	37:24 38:6 39:1	30:15 33:12 35:19	Zarnacks 74:15,19,22	<b>2.35</b> 58:4
2:15,16	view 1:15 2:4 94:11,24	40:3,25 41:17 42:2	50:3 51:8 52:5,15 69:9 70:5 77:11,11	74:22	<b>20</b> 53:8,9 54:16 58:8
unlawful 35:23	visited 111:10	43:6,17 44:3,25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	zero 20:18 142:15	58:10 66:4,4 126:6
unless 45:16	visiting 157:14	45:12,16,17 46:18	78:17 81:9 88:12	<b>Zoom</b> 1:5 4:9	2004/2005/2006 93:8
unpaid 12:22	vis-à-vis 71:13	46:24 47:9 48:25 49:16 57:22 63:8	89:2 98:9,10 99:17	Zuzana 30:8,9 32:20	<b>2005</b> 92:6 93:23
until 39:7 50:22 56:14	volume 105:2		111:5,8,9,16,23	75:3	<b>2005/2006</b> 91:15 92:24
57:22 59:21 99:8	voluntarily 39:1 125:3	65:11,15 67:16,24	112:2,3,9,11,14		<b>2006</b> 93:23 105:15,20
126:7 144:18	voted 103:1	68:12 69:6 72:20	114:13 117:1	\$	107:24 108:5
169:14,18,21	Vu 79:6	73:9,13 75:9 76:3	126:23 127:1 128:7	<b>\$100,000</b> 27:10,21	109:21 110:3,5,7
untrue 61:18	vulnerability 14:1,4	78:9,23 82:19 86:9	129:18 135:24	28:10,11	159:24 160:3,11,12
update 140:5,10		88:14,16 99:13	136:1,25 140:10	<b>\$12</b> 109:2,2,3	163:8,16,21,23
updated 121:7	W	100:11 104:5 110:2	156:22 167:20,22	, <del></del>	
I .	Ī	i	i		

Monday, 28 June 2021

	T	T	T	ı	1
164:3,8,14,18,22	157:22,23	6			
166:6,10 167:15	<b>2016</b> 96:9,16,20,22				
1		<b>6</b> 1:4 99:13 117:11,21			
168:11	97:1,6 98:3 125:13	146:5 149:2			
<b>2007</b> 103:24 104:16	126:8,8,17	<b>6.05</b> 141:9			
105:16,17	<b>2017</b> 88:24 114:13,16	<b>6.07</b> 141:14			
<b>2008</b> 93:1,3,5,16 94:1	114:22 116:13	<b>6.13</b> 145:2			
94:14,19,19 95:15	117:14 118:14,25	<b>6.15</b> 145:4			
95:16,16,25 96:1,10	121:11,17	<b>6.3</b> 117:21			
96:12 136:8	<b>2021</b> 1:7 1:1	<b>6.4</b> 117:21			
<b>2009</b> 150:19	<b>21</b> 59:11,11 62:22				
<b>2009/2010</b> 93:23	<b>22</b> 60:21,22 62:23	<b>6.5</b> 117:21			
<b>2010</b> 14:17,20 15:4,13	<b>23</b> 64:11,12	<b>6.6</b> 117:21			
	<b>23.1</b> 23:11,14	<b>66</b> 69:19			
17:11 18:8 19:16	T				
21:8 22:22 26:6,14	<b>25</b> 53:18 54:20 55:3,9	7			
84:19 85:3 86:2,11	55:19 58:14,22 66:9	<b>7</b> 66:19 117:12,25			
86:16 88:17,20 89:4	<b>25th</b> 69:21 75:7,24	146:6 163:15			
89:12,15,19 90:4,9	<b>26</b> 38:2 50:16 51:3	168:22			
90:18 91:4 93:10	52:25 66:2,6,18	<b>7.00</b> 80:18			l
95:16 104:6 105:18	67:9 68:5,9				l
106:23 107:1,3	<b>27</b> 3:6 69:18,20	<b>7.01</b> 169:20			
111:1,15,21 116:10	<b>28</b> 35:22,25 38:3	<b>77</b> 76:12			
118:12 119:8,14	28th 1:7 1:1	<b>78</b> 3:10			
138:20 149:8,23	<b>29</b> 3:7,8				
150:13,18,24,25	<b>29th</b> 149:8 150:18,24	8			
152:7 153:17,20,24	153:17,24 154:24	<b>8</b> 29:25 104:9 168:22			
154:24 157:23	155.17,27 157.27	8th 122:5 124:13			
		<b>8.15</b> 38:21			
163:13	3	<b>80</b> 3:11			
<b>2010's</b> 106:9	<b>3</b> 103:21 104:2 110:21	<b>81</b> 3:12			l
<b>2011</b> 9:20 10:12 12:21	117:4,7,19 145:22				l
14:12 18:13,19	146:3	<b>82</b> 3:13			l
19:19 81:16,25 89:1	<b>3.00</b> 57:17	<b>85,761,624</b> 50:19			l
103:24 104:16,18	<b>3.1</b> 158:3	<b>89</b> 134:6			l
105:17,21 107:5	<b>3.2</b> 161:18				l
108:12,23 113:5,8	<b>3.2.1</b> 110:21,25	9			l
117:23 118:4 119:4	<b>3.2.2</b> 110:22	<b>9</b> 3:4,5 53:10 83:23			l
119:10 135:10	<b>3.24</b> 78:19	84:10 120:11			l
136:13,14,17		9th 55:24 58:11			l
149:12	<b>3.30</b> 57:14	<b>9,960,000</b> 114:15			l
<b>2012</b> 84:18 85:3 87:22	<b>3.31</b> 80:22 81:7	121:9			l
	<b>3.33</b> 82:11				l
88:3,23 89:10,13,19	<b>30</b> 142:15	9-point-something			l
90:4 101:9,12 114:2	<b>30%</b> 104:3 108:19,20	120:12			l
114:13,15,22	108:22 109:1,4,19	<b>9.96</b> 118:13 120:11,20			l
116:13 117:14	110:14	9.960.000USD 120:4			
118:14,25 121:11	<b>31</b> 3:9	<b>93</b> 120:22 121:5			
121:17,24 122:5	<b>33</b> 11:22	<b>98</b> 134:6			
123:4 124:13	<b>35</b> 109:4				
128:17 131:19	<b>39</b> 110:1				
132:10,21 133:14	<b>39.5</b> 110:16				
149:14,15 151:9	110.10				
157:18 160:22	4				
164:25 165:7,22					l l
166:3	<b>4</b> 2:6,6 80:20 104:2				
<b>2013</b> 38:7,7,8 84:12	114:12,13 117:7,7				
	121:6 146:4 149:4				
101:6,11,16 102:16	<b>4.04</b> 99:7				
122:23 123:5,9	<b>4.15</b> 80:17				
126:20,23 127:17	<b>4.34</b> 99:8				
152:4,6 153:6 155:4	<b>4.35</b> 99:9				
<b>2014</b> 50:15 53:10,24	<b>40</b> 120:15,16 163:2,3				
55:13,17,24 58:11	167:4				
59:14 60:23 75:7,24	<b>40s</b> 159:17				l l
96:10 139:17 140:4	TUB 137.17				
140:9 146:14,16,25					
147:7,14,16,17,17	5				l l
147:19,22 153:22	<b>5</b> 105:11 120:5 121:10				
154:23 155:11,18	146:5				
<b>2015</b> 76:20,23 96:9	<b>5.50</b> 141:12				
117:23 118:4 119:4					
117.43 110.4 117.4					