

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

Case No. ARB/21/51

The International Dispute
Resolution Centre (IDRC)
1 Paternoster Lane
LONDON, EC4M 7BQ

Day 5
Hearing on the Merits

Tuesday, 6th February 2024

Before:

PROFESSOR GABRIELLE KAUFMANN-KOHLER
MR STEPHEN L DRYMER
PROFESSOR PHILIPPE SANDS

DISCOVERY GLOBAL LLC

Claimant

-v-

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

Respondent

Secretary to the Tribunal: JARA MÍNGUEZ ALMEIDA

Assistant to the Tribunal: MAGNUS JESKO LANGER

Transcript produced by Anne-Marie Stallard
and Emma Lovell

APPEARANCES

FOR CLAIMANT

MARK TUSHINGHAM, Twenty Essex
NEIL NEWING, Signature Litigation
COLIN GRECH, Signature Litigation
PIETRO GRASSI, Signature Litigation
BEN PHAROAH, Signature Litigation
ALEXANDER FRASER, Party Representative
MICHAEL LEWIS, Party Representative

FOR RESPONDENT

STEPHEN ANWAY, Squire Patton Boggs
ROSTISLAV PEKAR, Squire Patton Boggs
TATIANA PROKOPOVÁ, Squire Patton Boggs
DAVID ALEXANDER, Squire Patton Boggs
JAKUB KAMENICKÝ, Squire Patton Boggs
DOUGLAS PILAWA, Squire Patton Boggs
CHRISTINA LUO, Squire Patton Boggs
JULIÁN KUPKA, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic
ZUZANA JEŠKOVÁ, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic
PETRA LEŠOVÁ, Ministry of Finance of the Slovak Republic
CLAIRE JORDAN, SLR Consulting
EWAN WHYTE, SLR Consulting
NICOLE SKAF, Charles River Associates

INDEX

	PAGE
Discussion re procedural matters	1
DR SIMON MOY (called)	3
Presentation by DR MOY	5
Cross-examination by MR PILAWA	15
Tribunal questions	15
Tribunal questions	26
Tribunal questions	34
Tribunal questions	37
Tribunal questions	38
Tribunal questions	42
Re-direct examination by MR NEWING	50
Tribunal questions	51
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	52
MR COLIN HOWARD (called)	56
Presentation by COLIN HOWARD	56
Cross-examination by MR PILAWA	66
Tribunal questions	77
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	83
DR CHRIS LONGMAN (called)	86
Presentation by DR LONGMAN	87
Cross-examination by MR NEWING	97
Tribunal questions	123
Questions from THE TRIBUNAL	141

DR TIAGO DUARTE-SILVA (called)144

MR RICHARD ACKLAM (called)144

 Presentation by DR DUARTE-SILVA and146

MR ACKLAM

 Cross-examination by MR NEWING157

 Tribunal questions175

 Tribunal questions178

 Tribunal questions179

 Tribunal questions185

 Tribunal questions205

 Re-direct examination by MR PILAWA207

 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL207

Discussion re procedural matters208

<p>08:59 1 Tuesday, 6 February 2024 2 (8.59 am) 3 THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everyone. It's not yet 4 exactly 9 o'clock but I see everyone is ready, so 5 I think we can start. 6 Mr Moy is ready as well. 7 DR MOY: Yes. 8 THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, sir. 9 DR MOY: Good morning. 10 MR TUSHINGHAM: Madam President, just before we begin, 11 I wonder whether we might just have a very brief 12 discussion. We've been in discussion with our friends 13 on the other side about a few logistical matters 14 concerning post-hearing briefs and the oral closings. 15 I'm entirely in your hands as to whether you would like 16 very briefly to discuss that now or whether you would 17 prefer to discuss that later in the day. 18 THE PRESIDENT: Well, maybe you can address it now, briefly, 19 so we hear what you have to tell us and then during the 20 lunch break, for instance, we can discuss it within the 21 Tribunal and revert to you later. That makes sense. 22 MR TUSHINGHAM: Of course. Stephen. 23 MR ANWAY: Members of the Tribunal, we recognise it's a bit 24 early to be discussing this, given that we still have 25 another day and a half of hearing time left, but we have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>09:01 1 submitted within 30 days of that preceding event. 2 MR DRYMER: That means 90 days? 3 MR ANWAY: That's correct. The principal reason is to know 4 the time charged for all of those activities. It takes 5 30 days, just given the invoicing systems. 6 MR TUSHINGHAM: And that's agreed by the Claimant. 7 THE PRESIDENT: That's agreed. 8 MR TUSHINGHAM: Yes. 9 THE PRESIDENT: Fine, so we'll discuss it within the 10 Tribunal over lunch. I don't expect any particular 11 difficulties, but let's discuss it and then revert to 12 you. Thanks for having done the work -- 13 MR TUSHINGHAM: Thank you. 14 THE PRESIDENT: -- for us. 15 Can I start with Dr Moy now? 16 MR NEWING: Yes, Madam President. 17 (9.02 am) 18 DR SIMON MOY (called) 19 THE PRESIDENT: Good. 20 You are Simon Moy? 21 DR MOY: Yes, I am. 22 THE PRESIDENT: From Rockflow Resources. 23 DR MOY: I was formerly at Rockflow. 24 THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes, we heard that you had changed firm. 25 Can you specify what your new firm is?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>09:00 1 reached agreement on I think all of the post-hearing 2 matters and we thought it may be beneficial for the 3 Tribunal to have the benefit of our thinking before 4 perhaps it starts discussing these matters itself. 5 Number one, the parties have agreed not to do 6 post-hearing briefs. That's principally for two 7 reasons. One, it's very clear to I think everyone in 8 the room that all three members of the Tribunal are 9 extremely on top of the file. And number two, I think 10 both sides are trying to be cost-sensitive. So for that 11 reason the parties have agreed not to do post-hearing 12 briefs, subject, of course, to the Tribunal's views. 13 THE PRESIDENT: No, you don't have to explain this further, 14 because that would have been our proposal as well. 15 MR ANWAY: Excellent. Number two, that the parties do 16 corrections to the transcripts within 30 days of 17 receiving the last audio file, since the audio file, 18 given all the translations, is important to the 19 corrections to the transcript. 20 Number three, that the parties have 30 days to mark 21 "redactions" to the video, if any, and consistent with 22 the Tribunal's procedural orders, the other side would 23 have 30 days to respond to the comments from the first 24 party on those issues. 25 And finally, number four, that costs submissions be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>09:02 1 DR MOY: Xodus. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Good, thank you. When did you change? 3 DR MOY: December 2022. 4 THE PRESIDENT: 2023? 5 DR MOY: No, 2022. 6 THE PRESIDENT: No, the reason I'm saying 2023 is because 7 I don't think it was signalled in your second report 8 that is from 15 September 2023. But maybe I missed it. 9 DR MOY: Yes, I've been there over a year. 10 THE PRESIDENT: Good. 11 You have provided us with two expert reports, the 12 first one of 30 September 2022 and the second one of 13 15 September 2023. 14 DR MOY: Yes. 15 THE PRESIDENT: You are heard as an expert. As an expert 16 you are under a duty to make only statements in 17 accordance with your sincere belief. Can you please 18 read the expert declaration. 19 DR MOY: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience 20 that my statements will be in accordance with my sincere 21 belief. 22 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. So we have received your 23 presentation, and you know that you have 15 minutes, and 24 you know that 15 minutes is short. 25 DR MOY: Yes, thank you very much.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>09:04 1 May I start, Madam President. 2 (9.04 am) 3 Presentation by DR MOY 4 DR MOY: Hello, Madam President, and members of the 5 Tribunal. I would like to first of all give a little 6 bit of information about myself. My name is Simon Moy, 7 I'm a reservoir engineer with 27 years' upstream 8 experience. I've been an integral part of subsurface 9 teams responsible for onshore developments in 10 Turkmenistan and offshore developments in Trinidad. 11 I've been responsible for the classification and 12 categorisation of resources for two oil company IPOs, 13 Burren Energy and Bayfield Energy. I've undertaken due 14 diligence on projects worldwide, in Africa, Asia, and 15 Europe. I'm a member of the SPEE, the Society of 16 Petroleum Evaluation Engineers. It's a society which 17 promotes the high standards in resource and reservoir 18 evaluations. 19 I'd like to follow on briefly from my colleague 20 Mr Atkinson's presentation, and make an important point. 21 The GCOS, the geological chance of success, factors in 22 chance of discovery. It takes into account reservoir 23 presence and quality, trap and seal, the presence of 24 source rocks to generate oil and gas. All of these are 25 present in the Slovakian licence areas. And please bear</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>09:07 1 once they've been developed. These depend on three 2 interacting elements: reservoir, well and surface, which 3 are defined using material balance, IPR curves, and 4 tubing curves. These interact via pressure, fluid 5 properties, permeability, well configuration, and 6 together they determine flow rates and ultimate 7 recoveries. Each of these three elements are described 8 in detail in my first and second reports. The methods 9 I've used are industry standard. 10 Of these three I'm going to focus on the material 11 balance method and its applicability to the Slovakian 12 prospects. 13 (Slide 5) So the material balance method is used 14 across an extremely wide range of reservoir types for 15 both oil and gas. It can be used for reservoirs under 16 a range of drive mechanisms, including solution gas, gas 17 cap, aquifer, and compaction drives, and it can be used 18 in low permeability reservoirs. 19 The left-hand example on the screen is taken from 20 Dr Longman's reports. That's an extreme example, and in 21 fact represents 12 separate fields. In fact, material 22 balance could be used on each of those separately. 23 A more realistic configuration is the generic 24 example on the right-hand side of the slide, which 25 includes both sealing and non-sealing faults. The oil</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>09:05 1 in mind that two historical wells blew out due to the 2 presence of oil and gas. 3 So in this short presentation I'm going to go 4 through the key elements of my work and methodology, and 5 there's four main elements: production profiles, 6 benchmarking, development plans, and the development 7 schedule. 8 (Slide 3) My starting point has been Mr Howard's 9 calculation of the P50 discovered volumes. This has 10 been derived from a rigorous industry-standard method to 11 determine which of the prospects would be discovered 12 following an exploration campaign. 13 I've generated production profiles for each prospect 14 based on sound reservoir engineering principles. 15 Importantly, these calculations have used property 16 values, such as for oil and reservoir permeability, 17 et cetera, taken from Slovakian data. Benchmarking has 18 been done for both gas and oil by comparison with Polish 19 Carpathian examples, including the PGNiG data kindly 20 supplied by Dr Longman. 21 High-level development schemes and schedules 22 appropriate for the size and type of these discoveries 23 is also presented. (Pause) 24 (Slide 4) So, once prospects have been identified, 25 I've calculated the production that would be expected</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>09:09 1 here, which is the shaded area, is in pressure 2 equilibrium and has a single oil water contact. 3 Production causes the pressure to decline, and different 4 fault blocks may show pressure declining at different 5 rates. However, what's important is that using the 6 correct averaging method, one can derive 7 a representative average reservoir pressure, which can 8 then be input into a material balance calculation. 9 For the Slovakian prospects, the pressures 10 calculated from the material balance method represent 11 just such an average reservoir pressure. 12 So, what is observed in the Polish Carpathian 13 fields. So the Ceranka report, Exhibit AA-11, contains 14 a number of cross-sections showing oil distributions. 15 (Slide 6) Now, as can be seen in the above slide, in 16 the cross-sections shown, despite extreme folding and 17 possible internal faulting, continuous distributions of 18 oil are apparent -- these are shown as the dark areas in 19 each -- with a single oil contact, oil water contact, 20 and a single depth. The presence and distribution of 21 oil is confirmed through multiple penetrating wells. 22 The oil distributions shown in the cross-sections 23 indicate that they are in pressure equilibrium. 24 Depletion resulting from production may result in 25 a range of pressures across the wells and fault blocks,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>09:10 1 but a representative average reservoir pressure would 2 still be definable. All of these examples could be 3 analysed using the material balance method. 4 Oil discoveries in Slovakia would be similar in 5 structure and would show similar distributions of oil. 6 They too could be analysed using the material balance 7 method. 8 (Slide 7) So turning to the issue of benchmarking. 9 Of the eight developed prospects, five are gas. 10 I undertook rigorous benchmarking of well and field 11 performance against Polish Carpathian fields, including 12 cumulative gas produced per well. Their data was 13 supplied in my exhibits, SM-51 to SM-54. 14 As can be seen from the plots, the modelled gas 15 prospects are comparable with the two Polish gas fields 16 which are highlighted. Average peak rates and 17 cumulative volume per well cover similar ranges. 18 A description of these plots is given in my second 19 report. 20 (Slide 8) Let's examine the oil benchmarking. The 21 plot shows the historic volume of oil produced per field 22 in the Polish Carpathians. Now, please bear in mind 23 that this is the result of 150 years of oil exploration 24 and development. Many of these fields were discovered 25 through drilling of surface features and oil seeps. In</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>09:13 1 to roughly 2,000. My demonstrative exhibit, CD-8, 2 graphically presents the depth and age distribution of 3 these 2,000 entries. 4 (Slide 10) The plots shown on the screen at the 5 moment have been taken from CD-8. On the left-hand side 6 the PGNiG data from the Polish Carpathians -- that's the 7 top plot -- is compared with historic production from 8 the same region -- bottom plot -- and powerful insights 9 can be obtained. The top plot shows depth versus date 10 for each of the 2,000 wells. The bottom plot shows the 11 oil production, with a rapid increase in gas production 12 post 1945, and that's shown in red. 13 What can be inferred? Well, most of the oil 14 production, that's 87%, has come from the pre-1946 15 wells, and most of these are less than 1,000 metres. 16 Gas production is from later, deeper wells. 17 Now, taking those 977 pre-1946 wells and plotting 18 their depths on the right-hand side shows that, in fact, 19 96% are less than 800 metres, and over half are less 20 than 400 metres. These two depths are equivalent to my 21 group 1b and 2b oil prospects shown in my second report 22 at table 3-4. 23 So a valid comparison of my productivity per well 24 has to be between prospects in group 1b and 2b only. 25 Other prospects in group 3b and 9b are deeper and would</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>09:12 1 fact, these are some of the oldest fields that I've ever 2 looked at. A description of this plot is given in my 3 second report. 4 Now, looking at the right-hand side of the plot, 5 i.e. fields having produced less than 500,000 barrels, 6 these would be of a size too small to be identifiable 7 from the available Slovakian seismic data, although it's 8 likely that structures of this size may exist in 9 Slovakia. 10 Now, looking at the larger fields on the left-hand 11 side of the plot, as can be seen, the Slovak oil 12 prospects, which I've marked in yellow and purple, are 13 of a size comparable with those Polish Carpathian 14 fields. 15 In addition, where data are available, recovery 16 factors have been calculated, and one can see that these 17 bracket the range I've calculated for the developed 18 Slovakian oil prospects. In fact, Polish fields have 19 slightly higher recoveries. 20 (Slide 9) Looking at the PGNiG data supplied by 21 Dr Longman, a simple verification process revealed that 22 2,000, roughly 2,000 were inappropriate mainly because 23 the data indicated that they were drilled into 24 stratigraphic intervals which were too deep. This QC 25 process reduced the number of entries from about 4,000</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>09:15 1 therefore have much higher pressures and would produce 2 at a higher rate. 3 (Slide 11) So let's recap. There are 977 pre-1946 4 wells, which produced 87% of the historic Carpathian oil 5 production, and that's 71.5 MMstb. That works out at 6 an average of 73 Mstb/well. 7 Now, considering that 90% of the wells were drilled 8 before 1930, and that peak oil production occurred in 9 1910, that's from wells drilled at or before that date, 10 most of the production would have been from very shallow 11 wells. 12 A reasonable comparison could be made with my 13 estimate of 143 to 220,000 barrels per well for group 1b 14 and group 2b, taking into account that these wells would 15 be drilled using modern drilling equipment and 16 techniques, minimising wellbore formation damage and 17 maximising production. 18 With this understanding, a x2 and x3 uplift over 19 pre-1946 well performance is reasonable. 20 (Slide 12) So now let's move on to the development 21 scheme. The table above on the screen at the moment is 22 taken from my CD-9 demonstrative exhibit. The first 23 point to make is that this is not a single development: 24 this represents activities spread over six years which 25 results in the development of three oil discoveries and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

09:16 1 five gas discoveries.
 2 Secondly, please examine the depths of these wells:
 3 the vast majority are less than 820 metres. From my
 4 onshore experience, wells of this type can be drilled
 5 with a simple rig, completed, and hooked up in less than
 6 14 days.
 7 Please also look at the year 2021, the busiest year
 8 for drilling. Of the 45 wells required, 43 are less
 9 than 770 metres. From a drilling point of view, all of
 10 the above is doable. The majority of these prospects
 11 are shallow, they can be drilled quickly and developed
 12 using standard oilfield equipment.
 13 I'd like to present a couple of European examples
 14 which illustrate the onshore oilfields similar to those
 15 described in my report that are currently being
 16 developed.
 17 (Slide 13) The first example is the Anshof field in
 18 Austria. It's presented here as an example of
 19 a European onshore discovery which was rapidly developed
 20 and produced in short timeframe, including the
 21 environmental permitting, using many of the techniques
 22 I have mentioned in my development scheme. If the
 23 Tribunal is interested, there is a very nice online
 24 article in NS Energy.
 25 The associated gas production would still need to be

Page 13

09:19 1 scheme and timescales reflect those observed in other
 2 onshore European developments, and also reflect personal
 3 experience.
 4 Thank you very much.
 5 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 6 Do I give the floor to Mr Pilawa?
 7 MR PILAWA: Yes.
 8 THE PRESIDENT: Yes please.
 9 (9.19 am)
 10 Cross-examination by MR PILAWA
 11 Q. Thank you very much.
 12 Good morning, Dr Moy.
 13 A. Good morning.
 14 Q. I'm Douglas Pilawa and I will be asking a few questions
 15 today.
 16 If we can keep this presentation up for just
 17 a moment, and if we can go back a slide.
 18 Dr Moy, was this information in either one of your
 19 expert reports?
 20 A. No, it wasn't.
 21 Q. Okay. I don't need the presentation up anymore.
 22 MR DRYMER: And what about the article that you mentioned.
 23 I didn't note the name. Is that referenced in any of
 24 your reports?
 25 A. No, they're not.

Page 15

09:17 1 exported or burnt for power, and although it's not clear
 2 from the article what the solution to this has been, the
 3 issue has clearly been resolved with little fuss and in
 4 short timeframe.
 5 The second example is Romanian, from an online
 6 article in the Oil & Gas Journal. Again, a recent
 7 discovery made by OMV --
 8 THE PRESIDENT: Dr Moy, I'm sorry for interrupting.
 9 I'm told there is one minute left, or one minute over.
 10 MS MINGUEZ ALMEIDA: One minute left.
 11 DR MOY: That's fine, I've got one more slide.
 12 Again, a recent discovery made by OMV of multiple
 13 fields, they are presented here as they are of a size
 14 which is comparable to the Slovakia prospects. In fact,
 15 two are twice the size of the largest prospects.
 16 Clearly, onshore oil drilling and development is alive
 17 and well.
 18 So in conclusion (Slide 14) I've used industry
 19 standard methodologies resulting in robust subsurface
 20 models and production profiles. I've shown the material
 21 balance method to be applicable to Polish fields and
 22 it's appropriate for Slovakian discoveries. I've
 23 undertaken rigorous benchmarking for both oil and gas
 24 and have shown comparable performance between Polish
 25 fields and Slovakian discoveries, and my development

Page 14

09:20 1 MR DRYMER: Thank you. I didn't remember it.
 2 MR PILAWA: Can you tell me your familiarity with the Slovak
 3 oil and gas regulatory framework?
 4 A. I'm not familiar with it, no.
 5 Q. Generally speaking, are you aware of the types of
 6 permits or other authorisations that an oil and gas
 7 company needs to secure for exploration or a development
 8 project in Slovakia?
 9 A. If it were specific to Slovakia, no. But the
 10 generalities and general regulations, yes, they're
 11 probably very similar. But I'm not familiar with the
 12 details of regulations in Slovakia.
 13 Q. Okay. And I think generally speaking, one of these
 14 I think you might be familiar with, but you're generally
 15 familiar with an EIA, an environmental impact
 16 assessment?
 17 A. That's correct, yes.
 18 Q. Okay. Are you aware that in Slovakia for any oil or gas
 19 producing well a preliminary EIA is required?
 20 A. Yes, I've heard that, yes.
 21 Q. As part of your preparation for your expert reports, did
 22 you undertake any geographical analysis of the
 23 1,200 square kilometres of the licence areas?
 24 A. I'm not quite sure that I understand your question.
 25 Q. Okay. Did you study the terrain at all?

Page 16

09:21 1 A. Only from what I've seen from maps.
 2 Q. Okay. If we could start at paragraph 8 and 9 of your
 3 first expert report, this is on page 5. Do you have it
 4 in front of you?
 5 A. Sorry.
 6 Q. I wasn't sure if you were looking at the screen or ...
 7 A. No, I'm ready, sorry about that.
 8 Q. Just to follow on and understand where your expert
 9 report lies in the three, in paragraph 8 you state that
 10 the first question you were asked to address was to:
 11 "Identify the likely volume of hydrocarbons which
 12 hypothetically could be produced from the prospects in
 13 the licence areas should they contain hydrocarbons."
 14 A. That's correct, yes.
 15 Q. Thank you. And I understand really the -- what you're
 16 trying to do here is Mr Atkinson has developed his PIIP
 17 estimations, which is amounts of oil and gas that might
 18 be in the ground.
 19 A. Might be, yes.
 20 Q. And so your analysis is, if there actually is oil or
 21 gas, then you are calculating the amount that might be
 22 produced from those amounts?
 23 A. It's -- the whole process is -- we have a selection of
 24 structures that have been mapped, and we have
 25 a selection of their relative in-place volumes. And the

Page 17

09:23 1 statistical process that's gone through allows a P50
 2 discoverable volume to be estimated. So that is, if you
 3 were to go out and drill that licence area in the way
 4 that's been described, what is the P50 chance, or what
 5 volume would you get from that process.
 6 And so -- and also what selection of prospects are
 7 you likely to find that are filled with hydrocarbons,
 8 either oil or gas. That process is described also in
 9 one of the papers that I present in my second report.
 10 Q. But really what I'm trying to -- or what I'm wrestling
 11 with is the uncertainty in this analysis.
 12 A. That's dealt with through the statistical process that
 13 we've undertaken, which is rigorous, to give you -- it
 14 is an estimate. It's P50 of the likely volumes you're
 15 going to discover if you undertook a drilling campaign.
 16 Q. The likely volumes that you will discover if there is
 17 oil or gas at each one of these prospects; right?
 18 A. There won't be oil and gas at each one because you're
 19 drilling the 40 prospects. But it's telling you what
 20 you are likely to discover if you were drill those
 21 40 exploration wells, on those 40 structures that
 22 Mr Atkinson has identified from the seismic.
 23 Q. And if we can go down to your next paragraph:
 24 "Separately for both oil and gas ..."
 25 You were asked to:

Page 18

09:25 1 "... generate representative most-likely production
 2 profiles for the prospects in the licence areas and
 3 outline a feasible development scheme."
 4 Correct?
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. And that development scheme assumes that exploration
 7 drilling occurs in the first instance; right?
 8 A. Well, you would have to discover, yes, oil and gas first
 9 through drilling.
 10 Q. And your model assumes that Discovery Global would drill
 11 an exploration well at all 40 prospects that Mr Atkinson
 12 identified; right?
 13 A. That's the -- yes, that's over two years.
 14 Q. Yes. And I understand that the way that the three
 15 reports interact with one another is that Mr Howard's
 16 decision-tree modelling produced successful oil and gas
 17 prospects; is that fair?
 18 A. Not quite. So the decision-tree analysis gives you
 19 an estimate based on -- first of all, you've got each of
 20 the in-place volumes for each of the mapped prospects,
 21 each of which may or may not contain hydrocarbons. You
 22 then have a geological chance of success. Both of those
 23 have been estimated by Mr Atkinson. The decision-tree
 24 process is a robust statistical method that you then run
 25 through to allow you to estimate a P50 likely

Page 19

09:27 1 discoverable volume should you drill all 40 of those.
 2 And then from that volume, that P50 volume -- and that
 3 was calculated for all four of the trends, the
 4 geological trends -- you have a series of scenarios
 5 which represent the successful prospects that would
 6 contain that P50 volume.
 7 So there's a selection for the two gas trends, and
 8 there's a selection of prospects for the two oil trends.
 9 And that's given us the eight prospects which we've
 10 identified that would be either filled with oil or with
 11 gas.
 12 Q. So I was just trying to ultimately get to the oil and
 13 gas prospects that you actually create a development
 14 plan for.
 15 A. Yes, sure.
 16 Q. So, just to come back to that, after this campaign of
 17 drilling 40 wells, the end product are oil prospects and
 18 gas prospects; right?
 19 A. Yes. A list of eight that are considered to be
 20 successful, statistically determined, out of the
 21 drilling of all 40.
 22 Q. And those eight are the ones that you used to create
 23 your development plan; right?
 24 A. Yes. Yes.
 25 Q. And I understand that the development scheme for those

Page 20

09:28 1 eight, that's made on a but-for basis?
2 A. Yes, so it's assuming, yes, exactly.
3 Q. And to understand that but-for basis, it's: but for
4 alleged actions of Slovakia, the development scheme is
5 what would likely have occurred?
6 A. That's correct.
7 Q. Okay.
8 Now, you're aware that the extent of Discovery's
9 drilling programme was to drill three exploration wells,
10 one at Smilno, Krivá Ol'ka, and Ruská Poruba; right?
11 A. Yes.
12 Q. And I believe that Mr Atkinson confirmed yesterday that
13 there is a very low chance of an actual accumulation of
14 oil or gas at Ruská Poruba; do you recall that?
15 A. I vaguely recall that.
16 Q. Okay. And I understand that the development scheme that
17 you've generated, the end product is one large,
18 integrated development plan; is that a fair
19 characterisation?
20 A. No. It's not.
21 Q. Well, maybe this will help. What I'm trying to
22 understand is, for example, at Smilno, the Smilno
23 prospect, your development plan does not say: here's the
24 Smilno prospect, if Discovery would have drilled here
25 and found oil, here's the specific development plan that

Page 21

09:31 1 A. It's the but-for case.
2 Q. It's not based on any fulsome drilling programme; is
3 that fair?
4 A. It's a -- we took into account -- when we did the
5 statistical approach of a drilling campaign with
6 a five-well walkway --
7 Q. Dr Moy, I'm actually just looking for -- there's no
8 document, for example?
9 A. No.
10 Q. It's a drilling programme that you used?
11 A. No, there isn't.
12 Q. Okay. And I want to come back to the Smilno prospect,
13 the gas prospect that we were just talking about.
14 A. Mm-hm.
15 Q. So if we could open up to page 29 of your first expert
16 report.
17 A. Mm-hm.
18 Q. And this is paragraph 115.
19 A. Okay. I have it.
20 Q. Okay. Great.
21 So this is the Smilno gas prospect, and you explain
22 here in paragraph 115 that:
23 "... Discovery ... envisaged a new 15 km
24 pipeline..."
25 From the original well or any subsequent development

Page 23

09:30 1 future production from Smilno would look like, but only
2 at Smilno.
3 A. I believe Smilno is gas, and the reason that --
4 Q. Oh sorry, you're right. Yes.
5 A. Gas and oil have been treated differently. So there are
6 the three successful oil prospects. Each of those is
7 developed separately in terms of sequence.
8 The gas prospects, those where gas discoveries
9 occurred, had to be developed, or would be developed, as
10 a whole. Because of the amount of gas that's in them
11 you would need to ensure you had sufficient time to
12 construct the export line, and that's again described in
13 my second report. And that's why the two are treated
14 slightly differently.
15 Q. Thank you. I understand that they are treated
16 differently. But there's no just standalone Smilno
17 development plan; right?
18 A. No.
19 Q. Okay. And beyond these initial three wells, we don't
20 actually know what Discovery was planning to do, do we?
21 A. I'm not aware of what their ultimate plans would have
22 been.
23 Q. Okay. And so beyond these first three wells, the
24 development plan that you were asked to generate is
25 a hypothetical plan?

Page 22

09:32 1 well at Smilno, and that pipeline would ultimately lead
2 into the Slovakian gas system; is that fair?
3 A. Yes, based on what I have seen of those documents, yes.
4 Q. Yes. And we're going to pull one of those up.
5 So if we can pull up SM-019. This is the document
6 that you cite in that paragraph called the "Smilno
7 feasibility study". It will come up on one of the
8 screens in just a moment.
9 Are you familiar with it? Take as much time as you
10 need.
11 A. Thank you. (Pause)
12 Yes. Yes.
13 Q. And if we can scroll down to the last paragraph on this
14 page. Thank you very much. And if we can see in this
15 last paragraph that very first sentence, it kind of
16 discusses this pipeline in a little more detail, and the
17 part of the route -- or the potential route it could
18 take, saying that:
19 "Distance of extraction network to gas pipeline ...
20 9000 ... Real terrain is complicated (hills, forest,
21 brooks) - therefore proposed track of connection
22 pipeline ..."
23 Et cetera. Do you recall that?
24 A. Yes. Yes.
25 Q. And if we could go to the fourth page to get an image of

Page 24

09:34 1 what this path might have looked like? There we go.
 2 Thank you very much. And just to orient everyone who
 3 might not have seen this document, that bottom yellow
 4 line, that's the Slovakian pipeline system; right?
 5 A. I believe, yes, that's ...
 6 Q. Okay. And the red-dotted line is a potential route that
 7 this pipeline could have taken?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. Okay.
 10 Now, you didn't undertake an analysis about the
 11 feasibility of building this specific pipeline; right?
 12 A. That's correct, I didn't.
 13 Q. Okay. And as far as you're aware, AOG, or Discovery
 14 Global, didn't have any draft agreements in place to use
 15 it, or any permits necessary for this pipeline?
 16 A. I'm not aware of any.
 17 Q. Okay. And this pipeline, this scenario, it's not
 18 reflected in your ultimate development plan; is that
 19 fair?
 20 A. That's -- yes, that's correct.
 21 Q. Okay.
 22 A. Because of the volume of gas.
 23 Q. Okay. We'll come to that volume of gas. But just this
 24 standalone possibility is not reflected in the
 25 development programme?

Page 25

09:36 1 I'm going to walk through a series of steps that I think
 2 would need to be undertaken, and let me know if this is
 3 generally the right idea. Does that sound okay?
 4 A. Yes, by all means.
 5 Q. Okay. So, first and foremost, if revenues wanted to be
 6 generated from this, gas would need to be discovered?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Okay. It would need to be in sufficient quantities to
 9 justify development; right?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Okay. And if the gas quantities justify development,
 12 the exploration well would need to be turned into
 13 a development well, or an additional well might need to
 14 be drilled that would become a development well?
 15 A. Yes, either of those.
 16 Q. Yes. Okay. Great.
 17 And under Slovak law, as we discussed earlier, any
 18 development well must undergo a preliminary EIA. Are
 19 you comfortable accepting that point?
 20 A. Yes, I understand that that needs to be done.
 21 Q. And of course that preliminary EIA could turn into
 22 a more fulsome assessment, which we've been calling
 23 a full EIA?
 24 A. What are the -- I don't know what the triggers would be
 25 for that.

Page 27

09:35 1 A. Yes, this is for one well.
 2 Q. Yes. Okay. Thank you.
 3 Are you aware of how Discovery Global was planning
 4 to finance its well-drilling programme?
 5 A. I'm not aware of the details, no.
 6 Q. Okay.
 7 I want to walk through --
 8 MR DRYMER: I'm just curious on that point, thank you, it
 9 will help me later on and probably shorten things.
 10 Have you read Discovery's submissions in this case?
 11 A. Some parts.
 12 MR DRYMER: Okay. I will be more specific. I'm not
 13 surprising. Have you read the evidence, the witness
 14 statements regarding how they intended to fund their
 15 ongoing developments?
 16 A. I've read through them, but it was a while back, so
 17 I can't really --
 18 MR DRYMER: Okay, understood.
 19 A. I'm not a ...
 20 MR DRYMER: Thank you.
 21 MR PILAWA: Thank you. I actually want to walk through with
 22 you, Dr Moy, if we can, what it would look like to just
 23 develop this one scenario, and what I mean by that is,
 24 let's say we go to Smilno, we find gas there, and we
 25 ultimately want to bring that gas into production. So

Page 26

09:37 1 Q. Okay. And while all of this is going on, maybe
 2 simultaneously, AOG would have to begin construction of
 3 this pipeline; right?
 4 A. It would need to be started, yes.
 5 Q. It would have the -- it would need to have the right to
 6 use the land that the pipeline is on; right?
 7 A. Certainly.
 8 Q. It would then need to enter into some form of
 9 an agreement with the Slovakian distribution network to
 10 connect to the Slovakian distribution system, right?
 11 A. Yes, correct.
 12 Q. And there would be additional infrastructure that's
 13 required, such as a processing facility of some sort, to
 14 separate the gas from other fluids; right?
 15 A. Yes, pretty minimal though.
 16 Q. Minimal, I accept that. But there would need to be some
 17 form of a facility to conduct that separation; right?
 18 A. That would probably be near the wellhead.
 19 Q. Okay. So that infrastructure would obviously need to be
 20 created?
 21 A. You just phone up and order it.
 22 Q. I'm sorry?
 23 A. You would phone up and order it: it's off-the-shelf.
 24 Q. Right. And once all of that is done, the pipeline is
 25 built, it's connected, then AOG could have started

Page 28

09:39 1 generating revenues?
2 A. I presume so, yes.
3 Q. Okay. And of course, if it can't build that pipeline,
4 it can't produce gas from this site, right?
5 A. There might be and there are other options. So, for
6 example, the gas could be used for gas to power.
7 Obviously you're then generating power, you need to
8 export route. That is a scheme that isn't described in
9 my report, but that's commonly done as well, when it's
10 difficult to get an export pipeline out from a site, for
11 example.
12 Q. And what does that prospect look like?
13 A. You usually have a gas to power generator, so the gas
14 will go in, get dehydrated at the wellhead. It then
15 goes to a gas engine. That will burn the gas and
16 generate electrical power, which obviously then has to
17 be hooked up to the national grid.
18 Q. But as far as you're aware, that was not AOG's plan for
19 this site, right?
20 A. Clearly not, no, not in this case. But it's an option
21 for any operator.
22 Q. And is it fair to say that while Krivá Ol'ka is an oil
23 prospect, these are generally -- and I'm happy for you
24 to walk me through them, but these are generally the
25 same steps. Of course, no need for a pipeline to

Page 29

09:40 1 connect to the Slovakian distribution system, but these
2 are the same general steps to bring that well into
3 production?
4 A. Yes, I mean for oil you would not have a pipeline,
5 obviously.
6 Q. But you would have a pipeline for associated gas?
7 A. Yes. Or you could also burn it, which apparently is
8 what some operators are doing, in the UK, for example.
9 Q. Do you think that AOG -- are you talking about gas
10 flaring?
11 A. No. No. Again, the gas -- sorry, the gas is burnt to
12 generate power, and then you don't need to use
13 a pipeline to get rid of the associated gas.
14 Q. But your but-for model provides, or it anticipates AOG
15 taking that associated gas and selling it into the
16 Slovakian distribution system?
17 A. Yes, in my scenario, yes.
18 Q. So if AOG could not have done that -- well, let me say
19 this: your but-for model depends -- that scenario
20 depends upon AOG constructing a pipeline for the
21 associated gas and connecting to the Slovakian
22 distribution system?
23 A. What's described, yes, requires a pipeline for
24 associated gas, yes.
25 Q. If we could go back to -- we made a reference to this

Page 30

09:41 1 earlier -- the successful gas prospects, that project.
2 And we can take these images down, and if we could pull
3 up Respondent's demonstrative number two, it should be
4 RD-2, or RD-002. Great. Thank you so much.
5 We're also going to be going back to parts of your
6 expert report, and if you need both on the screen,
7 I just want to make sure that we're oriented, so just
8 let me know.
9 A. Thank you.
10 Q. I'm sure that you have seen this image before, right?
11 A. I have, yes.
12 Q. And generally speaking, do you accept that this
13 represents somewhat what your final development model
14 will look like?
15 A. Yes, in general.
16 Q. Okay.
17 A. Yes, it's an amalgam of various sources.
18 Q. Exactly. But you're okay with this image, right?
19 A. Yes, it's fine.
20 Q. Okay, and now we're going to start looking at your
21 expert report at the same time. If it's possible to
22 keep this up here and ideally still see some of the
23 details of it, we're going to try that.
24 So if we could also pull up Dr Moy's first expert
25 report, specifically page 53, paragraph 207.

Page 31

09:43 1 Yes, perfect. Thank you so much. Okay, in
2 paragraph 207, you made reference to this earlier, this
3 is talking about the gas developments, and can you
4 please read the sentence for the record that begins with
5 "Plateau gas rates ..." kind of towards the end and
6 extends onto the next page.
7 A. Okay, sure:
8 "Plateau gas rates will be too high to transport
9 within the existing SPP domestic gas network, therefore
10 produced gas will be fed into the new Poland-Slovakian
11 interconnector via a centrally located hub (somewhere
12 around (BM03 ...) and thence into a 75km, 500 mm
13 diameter pipeline. At the far end, it will be
14 compressed to 80 bara, and fed into the Poland-Slovakian
15 interconnector."
16 Q. Thank you, Dr Moy, and for illustration purposes, I know
17 that the parties have estimated this to 55 kilometres or
18 75 kilometres, but it's somewhere around
19 55-75 kilometres; right?
20 A. I would say, yes.
21 Q. And that's that red line on the development model. You
22 can see that; right?
23 A. I believe so. That's not my red line. The point on the
24 right-hand side I believe is close to where the
25 Poland-Slovakia interconnector enters Slovakia, so it

Page 32

09:44 1 would connect at some point along its length.
 2 Q. Fair enough. And the reason it has to take this route
 3 is because the gas prospects produce an amount, or gas
 4 rate, plateau gas rates that are too high for the
 5 domestic pipeline system?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Okay.
 8 A. That's the case, because the capacities are too small.
 9 Q. Okay. So in the but-for model, the development scheme
 10 that you've put forward, the five gas prospects like
 11 this can only succeed if that pipeline is built; right?
 12 A. Yes. That's correct.
 13 Q. Okay.
 14 Now, for the other prospects, or the successful
 15 ones, we're going to move to the oilfields.
 16 A. Mm-hm.
 17 Q. And those are -- there are three of them; right?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. And I think we talked about earlier that all three of
 20 those oilfields anticipate associated gas being dealt
 21 with by being pumped back into the Slovakian
 22 distribution system; right?
 23 A. That's correct, yes.
 24 Q. And actually Mr Howard's DCF monetises that amount; the
 25 idea is that those are sold, right, those amounts of

Page 33

09:47 1 And there's also a central gas-processing facility
 2 that would need to be built; right?
 3 A. Yes. That would collect the gas from the gas wells.
 4 Q. Okay. And the model anticipates the pipelines for the
 5 associated gas that we just discussed; right?
 6 A. Yes, they're not marked here, but they would be from
 7 those oilfields that are at the bottom right-hand side.
 8 Q. And at no point does the model ever consider that
 9 Discovery fails to obtain all of the permits or
 10 authorisations required for the project; right?
 11 A. That's correct.
 12 Q. Okay.
 13 If we could go to your second report, and
 14 specifically page 36. This is figure 5-1.
 15 A. Yes, I have it.
 16 Q. Sorry, this should be page 36. Thank you.
 17 Maybe we can make this a little easier on the eyes.
 18 We can remove the development plan and just focus on the
 19 report. Right. We can blow that up a little bit.
 20 Thank you.
 21 So this is the schedule that you have proposed for
 22 the exploration and development plan; right?
 23 A. That's correct.
 24 Q. And if we start at the top, this is the exploration
 25 phase?

Page 35

09:46 1 gas?
 2 A. Yes, the small component, yes.
 3 Q. So in the but-for model, I guess, the development scheme
 4 here, for those oil prospects, that scheme to work --
 5 I'm sorry, that plan to work, those pipelines would need
 6 to be constructed as well; right?
 7 A. As described in my second report, the associated gas is
 8 disposed and sold via pipeline. But as I said, you
 9 know, there are current examples where operators burn
 10 its gas to power. So that would be an option. It's not
 11 described as such in my report, that second option.
 12 Q. Yes, your model is the one where it's fed back into the
 13 Slovakian distribution system?
 14 A. That's correct, yes.
 15 MR DRYMER: You say it's not described as such. I know you
 16 mention -- it's not modelled; is that the point?
 17 A. That's correct, yes.
 18 MR DRYMER: Thank you.
 19 MR PILAWA: And if we look at the model just in its
 20 entirety, this development plan contains 99 producing
 21 wells; right?
 22 A. It's a series of different field developments, a total
 23 of 99, I believe, development wells; 33 are oil, and 66
 24 are gas.
 25 Q. Okay. So 99 wells.

Page 34

09:49 1 A. The top line, yes.
 2 Q. Exactly. That blue line that says 20 and 20?
 3 A. Mm-hm.
 4 Q. And this is 40 exploration drills over the course of
 5 2017 and 2018; right?
 6 A. That's correct.
 7 Q. And it also includes site preparation, right; it's not
 8 just drilling?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Okay. And this all takes place within the course of
 11 two years; right?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. And it doesn't account for any material delays that
 14 might occur within that timeframe?
 15 A. Well, you should be able to drill 40 wells in two years,
 16 taking into account the time required for site prepare,
 17 getting your kit and getting out there and drilling
 18 those wells.
 19 Please bear in mind that those 40 wells, half of
 20 them are less than 1,000 metres, so you can do that with
 21 a small rig on the back of a truck.
 22 Q. I understand that. But I'm just talking more about kind
 23 of the operational issues that one can experience in any
 24 type of project like this. The model -- even if there
 25 are material delays or even if there are issues, for

Page 36

09:50 1 example, constructing some sites, there are a whole host
2 of issues that could arise. That's uncontroversial;
3 right?
4 A. There could be, yes.
5 Q. There could be. But in your model, all of that, even if
6 there are major operational delays, 40 wells are still
7 drilled by the end of 2018; right?
8 A. I've assumed --
9 THE PRESIDENT: Can I just ask for a clarification. If
10 I read this correctly, you have not counted time for the
11 preliminary EIA?
12 A. That's not in there, I don't believe.
13 THE PRESIDENT: That's not in there. Thank you. Apologies.
14 MR PILAWA: No problem at all.
15 So you were instructed to assume that drilling would
16 commence on 1 January 2017; correct?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. Am I correct in my understanding that as part of that
19 instruction, you were also instructed to assume that
20 Discovery already had access rights to each of these
21 40 well locations?
22 A. I assume that that would be sorted out as part of the
23 process of site preparation and drilling.
24 Q. Okay, let me see if I just understand. I'm just going
25 to read the transcript. One moment. (Pause)

Page 37

09:51 1 THE PRESIDENT: Are you counting the access rights --
2 securing the access rights as part of the site
3 preparation within the two years, or do you assume it's
4 done before?
5 A. Well, some of these would be ongoing because you've got
6 two years to do the ones -- the last 20 would be in the
7 second year, so you've got a whole year to do that. And
8 I have simply presumed that there would be some small
9 amount of preparatory work prior to the drilling of the
10 first well.
11 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
12 MR PILAWA: So 2017 and 2018 are devoted to drilling
13 40 exploration wells, preparing the sites, and securing
14 access to all of these locations; right?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. Okay. Are you aware of Discovery Global ever
17 undertaking a project like this before?
18 A. I'm aware that Mike has a lot of experience drilling
19 wells. And I'm aware that they had AFEs for three wells
20 which, for whatever reason, they weren't able to drill.
21 That is the extent of my knowledge.
22 Q. I'd like to talk a little bit about the Petroleum
23 Resource Management System, what we'll just call PRMS to
24 make it a lot easier.
25 Now, you mentioned it in the presentation, and

Page 38

09:53 1 I'm thankful for that. Would you agree with me that the
2 PRMS represents industry guidelines?
3 A. Yes, certainly.
4 Q. And oil and gas companies are both familiar with and
5 utilise PRMS?
6 A. Yes, they do.
7 Q. And financial institutions understand what the PRMS is?
8 A. One would hope so, yes.
9 Q. I was hoping that would be non-controversial!
10 You have extensive experience with PRMS; right?
11 A. Yes. I do.
12 Q. And you understand the reserve and resource
13 classification under the PRMS?
14 A. That's correct.
15 Q. And the classification of reserves is an important step
16 in a hydrocarbons project; right?
17 A. It is, yes.
18 Q. It signifies that the project has reached a stage where
19 it can be considered commercially viable; right?
20 A. If one is in the situation where you've got reserves.
21 Yes.
22 Q. Thank you. And that reserves classification often helps
23 secure financing for a project; right?
24 A. Yes, it would.
25 Q. And generally speaking, that reserves classification is

Page 39

09:54 1 made in some form of an independent report, like
2 a competent person's report, right?
3 A. Yes, usually.
4 Q. I'm just going to abbreviate that as CPR from here on
5 out, competent person's report; thanks.
6 A. For the benefit of the Tribunal I would like to point
7 out that there is value in prospective and contingent
8 resources as well. Not just in reserves. (Pause)
9 Q. It's fairly common for CPRs to utilise the PRMS
10 guidelines; right?
11 A. Yes, it is.
12 Q. And talking about reserves, they must be discovered,
13 recoverable, commercial, and remaining; right?
14 A. That's correct.
15 Q. And all four of those must be satisfied for a reserves
16 classification, right?
17 A. Yes.
18 Q. So it would be contrary to the PRMS guidelines to make
19 a reserves declaration if one of those criteria is not
20 met; right?
21 A. Usually, yes. When you're looking at the situation
22 here, we have a but-for situation.
23 Q. Dr Moy, I'm not talking about this situation. I'm just
24 talking about the PRMS guidelines in general.
25 A. That's correct, yes.

Page 40

<p>09:56 1 Q. So if one of those -- I'm sorry, it would be contrary 2 under the PRMS guidelines to make a reserves 3 classification if one of those criteria is not met? 4 A. Yes. Could you repeat those for me, please? 5 Q. Sure. Do you want to open up the PRMS? 6 A. No, no, no, just ... 7 Q. Okay: discovered. 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. Recoverable. 10 A. Mm-hm. 11 Q. Commercial. 12 A. Mm-hm. 13 Q. And remaining. 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. You need all four of those, right? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. And "discovered" means that drilling has taken place and 18 confirmed the existence of hydrocarbons, right? 19 A. That's correct. 20 Q. So it would be contrary to the PRMS guidelines to make 21 a reserves classifications if the hydrocarbons are 22 undiscovered, right? 23 A. Yes. Usually, yes. 24 Q. So your expert reports, which make a reserves 25 classification, even though Discovery's hydrocarbons are</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>09:58 1 discoverable volumes are, and those prospects that would 2 be filled with gas and oil. At that point they would be 3 considered and classified as contingent resources. 4 So the difference between contingent resources and 5 moving on to reserves, is down to seven commercial 6 criteria, and that includes the finance, all the -- you 7 know, the environmental, the paperwork, and just 8 development plans. 9 So when I describe the volumes that would be 10 produced as reserves, it's in a but-for case, assuming 11 that those commercial criteria would be met following 12 the successful discovery. 13 THE PRESIDENT: But on what basis, on what data do you 14 accept that the commerciality requirements would be met? 15 A. Because, first of all, it's done elsewhere, it's not 16 an unusual development. It's not of a size that's 17 unreasonable. All of these seven elements, so the 18 development plan, the export route, they are all doable, 19 they are all feasible, they're all reasonable. 20 I haven't seen anything in what needed to be done 21 that one would suggest is unattainable, unreasonable. 22 So in a but-for case, knowing the will of Discovery, 23 they, having made a discovery, would actually want to 24 develop it. I can't see any barriers that would stop 25 any of those seven commercial criteria from being met.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>09:57 1 undiscovered, that does not conform to the PRMS 2 guidelines, does it? 3 A. We're talking about the but-for situation. 4 Q. But I'm not talking about the but-for situation. 5 I'm talking specifically about PRMS and those 6 requirements -- 7 A. Well -- 8 Q. -- and so the question is, your expert reports, which 9 make a reserves classification, even though the 10 hydrocarbons are undiscovered, that does not conform to 11 the PRMS, does it? 12 A. It will do in the but-for case. There is a difference. 13 THE PRESIDENT: Yes, maybe can I ask for a clarification. 14 I did not understand how in the but-for you convert, if 15 I can say, resources into reserves. But the state of 16 the evidence that we have is still the resource state. 17 A. Sure. May I explain? 18 THE PRESIDENT: Yes please. 19 A. Okay, so in the but-for -- so the licence areas contain 20 prospective resources as mapped. They haven't been 21 drilled yet. The process, the decision tree, the 22 incorporation of the geological chance of success, gives 23 one an estimate of: if you went out with your drilling 24 rigs and you drilled up those 20 prospects, it would 25 give you an estimate of what your 50/50 chance of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>10:00 1 THE PRESIDENT: Provided they make the discovery, which you 2 account for by the probability; is that -- 3 A. That's correct, yes. 4 THE PRESIDENT: Good. Thank you. 5 MR PILAWA: Thank you. 6 THE PRESIDENT: Apologies for the interruption. 7 MR PILAWA: That's fine, Madam President. I'm going to go 8 to that list of seven criteria for commerciality. 9 Okay, I'd like to put two documents on the screen. 10 We're now moving into the but-for scenario and the 11 evidence that you've presented as justifying the 12 classification for reserves. 13 Just before I do that, are you aware of any 14 competent person's report that has made a reserves 15 declaration assuming that commerciality is met? 16 A. Sorry, say that again? 17 Q. Are you aware of any competent person's report that 18 makes a reserves declaration by assuming commerciality? 19 A. Not a competent person's report, no, because it's not 20 used for that purpose. 21 Q. Because it's not in line with PRMS? 22 A. No, it doesn't deal with the but-for situation. 23 Q. The competent person's report doesn't deal with the 24 but-for situation? 25 A. No.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

10:01 1 Q. It wouldn't. So it's unlikely that you would qualify
2 for reserves-based lending, for example, with
3 a competent person's report that operates on a but-for
4 scenario, because that's not common; right?
5 A. Usually the competent person's report is a description
6 of what's there at the moment.
7 Q. And what we have at the moment here are undiscovered
8 hydrocarbons; right?
9 A. That's correct, in a prospective area.
10 Q. If we can pull up Dr Moy's first expert report, and we
11 are going to go -- excuse me, just give me one moment.
12 (Pause)
13 Can we go to page 57 of his first expert report, and
14 at the same time -- I'm sorry, at the same time can we
15 please pull up Exhibit AA-037. And specifically, and
16 just -- this is PRMS.
17 A. Correct.
18 Q. And specifically if we can go to page 11 of the PDF
19 itself. Okay. So down at the bottom is where we start
20 the discussion of the determination of commerciality and
21 the seven criteria that must be met; you see that,
22 right?
23 A. Correct, yes.
24 Q. We're going to look at this in your expert report at the
25 same time because I think there's a little bit of

Page 45

10:03 1 a difference in language, but I just want to be clear
2 here.
3 A. Mm-hm.
4 Q. So the very first commerciality requirement in your
5 report says:
6 "A technically mature development plan."
7 Under PRMS it says there must be:
8 "Evidence of a technically mature, feasible
9 development plan."
10 And the only evidence of a development plan here is
11 the one you created, right?
12 A. That's my development plan, yes.
13 Q. Would you consider your development plan technically
14 mature?
15 A. Not at this stage, no.
16 Q. Okay. Let's move to financing, the second one.
17 Paragraph 224.2 of your first expert report, and here,
18 letter B under "Determination of Commerciality". There
19 must be:
20 "Evidence of financial appropriations either being
21 in place or having a high likelihood of being secured to
22 implement the project."
23 And in your report the only evidence you have
24 provided is your opinion that "it is highly likely that
25 funding would be available"; is that right?

Page 46

10:04 1 A. That's correct.
2 Q. And if we go down to G in particular on AA-37, so if we
3 go down to the next page, and we will have to also go
4 down one page in Dr Moy's report. Paragraph 224.7.
5 This requirement says that there must be:
6 "Evidence that legal, contractual, environmental,
7 regulatory, and government approvals are in place or
8 will be forthcoming, together with resolving any social
9 and economic concerns."
10 Starting with evidence of legal approvals, you've
11 provided no evidence of what legal approvals might be
12 necessary; correct?
13 A. Well, that's outside my area of expertise, but I --
14 Q. And you've --
15 A. -- I simply -- the development being described in my
16 report are ones which are being undertaken right now in
17 Europe. So --
18 Q. But I'm talking about specifically in Slovakia. You
19 haven't shown any of the legal approvals that might be
20 necessary for that project; fair?
21 A. No. I haven't. No.
22 Q. And you've provided no place that they are in place or
23 they will be forthcoming, right?
24 A. I believe that they would be forthcoming.
25 Q. What are the legal approvals that would be needed?

Page 47

10:05 1 A. It's not my area of expertise.
2 Q. For contractual approvals, you haven't exhibited any
3 contracts or drafts of contracts for all of the
4 infrastructure needed for this project, right?
5 A. No, I haven't.
6 Q. Regarding environmental approvals, we discussed the
7 preliminary EIA that's required for all producing wells.
8 There are 99 producing wells in the model and the only
9 evidence that you have cited is that it's to be expected
10 that these go through without issue; is that right?
11 A. That's correct.
12 Q. And now on the last part, "resolving ... social and
13 economic concerns", not in paragraph 224.7 of your first
14 expert report, but reflected in PRMS. Are you aware
15 that many local Slovak citizens were opposed to
16 Discovery's project?
17 A. I'm aware of demonstrations, yes.
18 Q. You are aware that local citizens opposed the drilling
19 of Discovery's three exploration wells?
20 A. I don't know the details. I don't know the reason why
21 they were demonstrating.
22 Q. But you know there were demonstrations, right?
23 A. Yes, I'm aware.
24 Q. Am I to understand that the reason that you excluded
25 this requirement is because you do not think that there

Page 48

10:06 1 would be social concerns for a development plan that
 2 encompasses 99 producing wells and at least two major
 3 pipelines constructed in Slovakia?
 4 A. Well, they have pipelines already. They have wells
 5 already in Slovakia, not in this area.
 6 Q. So is your testimony that you don't think there would be
 7 social concerns about this development plan?
 8 A. I don't think there would be anything that couldn't be
 9 overcome with the right approach. Nothing that's
 10 proposed in my report is of a scale or requiring
 11 technology that doesn't exist. It's done right now in
 12 Europe.
 13 Q. In Europe. But I'm talking specifically about this
 14 region of Slovakia.
 15 A. In this region it's underappraised and there's, as far
 16 as I'm aware, no longer any production of hydrocarbons.
 17 But there are -- there is oil being produced in other
 18 parts of Slovakia.
 19 Q. In other parts of Slovakia. But this region in
 20 particular, this would be a major development programme
 21 or project in this region of Slovakia; right?
 22 A. It would be a series of developments, yes.
 23 Q. But one final product that has 99 producing wells and
 24 multiple pipelines built; right?
 25 A. Over a very large area, yes.

Page 49

10:09 1 a portfolio of prospects.
 2 Q. And is this a process that is taken into account by
 3 other people when making decisions about --
 4 (overspeaking)?
 5 A. It would be, yes. Yes.
 6 Q. Thank you. You were also asked some questions this
 7 morning about the oil prospects and how associated gas
 8 may be dealt with.
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Can you explain whether the ability to extract and
 11 generate revenue from the oil is affected by how the
 12 associated gas is dealt with?
 13 A. You would need to be able to get rid of your associated
 14 gas. That's either by exporting it or by burning it.
 15 If you couldn't, you would need to reduce your oil
 16 production. Or stop it completely.
 17 MR NEWING: Thank you. No further questions.
 18 MR DRYMER: And just to be clear, I believe in answer to
 19 Mr Pilawa's questions, a couple of them earlier, you
 20 clarified that when you say burning, you mean burning to
 21 produce energy, not flaring.
 22 A. No, not flaring. Not flaring at all.
 23 MR DRYMER: I just want to clarify that.
 24 A. Sorry, yes. Yes, gas engines, so --
 25 MR DRYMER: Gas engines, yes.

Page 51

10:08 1 Q. A mix of private land and public land, right?
 2 A. Yes, just as it's done elsewhere.
 3 Q. And I'm talking about the private landowners in this
 4 instance. Is it your testimony that those private
 5 landowners, all social concerns about building this
 6 development plan, all of those social concerns would be
 7 adequately addressed; is that your testimony?
 8 A. Yes it is, actually.
 9 MR PILAWA: Okay.
 10 I have nothing further, Madam President.
 11 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 12 Mr Newing, questions in re-direct?
 13 MR NEWING: Yes, just a couple of short questions. Thank
 14 you, Madam President.
 15 (10.08 am)
 16 Re-direct examination by MR NEWING
 17 Q. Dr Moy, you discussed this morning the statistical
 18 process which has led to identifying the P50 estimate.
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. Can you explain whether this identification of the P50
 21 process is a standard process that is used?
 22 A. Yes, it is. I mean, in my second report there's an SPE
 23 paper. Even the diagrams mirror some of the material
 24 that my colleague, Mr Howard has produced. Yes, so it's
 25 the standard method to estimate that quantity for

Page 50

10:10 1 A. -- it's burned properly, power is generated, and hooked
 2 in. Sorry about that confusion.
 3 MR DRYMER: Noted. Thank you.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: Any questions?
 5 MR DRYMER: No questions.
 6 (10.10 am)
 7 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
 8 THE PRESIDENT: I just have one question that may seem
 9 a little simple to you as a reservoir engineer.
 10 When does drilling begin? When you have the
 11 drilling rig in place?
 12 A. Yes, absolutely. The drilling rigs -- the site is
 13 prepared, the drilling rig would arrive. Basically it's
 14 called "spudding the well", so basically you would start
 15 preparing -- driving in the casing from the surface, and
 16 then you would enter into that with your drill bit and
 17 start the process.
 18 THE PRESIDENT: When the surface conductor is driven into
 19 the ground, that is before you start drilling?
 20 A. Yes, usually, because the surface conductor you don't
 21 want caving in around the drill bit. So you would put
 22 in a -- usually it's driven in, hammered in, to
 23 consolidate the surface soils.
 24 THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
 25 A. And then basically you've got the starting point to

Page 52

10:11 1 enter in with your large-size drill bits to drill that
 2 first section.
 3 THE PRESIDENT: And then you bring the drilling rig to the
 4 site?
 5 A. No, once you -- well, usually you could use the drill
 6 rig to hammer in the surface casing, and then you
 7 transfer to using a drill bit to drill out what's inside
 8 of that surface casing, and then you drill down and
 9 you're using ever-decreasing drill bit diameters to
 10 drill deeper down.
 11 THE PRESIDENT: What was the position at Smilno? I think
 12 you address it at -- no, you address it more generally
 13 in paragraph 47 of your first report, where you speak of
 14 Discovery's intentions.
 15 A. Yes, hold on. Sorry, which paragraph, Madam President?
 16 THE PRESIDENT: 47. Page 11.
 17 A. And paragraph, did you say?
 18 THE PRESIDENT: 47.
 19 A. 47. Hold on, let me just ...
 20 Yes, that's right.
 21 THE PRESIDENT: Actually, it's not only Smilno. It's all
 22 three sites.
 23 A. Yes, I don't know exactly which one of those, it just
 24 says:
 25 "... in the case of the most advanced of these, the

Page 53

10:14 1 THE PRESIDENT: And we thank you very much.
 2 DR MOY: Thank you.
 3 THE PRESIDENT: Is it a little too early to take a break, or
 4 do you want a relatively short break?
 5 MR PILAWA: I would appreciate a 15-minute break, if
 6 possible.
 7 THE PRESIDENT: 15 minutes?
 8 MR PILAWA: A 15-minute break.
 9 MR NEWING: That's fine.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: We will take a 15-minute break now, and the
 11 next witness is Mr Howard; is that the plan?
 12 MR NEWING: Yes, that's correct.
 13 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Good.
 14 Let's take 15 minutes, then.
 15 MR PILAWA: Thank you.
 16 (10.15 am)
 17 (A short break)
 18 (10.30 am)
 19 MR NEWING: Just before we start, can I just say Mr Howard
 20 does have some health issues, so depending on the length
 21 of the examination he may need to take a short comfort
 22 break. He will let you know if that is necessary, but
 23 hopefully that's okay.
 24 THE PRESIDENT: Fine, please let us know if we don't
 25 remember.

Page 55

10:13 1 surface conductor had been driven into the ground ..."
 2 THE PRESIDENT: That was the situation at Smilno, if I am
 3 not mistaken, and if I am mistaken, counsel will correct
 4 me.
 5 A. Yes, I'm not sure which of those three it was.
 6 THE PRESIDENT: I think it was Smilno.
 7 MR NEWING: That is correct, madam.
 8 THE PRESIDENT: That's correct; thank you. And my question
 9 is: do you consider that drilling had started then, or
 10 not?
 11 A. It depends --
 12 THE PRESIDENT: And if you don't have sufficient
 13 information, you simply say so.
 14 A. I do remember seeing the images, the photographs of the
 15 drill rig coming along the road. I don't know which
 16 site it was for, and I don't know whether the surface
 17 conductor had already been driven in prior to the
 18 arrival of the rig.
 19 So, yes, all I know is the rig tried to gain access
 20 to a site.
 21 THE PRESIDENT: Good. Thank you.
 22 I have no other questions. That is my main other
 23 question that I had asked before. So that concludes
 24 your examination.
 25 DR MOY: Thank you very much.

Page 54

10:30 1 MR COLIN HOWARD (called)
 2 THE PRESIDENT: So, sir, you are Colin Howard.
 3 MR HOWARD: That's correct.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: You are our third Rockflow expert?
 5 MR HOWARD: Yes.
 6 THE PRESIDENT: You have submitted two expert reports, the
 7 first one of 3 October 2022, and the second one of
 8 18 September 2023.
 9 MR HOWARD: That's correct.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: You are heard as an expert and you are under
 11 a duty to make only statements in accordance with your
 12 sincere belief. Can you please read the expert
 13 declaration?
 14 MR HOWARD: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience
 15 that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere
 16 belief.
 17 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 18 So now we see your presentation on the screen and
 19 you have 15 minutes, and you can proceed, please.
 20 (10.31 am)
 21 Presentation by COLIN HOWARD
 22 MR HOWARD: Thank you, Madam President.
 23 (Slide 2) The first slide is just a very brief
 24 outline of my background. I don't propose to go through
 25 that in the interests of time. It's there for

Page 56

10:32 1 reference.
 2 (Slide 3) On the second slide is just a note of my
 3 instruction from Signature to calculate a fair market
 4 value of Discovery's share of the Slovakian assets at
 5 the date of the award, and I note that my valuation is
 6 therefore an ex-post one, and a but-for scenario.
 7 (Slide 4) As you will have noted from my expert
 8 reports, my valuation methodology that I chose was to
 9 use an income-based method, and specifically I used
 10 a discounted cash flow model using the volumes and
 11 geological chance of success presented by Mr Atkinson
 12 and Dr Moy, the Rockflow geological and reservoir
 13 engineering experts.
 14 I used that model to calculate a net present value,
 15 NPV, of the prospects within the licence area. I would
 16 be very happy to expand on the details of my discounted
 17 cash flow model, but I don't propose to go through it in
 18 any detail.
 19 (Slide 5) Just to note, the inputs of those
 20 discounted cash flow model are Dr Atkinson's
 21 probabilistic volume distributions, and his assessment
 22 of the geological chance of success. I used a Monte
 23 Carlo simulation methodology, combined with decision
 24 trees, to establish a probability distribution of
 25 successfully discovered volumes, i.e. volumes that could

Page 57

10:33 1 reasonably be discovered within the area. And we select
 2 the P50, or median, as the most likely outcome. I then
 3 identify a set of prospects that most closely matches
 4 the P50 volume.
 5 Dr Moy then has presented a development scheme for
 6 those set of prospects, and of course those and the
 7 associated costs are input into the DCF model to
 8 calculate the net present value.
 9 (Slide 6) Just to summarise, my valuation for that,
 10 submitted on 18 September, was \$133 million, a shade
 11 over. The table below confirms that and is taken from
 12 my expert report, second expert report.
 13 At the end of this presentation there are a number
 14 of addendum slides which I won't be going through in
 15 detail, which explain my choice of valuation
 16 methodology. And I'm happy to take questions on those
 17 should the panel require.
 18 I just want to move on to valuations regarding prior
 19 transactions regarding the asset, and these were used by
 20 the Respondent's expert in order to come up with their
 21 valuations, and there are three of them: the sale of the
 22 San Leon overriding royalty back to Discovery (Slide 8);
 23 the proposed Gulf Resources investment; and the Akard
 24 investment, all three in 2015.
 25 (Slide 9) Just a quick note on the valuation of

Page 58

10:35 1 prospective resources, i.e. prospects, as they
 2 undoubtedly were in 2015. This, of course, the
 3 valuation depends on both the volume, or assessment of
 4 volume, and the geological chance of success.
 5 Therefore, those perception of value is dependent on
 6 what we know about the asset at that time. It's our
 7 perception of value at a particular point in time when
 8 we make that assessment.
 9 When a new piece of information becomes available,
 10 we revise our estimates of volume and GCOS, and
 11 therefore the valuation changes.
 12 And I should just note that this process, data
 13 acquisition and interpretation, is not a smooth one: it
 14 goes in fits and starts as new pieces of information
 15 come along. And of course our valuation would reflect
 16 that.
 17 I'm not going to go through it in any great detail,
 18 but you will have received the demonstrative exhibit,
 19 which is a timeline of different events. The second
 20 column notes the asset transactions, and the fourth
 21 column notes when data was acquired or interpreted, both
 22 of them.
 23 MR DRYMER: A very quick look, sir: this is technical data;
 24 we're not talking financial data?
 25 MR HOWARD: No, technical data. Yes.

Page 59

10:37 1 MR DRYMER: Thank you.
 2 MR HOWARD: If I just come to the San Leon overriding
 3 royalty (Slide 10). When San Leon Energy -- when
 4 Discovery acquired the asset from San Leon, San Leon
 5 retained an overriding royalty interest, and that was
 6 sold back to Discovery for £120,000 in January 2015.
 7 CRA, that's Charles River Associates, I use that for
 8 the Respondent's quantum experts, they say this implies
 9 a value of 1.8 million at the Respondent's ex-ante date
 10 for the Discovery share.
 11 Two things to note. At the transaction date there
 12 is still a considerable amount of data acquisition
 13 continuing after that, some of the data processing and
 14 some of the magneto-telluric data. In fact,
 15 interpretation continued for a number of years
 16 afterwards.
 17 The other point to note is that the San Leon sale
 18 I do not believe was a fair market value transaction.
 19 (Slide 11) Mr Lewis' witness statement notes that
 20 San Leon was in a "cash flow crisis and needed to secure
 21 cash quickly" and that the sale of the San Leon
 22 overriding royalty enabled them to overcome that cash
 23 crisis.
 24 I don't believe Mr Lewis' testimony a couple of days
 25 ago was challenged on that.

Page 60

10:39 1 CRA claim that this was not in fact the case and
2 that they were not cash-strapped, and present
3 information from the San Leon annual accounts to show
4 that they were in fact able to raise corporate finance
5 of several million euros. But a close reading of the
6 annual report showed that in fact that was secured in
7 a personal capacity by the CEO, Mr Fanning. So,
8 actually, the company, San Leon, did not appear able to
9 raise finance on their own.
10 They also appeared to be paying excessive finance
11 costs, and the auditors noted in 2015 there was an item
12 of concern on San Leon's status as a going concern, the
13 materiality.
14 Taking that together, I don't believe we can
15 consider the San Leon overriding royalty was a fair
16 market value calculation.
17 (Slide 12) When it comes to the Gulf Shores
18 investment, this was a deal that would include two wells
19 and an option on two further wells, this implied under
20 CRA assessment a valuation of \$10.1 million in March,
21 I believe it was, at the ex-ante date, the Respondent's
22 ex-ante date. However, Gulf Shores' due diligence only
23 appeared to focus around the immediate area of the two
24 wells that they were committed to. There did not appear
25 to be a full evaluation of the rest of the licence area,

Page 61

10:41 1 and therefore they would not be in a position to
2 actually assess that.
3 I also note that, again, the full prospectivity of
4 the area had not been established by this date. It was
5 an evolving process that continued right up to the EGI
6 report in 2021, which was a fully integrated study of
7 all the data available.
8 (Slide 13) Pretty much the same things apply to the
9 Akard investment, which did actually proceed. Again, it
10 was funding for three wells in return for 50% of
11 Discovery's share of the licence. Although this was
12 several months later, there was still ongoing evaluation
13 and the EGI study had not been completed, which
14 Mr Atkinson based his interpretations and assessments
15 on.
16 Again, because that was not established, I don't
17 believe it's an assessment of what the licence area
18 prospectivity is.
19 (Slide 15) I now come to valuation based on
20 comparables ex-ante methodology. I note that my
21 analysis is, of course, a but-for case and is ex-post.
22 But it is possible to look at the share prices of
23 comparable companies at the ex-ante date, and this is
24 what CRA have done.
25 Essentially what they're doing, what we're doing is

Page 62

10:42 1 saying comparing with companies in Eastern Europe that
2 have 2P declared reserves, and bear in mind that Dr Moy
3 has stated that he believes that in due course, once
4 discovered, appraised and given appropriate permissions,
5 these would be developed in the licence area and would
6 become 2P reserves in the but-for case.
7 (Slide 16) This is the graph from the CRA first
8 report, and we're graphing the enterprise value in
9 millions of dollars on the vertical axis, against the 2P
10 reserves, millions of barrels of oil equivalent.
11 In coming up with a valuation, an ex-ante valuation,
12 in actual fact, CRA do not use the data shown on that
13 graph. They use data from a company called ADX because
14 they claim that ex-ante, they were the only company that
15 did not have 2P resources.
16 However, when we look into it, the ADX prospective
17 resources are actually gas condensate fields, offshore
18 Tunisia, and Sicily as well, I believe, and they're
19 entirely incomparable. They don't relate to the type of
20 thing we are looking to find in Slovakia.
21 They also note that ADX had prospective resources of
22 1,414,000,000 barrels of oil equivalent. I can't
23 actually find that number in the references given in
24 CRA, but I believe it's an unrisksed volume; in other
25 words, it's a volume that could be there.

Page 63

10:44 1 CRA derive a value on their ex-ante valuation of
2 just \$0.15 million. But that is based on this value of
3 1,414 prospective resources, which is an unrisksed
4 number, and therefore this calculation cannot stand; the
5 logic is incorrect.
6 Conversely, when I look at this graph in front of me
7 (Slide 16) I see that, putting aside the data point for
8 JKX, there is a rough linear trend going from the origin
9 up through those values, showing there's a sort of
10 relationship between enterprise value and the amount of
11 reserves. That is not unexpected.
12 From the gradient of that line, we can get what's
13 called an enterprise value/2P ratio, which I derive at
14 \$4.375 per boe. If I take the assessed volume of
15 discovered resources, i.e. the ones we simulate that is
16 the P50 value for Discovery's share,
17 8.24 million barrels, that equates to a value of
18 \$36 million, as of 7 June, and of course that value
19 could be adjusted to the award date.
20 (Slide 19) When they do a similar analysis in their
21 second report, they still rely on the data from ADX,
22 from the first report, which again I believe is not
23 correct because it's an unrisksed volume and the
24 calculations are not correct.
25 They also appear to make a fundamental error where

Page 64

10:46 1 they apply a reserve adjustment factor, or RAF, to
 2 volumes which are already risked. In other words, they
 3 are the discovered volumes. And that's a double dipping
 4 on the geological chance of success, which they put at
 5 5-10%.
 6 If you correct for both the recovery adjustment
 7 factor and the fact that they haven't actually included
 8 associated gas from the oilfields, you essentially get
 9 back to the 36 million figure I was talking about.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: I think you've reached the 15 minutes. You
 11 have exceeded them by 1 minute. But, of course, you can
 12 get to a conclusion. I'm just saying there's not really
 13 time left.
 14 MR HOWARD: Yes. I will do that.
 15 I'll just note briefly that when they did the
 16 ex-post comparables analysis (Slide 21), it's a similar
 17 picture, but the linear trend is not so apparent, and
 18 they use a weighted average method of deriving the
 19 dollar per boe, which I believe is not appropriate.
 20 I will leave my formal presentation there. Just
 21 note that at the end of the presentation I have the
 22 addendum slides of my reasons for using a discounted
 23 cash flow for my valuation. Thank you.
 24 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 25 Mr Pilawa.

Page 65

10:48 1 (10.48 am)
 2 Cross-examination by MR PILAWA
 3 Q. Thank you, Madam President.
 4 It's still morning: good morning, Mr Howard.
 5 Can you go to slide 19, please. Thank you. Do you
 6 remember this slide?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. Those figures in the last bullet point, those are new
 9 calculations that you've done; right?
 10 A. That's correct, yes.
 11 Q. Okay. They're not in either one of your expert reports;
 12 right?
 13 A. That's correct.
 14 Q. Okay. And then I don't think we saw it on the screen,
 15 but I received your slides, and can you confirm for me
 16 that slide 22 of your presentation also contains new
 17 calculations?
 18 A. Which one specifically?
 19 Q. The 24.7 million?
 20 A. Yes. That's my eyeballing of the -- but it is derived
 21 from the graph that was presented in the CRA report
 22 number 2.
 23 Q. And this is the first time that you've provided the
 24 24.7 million number?
 25 A. That's correct.

Page 66

10:50 1 Q. Okay.
 2 I don't need the slide show any more.
 3 So talking about the second expert report that you
 4 issued, there were -- well, actually, let me back up.
 5 You mentioned this earlier: the basic, or the analysis
 6 that you are taking is the but-for analysis; right?
 7 A. That's right.
 8 Q. Okay. And you are calculating the fair market value on
 9 your but-for basis?
 10 A. That's right.
 11 Q. And that but-for basis is, again, the idea that had
 12 Discovery continued operating in Slovakia, it would have
 13 developed a large-scale project; is that fair?
 14 A. The individual oil projects are not large-scale.
 15 They're quite small, in fact. The gas projects, taken
 16 together as an integrated development, I would call
 17 a mid-scale project, it's not a very large project.
 18 Q. Okay. And that but-for scenario, the but-for,
 19 specifically the DCF, it's one unified integrated final
 20 product; right?
 21 A. The model is a single model, but within the model, each
 22 project, the individual oil projects, and then the gas
 23 project, are modelled as separate incremental tranches,
 24 which has to be done in order to correctly calculate the
 25 tax effect at the corporate taxation level.

Page 67

10:51 1 Q. Okay. But they're not separated by well locations. So
 2 there's no --
 3 A. They are -- the three individual oilfields are separate
 4 well locations, yes.
 5 Q. Right, but if I'm thinking about Smilno, for example,
 6 there's no fair market value exclusive to Smilno?
 7 A. Not to Smilno, because it's one of the gas fields which
 8 is considered as an integrated single project.
 9 Q. Right. Okay. And that DCF was the \$133 million that
 10 you mentioned earlier, and in your second report there
 11 is also a \$36 million valuation from comparable
 12 companies, which we'll discuss, and a 5.10 million
 13 comparable transaction approach. Those were the three
 14 numbers in the second expert report; right?
 15 A. I recognise -- can you give me the reference to the
 16 5 million one?
 17 Q. Sure. It's paragraph 338 of your second expert report.
 18 A. Yes, I have it.
 19 Q. Okay.
 20 I want to discuss a little bit the points you made
 21 in your presentation about data acquisition. And
 22 I believe we have received Mr Howard's demonstratives,
 23 and we can project those on the screen; is that right?
 24 So CD-10. I think you have a copy of it in your hand as
 25 well?

Page 68

10:54 1 A. Okay. (Pause)
 2 Q. There are a few dates when we get the spreadsheet up
 3 that I'm going to want to talk about.
 4 A. Sure.
 5 Q. But before we get into that, you understand that
 6 Discovery Global purchased AOG in March 2014; right?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And the previous owner of AOG was San Leon; right?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. Have you analysed the data that Discovery Global
 11 inherited from San Leon?
 12 A. Not personally. Do you mean the geological data, or ...
 13 which data?
 14 Q. Yes, sure. I understand that Discovery Global, when it
 15 purchased AOG, inherited, for example -- if we can go up
 16 on that spreadsheet? Thank you.
 17 I understand that when Discovery Global purchased
 18 AOG, for example, it inherited this seismic data that
 19 AOG or the previous owner had taken from 2008 to 2011?
 20 A. That's correct.
 21 Q. So I'm talking about -- and, for what it's worth,
 22 I'm also talking about July and August 2012, and then
 23 the March 2013 entries right here, where the gravity
 24 surveys and the interpretation reports -- I'm talking
 25 about that type of data?

Page 69

10:58 1 responding to CRA's report, explaining that:
 2 "Certain industry codes do not recommend using
 3 an income approach for prospective resources."
 4 Are you comfortable with that characterisation of
 5 this part of your report?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. And you state in paragraph 72:
 8 "In this context, I note that I am not preparing
 9 a valuation for 'public reporting', but for a legal
 10 arbitration, and neither is the Claimant."
 11 Can you tell me what you meant by that statement?
 12 A. Yes, this is in the context where CRA quote the VALMIN
 13 code for reporting information to the Australian
 14 Stock Exchange, for purposes of stock listing or
 15 announcements to press releases, et cetera. It's in
 16 that context.
 17 Q. Well, would your report have been different if you were
 18 preparing it for public reporting purposes?
 19 A. If I was preparing a valuation for public reporting, you
 20 would need to follow the rules of that exchange. But it
 21 would be seen in the context of what it was. That is
 22 not necessarily a fair market value. It's not doing
 23 a fair market value calculation.
 24 Q. So one of the -- well, we note here -- I'm sorry,
 25 I should say you note specifically, or you make

Page 71

10:56 1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. So I understand that this was part of an overall package
 3 of data that Discovery Global purchased. Or, I should
 4 say, was handed over in the transaction.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. So you haven't reviewed that data?
 7 A. No. It's not my role to review the technical data.
 8 Q. Okay. Did you review the manner in which Discovery
 9 Global reinterpreted some of that data, or reprocessed
 10 it?
 11 A. I'm not aware of the nature of the interpretation.
 12 I'm not qualified to comment on that.
 13 Q. Can you tell me the value that was added by the
 14 reprocessing and reinterpretation of monetary figures?
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. If we could put up Mr Howard's second expert report at
 17 paragraph 72, and I will get you a page number in just
 18 a moment. Page 18 of Mr Howard's second expert report.
 19 Yes. And I'm looking at that paragraph 72, Mr Howard,
 20 and that first sentence where you -- well, let's back
 21 up.
 22 For context, here in this part of your report, and
 23 I'm happy if you want to take a moment to look at the
 24 previous page just to kind of see the context, but this
 25 is where you're discussing prospective resources and

Page 70

11:00 1 reference to the Australian Stock Exchange here. You
 2 rely on a guidance note for listing rules, and you state
 3 here that that guidance note is "underpinned by the
 4 SPE-PRMS". And so you see the --
 5 A. That's correct.
 6 Q. Yes. Thank you.
 7 Can we pull up document CRA-35 and if we could go to
 8 page 16 of the PDF itself, section 5.28.6, right there
 9 in the middle. Are you able to see that, Mr Howard?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. Can you read that for the record?
 12 A. "An entity must not report forecast financial
 13 information derived from an estimate of prospective
 14 resources."
 15 Q. Okay. Thank you.
 16 Sticking with your second expert report, can we
 17 please now turn to paragraph 375, and this is page 99
 18 (PDF page 97).
 19 A. I should note on that previous quotation, that's
 20 reporting to the Australian Stock Exchange. It's not
 21 reporting to anyone. It is in the context of what you
 22 must report to the Australian Stock Exchange.
 23 Q. And in that context, the Australian Stock Exchange
 24 prohibits financial forecasting of prospective
 25 resources, that's what the document says, right?

Page 72

11:02 1 A. Financial forecasting, but that is not the same as
 2 valuation.
 3 Q. I accept that. I'm just trying to confirm that
 4 specifically the Australian Stock Exchange prohibits
 5 using prospective resources for --
 6 A. For --
 7 Q. -- forecasting.
 8 A. -- mostly mining projects. The VALMIN code is
 9 essentially a code for mining projects. They have
 10 a sentence in there where they say this can be used for
 11 oil and gas projects. In my professional experience,
 12 I've never seen that actually happen.
 13 Q. I think in the paragraph before you were talking about
 14 how the guidance note was saying that this was
 15 underpinned by the SPE-PRMS and that's about
 16 hydrocarbons, right?
 17 A. That's correct, yes. So if they were reporting on oil
 18 and gas, they would use PRMS, yes.
 19 Q. Thank you.
 20 So going back to 375 here, in paragraph 375, this
 21 \$36 million valuation is based on the reserves in your
 22 DCF model; right?
 23 A. In the but-for case.
 24 Q. Yes, and the reserves in the DCF model, in the but-for
 25 case. And those reserves are the ones in paragraph 374

Page 73

11:03 1 immediately preceding, right?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. And this \$36 million calculation is calculated on the
 4 ex-ante date; right?
 5 A. It was calculated at that date, yes.
 6 Q. Okay.
 7 A. But the but-for case is, of course, ex-post.
 8 Q. I understand that, but this calculation is specifically
 9 as [at] the ex-ante date; right? That's what
 10 paragraph 375 says.
 11 A. Just to be clear what that means, the \$4.375 per boe is
 12 derived from the gradient of that graph shown in the CRA
 13 report, and those enterprise values were from the
 14 companies at their ex-ante date. Which is different
 15 from the ex-ante data that the Claimant uses, yes.
 16 Q. But I understand this to mean you are adopting the
 17 ex-ante date that Charles River Associates has been
 18 using, and you are providing your valuation as at that
 19 date, which is \$36 million; right?
 20 A. No, that's not correct. My valuation is based on my
 21 discounted cash flow model. I have merely said that if
 22 you did use the method that CRA recommend, or propose,
 23 and you look at the discovered resources, which we,
 24 myself and my colleagues, have come up with in our
 25 but-for case, using that value of \$4.375 per boe, you

Page 74

11:05 1 would come up with that figure. But that is not my
 2 valuation.
 3 Q. Okay. I understand it's not your valuation. But that
 4 \$36 million derives from your discounted cash flow
 5 analysis; that's correct, right?
 6 A. No, it doesn't. It derives from the discovered volumes,
 7 which actually come from Dr Moy's and Mr Atkinson's
 8 work, and the Monte Carlo simulation, which I have
 9 undertaken. But that hasn't got anything to do with
 10 financial forecasting or discounting. That is purely in
 11 terms of volumes. And I then just multiplied by the
 12 4.375, which is not derived from my discounted cash flow
 13 model. That is the gradient on the graph presented by
 14 CRA.
 15 Q. Okay. So paragraph 375 says:
 16 "Using the \$4.375/boe value ..."
 17 So you're using this, and it values the reserves in
 18 your DCF -- I understand this isn't your valuation, but
 19 it values the reserves in your DCF model at 36 million.
 20 Are you comfortable with that?
 21 A. Yes. The reserves were input into my DCF model but
 22 they're not derived from my DCF model.
 23 Q. These are the reserves that Dr Moy -- I'm sorry,
 24 I should say this: Mr Atkinson and Dr Moy have produced
 25 two expert reports that then produce so-called reserves?

Page 75

11:06 1 A. Part of my work was to go from the unrisks volumes to
 2 the risks volumes, which are the discovered resources.
 3 And that part of my work is undertaken within the same
 4 Monte Carlo spreadsheet that Dr Atkinson uses. But that
 5 part of the work is my responsibility.
 6 You will note in that spreadsheet there are initials
 7 on the top of every column, just to make exactly clear
 8 who did what bit of analysis. It just, from a technical
 9 point of view, for data integrity, it is important to
 10 keep all the information in the same Monte Carlo
 11 spreadsheet.
 12 So part of my work was to work out, from the
 13 unrisks volumes that could be in the prospects, to do
 14 an exploration simulation exercise to come up with a P50
 15 volume of what is the most likely discoverable volumes.
 16 And we then chose a set of prospects that almost exactly
 17 matches that P50 volume of discovered resources. And
 18 Dr Moy built a development schedule for that.
 19 Q. Yes. I understand that.
 20 This paragraph in particular though, I understand
 21 it's not your valuation, that \$36 million, that
 22 arrives -- we arrive at that through the reserves in
 23 your DCF model. Those are the words in 375; right?
 24 A. The volume, the reserves --
 25 Q. Yes?

Page 76

11:08 1 A. -- are the same as I use in my DCF model, yes.
 2 Q. Okay. At the Respondent's ex-ante date; right?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And at the ex-ante date, Discovery Global only had
 5 prospective resources; right?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Okay.
 8 A. But of course, I should note it's a but-for case.
 9 Q. I know.
 10 A. Yes.
 11 THE PRESIDENT: I'm not sure what -- you are saying it's the
 12 but-for, but the but-for in your analysis comes later
 13 than the Respondent's ex-ante date. So there seems to
 14 be some disconnect between the dates; no?
 15 A. Let me try to explain. It's difficult without all the
 16 information directly in front of us.
 17 THE PRESIDENT: But conceptually they mean --
 18 A. CRA have presented data from so-called comparable
 19 companies and their share prices indicate their asset
 20 values, corrected for debt and cash balances, and of
 21 course those can be quoted at any date that we wish.
 22 They have quoted the data at the ex-ante date that they
 23 chose. We have then come up with a valuation. If the
 24 oil price changes over time, you would expect the asset
 25 values, hence the share values, to go up and down, and

Page 77

11:10 1 those can be adjusted for in a very approximate way by
 2 applying something -- CRA use the FTSE 350 Oil & Gas
 3 index as a multiplier, which can be done, but it's a bit
 4 of a blunt instrument.
 5 So all I have done is take CRA's chart and say: at
 6 that date, if you have 2P reserves, this is what their
 7 value would be. Not just Discovery --
 8 THE PRESIDENT: So you assume you would have --
 9 A. If anyone had --
 10 THE PRESIDENT: -- 2P reserves at the time of the ex-ante
 11 valuation date; is that right?
 12 A. Yes, but it's a generic description. I'm saying if
 13 anyone had some reserves at that date of that magnitude,
 14 we can, you know, from that graph, implies that they
 15 would be worth \$36 million.
 16 If other companies had the same volume of 2P
 17 reserves at that date, we could say that would also be
 18 worth \$36 million, in a very approximate way.
 19 Now, at the ex-ante date of course we know Discovery
 20 had not been able to drill and therefore did not have
 21 those reserves. But if they had have done, they would
 22 have been worth \$36 million, and we could then move that
 23 value forward in time to a point at which they would
 24 have had, in the but-for case, the appropriate reserve
 25 declarations, and we can arrive at a valuation adjusting

Page 78

11:12 1 using the FTSE oil and gas index or another index.
 2 THE PRESIDENT: So you would take the ex-ante reserves value
 3 and then you move it forward to the ex-post date, and
 4 you adjust with the FTSE factor, or whatever --
 5 A. 350 index. That is what you can do. It is not the
 6 method I've chosen for my valuation. I'm saying if you
 7 did do that, using the graph that CRA have produced, you
 8 would come up with a value of 36 million at that date,
 9 which can then be adjusted.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 THE PRESIDENT: Please carry on. Apologies for the
 13 interruption.
 14 MR PILAWA: No. No problem at all.
 15 So coming to the San Leon overriding royalty that
 16 you discussed, I believe -- and correct me if I am
 17 wrong -- in the presentation that you gave, you
 18 discussed how one of the issues with that royalty, or
 19 any valuation derived from that, is that the data
 20 landscape had changed?
 21 A. That was one of the points, yes.
 22 Q. One of the points. And you haven't quantified what that
 23 change in data represents; right?
 24 A. No, one would -- in order to do that, one would --
 25 Q. No, that's -- this is just to move to the second part of

Page 79

11:13 1 the sale, the fair market value aspect.
 2 So I understand that you rely on Mr Lewis' testimony
 3 that the sale for the San Leon royalty value was not
 4 fair market value, and --
 5 A. It's one of the points that I rely on.
 6 Q. It's one of the points that you rely on.
 7 And one of the issues that you have with that
 8 royalty -- well, let me say this: apart from relying
 9 upon Mr Lewis' testimony and looking at San Leon's
 10 annual report, what are the other pieces of information
 11 that you've used to determine that this was not a fair
 12 market value sale?
 13 A. Those were essentially the two points I used. In fact,
 14 the single point that the auditor raised, regarding --
 15 there was a materiality issue regarding going concern,
 16 that by itself I believe would make it not a fair market
 17 value transaction.
 18 Q. But you are aware that San Leon, to the extent it needed
 19 to find alternative funding or sources of funds, it had
 20 that ability at the time; are you aware of that from
 21 their annual reports?
 22 A. Are you referring to the loan finance that --
 23 Q. Right, I'm talking about the \$30 million additional loan
 24 facility that they had at their disposal?
 25 A. In their annual report?

Page 80

11:15 1 Q. Yes.
 2 A. I don't know the conditions of that \$30 million loan
 3 facility.
 4 Q. But you are aware that it exists, did I understand that
 5 right?
 6 A. I wasn't aware specifically of that one.
 7 Q. Okay. Did you want to see the document?
 8 A. Yes. By all means.
 9 Q. Okay. Can we pull up C-259. Page 32 of the PDF. And
 10 if you can zoom in to that middle column right at the
 11 top of the page. No, other to the other side. Right in
 12 the middle:
 13 "In the event, that the Placing is not approved ..."
 14 Do you see that at the top:
 15 "... the Group has an additional loan facility of
 16 £30 million available ..."
 17 A. Yes. Which report is this one? What date is this? Is
 18 this the 2014 --
 19 Q. 2014.
 20 A. 2014.
 21 Q. Yes.
 22 The question that I have though is, if San Leon, the
 23 previous owner of the royalty, and the previous owner of
 24 all of the data underlying the asset, if they were
 25 sitting on an asset that would pay them passive income

Page 81

11:17 1 of tens of millions of dollars, wouldn't one of the last
 2 things they would want to get rid of be that royalty?
 3 A. I don't believe at the time they, San Leon, thought it
 4 was worth that million. I think there was a gap in what
 5 their valuation was and what Discovery believed. And of
 6 course, in the context of the sale to Discovery,
 7 Discovery is not going to go to San Leon and say:
 8 I think it's worth more, let me pay you more.
 9 Q. But you agree with me that San Leon of all parties was
 10 in the best position at that time to place a value on
 11 that royalty; right?
 12 A. I'm not sure that's the case, no.
 13 Q. Well, they had all the data underlying the asset; right?
 14 As the previous operator?
 15 A. They had the data that existed at that time. And in the
 16 following months after the acquisition, Discovery
 17 acquired some more data, magneto-telluric, I think. But
 18 they also reinterpreted and reprocessed the seismic
 19 data, and that was key to the value that they placed on
 20 the royalty.
 21 Q. And that's the improvement or -- the improvements with
 22 the data that you can't quantify, right?
 23 A. I can't put a number on it, no.
 24 Q. Okay.
 25 A. But clearly Discovery felt the reprocessing was worth

Page 82

11:19 1 doing for the -- you know, to improve the quality of the
 2 data. They cannot predict what the results of the
 3 reprocessing might be. Sometimes you reprocess data and
 4 it confirms that perhaps a trap is not there. That does
 5 not appear to be the case, because if that was the case,
 6 Discovery would not want to proceed with putting money
 7 into an asset that wasn't worth pursuing. They clearly
 8 pursued with the asset, because they felt the
 9 reprocessing improved their valuation of the asset.
 10 MR PILAWA: That's fine.
 11 I have no further questions, Madam President.
 12 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr Newing?
 13 MR NEWING: I have no questions, Madam President.
 14 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions?
 15 (11.20 am)
 16 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
 17 THE PRESIDENT: We were discussing the 36 million valuation
 18 through comparable companies, and you said you get there
 19 by using the reserves that you have also used for your
 20 DCF, and then -- is that not ...?
 21 A. Yes, the work that my colleagues and myself have done
 22 has come up with a volume that we think is -- you know,
 23 if we proceeded, or if Discovery proceeded with the
 24 exploration programme, we think that is the P50, the
 25 most likely volume that would result from that drilling

Page 83

11:21 1 programme.
 2 THE PRESIDENT: That would be produced.
 3 A. Yes.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: Yes.
 5 A. Obviously it's a probability distribution and the P50 is
 6 the most likely. It could be higher, it could be
 7 greater. But the probability of it being greater is
 8 equal to the probability of it being smaller.
 9 THE PRESIDENT: And then you said that you took the reserves
 10 at CRA's ex-ante date, and you explained to me that the
 11 disconnect between the dates, because there were no
 12 reserves at that date but only resources, could be made
 13 up for by moving to the ex-post date by applying the
 14 FTSE index.
 15 A. That can be done, yes.
 16 THE PRESIDENT: Which you do not -- which is not your
 17 preferred method, but is the one CRA has used; is that
 18 right?
 19 A. Yes, if you like, that 36 million sort of arrives from
 20 the volume of -- that we think might be discovered. But
 21 using the data from the ex-ante date, just because
 22 that's the date they're having to choose and present the
 23 chart on, that analysis could have been on any day, you
 24 know, and in fact they do produce equivalent charts for
 25 ex-post valuation in their reports. And you might have

Page 84

11:22 1 seen one of them in my presentation.
 2 And the data points move around a bit. But the
 3 overall picture is similar. They move around because
 4 the oil price is going up and down, and therefore asset
 5 values will, of course, move.
 6 And bear in mind that these are comparable
 7 companies. The fields and assets they have are not
 8 necessarily directly comparable. They are in Eastern
 9 Europe, and they are 2P reserves, partly. But the asset
 10 values on those charts, the enterprise value is, of
 11 course, a mixture of whatever -- whether they have
 12 reserves, contingent resources, and prospective
 13 resources. The share price just reflects investors'
 14 perception of the basket of assets that they have.
 15 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Do I understand this correctly: that
 16 if we find that your reserve quantities are not
 17 sufficiently certain, for legal reasons not for
 18 technical reasons, then we cannot use this market-based
 19 valuation because it is dependent on these quantities of
 20 reserves? It is built on it; is that right? Or do
 21 I misunderstand something?
 22 A. All the numbers we have presented, both in my valuation
 23 and in the CRA, depend fundamentally on the quantity of
 24 reserves that might be found. I think that's, yes,
 25 common sense.

Page 85

11:24 1 In terms of not sufficiently certain, obviously
 2 I can't speak about the legal definition of that.
 3 THE PRESIDENT: No, and I'm not asking you that question.
 4 I'm just trying to understand the basis for the
 5 market-based valuation. But you just answered, so
 6 that's fine.
 7 I have no further questions, so that ends your
 8 examination. Thank you very much, Mr Howard.
 9 MR HOWARD: Thank you, Madam President.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: Do we wish to move on, or do we need a short
 11 break? The next witness is Dr Longman; is that right?
 12 MR PILAWA: Exactly.
 13 MR NEWING: I'm happy to move on. I don't know if a couple
 14 of minutes is needed to bring up Dr Longman's slides.
 15 THE PRESIDENT: Maybe we'll just switch the slides and
 16 whatever needs to be done. That will take, let's say,
 17 ten minutes, because five minutes is generally not very
 18 realistic.
 19 (11.26 am)
 20 (A short break)
 21 (11.35 am)
 22 THE PRESIDENT: I think we're ready to start.
 23 DR CHRIS LONGMAN (called)
 24 THE PRESIDENT: Dr Longman, you confirm for the record you
 25 are Chris Longman?

Page 86

11:35 1 DR LONGMAN: I am.
 2 THE PRESIDENT: From SLR Consulting?
 3 DR LONGMAN: That's correct.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: You have submitted two reports, the first
 5 one 31 March 2023, and the second one 14 December 2023?
 6 DR LONGMAN: Yes.
 7 THE PRESIDENT: You are heard as an expert witness and you
 8 know that I will now ask you to read the expert
 9 declaration into the record.
 10 DR LONGMAN: I solemnly declare upon my honour and
 11 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with
 12 my sincere belief.
 13 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. Now we have received your
 14 presentation, and you have 15 minutes to ...
 15 DR LONGMAN: I think we're just waiting for it to come up.
 16 MR DRYMER: You have been patient the last couple of days;
 17 you will have to be patient a few minutes longer!
 18 (Pause)
 19 THE PRESIDENT: Is there a difficulty?
 20 (Pause)
 21 Good.
 22 So now you have 15 minutes.
 23 (11.39 am)
 24 Presentation by DR LONGMAN
 25 DR LONGMAN: So yes, good morning, Madam President, members

Page 87

11:39 1 of the Tribunal.
 2 I think as we've established, I'm Chris Longman.
 3 I'll run through a presentation this morning.
 4 I'm a geologist by background, and I have had 40 years
 5 plus working in the upstream oil and gas industry.
 6 (Slide 2) I'll run through a series of topics this
 7 morning. I won't go through this slide in detail. It
 8 will become apparent as we run through it what we're
 9 reviewing, the licences, the potential, and what's being
 10 done on those licences.
 11 (Slide 3) As has been shown before, the Discovery
 12 Global licences are in the north-eastern quadrant of
 13 Slovakia. It's the blue circle in the top right-hand
 14 diagram there, within the Carpathian Mountains, and the
 15 geological setting of these licences is one of a series
 16 of nappes that are thrust from the southwards over each
 17 other, so successive thrusts override the previous one,
 18 and you can see that in the bottom left diagram here
 19 where you've got a series of thrusts that are moving, as
 20 I say, from left to right, each one overlying it.
 21 The most important thing about that is that it's
 22 a very complex structural setting, so there's lots of
 23 faulting and fracturing within the rocks themselves.
 24 And I think as has been mentioned before, the surface
 25 nappe within the Claimant's licences is mostly the

Page 88

<p>11:40 1 Magura nappe and a little bit of the Dukla nappe. 2 (Slide 4) This map shows that in a little bit more 3 detail. The Claimant's licences are in the pink outline 4 there, and you can see that the Magura nappe, in the 5 sort of dirty grey colour, the Dukla nappe, the darker 6 grey, are the ones that cover the Claimant's licences. 7 And then the Silesian nappe, further to the north-east, 8 doesn't actually overlie the -- or underlie the 9 Claimant's licence area. 10 So looking at that in terms of trends, the 11 Claimant's licences are on trend with the Magura and 12 Dukla nappes, but I don't believe they are on trend with 13 the Silesian nappe. 14 The key to that is that there's a lot of analogue 15 data from Poland, less so from Slovakia, where there has 16 been an exploration history in all these nappes, and 17 therefore, in my opinion, the analogues should focus on 18 the Magura and Dukla nappes, rather than the Silesian 19 nappe. Although, taking into account the Silesian nappe 20 is important and, as you will see later, I have done 21 that. 22 (Slide 5) You've seen these diagrams as well before 23 from Mr Atkinson. It's really just trying to reinforce 24 that when we're looking at analogue field information, 25 the most relevant ones I think are those that are in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>11:44 1 licence themselves, the database that they have, again, 2 the outline of the licence is in pinky-purple, so the 3 primary information that we've got is a series of 4 seismic data and historical wells. There are some 5 34 wells, but as you can see from the map, they are 6 clustered in three main areas. The last well was 7 drilled in 1998, so there has been no recent drilling, 8 and the seismic is 770 kilometres or so of 2D data 9 dating from the early 2000s. 10 There's also additional data, gravity, magnetic, 11 surface geology, et cetera, and, as has been referenced 12 before, magneto-telluric data that was acquired by the 13 Claimant but hasn't been used in Mr Atkinson's 14 evaluation. 15 It's important to note, I think, that the Claimant 16 did not acquire any seismic data or drill any new wells 17 during the period it held the licence. 18 (Slide 8) Mr Atkinson has created a series of 40 19 leads, and we had a debate yesterday about leads versus 20 prospects. My view is that they are leads because they 21 are not well-enough defined under PRMS to qualify as 22 prospects. 23 Of those leads 18 are oil, 22 are gas, and the map 24 here in the top shows Mr Atkinson's interpretation 25 underlying red circles, which are actually taken from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>11:42 1 same nappes as are prospective in the Claimant's licence 2 area. 3 Mr Atkinson yesterday provided a diagram in which he 4 had noted that the reservoir and porosity parameters in 5 the Silesian nappe were better than in the Magura and 6 Dukla nappes. Again, I think that's important just as 7 a general reference point, to indicate that while you 8 can take note of the Silesian nappe, the best analogues 9 are those that are relative to the Claimant's licence 10 area. 11 To that extent, I find it difficult to accept some 12 of the benchmarking that was done by the Claimant in 13 relation to the licences, and they were referenced 14 yesterday again, I think, with the purple and blue 15 outlines. 16 (Slide 6) In addition to the analogue data from the 17 Polish nappes, there's also been some recent exploration 18 in Poland, and this map here shows the location of 19 12 wells drilled since 2000, all to the north-west of 20 the Claimant's licence area, some within the Magura and 21 Dukla nappes, some within the Silesian nappe. I think 22 the important thing to note out of that is that in the 23 last 20-plus years, of these 12 wells, we're not aware 24 that any commercial discoveries have been reported. 25 (Slide 7) Moving a little bit on to the Claimant's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>11:46 1 the Claimant's 2017 investor presentation where they 2 identified 11 prospects. So it's just a comparison of 3 the 11 that were referenced in 2017 in the investor 4 presentation with the 40 that Mr Atkinson has 5 identified. 6 And you can see there's some similarity and some 7 difference. One of the key differences, as was 8 referenced again yesterday, is that the Poruba feature, 9 which is one of the three AFE wells, doesn't feature on 10 Mr Atkinson's analysis. 11 (Slide 9) We have had a look at the data underlying 12 the interpretation of those 40 leads. We didn't have 13 that data to start with, but we were provided it halfway 14 through. 15 We focused on the eight leads that have come out of 16 the decision-tree analysis which, again, has been 17 referenced in the proceedings, to have a look at how we 18 viewed those leads. And we felt that three of those 19 were very poorly defined and probably didn't even 20 qualify as leads, and we looked in the remaining five. 21 This is just an example of one of them, and what 22 I was trying to do here, which I don't need to go over 23 now because, again, Mr Atkinson referenced it yesterday, 24 is that the area that was interpreted has then been 25 assumed to be the most likely case, and Mr Atkinson</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>11:47 1 doubled his area, so as he demonstrated yesterday, 50% 2 of the time the area is going to be sampled from an area 3 that was bigger than actually mapped. 4 You can also see from this that one of the other 5 problems is, if you double the areas, then they start 6 overlying each other, the prospects. 7 And I have to note that these leads are identified 8 on what is very poor seismic data quality. 9 (Slide 10) Looking at some of the oil leads, and 10 most of this sort of benchmarking analysis is available 11 for oil rather than gas, because there's very little 12 analogue gas data. 13 So this is just a plot of looking at the cumulative 14 production from nappes in Poland relative to a fixed 15 area, so 1,000 kilometres squared. The reason for doing 16 this was to try and gauge what some of the history is, 17 and what the oil leads identified by Rockflow are 18 indicating, and you can see there that under our 19 analysis we have a significantly higher density of 20 potential resource in Rockflow's analysis than has been 21 evident historically. It's even bigger than the 22 Silesian nappe, which is the best of the nappes, but is 23 significantly bigger than the Dukla and Magura nappes, 24 which are the two relevant nappes for the leads 25 identified. They are all identified within the Magura</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>11:51 1 (Slide 12) The decision-tree analysis that was 2 undertaken uses the resource volumes, which I think are 3 overestimated, and also the GCOS figures, which, again, 4 in my opinion, are overestimated. And that was run 5 through an analysis to come up with a statistical output 6 of the most likely, the P50 outcome. 7 Each time that gets run, you end up with a different 8 output, and you can see there it just compares the 2022 9 figures with the 2023. So the first time there were 10 nine prospects, the second time there were eight 11 prospects, and we've got three oil prospects and five 12 gas prospects in the latest version. Some are 13 consistent between the two years; others are not. 14 (Slide 13) A little bit more just looking at the 15 individual well production. Again, this is trying to 16 benchmark the -- sort of sense-check what's being done. 17 Again this is oil, because that's where we've got some 18 historic comparison. 19 Using our analysis we've got somewhere around about 20 20 million -- sorry, 20,000 barrels per well from a lot 21 of the historical data, and in the Claimant's analysis 22 they are recovering round about 400,000 barrels per each 23 well in their development scenario, which is 24 a significant increase, whichever way you look at it, 25 and has a double effect, because if you can produce more</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>11:49 1 and Dukla nappes. 2 (Slide 11) The other element to do with the leads is 3 not only the size of them, but also the geological 4 chance of success. Again this was referenced yesterday. 5 Mr Atkinson and myself used the same methodology to 6 calculate the chance of success, but we have a different 7 view of the input data. 8 You can see here that Mr Atkinson's assessment of 9 the geological chance of success is roughly three times 10 my assessment, and there's very little independent 11 analysis of GCOS, but there was the RPS 2012 CPR, which 12 again was referenced yesterday, and that gave an average 13 of 9% for each of the individual reservoir targets that 14 were analysed in that report. 15 There's another issue about the chance of success, 16 which is that no dependency between leads has been 17 accounted for in the Claimant's analysis, and the little 18 chart at the bottom there just shows the same one we had 19 before. But the two prospects that are adjacent and 20 potentially overlie each other, if you drill one and it 21 fails, then the chance of success on the other one is 22 obviously going to reduce. Equally, the corollary would 23 be true: if you drill the first one and it's a success, 24 then the chance of success would improve on the other 25 one.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>11:52 1 oil from a well, then you need less wells to develop and 2 therefore the cost of any potential development is 3 reduced. 4 (Slide 14) There's also an issue over the drilling. 5 Mr Moy put his chart up earlier on today, and as is 6 referenced, the concept is to drill 40 exploration wells 7 and, in the event of the success, modelled 8 99 development wells. 9 The concept of drilling 40 development wells 10 consecutively by any company exploring, without the 11 opportunity to reflect and integrate whatever 12 information you get from those 40 wells, is not 13 something I've ever come across, and it wouldn't really 14 make any sense to me in a process. 15 And the 99 development wells are drilled in 16 a four-year period. Again, an extremely aggressive pace 17 of drilling. And the charts at the top right there just 18 compare the rate of drilling for exploration and 19 development with the historical activity, and again it's 20 a significant increase. 21 I should note that this chart is corrected from the 22 figure that was in my second report, because I had 23 erroneously divided the 99 wells by five years rather 24 than four years. So it actually looks worse in this 25 chart than it did in my second report.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

11:54 1 (Slide 15) Another thing to look at is the oil leads
2 in relation to the historical information. You've seen
3 the chart at the top. That is the three leads that were
4 assessed to go into the DCF calculation from 2023 in
5 yellow, plotted against historical field size for
6 Poland, or for the Carpathian -- the Polish Carpathian
7 fields. And you can see even on that analysis two of
8 those leads would be in the top eight all-time.
9 I'm nearly at the end.
10 THE PRESIDENT: You're over time, but I understand that you
11 soon are done.
12 DR LONGMAN: And in the bottom chart, that's just plotting
13 all 18 of the Rockflow oil leads against the historical
14 ones, and you can see how dramatic the difference is.
15 (Slide 16) So in summary, I don't think the licences
16 are on trend, and there's little historical analogue for
17 what's been done.
18 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
19 Mr Newing.
20 (11.56 am)
21 Cross-examination by MR NEWING
22 Q. Good morning, just about, Dr Longman. My name is Neil
23 Newing and I will be asking you some questions on behalf
24 of the Claimant.
25 I would ask you, please, to turn to your first

Page 97

11:56 1 expert report. We're going to look at page 5 of the
2 PDF, and I think it's internal page 1 if you are looking
3 in the hard copy. And I am looking at paragraph 2.
4 A. The bullet points?
5 Q. Yes. I will just wait a moment for that to be brought
6 up on screen. (Pause)
7 It's at page 5 of the PDF, please.
8 Okay, so in this first bullet point do you see you
9 stated the general conclusion that:
10 "It is extremely unlikely that any significant oil
11 or gas accumulations lie within the Claimant's
12 exploration areas ..."
13 Do you see that?
14 A. I do.
15 Q. And at the time of this first report you had not
16 conducted any assessment of the licence areas yourself
17 to determine what hydrocarbons might be in place, had
18 you?
19 A. No, that was based on the review of the information in
20 Mr Atkinson's first report.
21 Q. I understand that you had, however, reviewed at that
22 point the study which had been conducted by EGI; right?
23 A. We had that available, yes.
24 Q. And that study was carried out by individuals with a lot
25 of experience in this particular region; is that right?

Page 98

11:57 1 A. It was. Yes.
2 Q. And you have had no reason to challenge the work that
3 they carried out in that study, have you?
4 A. I haven't challenged that work, no. That's the primary
5 piece of work underlying what was done.
6 Q. And that study concluded that there were at least five
7 potential traps in the underlying Dukla nappe, didn't
8 it?
9 A. I think it identified five features for which it
10 calculated volumes, yes.
11 Q. But all of those were only in the underlying Dukla
12 nappe?
13 A. I don't remember, but I believe so.
14 Q. Okay. To refresh your memory, let's take you to
15 document AA-002. And page 75 of the PDF, please. And
16 you see there section 9:
17 "Whole volume estimates of potential traps in the
18 Smilno antiformal stack".
19 Which I understand is basically the Dukla nappe, the
20 underlying Dukla nappe, the parts underneath the Magura
21 nappe or the part that's poking out in the tectonic
22 window?
23 A. Yes, that's correct.
24 Q. And this study did not seek to assess whether there were
25 any traps in the rest of the Magura nappe, did it?

Page 99

11:59 1 A. I don't recall whether it sought to do that or not.
2 Q. You've referred in your first expert report to the fact
3 that EGI only identified five potential structures, and
4 compared that to the 40 identified by Mr Atkinson; do
5 you recall that?
6 A. I do.
7 Q. But as we've just seen, this study was only looking at
8 those structures that were in the underlying Dukla
9 nappe, wasn't it?
10 A. I'm not sure it was only looking at the structures.
11 Those are the ones that it identified in the end.
12 Q. But there is no part of this report where it seeks to
13 identify any structures in the rest of the Magura nappe?
14 It doesn't say one way or the other whether there are
15 any structures in the rest of the Magura nappe?
16 A. It didn't, but it created a series of maps. It then
17 focused on that particular area, as I understand it.
18 Q. But in that same area in which they identified five
19 structures, Mr Atkinson has identified eight; is that
20 right?
21 A. I don't know. I don't have the comparison between the
22 two particular areas.
23 Q. Okay. If I can take you to Mr Atkinson's first report
24 at page 36. And paragraph 107.2, you will see at the
25 bottom. Mr Atkinson states:

Page 100

12:01 1 "I defined 8 gas prospects in the Smilno area in the
2 Dukla Nappe, based on the Base Magura structure map
3 except for one mapped at an intra-Dukla Nappe surface
4 (the 'base Antiformal Stack' surface)."
5 Do you see that?
6 A. I do.
7 Q. So the appropriate comparison would have been to compare
8 EGI's five identified structures with the eight that
9 Mr Atkinson has identified, not the total 40, wouldn't
10 it?
11 A. I don't know for certain without going back to the whole
12 of the description around the EGI report itself.
13 Q. Since the date of your first expert report you've
14 conducted an assessment of five of the Claimant's eight
15 prospects -- I know there is a difference between you as
16 to whether they are prospects or leads, but what the
17 Claimant has said are prospects -- that are part of
18 their P50 case, haven't you?
19 A. I have.
20 Q. And in relation to the other three of those prospects,
21 your position is that you do not recognise them as valid
22 targets; right?
23 A. Yes. That's correct. We didn't see that they were
24 identified sufficiently to be classified as leads.
25 Q. And so your position is they're not even leads, but

Page 101

12:03 1 Do you see that?
2 A. I do.
3 Q. So you accept, again, that being notionally drill-ready
4 is enough to be considered a prospect?
5 A. I do.
6 Q. So in this very same paragraph you are actually talking
7 about the two wells that the Claimant had intended to --
8 or in fact three wells that the Claimant had intended to
9 drill at Smilno, Krivá Ol'ka, and Ruská Poruba, aren't
10 you?
11 A. I am.
12 Q. And so your position in your first expert report is that
13 you agreed that, at the very least, the Smilno and
14 Krivá Ol'ka sites were notionally drill-ready and so
15 could be considered as prospects?
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. And were you aware that both the Smilno and Krivá Ol'ka
18 sites had AFEs?
19 A. Yes, that's why I considered them as prospects
20 potentially.
21 Q. Were you aware that two of the three prospects that you
22 decided in your second report were not even leads, let
23 alone prospects, were in fact the Smilno and Krivá Ol'ka
24 sites?
25 A. I am aware of that, yes.

Page 103

12:02 1 certainly not prospects; that's correct?
2 A. That's correct.
3 Q. But will you agree with me that whether something is
4 a prospect is based on the judgment of those that are
5 providing the funds and carrying out the drilling that
6 there is sufficient detail to justify them pursuing
7 their drilling?
8 A. I think that's a reasonable observation, yes. There was
9 an AFE for various features, so one of the
10 classifications for something being a prospect is that
11 there is a sufficient comfort by the owner to go
12 forwards with that.
13 Q. And so if there were AFEs for particular wells, you
14 would agree that those would be considered prospects at
15 that point?
16 A. I think in broad terms, yes.
17 Q. Okay. Can we also turn to paragraph 48 now of your
18 first expert report. That is on page 20 of the PDF and
19 page 16 of the hard copy document. And we're looking at
20 paragraph 48.
21 A. Yes.
22 Q. And at the very last sentence, I'm going to look at the
23 rest of this in a moment, you said:
24 "As these were notionally drill-ready, they could be
25 considered as prospects."

Page 102

12:04 1 Q. And so despite accepting, as you have just done, that
2 both the Smilno and Krivá Ol'ka sites were able to be
3 considered prospects as they were notionally drill-ready
4 and had AFEs, you nonetheless now claim that they are
5 not prospects?
6 A. I do. That's because my evaluation of them is very
7 different from the Claimant.
8 Q. But you have accepted that the fact that the Claimant
9 itself considered they were ready and had AFEs on them
10 is enough for them to be considered a prospect?
11 A. In the eyes of the Claimant, yes. But not in my
12 opinion.
13 Q. And obviously nothing has changed between the Claimant's
14 decision that they were prospects and today, that will
15 have changed the Claimant's view that they were
16 prospects?
17 A. I can't say that. I don't know whether the Claimant has
18 changed its view.
19 Q. Were you instructed for your second report not to assess
20 those prospects, or those areas, at all?
21 A. Absolutely not.
22 Q. But isn't it the case that in fact two of those
23 prospects are -- two of those areas that you have not
24 identified as prospects are in fact prospects, as they
25 meet the requirements that the Claimant itself

Page 104

12:06 1 considered them to be and they had AFEs on them?
2 A. No, that can't be the case, because at the time that
3 I was doing the analysis, the Claimant didn't hold the
4 licences. So I think there's a difference between, if
5 you go back in time, that was their view, but
6 I'm looking at it now on the basis of the information
7 that's available to me. And, as I say, there's a very
8 different opinion between my assessment and what the
9 Claimant's assessment was in the past.
10 Q. But the information you have looked at is the same
11 information that the Claimant had?
12 A. As far as I'm aware it's the same. I mean, we had the
13 dataset that was provided by the Claimant.
14 Q. The eight of the Claimant's prospects which you have
15 looked at, although three of them not assessed, as
16 I say, form part of the Claimant's P50 case; right?
17 A. The P50 decision tree case, yes.
18 Q. And so all that you have actually assessed are five of
19 the prospects that the Claimant considers would be
20 within that P50 case?
21 A. We looked at five in detail. Looked in detail at the
22 eight, but decided that three were not valid, or were
23 insufficiently well-defined to qualify as leads, and
24 reviewed the remaining 32. But only in a superficial
25 way.

Page 105

12:07 1 Q. And so in discounting the three that you do not consider
2 to be prospects, all you are in fact saying is that
3 those three prospects should not have formed part of the
4 Claimant's P50 case?
5 A. Well, it was the Claimant who assigned those eight leads
6 to their P50 case. That wasn't my decision. That was
7 their decision. My review was that of those eight, five
8 could be considered leads and three not.
9 Q. So you have not conducted your own alternative
10 assessment of what you think the P50 case would be?
11 A. Well, I have, to the extent that I've calculated volumes
12 for and risks for those five that I identified as leads.
13 Q. But you have not actually considered across the entirety
14 of the licence areas whether the P50 case would be those
15 five prospects?
16 A. No, but I can't, because, as I say, the Claimant's P50
17 case is a statistical Monte Carlo output, which, you
18 know, that's what they came up with.
19 Q. But you haven't conducted any similar assessment of your
20 own?
21 A. No.
22 Q. Turning to the five that you did assess, could we please
23 turn to page 59 of the PDF of your second report. This
24 is page C.1 in appendix C of your second report.
25 It's page 59 of Dr Longman's second report, it's

Page 106

12:09 1 tab 318. (Pause)
2 Page 59 on the PDF. And if we look at paragraph
3 C.3, at the very beginning it's stated:
4 "SLR note that the majority of Mr Atkinson's
5 'Prospects' are defined based on two-way time ...
6 grids - either his own or those of EGI. Structures
7 which are 'drill ready' and form true Prospects under
8 [PRMS] would never be presented in TWT. TWT maps are a
9 step in the process of generating depth maps and are
10 often used to illustrate exploration concepts ..."
11 Do you see that?
12 A. I do.
13 Q. I notice it says here "SLR note", rather than "I note",
14 which you use in the next paragraph. Does that mean
15 that you did not personally conduct those assessments?
16 A. I worked with one of my colleagues, who is referenced in
17 the acknowledgments, in looking at the seismic projects
18 that we had. But the interpretation of the Kingdom
19 dataset is not my area of speciality.
20 Q. Okay. So you go on to say that these are a step in the
21 process of generating depth maps, as you say?
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And so you would accept that the depth maps would be
24 helpful for you if you were actually trying to assess
25 this further?

Page 107

12:11 1 A. And there are depth maps and time maps.
2 Q. So you do accept that depth maps have been provided by
3 Mr Atkinson in his Kingdom project?
4 A. There are some depth maps, yes.
5 Q. But here you suggest that in fact that's not the case.
6 So is it the case that the depth maps were not assessed?
7 A. No. I say that the majority, there were depth maps and
8 time maps, and in fact you will see in appendix C there
9 are some depth maps and time maps.
10 Q. So the conclusion that in fact the majority are -- or
11 that the information is not sufficient has not taken
12 into account the fact that there are these additional
13 maps which have been looked at?
14 A. Sorry, I don't ...
15 Q. Sorry, I'll rephrase that question.
16 Your conclusion that, or the conclusion I understand
17 you to be drawing in paragraph C.3 is that the prospects
18 have been defined on a first stage of data, rather than
19 the next stage, which would be depth maps. But can you
20 tell me today whether you can be -- whether you know if
21 depth maps were looked at for the five prospects that
22 you have particularly looked at in detail, or SLR have
23 looked at in detail?
24 A. Yes, some were depth and some were time.
25 Q. So for the five that have been assessed, paragraph C.3

Page 108

12:13 1 is not applicable?
 2 A. Well, the -- it ... "not applicable". It is applicable
 3 to the extent that what I'm referencing here is two-way
 4 time grids. Yes, there are some depth grids. Yes,
 5 there were some depth grids for the five that we looked
 6 at. Yes.
 7 But whether it's a lead or a prospect is not
 8 absolutely due to whether there's depth or time. It's
 9 an assessment as to what the validity of that
 10 interpretation is, how robust it looks.
 11 Q. As we've mentioned, Mr Atkinson has identified what he
 12 calls 40 prospects; right?
 13 A. Correct.
 14 Q. If we can go back to your first expert report, please,
 15 at page 22 of the PDF, and 18 of your hard copy, at
 16 paragraph 61 at the bottom. You are seeking here to
 17 draw a comparison between the number of prospects
 18 identified by Mr Atkinson and those which were referred
 19 to in contemporaneous documents prepared by AOG, and if
 20 we go over the page we see the table where you do that;
 21 correct?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. We've already discussed EGI, so I'm not going to look at
 24 that for the moment. But this refers to three different
 25 documents, or sets of documents, from AOG in 2014, 2015,

Page 109

12:16 1 presentations that these represent all of the leads that
 2 would be in the licence areas, do they?
 3 A. As far as I'm aware, they don't.
 4 Q. And wasn't the point of such presentations to identify
 5 the initial areas that they wished to drill?
 6 A. I think the focus was on the initial area. But if you
 7 were putting together an investor presentation, then
 8 I would have thought it would be only sensible to flag
 9 that you have whatever number of additional prospects or
 10 leads that you are assessing at the time.
 11 Q. But would you agree there would be no point in spending
 12 money to identify a further 20 or 30 prospects until you
 13 had someone on board, if that were the point of these
 14 presentations?
 15 A. No, I wouldn't. I wouldn't agree with that.
 16 Q. So in your view, Discovery should have spent a lot of
 17 time and money identifying every prospect or lead that
 18 may exist in an area before going to any investor?
 19 A. No, not necessarily. But I think that they should have
 20 undertaken enough of an evaluation to be comfortable in
 21 their own mind where to focus their efforts.
 22 Q. But do you accept that this was not an intention on
 23 their part to show everything that might exist in the
 24 area?
 25 A. Sorry, that this was?

Page 111

12:14 1 and 2017 that you have used to compare against the
 2 40 prospects identified by Mr Atkinson; correct?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And the conclusion which I understand you are seeking to
 5 draw here is that AOG itself never identified more than
 6 seven leads, or prospects, and therefore Rockflow's
 7 assessment far exceeds that?
 8 A. Not quite. There are seven leads identified there in
 9 the investor presentation as an example, which were
 10 tabulated. But I think as you may recall from the
 11 presentation, I superimposed all the circles that were
 12 in the investor presentation, which I think totalled 11.
 13 So I think there were 11 circles, but only seven of
 14 those were documented in the investor presentation.
 15 Q. Understood. But the point you're trying to make is that
 16 Rockflow's assessment exceeds that that AOG itself had
 17 carried out?
 18 A. Well, Rockflow's assessment identified a larger number
 19 of leads than any of the previous assessments. Yes.
 20 Q. But are you aware of, at any point in any of Discovery's
 21 previous presentations, it was purporting to set out
 22 a full assessment of how many leads would exist in the
 23 licence areas?
 24 A. No.
 25 Q. And in fact they do not say anywhere in their

Page 110

12:17 1 Q. That these presentations were not intended to show
 2 everything that they considered might exist in the area.
 3 A. I don't know. I can't say what their intention was when
 4 they put that together.
 5 Q. On that basis, isn't it inappropriate to say that this
 6 is therefore a comparable figure to the number of
 7 40 prospects identified by Mr Atkinson?
 8 A. I don't see that that follows. I'm trying to compare
 9 what was made available in their investor presentations
 10 or Opcom minutes with what is there now. I'm just
 11 comparing the two, or the sets of different analyses.
 12 Q. But isn't it important to understand the basis on which
 13 those numbers have been put forward, to understand
 14 whether they are, in fact, comparable?
 15 A. Well, as I say, I think that's the only information that
 16 there is to compare. I mean, I can't go further than
 17 that.
 18 Q. Turning now to look a bit at the exploration history
 19 that's taken place in the licence areas. You accept
 20 that there has been drilling activity in the actual
 21 licence areas in the past; correct?
 22 A. I do.
 23 Q. And can we please look at page 12 of your report, 16 in
 24 the PDF, I think.
 25 A. First report or second?

Page 112

12:19 1 Q. The first report that you've still got open.
 2 A. Sorry, 12, did you say?
 3 Q. 12 in your hard copy, yes, I think. And 16 in the PDF.
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. And here you set out a table that shows the exploration
 6 history in the licence areas over the 20th century,
 7 essentially?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. And many of these would have been drilled with old
 10 technology or techniques, and with poor, if any, data;
 11 would you agree?
 12 A. The vast majority, yes.
 13 Q. And yet the majority of these wells reported
 14 hydrocarbons existing, didn't they?
 15 A. Well, there were a lot of hydrocarbons reported, but
 16 that's partly because this is an area where everything
 17 is -- the whole petroleum system is one where you have
 18 hydrocarbons, but the difference is, have you got
 19 hydrocarbons trapped in a viable feature and a potential
 20 field. And most of these are what appeared to be shows,
 21 apart from a couple of the historic fields that were
 22 produced.
 23 Q. But this is despite the fact that they actually had
 24 little data to go on to try and find actually where to
 25 put those wells, and the older technology that would

Page 113

12:20 1 have existed?
 2 A. Yes, I don't know the basis on which all those wells
 3 were located.
 4 Q. And you will accept that no drilling has taken place
 5 since the acquisition of the data that is now available,
 6 and that Discovery has interpreted the 2D seismic, the
 7 gravity, the MT data?
 8 A. Yes, the last drilling was 1998.
 9 Q. And so all of that data that's been acquired since would
 10 most likely improve the chances of being able to find
 11 something, or put something in the right place?
 12 A. It should improve the ability to put something in the
 13 right place. It won't necessarily improve the chance of
 14 finding something.
 15 Q. Based on the fact that wells which were drilled without
 16 the benefit of that data had discovered hydrocarbons,
 17 isn't it likely that wells drilled with the benefit of
 18 that data would also discover hydrocarbons?
 19 A. No, that doesn't necessarily follow. As I say, this
 20 area is one where you've got an active petroleum system,
 21 everything is faulted, fractured, broken. So there's
 22 a lot of seeps, there's a lot of oil and gas in
 23 fractures and coming to the surface. So that's why you
 24 would have acquired or would have seen a lot of shows in
 25 historical wells.

Page 114

12:22 1 What you're trying to achieve is a viable structure
 2 with reservoir in that is large enough to be
 3 a commercial discovery these days.
 4 Q. But with the benefit of the data that has now been
 5 acquired, as you say, would that not improve the chances
 6 of being able to find where those would be?
 7 A. It should improve the chances, but the quality of the
 8 data is still -- it still makes it difficult to give you
 9 confidence in what is in the subsurface.
 10 Q. I'd like to look now at some of the benchmarking
 11 exercises that you have carried out, and you've
 12 mentioned some of these in your presentation today. But
 13 we're going to look at your second report, please, at
 14 page 10 in the hard copy, and page 17 on the PDF.
 15 This is a map where you have indicated in different
 16 colours the different nappes in the Polish Carpathians;
 17 right?
 18 A. Correct.
 19 Q. And then you use this on the next page -- I'm going to
 20 come back to the map -- to compare the resource density.
 21 Just to confirm, this is oil only at this point.
 22 A. Sorry?
 23 Q. This is just oil you're looking at, at this point?
 24 A. Yes, as I think I mentioned in the presentation, it's
 25 very hard to get -- there isn't data on gas benchmarking

Page 115

12:23 1 within the nappes. So you can only really do oil
 2 benchmarking.
 3 Q. And so you've used the map in the table which you can
 4 see on the next page to compare the amount of oil that
 5 has been found in each nappe in Poland with the amount
 6 of oil that Mr Atkinson estimates may exist in the
 7 licence areas?
 8 A. Correct.
 9 Q. And so that calculation is made on the basis that you
 10 need two inputs: the total amount of oil and the size of
 11 the relevant area; correct?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. And so if, for example, you had the same amount of oil
 14 but across two different sized areas, a larger area
 15 would result in a smaller resource density; correct?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. So the accuracy of the resource density calculation
 18 depends on how you define the area, does it not?
 19 A. That's one of the components, yes.
 20 Q. And if I understand correctly, if we take, for example,
 21 the Silesian nappe, because it's just the easiest to see
 22 on this map for the moment, as outlined in pink, you
 23 have used the entirety of the Silesian nappe area in
 24 your calculation for the resource density?
 25 A. Yes.

Page 116

12:24 1 Q. Now, and you will have seen this in Mr Atkinson's
2 presentation yesterday, and he mentioned this, that the
3 green sort of blobs on the right-hand side of the map
4 are where the oil is, or where the oil has been found,
5 in that Silesian nappe; correct?
6 A. That's where the bulk of the oil that's been found lies,
7 yes.
8 Q. But in fact, there are no green blobs in the western
9 half of the nappe at all, are there?
10 A. There are green blobs that are towards the sort of
11 centre. There's no green blobs in the western half.
12 But there have been wells drilled across the area of the
13 nappes.
14 So there's been exploration there, but no success.
15 Q. But you have nonetheless used the entirety of that nappe
16 to determine the resource density, even though half of
17 it, at least, has no oil in it, or has not found any
18 oil?
19 A. I have, but it doesn't make sense to me to just say:
20 okay, well we'll compare it against the successful bid.
21 Surely you need to compare it against the areas that
22 have been explored within that nappe: (a) the Silesian
23 nappe is different from the Claimant's licence area, but
24 (b) how would you know whether the area corresponds to
25 the positive half or the negative half of the area?

Page 117

12:26 1 Q. But the same is true of the licence areas, isn't it? So
2 if you don't know -- if you're comparing the Silesian
3 nappe where only half of it has oil with the licence
4 areas, surely the assumption should be: well, maybe only
5 half of that will have oil. You're simply not comparing
6 the same things, are you?
7 A. Sorry, you've lost me.
8 Q. Well, if you are not going to take just the section
9 where oil has been found to compare against the licence
10 areas, you said you're taking the whole area because
11 that's where there has been exploration, and the fact
12 that oil has not been found in half of it doesn't
13 matter. But you're comparing that to the very small
14 licence areas, but you're not making any similar
15 conclusion that there may not be some oil in half of
16 that.
17 A. Sorry, I don't quite follow. If you're trying to say
18 that I could have chosen one half than the other, then
19 I suppose I could have chosen the negative half and
20 said: there's no oil there.
21 Q. Well, exactly my point, in the sense that what you're
22 doing is you've tried to show in your table that
23 Mr Atkinson's estimates far exceed those in the other
24 nappes. But, again, it depends entirely on how you are
25 comparing the areas. As you say, if you had taken, for

Page 118

12:28 1 example, part of the areas where there's no oil, the
2 result would have been very different.
3 A. It would. So I think I come back to my original
4 position, which is to me it seemed most logical to take
5 the entire area.
6 Q. But isn't the result of this that basically you can
7 manipulate this as much as you wish in order to get to
8 the result that you want to have?
9 A. I didn't manipulate it to get to the result that
10 I wanted to have. I took the data as I had it, which
11 was the available information in Poland, and allocated
12 it by nappe and came out with an answer.
13 Q. If we can now please turn to paragraph 109 of your first
14 expert report, and that's on PDF page 33 of your first
15 expert report, page 29 in the hard copy.
16 And you make a conclusion here by, again,
17 a benchmark analysis between the oilfields that have
18 been estimated or identified by Mr Atkinson, compared to
19 those which have been found in Poland, and say that:
20 "... the Claimant's expected field size is over
21 30 times greater than the existing Polish Carpathian
22 fields."
23 Correct?
24 A. Yes.
25 Q. And again, this is just oilfields we're talking about?

Page 119

12:29 1 A. It is.
2 Q. And in conducting this exercise you have included all
3 known Polish oilfields; correct?
4 A. Yes.
5 Q. Do you accept that the Polish field dataset includes
6 many fields which are smaller than Mr Atkinson's
7 prospects?
8 A. Yes.
9 Q. And the reason for this is that the data in the licence
10 areas does not allow such small prospects to be mapped;
11 isn't that right?
12 A. Well, I've simply taken the leads that Mr Atkinson
13 identified and used them. The data is not very good.
14 Would you be able to see tiny fields on that data? No.
15 But then again, if and when you drilled the 40 leads,
16 would you end up with that volume, or are you likely to
17 end up with a smaller volume? We don't know.
18 Q. So you don't know whether smaller fields may exist in
19 the licence areas, do you?
20 A. I don't, no.
21 Q. But this graph assumes a full range of oilfields in
22 Poland, including very small ones, but then compares
23 them only with those that have been large enough to be
24 mapped in the licence areas?
25 A. Well, again, it's comparing the existing data, which

Page 120

12:31 1 shows that in Poland there is a significant range in
2 field size.
3 Q. So you accept that the reality is that there's simply
4 not the data to be able to know what the same field size
5 may be in Slovakia, or similar field size, and so you're
6 using a set of data from Poland that is much larger than
7 the set of data that exists for the licence areas?
8 A. Well, again, I am, because I'm just using the data that
9 is available.
10 Q. But you're not comparing the same representative samples
11 then, are you?
12 A. Well, I am. I'm using, as I say, what is available.
13 Q. But what is available isn't necessarily representative
14 of what actually exists?
15 A. Well, no, but you're never going to know that until
16 you've explored. So you've got to use what data is
17 available to you.
18 Q. But the data that you've had available from Poland is
19 data that's been accumulated over 150 years. So that's
20 a much larger sample to compare against just what
21 Mr Atkinson has done.
22 A. Well, it is. But, as I say, I'm not sure -- I'm not
23 sure where -- what you can do. I mean, I'm simply
24 plotting up the historical data from Poland.
25 Q. And I'm not saying that there is more data that you

Page 121

12:33 1 more modern, is, again, not using the data in the
2 correct way to compare to what Mr Atkinson is estimating
3 as at today?
4 A. No. I don't think that follows. Because what he's
5 plotted here is what's been produced from fields. It's
6 not related to individual well performance, this chart.
7 It's field production.
8 Q. Can we please turn now to your second --
9 MR DRYMER: Pardon me, but on that point, wouldn't field
10 production change as a result of modern techniques as
11 well?
12 A. Well, not necessarily, no, just the number of wells that
13 you might need to produce the field.
14 MR DRYMER: I see.
15 A. If the field size is, let's say, a million barrels --
16 MR DRYMER: Got it.
17 A. Then if you have got old wells producing small volumes
18 there's only a million barrels to produce.
19 MR DRYMER: I see.
20 A. If you did modern ones then you would be able to do it
21 with less wells. But you're not going to change the
22 size of the field.
23 MR DRYMER: Not for another few million years, perhaps.
24 A. Well, maybe.
25 MR DRYMER: Maybe. But production from a field of a given

Page 123

12:32 1 could have. But my point is that if you don't have
2 similar data, again, you're not making a comparison with
3 similar things, are you?
4 A. Well, I don't think I agree.
5 Q. Wouldn't a more appropriate comparison [have been] to
6 have compared fields that were of the same size that
7 Mr Atkinson had been able to identify, and exclude the
8 smaller ones that have not been able to be mapped in
9 Slovakia?
10 A. Well, no, I don't think so, because then you're
11 arbitrarily selecting part of the data that's available.
12 Q. But aren't you arbitrarily making this comparison anyway
13 by including data from one set that simply doesn't exist
14 in another set?
15 A. Not in my opinion, no.
16 Q. As I mentioned, the vast majority of the Polish wells
17 are historical and date back over 150 years. Not all of
18 them that long, but over a span of 150 years. And so
19 the production of those wells would not be comparable to
20 what could be achieved today; would you agree?
21 A. I would expect that you would get some improvement using
22 modern technology, yes.
23 Q. And so, again, taking this Polish data, without taking
24 into account how old some of these wells may have been,
25 or that production may have been improved if they were

Page 122

12:35 1 size wouldn't increase?
2 A. It could, yes.
3 MR DRYMER: Yes.
4 A. But the production rate, but not the total volume.
5 MR DRYMER: That's what I mean, forgive me. Yes.
6 THE PRESIDENT: So it would take longer to extract all of
7 the oil from the field; yes?
8 A. Historically, yes.
9 MR NEWING: Thank you.
10 If we could turn now to your second report, please,
11 at page 16 in the PDF and 23 in your hard copy,
12 I think -- no, the other way around. 23 in the PDF and
13 16 in your hard copy. Sorry.
14 A. Yes.
15 Q. And this is a chart which I think you showed again in
16 your presentation earlier --
17 A. I did.
18 Q. -- which you say represents a comparison between the
19 average amount of oil recovered by well in the Polish
20 nappes we've been looking at, and those proposed by
21 Rockflow.
22 A. Yes.
23 Q. And you acknowledge in paragraph 66 that technology, as
24 you've just mentioned, would have improved well
25 performances, and in fact you assume that there may have

Page 124

12:36 1 been a four-fold technology driven improvement?
2 MR DRYMER: That's what I was looking for, thank you.
3 A. I do.
4 MR NEWING: But even with that you say your view is that
5 Rockflow's assumption are still inflated by 10 to 20
6 times?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. And the data that you have used for this comparison is
9 contained in a very large spreadsheet which, don't
10 worry, I'm not going to ask you to bring up, but which
11 is at CDL-14 for the Tribunal's purpose?
12 A. Yes.
13 Q. And contains a list of over 4,000 wells that have been
14 drilled in Poland since 1850; correct?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And you've used the data from all of those wells to
17 perform this comparison, haven't you?
18 A. I've used the data from, yes, the set of wells that
19 reflected the oilfields, yes.
20 Q. You will have seen from Dr Moy's presentation this
21 morning that in his view many of the wells in that data
22 would be inappropriate to use, as they relate to
23 stratigraphic intervals which are too deep to be present
24 in the Slovakian licence areas; do you remember him
25 explaining that?

Page 125

12:39 1 information to know whether the amounts have come from
2 those deeper parts or from the shallower parts?
3 A. Well, there's no production from the deeper
4 stratigraphy. So any production -- as I've tried to
5 explain, if you drill a well through the Silesian nappe
6 and you've got the deeper section in which the TD is, if
7 that well's produced any oil, then it's produced out of
8 the Silesian nappe section. There's no -- as far as
9 I'm aware, there's no production from the deeper
10 stratigraphy.
11 Q. And is that information that you've gained from that
12 dataset about the wells in Poland, or is that
13 information that you are assuming?
14 A. The dataset on wells doesn't, I don't think, identify
15 which the producing horizons are. But, as I say, as far
16 as I'm aware, there's no indication of deeper production
17 in Poland from the section below the Silesian nappe.
18 Q. Dr Moy made clear in his presentation this morning that
19 I think he said around 87% of the oil wells that have
20 been drilled were from before 1946. Do you recall that?
21 A. I do recall that.
22 Q. And that they were virtually all shallower wells?
23 A. The majority were shallow wells, yes.
24 Q. Yes, 96% or something, I think he said. And he
25 explained in his presentation that when you look at the

Page 127

12:37 1 A. I do. I do remember him saying that.
2 Q. Do you accept that those would be inappropriate to use
3 as a comparison?
4 A. No, I don't, because I think the mistake there is that
5 underneath the Silesian nappe you do have the older
6 stratigraphy, and I think the reference to the
7 stratigraphy in the well database is where the well
8 TD'd. So if it drills all the way through the Silesian
9 nappe, it then TDs in older formation. So I don't think
10 that the removal of those simply because they were a TD
11 in an older formation negates the use of those wells,
12 because they've drilled through all the shallower
13 formations in the Silesian nappe.
14 Q. But do you accept that the deeper you go, the greater
15 the production may be?
16 A. Not --
17 Q. The greater the pressure?
18 A. Not necessarily. Yes, the deeper you go, the higher the
19 pressure. But equally you may have, the deeper you go,
20 the reservoir will deteriorate, and so you've got
21 a balance between higher pressure and poorer reservoir
22 parameters often.
23 Q. But the data that you've used, which includes these
24 wells which go far deeper than would exist in the
25 Slovakian licence areas, do not actually give you the

Page 126

12:40 1 amount of oil recovered in those pre-1946 shallower
2 wells, the average production in fact comes out at
3 something as 73,000 barrels per well, much higher than
4 the averages that you have included in your table?
5 A. But I think that's partly a function of the fact that he
6 has removed a lot of the wells from his comparison.
7 I think it's worth noting that even in the Claimant's
8 documentation, they have a list of wells in some of
9 their analogue fields that they've put in, and that list
10 of wells totals somewhere near 3,700 wells. So I think
11 reducing the number down to the number that Dr Moy was
12 reporting, there seems to be a mismatch somewhere.
13 Q. Would you accept, though, that if most of the production
14 has come from shallower wells, even in your larger
15 dataset -- I think that's what you were telling me just
16 now, because the production is still coming from the top
17 part -- that this should be compared to the shallower
18 wells' production that is being proposed by the
19 Claimant's experts?
20 A. You can compare against the shallower as well as the
21 deeper. The figure in this chart is actually the
22 average of all three levels. The three oilfields in the
23 Claimant's model are at different depths. So this
24 figure of 400 is an average. The range within that
25 model is from about 200-700.

Page 128

12:42 1 Q. I think Dr Moy explained in his presentation earlier,
 2 and it's in his second report at table 3-4, that the
 3 recovery estimated for wells that were at the shallower
 4 depths is from 143 to 220,000 barrels.
 5 A. And that equates to the -- broadly to the figure of 200
 6 I just gave.
 7 Q. Yes. But that's half of the 400 figure that you've
 8 assumed in this chart.
 9 A. At the low end, yes. But 700 is much bigger.
 10 Q. But if we were only comparing the shallower wells, on
 11 the basis that in Poland most of the oil has been
 12 recovered from shallower wells.
 13 A. Yes, if you want to go down that route. But 200 is
 14 still significantly more than the analysis here.
 15 Q. Yes. But assuming your four-fold production --
 16 four-fold improvement, sorry, in production, it suddenly
 17 becomes a lot less than you've suggested.
 18 A. Sorry, it becomes a lot less?
 19 Q. The increase, or the difference in the amount which
 20 Rockflow have estimated, which you have suggested, when
 21 it's 400, after taking into account a four-fold
 22 technology-driven improvement, is inflated by 10-20
 23 times, would be at least half that?
 24 A. Well, it depends which nappe data you are taking.
 25 I mean, if you took the whole of the Poland average,

Page 129

12:46 1 chance of success; it's one of the points that you
 2 summarise from the RPS report.
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. And this RPS report was issued in May 2012; correct?
 5 A. 2012, I don't remember whether it was May, but I'll
 6 accept it was May. Definitely 2012.
 7 Q. And so this was before the processing and interpretation
 8 of the seismic data had been completed by Discovery;
 9 correct?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And before the MT data had even been acquired, let alone
 12 processed and interpreted?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. And even before the EGI study as well?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. And yet RPS identified four prospects on the basis of
 17 the data that they had available to them then?
 18 A. They did, although as you can see in the description
 19 below the table in the paragraphs, they were heavily
 20 caveating what they had identified.
 21 Q. But they did actually identify four prospects.
 22 A. They carried four prospects in that report, yes.
 23 Q. And two of the prospects are in the Smilno area;
 24 correct?
 25 A. They are.

Page 131

12:44 1 we've got 20 there. But again, the historical data from
 2 the Dukla and the Magura gives you a figure of 8, if you
 3 average that.
 4 So, yes, the difference would be less for the
 5 shallow wells.
 6 Q. So, again -- once again, in conducting all of these
 7 exercises, and I'm not suggesting you have done this,
 8 but ultimately, depending on how you look at the data
 9 and which bits of the data you want to use, will change
 10 the result that you're looking at?
 11 A. Well, I think that's always the case. I mean we are
 12 looking at the data and taking all the data that we've
 13 got and presenting it, and other people will take the
 14 data and present it differently, as has been
 15 demonstrated this morning.
 16 Q. I'm going to look now at one of the documents that we
 17 discussed with Mr Atkinson yesterday, which is the
 18 RPS CPR report. This is referenced by you in your
 19 second expert report at PDF page 12, and internal
 20 page 5. Do you see that?
 21 A. Yes.
 22 Q. And if you go over the page, in fact, you have a summary
 23 table that you have put together.
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. Which you say summarises in particular the geological

Page 130

12:47 1 Q. And one of those would equate to the well that Discovery
 2 was planning to drill?
 3 A. Probably, yes.
 4 Q. And the other, I think, equates to Mr Atkinson's BM04
 5 well?
 6 A. I don't know. I haven't compared those.
 7 Q. I'm going to put it to you that that's what they equate
 8 to.
 9 Both of those, the Smilno well, the Discovery Smilno
 10 well, which is Mr Atkinson's BM01, and Mr Atkinson's
 11 BM04, are wells that, again, are two of the three that
 12 you have discounted as not being prospects?
 13 A. Correct.
 14 Q. And so here we have a second independent report, which
 15 has identified that those would be prospects that you
 16 disagree with?
 17 A. I do, but when you -- as I say, if you read the whole of
 18 that report, they do make comment about the level of
 19 data that they have available. But yes, they are
 20 carried in that document.
 21 Q. So looking at the geological chance of success, and the
 22 table, and it's the right-hand column in this table,
 23 where you've set out the figures from the RPS report.
 24 A. I have.
 25 Q. You say that based on this, the range calculated by RPS

Page 132

12:49 1 is between 6% and 12% with an average of 9%?
2 A. I do.
3 Q. And you say that that supports your calculation of 7.5%,
4 compared to Mr Atkinson's 20.6%?
5 A. Yes. I view that as being more comparable with my
6 analysis than Mr Atkinson's, yes.
7 Q. Just as a first point, your calculation of the GCOS is
8 a calculation of the GCOS from just the three gas
9 prospects that you have assessed, isn't it?
10 A. Sorry, my calc --
11 Q. Your own GCOS calculation of 7.5% comes from your
12 assessment of the three gas prospects out of the five
13 that have been assessed; correct?
14 A. Oh, what, you mean because I took two out?
15 Q. Yes.
16 A. Yes.
17 Q. And so it's not a calculation of the GCOS -- the average
18 GCOS for all gas prospects in the licence areas; only
19 those that you have looked at.
20 A. Yes. I've only calculated a GCOS for the leads that we
21 looked at in detail.
22 Q. And so your 7.5% GCOS is also not a calculation of the
23 GCOS of these particular Smilno prospects that RPS has
24 looked at here, let alone the Zborov ones, as you
25 discounted both of those Smilno ones?

Page 133

12:52 1 Q. Okay. I'll come back to that in a moment.
2 So what they are saying this is here, this 16, is
3 the chance that at least one of the three reservoirs in
4 that prospect will be successful; do you agree with
5 that?
6 A. Yes, that's an analysis, on the basis that you have one
7 success.
8 Q. Yes. And it's higher because the chance of hitting one
9 out of those three is higher than hitting each one of
10 them individually?
11 A. Yes, that's what the analysis is designed to show, yes.
12 Q. And if we turn over the page, at the table on the next
13 page at the top, we see the same for the Zborov B
14 prospect, we see the title there; yes?
15 A. Yes.
16 Q. And this one has five individual reservoirs, and then
17 they've allocated a total of at least one success of
18 30%.
19 A. Yes.
20 Q. And so again I put it to you that the 30% is the chance
21 of success that they've identified for the Zborov B
22 prospect.
23 A. Well, these two prospects have got stacked different
24 reservoirs in them. So there's separate reservoirs
25 within the same prospect that they've put here. So each

Page 135

12:50 1 A. Well, they're different GCOS calculations for different
2 prospects, effectively, or different leads, the way
3 they've been evaluated. They may be in the same
4 geographic location. But, yes, I calculated the GCOS
5 for the three that I evaluated. RPS have calculated
6 chance of success for the four that they carried.
7 Q. Can we please turn to CDL-008, which is the RPS report.
8 And if we can go, please -- you will see there
9 it's May 2012, just to confirm the May date.
10 If we can go, please, to PDF page 91. And in the
11 table at the bottom, you will see this is the summary in
12 that report for the Zborov A prospect; correct?
13 A. It is, yes.
14 Q. And it shows that within that prospect there are three
15 individual reservoirs for which they have assigned
16 separate geological chance of success. In this they say
17 GPOS rather than GCOS, but it's the same thing?
18 A. It is, yes.
19 Q. And those three numbers, the 8, 6, 6, are the ones that
20 you have reproduced in your table?
21 A. Correct.
22 Q. But what this table also then shows is that the total
23 GCOS for the prospect is 16%; do you see that?
24 A. I see the number of 16. I disagree with your analysis
25 that that's the GCOS for the total prospect.

Page 134

12:54 1 individual opportunity has a GCOS calculated. They've
2 then done a statistical analysis to look at the impact
3 of drilling and finding one of those five, or at least
4 one of those five reservoirs.
5 Q. Yes, so this is the chance of success of finding at
6 least something, at least one of those reservoirs, in
7 this prospect?
8 A. It is.
9 Q. So for the purpose of the prospect as a whole, this is
10 their chance of success of finding at least one of those
11 reservoirs?
12 A. That's the way they've assessed it, yes.
13 Q. And if you scroll down to the second table, you can see
14 that they summarise this by the four prospects,
15 Smilno A, Smilno B, Zborov A, Zborov B, and the figures
16 they use -- Smilno is not challenged here, but the
17 figures they use are the 16% and 30% figures; do you see
18 that?
19 A. I do.
20 Q. And yet you have not referenced those figures at all in
21 your table, have you?
22 A. I haven't, because there's a reason behind that, which
23 is that these, as I say, they're looking at -- what I've
24 put here is the chance of success for each individual
25 reservoir within the prospect. And that is a more

Page 136

12:55 1 direct comparison with what I'm looking at in assessing
 2 the GCOS for the leads identified.
 3 The leads identified by Mr Atkinson are not a series
 4 of separate stacked reservoir. Each lead has one
 5 target.
 6 Q. But Mr Atkinson explained yesterday in his testimony
 7 that they deliberately did not try to identify
 8 individual reservoirs, but that doesn't mean that they
 9 are not -- that they may not be stacked reservoirs.
 10 They simply chose a more simple approach. Do you recall
 11 him saying that?
 12 A. These are -- I don't recall him saying that, but these
 13 are individual separate targets within one prospect in
 14 the RPS.
 15 Q. But RPS itself has determined, as you can see from this
 16 second table, that the chance of success for the
 17 prospect as a whole is 16% and 30%, yet you make no
 18 reference to those in your report at all; isn't that
 19 misleading?
 20 A. Not as far as I'm concerned, no. Because, as I say,
 21 I've quoted the GCOS that RPS put forward for the
 22 individual target within the prospect.
 23 Q. Would you agree with me -- I appreciate you don't have
 24 a calculator with you, but would you agree with me that
 25 to work out the average of the GCOS with the prospects

Page 137

12:58 1 Q. You say at paragraph 33 on the next page that:
 2 "The scope of the evaluation was ... '... to
 3 determine the prospective resources in the two committed
 4 wells in the Ol'ka and Stromy areas."
 5 So they were only looking at those two wells and did
 6 not undertake an evaluation of the rest of the licence
 7 areas, did they?
 8 A. They looked at the area around those two wells.
 9 Q. But not the entirety of the licence areas?
 10 A. No.
 11 Q. And you also note in that paragraph that although they
 12 had 12 seismic lines available, they only interpreted
 13 five of them.
 14 A. I think that was a reference they made, yes.
 15 Q. Would you agree that that's a very limited basis on
 16 which to perform an analysis?
 17 A. Well, it depends what you mean by the analysis. If
 18 those five lines cover the area that they were charged
 19 with reviewing, then fine. If the rest of the lines
 20 were outside the area they were charged with looking at,
 21 you know.
 22 Q. Well, you yourself seemed to note that they had 12
 23 seismic lines available to them.
 24 A. Well, I think that's stated in the report.
 25 Q. And in the report it doesn't appear that they considered

Page 139

12:57 1 as set out in this table, you would add the four numbers
 2 and divide by 4: 12 plus 12 plus 16 plus 30, and divide
 3 by 4?
 4 A. If you were taking those numbers.
 5 Q. Yes?
 6 A. You would. But as I've said, I haven't taken those
 7 numbers.
 8 Q. And that average -- you may be mathematically minded to
 9 do it, but I'll put it to you that that average comes
 10 out at 17.5%. That is in fact much closer to
 11 Mr Atkinson's GCOS of 20.6% than to your 7.5%, isn't it?
 12 A. If you do that analysis, you get that comparison. But,
 13 as I say, I don't agree with that analysis.
 14 Q. In respect of oil, the other document that you seek to
 15 rely on is a draft 51-101 report, which is a Canadian
 16 regulatory filing that governs the disclosure of oil and
 17 gas activities for security purposes; correct?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. And you deal with this in your second report at
 20 paragraph 32, which is on PDF page 14, and hard copy
 21 page 17. And following; it goes on from there.
 22 And the draft document was prepared in 2014;
 23 correct? I think you say that somewhere. I can pull it
 24 up. It's the footnote at the end.
 25 A. Yes, December '14.

Page 138

12:59 1 the surface geology, does it?
 2 A. I don't remember.
 3 Q. But would you agree that this is a very preliminary
 4 assessment of a limited area of the licence areas?
 5 A. Well, I don't know about the word "preliminary". It's
 6 a specific focus that they have been charged with, yes.
 7 Q. And they did not specifically undertake assessment of
 8 the geological chance of success or chance of
 9 development because -- and you set this out at
 10 paragraph 35 -- they were not yet considered to be
 11 prospects; correct?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. But all this means at the time is that they personally
 14 did not consider that there was sufficient data that
 15 those who might want to drill here would consider them
 16 prospects.
 17 A. Sorry?
 18 Q. All that means is that they do not consider them to have
 19 had sufficient data that would enable them to consider
 20 that someone who wanted to drill there would consider it
 21 a prospect?
 22 A. Sorry, I'm still not quite sure where you're ... I mean,
 23 they simply state that they don't have the level to --
 24 in their opinion, to calculate a chance of success.
 25 (Pause).

Page 140

13:01 1 MR NEWING: Sorry, one moment. (Pause).
 2 No further questions.
 3 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 4 Any questions in re-direct?
 5 MR PILAWA: I have no questions on re-direct,
 6 Madam President.
 7 THE PRESIDENT: Do my colleagues have questions for
 8 Mr Longman?
 9 (1.02 pm)
 10 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
 11 MR DRYMER: Doctor, thank you for your evidence. As with
 12 your friends, Messrs Atkinson, Moy and Howard, I believe
 13 I understand the details of your analysis, but
 14 I sometimes like to zoom out and ask a more conceptual
 15 question, to be sure I don't miss the forest for the
 16 trees.
 17 Could you elaborate briefly on the notion that
 18 prospectivity is in part a function of a developer's
 19 willingness to drill? Did I understand that aspect of
 20 your evidence, of your testimony earlier correctly? Or
 21 no?
 22 A. That's an interesting question.
 23 MR DRYMER: Well, I'm not trying to put words in your mouth.
 24 A. No, no. In the ideal world, I think you want to have,
 25 obviously, as much comfort as you can get on

Page 141

13:05 1 Does that -- you obviously assume that or take that
 2 into account in your work. Phrasing it this way, does
 3 it change in any way your conclusions here, in terms of
 4 prospectivity?
 5 A. No, because I think regardless of whether the developer
 6 or the explorer is willing to take the risk, you've
 7 still got to have a view of what might be there.
 8 MR DRYMER: Yes.
 9 A. So what the individual company might do I don't think
 10 changes your view of what you would assess might be
 11 there in the first place.
 12 MR DRYMER: I understand. I understand. Alright, that's
 13 good. Thank you very much.
 14 THE PRESIDENT: I have no further questions, Dr Longman. So
 15 that concludes your examination.
 16 DR LONGMAN: Thank you.
 17 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.
 18 So this is a good time for a lunch break. Should we
 19 resume at 2.15?
 20 Let me ask, how much time do you envisage for the
 21 next cross?
 22 MR NEWING: Probably a similar amount of time. I'm not
 23 entirely sure how much time I took then. But probably
 24 similar, no more than an hour and a half, I would
 25 imagine.

Page 143

13:03 1 understanding what you're targeting. But you've got to
 2 work with the information that is available, and
 3 I suppose it comes down to a perception of risk in the
 4 end as to what individual companies are going to see as
 5 being an appropriate opportunity to follow.
 6 MR DRYMER: That sounds, in a very, very gross sense,
 7 subjective. Is that the case? And doesn't that cut
 8 both ways?
 9 A. Yes, exploration is a risk and reward game. So there's
 10 always going to be an element of objectivity, to the
 11 extent that you can have that, and subjectivity, to the
 12 extent that you're going to make a decision at some
 13 stage.
 14 MR DRYMER: But even if two individuals, companies, whatever
 15 it may be, agree on all of the objective measurable and
 16 verifiable data, so to speak, there still might be
 17 a difference in their perception of risk and reward?
 18 A. Absolutely. Absolutely.
 19 MR DRYMER: Yes, and -- well, I guess it's not an overly
 20 controversial proposition, then, that whether a site is
 21 called prospective or not may come down to simply the
 22 willingness of the developer to take the risk or not?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 MR DRYMER: Right. Okay. I thought -- I just wanted to be
 25 sure I understood that.

Page 142

13:07 1 THE PRESIDENT: An hour and a half.
 2 MR NEWING: In fact, I was a lot less than I thought I was,
 3 but certainly no more than an hour and a half.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: I think then we have plenty of time this
 5 afternoon. We need to have ...
 6 So we'll resume at 2.15.
 7 MR NEWING: Thank you.
 8 MR PILAWA: See you then.
 9 (1.07 pm)
 10 (Adjourned until 2.15 pm)
 11 (2.18 pm)
 12 THE PRESIDENT: Fine, we're ready to start.
 13 You are both ready? Good.
 14 DR TIAGO DUARTE-SILVA (called)
 15 MR RICHARD ACKLAM (called)
 16 THE PRESIDENT: Sir, you are Tiago Duarte-Silva?
 17 DR DUARTE-SILVA: That's right.
 18 THE PRESIDENT: And you are Richard Acklam?
 19 MR ACKLAM: That is correct.
 20 THE PRESIDENT: You are both from Charles River Associates.
 21 MR ACKLAM: That's correct.
 22 THE PRESIDENT: You have submitted two expert reports,
 23 31 March 2023 and 14 December 2023.
 24 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Yes.
 25 MR ACKLAM: Correct.

Page 144

14:20 1 THE PRESIDENT: You will be heard as expert witnesses. As
 2 expert witnesses you have a duty to make statements in
 3 accordance with your sincere belief. Can you please,
 4 one after the other, read the expert declaration.
 5 MR ACKLAM: I solemnly declare upon my honour and conscience
 6 that my statement will be in accordance with my sincere
 7 belief.
 8 DR DUARTE-SILVA: I solemnly declare upon my honour and
 9 conscience that my statement will be in accordance with
 10 my sincere belief.
 11 THE PRESIDENT: Before you start with the presentation, when
 12 you get questions, will one of you take the lead and
 13 either answer or delegate to the other? Have you
 14 clearly allocated portions of the reports that go to the
 15 one or the other, or how are you organised?
 16 DR DUARTE-SILVA: The report is the joint opinion of both of
 17 us. When we get a question, what we can say is one of
 18 us will answer, not two of us will answer.
 19 I can make that judgment, if that's okay with the
 20 Tribunal.
 21 THE PRESIDENT: Good. The idea is simply that it is not one
 22 who starts and the other then who corrects, or whatever.
 23 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Of course.
 24 THE PRESIDENT: One person per question, and you will decide
 25 how to allocate.

Page 145

14:22 1 them to an appendix to this slide show.
 2 (Slide 1) So what we will talk about today is in the
 3 market approach we will show that if it is based on past
 4 transactions, you will reach a but-for fair market value
 5 below \$2 million. We will also show that based on
 6 companies that were deemed comparable by the Claimant
 7 itself, that fair market value is below \$1.1 million.
 8 We will then show that the Claimant's sunk cost
 9 claim is unreliable; the lost opportunity claim is
 10 unsubstantiated, and then we will provide comments on
 11 the appropriate rate of interest from an economic
 12 standpoint.
 13 Now I'll turn to my colleague.
 14 MR ACKLAM: So when it first invested in the project, the
 15 Claimant granted an overriding royalty of 3.5% of
 16 revenues from the licences to San Leon. (Slide 2) That
 17 was in March 2014. San Leon then sold the ORR
 18 in January 2015 for £120,000, and that corresponds to
 19 \$5.15 million for 100% of the revenues from the
 20 licences, or \$1.29 million for the Claimant's share.
 21 Now, it's necessary to move these numbers from the
 22 transaction date of January 2015 to both the ex-ante and
 23 ex-post valuation dates. To do this we used the
 24 FTSE 350 Oil & Gas stock price index, which results in
 25 but-for fair market values of \$1.82 million and

Page 147

14:21 1 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Yes.
 2 THE PRESIDENT: Good. Fine. So you may start. As you
 3 know, you have 15 minutes.
 4 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Yes, good afternoon to all members of the
 5 Tribunal.
 6 Before we start we just need to make two very minor
 7 corrections in our second report. Specifically,
 8 footnote 53 should have cited to a different document.
 9 It should have cited to CRA-63, page 64.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: That's your second report?
 11 DR DUARTE-SILVA: That's right.
 12 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 13 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Which is San Leon's 2015 annual report.
 14 Also, footnote 103 should read
 15 1,577,000,000 barrels. I'll repeat that.
 16 1,577,000,000 barrels of prospective resources. Instead
 17 of the 1,414,000,000 barrels of prospective resources.
 18 So we will now start, if that's alright?
 19 THE PRESIDENT: Yes please.
 20 (2.22 pm)
 21 Presentation by DR DUARTE-SILVA and MR ACKLAM
 22 DR DUARTE-SILVA: So at the Tribunal's instruction, we have
 23 focused our slides on the market approach and the sunk
 24 costs approach. However, because we had already
 25 prepared slides on the income approach, we have moved

Page 146

14:24 1 \$1.66 million respectively.
 2 Now, this royalty is based on revenues only, so
 3 therefore the values are biased upwards compared to the
 4 true fair market value, which is affected by costs,
 5 taxes and other deductions which do not come into play
 6 in the royalty.
 7 This transaction --
 8 DR DUARTE-SILVA: We're having trouble flipping the slides,
 9 I am sorry.
 10 MR ACKLAM: Could we go to the next slide, please (Slide 3).
 11 This transaction is representative of market value.
 12 The seller was not compelled to sell the royalty. The
 13 stream of revenues could, for example, have been
 14 converted into financing collateralised by those
 15 revenues. It was not part of a fire sale. San Leon
 16 does not appear to have been in a "dire financial
 17 situation". It had alternative sources of funding
 18 available to it at the time of the ORR sale and it was
 19 paying its directors significant amounts over this
 20 period. And we saw some new arguments raised by
 21 Mr Howard today, and in our opinion those are invalid
 22 and contradicted by other evidence available.
 23 Furthermore, the seller was well informed about the
 24 sale. San Leon was better positioned than almost any
 25 other buyer to know the ORR's true value, given its

Page 148

14:25 1 historic ownership of the project. And San Leon would
2 not have left such a significant amount of money on the
3 table when it sold the ORR for £120,000.
4 Just to compare, Mr Howard's discounted cash flow
5 model implies that these revenues were worth \$61 million
6 in undiscounted terms.
7 (Slide 4) There was also an attempted transaction
8 that is consistent with the fair market value implied by
9 this ORR transaction, and that is the agreement by Akard
10 to provide \$3.7 million of funding to the Claimant
11 in October 2015. Now, if the Akard agreement had been
12 for purchasing 50% of the proceeds of the Claimant's
13 share in the licences, that would mean a fair market
14 value of 3.7 million for the Claimant's 25% share. And,
15 again, moving this fair market value from the
16 transaction date to the ex-ante and ex-post valuation
17 dates, using the same index as with the ORR, results in
18 but-for fair market values of \$5.7 million and
19 \$5.2 million respectively.
20 However, in fact, Akard actually purchased more than
21 50% of the proceeds of the Claimant's share of the
22 licences for that \$3.7 million. So initially Akard
23 would have received 80% of the proceeds until it had
24 been paid four times its initial investment. That would
25 have then switched to Akard receiving 65% of the

Page 149

14:27 1 proceeds until it had received five times its original
2 investment, before finally reverting to a 50/50 share
3 between Akard and the Claimant.
4 As a result, Akard had purchased more than 50% of
5 the proceeds, and therefore the project is worth less
6 than the ex-ante and ex-post fair market values
7 indicated on this slide.
8 (Slide 5) So I've spoken there about value implied
9 by historic transactions. I'll now speak a little bit
10 about fair market value implied by comparable companies.
11 (Slide 6) So in the market approach we need to
12 select firstly comparable companies, and then a metric
13 by which to compare them. We note that the project did
14 not have reserves at the ex-ante valuation date, only
15 prospective resources. The Claimant itself had selected
16 eight companies which it deemed to be comparable to
17 Discovery; however, at the ex-ante valuation date, only
18 ADX Energy of these eight did not have any reserves.
19 Therefore, we use ADX Energy on an ex-ante basis to
20 imply a valuation for the Claimant's share of the
21 licences.
22 The metric we use is the ratio of enterprise value
23 to estimated resources, and based on ADX Energy's
24 enterprise value and expected resources at the ex-ante
25 valuation date, each barrel of those resources is worth

Page 150

14:28 1 0.6 cents.
2 (Slide 7) The result of this is that the fair market
3 value of the Claimant's share of the licences at the
4 ex-ante valuation date is \$40,000. However, ADX
5 Energy's enterprise value, that 8 million, includes the
6 value of both contingent and prospective resources,
7 because ADX Energy had both contingent and prospective
8 at that time, whereas the project only had prospective
9 resources.
10 Generally, contingent resources are valued more, or
11 higher per barrel than prospective resources.
12 Therefore, this value is biased high relative to the
13 project.
14 We also note the calculation by Mr Howard of
15 36 million at the ex-ante valuation date. This uses
16 a metric of EV per 2P reserves, despite the fact that
17 the project did not have reserves at the ex-ante
18 valuation date.
19 Furthermore, Mr Howard used a weighted average of EV
20 per 2P ratios across the comparable companies, although
21 he described it in his report as a notional line of best
22 fit. The value that he calculated for this was \$4.375
23 per barrel, and he then multiplied this by the reserves
24 which Mr Howard considered the project to have at the
25 ex-ante valuation date to reach the \$36 million

Page 151

14:30 1 valuation.
2 (Slide 8) On an ex-post perspective, we analysed the
3 same eight companies deemed comparable by the Claimant,
4 with two adjustments. We removed Cub Energy, which by
5 the ex-post date had sold all of its oil and gas assets,
6 and as with Mr Howard, we also removed JKX.
7 At the ex-post date all the remaining six comparable
8 companies all had 2P reserves; therefore on an ex-post
9 analysis we use the ratio of enterprise value to 2P
10 reserves, as opposed to resources. And, again, using
11 Mr Howard's approach of calculating a weighted average
12 of EV to 2P, this results in a value for those reserves
13 of \$1.44 per barrel.
14 Now, the result of this, if the Claimant had
15 reserves in the but-for, ex-post scenario, would be
16 a valuation of \$11.9 million, so that's that 1.44 per
17 barrel, multiplied by Mr Howard's estimation of the
18 Claimant's reserves at the ex-post date. However,
19 according to Dr Longman, the project would have only had
20 prospective resources at the ex-post valuation date and
21 not reserves, and generally, petroleum evaluation
22 engineers value undeveloped prospective resources at
23 5-10% of reserves.
24 Therefore, if a project only had prospective
25 resources at the but-for, ex-post valuation date, that

Page 152

14:31 1 implies a fair market value of between 0.5 and
2 \$1.1 million.
3 I'll now pass back to my colleague.
4 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Thank you.
5 (Slide 10) So we have seen two ways to look at the
6 market approach on an ex-ante and ex-post basis, and if
7 you look at the globality of them we are talking at
8 under \$2 million of but-for fair market value.
9 I will now talk about the sunk cost claim, which is
10 the next slide (11).
11 Generally we can say that sunk costs are not a good
12 measure of the project's fair market value, and one
13 clear example of this is that the owner of the project
14 before San Leon had invested \$7.6 million into the
15 project by January 2013, and then San Leon sold to the
16 Claimant for just €153,000. So just investing capital
17 doesn't mean necessarily that it is worth at least that
18 capital.
19 In any case, let's examine what the Claimant's sunk
20 cost claim is, and it is the sum of these three amounts:
21 the amount paid to acquire Aurelian Oil & Gas Slovakia
22 for €153,000; the amount paid to buy the ORR in January
23 2015 of £120,000; and the bulk of it, AOG's, in this
24 case Alpine, Alpine's share of the exploration
25 expenditures incurred on the project between 2014 and

Page 153

14:33 1 2020.
2 However, when we examined the sunk cost calculation
3 of €2.8 million in Fraser's statement 2, we find it
4 quite unreliable.
5 First, the annual reports submitted in evidence are
6 not audited, and that is acknowledged by Mr Fraser in
7 his second statement, paragraph 52.
8 Also, there's no invoices attached to the annual
9 reports. There are just some summaries, in some of
10 them.
11 So these numbers are just not reliable. There's
12 also no evidence that these claimed amounts were ever
13 disbursed, because just being charged something by
14 a supplier doesn't mean ever that you necessarily paid
15 for them. There's no indication of proofs of payment or
16 anything of that sort.
17 Mr Fraser also applies interest to these alleged
18 costs, but, even if they were disbursed, their timing is
19 still unknown, so we don't know when they were
20 disbursed, if they were disbursed, so we don't know
21 what's the start date for that interest.
22 The Claimants also make an argument about a lost
23 opportunity claim (Slide 13) and this lost opportunity
24 claim was shown in their Reply Memorial to be between
25 Mr Howard's DCF model of 133 million, and 40% of that

Page 154

14:34 1 value, 53 million.
2 But, until the start of this hearing we were unaware
3 of why 40%, so we didn't respond to it. When 40% was
4 shown, there was no explanation of why 40%. We learned
5 that elsewhere in the Memorial, the Claimant cite to
6 Sapphire v NIOC, and we learned on the first day of the
7 hearing that the argument for 40% is 2 out of 5 million
8 in claimed lost profits. 2 out of 5, that's 40%.
9 There's no explanation in the award of what those
10 lost profits represent or how much they were already
11 reduced by uncertainty. Were they as reduced by
12 uncertainty, more reduced by uncertainty than
13 Mr Howard's DCF model? It's impossible to know.
14 But we see, for example, and I'm not saying this is
15 the right way to do it, but we see, for example, that
16 the same award talks about receiving a net income of
17 \$46 million if everything goes as well as possible. In
18 that case, 2 million would be 4% of 46 million. And
19 again, just as an illustration: if you were to apply 4%
20 to 133 million, you will get \$5 million.
21 (Slide 14) Finally, the Claimant's argument for its
22 rate of interest on damages lacks economic
23 substantiation. The Claimant argues for interest at
24 LIBOR plus 4% (Slide 15) arguing that's the approximate
25 borrowing costs which Discovery would have had to have

Page 155

14:36 1 pay. But this is wholly unsupported.
2 First, there's no reason to think that the Claimant
3 had to borrow. There is no evidence that the Claimant
4 borrowed any amounts. There's no evidence that such
5 hypothetical borrowing would have been at LIBOR plus 4%.
6 And the only Claimant's reference to a rate of LIBOR
7 plus 4% is to another case, another award,
8 Murphy v Ecuador II, which implies that they're
9 requesting interest based on those parties' borrowing
10 costs.
11 In contrast, the appropriate interest rate on
12 a US dollar claim should be at most the interest rate on
13 dollar-denominated Slovakian sovereign bonds, because
14 the only default risk that is relevant would be the risk
15 that Slovakia does not pay an award, and the Claimant
16 has not been exposed to business risks of the project.
17 (Slide 16) As I noted at the beginning of this
18 presentation, we also have an appendix here that can be
19 useful to you, that shows as I noted --
20 THE PRESIDENT: I should note that you are just reaching the
21 15 minutes.
22 DR DUARTE-SILVA: I'll stop there.
23 THE PRESIDENT: These are the appendices that you have?
24 DR DUARTE-SILVA: That is. That is right. And all, from A
25 to F, they are appendices just for your reference,

Page 156

14:37 1 guidance. They talk, for example, about the timeline of
2 the assets' ownership, that could be helpful to the
3 Tribunal. And the terms of transactions and so on.
4 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
5 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Of course.
6 THE PRESIDENT:
7 Mr Newing, your turn.
8 (2.37 pm)
9 Cross-examination by MR NEWING
10 Q. Thank you.
11 Good afternoon. My name is Neil Newing and I will
12 be asking you some questions on behalf of the Claimant.
13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Thank you.
14 Q. We've heard you state, and we have read in your reports,
15 that you claim the appropriate valuation method to use
16 in this circumstance is a market-based approach;
17 correct?
18 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
19 Q. And that's based on looking at comparable transactions
20 or companies; yes?
21 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
22 Q. And do you accept that in looking to find comparable
23 transactions involving oil and gas assets, it's
24 important to look at the nature of the assets in
25 question?

Page 157

14:38 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Of course it is, and the company did
2 that for us, they selected eight comparable companies.
3 Q. So, just to pick you up on that, you have said that
4 a few times. At no point in any of the first expert
5 reports supplied by the Claimant did they conduct their
6 own market-based valuation, did they?
7 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) The Claimant's experts to this date
8 have not submitted any claim for damages based on fair
9 market value, except for the income approach and the
10 \$36 million that we discussed before. Other than that,
11 there's no claim for damages based on fair market value.
12 Q. So when you say the companies were chosen by Discovery
13 as comparable transactions for the purposes of this
14 market-based valuation, they were not chosen by
15 Discovery for that purpose, were they?
16 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) For which purpose, I'm sorry? I don't
17 have a transcript.
18 Q. For the purposes of conducting a market-based comparable
19 transaction valuation?
20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Those companies were selected by the
21 Claimant to perform a valuation of the project.
22 Q. But not a market-based valuation, which you are using
23 here --
24 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe it was a market-based
25 valuation. They used it to calculate the fair market

Page 158

14:39 1 value.
2 Q. They used it, did they not, to work out the cost of
3 equity capital -- the cost of capital for the purposes
4 of the DCF model, which is a completely different
5 approach?
6 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Well, the way to calculate the
7 market-based approach based on comparables would be to
8 look at comparable companies. When the company looks --
9 when the Claimant looks at calculating the cost of
10 capital, they're naturally looking at comparable
11 companies. So they were deemed comparable by the
12 Claimant.
13 Q. Can I ask you to look at the second expert report of
14 Mr Howard, please, at page 94.
15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't have it in front of me.
16 Q. It will come up on the screen in a moment.
17 In fact, page 95. And you will see at paragraph 362
18 Mr Howard refers to the fact that in your report you
19 have said he "does not disagree with this list of
20 comparable companies", but says this is "misleading",
21 because he has considered them comparable:
22 "... on the basis that they were small oil and gas
23 companies, operating in Eastern Europe, and therefore
24 would have similar WACCs to Discovery ..."
25 And then in the next paragraph he says:

Page 159

14:41 1 "At no point did I state that the companies had
2 assets comparable to those of Discovery ..."
3 And explains why; do you see that?
4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I see that's Mr Howard's opinion.
5 Q. And you didn't respond to this opinion at all in your
6 second report, did you?
7 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I did, I said the company deemed them
8 comparable.
9 Q. But you didn't address the points that he had made here
10 as to why he said he did not consider them to be
11 comparable?
12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I did. I said the company, which had
13 the best possible way to assess this, deemed them the
14 comparable. That's my response.
15 Q. Okay, so you basically don't accept Mr Howard's position
16 here that he did not consider them to be comparable.
17 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Could you repeat the question?
18 Q. You don't accept Mr Howard's position as stated in these
19 paragraphs that he did not consider those companies to
20 be comparable for the purpose of a market-based
21 valuation approach?
22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I'm trying to answer your question.
23 I think I already answered, but I'll try again.
24 Mr Howard has a certain opinion of what is a comparable
25 company. I looked at what the company, the company

Page 160

14:42 1 itself, the Claimant, thought was comparable. I think
 2 that's a better assessment than Mr Howard's assessment.
 3 And the company did that before Mr Howard performed this
 4 analysis.
 5 Mr Howard also commented on this in his first
 6 report, talked about this list of comparable companies,
 7 and all he said was actually, in accordance of what we
 8 do, is he grabbed those list of comparable companies and
 9 said only one of them, Cub Energy, has prospective
 10 resources. Which was a clerical mistake. It's not, as
 11 we showed in our second report, Cub Energy was not in
 12 that status. So we corrected that and we found the only
 13 one that does have prospective resources is ADX. So we
 14 basically followed his approach and corrected it for
 15 a mistake he made.
 16 So he did consider them comparable in the first
 17 report.
 18 Q. For a different purpose?
 19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't understand what you mean by
 20 "a different purpose". We were calculating fair market
 21 value, and whether you're calculating it to calculate
 22 the cost of capital, or to use multiples, they're
 23 comparable companies. It's common to use the same
 24 comparable companies to calculate the cost of capital
 25 and to calculate multiples.

Page 161

14:44 1 Q. But you would accept that Mr Howard has a different view
 2 to you on that?
 3 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, Mr Howard's opinions differ from
 4 mine.
 5 Q. Thank you. So you first look in your report, and you've
 6 discussed today, the prior transactions on the assets;
 7 correct?
 8 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 9 Q. And there are three transactions that you look at: the
 10 San Leon ORR, Gulf Shores and Akard, although you didn't
 11 mention Gulf Shores at all today.
 12 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
 13 Q. And all of those three transactions took place in 2015;
 14 yes?
 15 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
 16 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Can I correct that? There's one
 17 transaction and two attempted completed transactions.
 18 Q. All of the three items that were prior -- what you call
 19 prior transactions, took place in 2015.
 20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Again, there's one transaction in 2015
 21 and there's two attempted transactions as well, in that
 22 year.
 23 Q. Which -- well, I accept that the Gulf Shores was not
 24 completed, but the other two were.
 25 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't believe the Akard agreement

Page 162

14:45 1 was completed. I believe that Akard did not fulfil the
 2 full agreement.
 3 Q. But the agreement itself was signed and accepted at the
 4 end of 2015, there was a default later, but the
 5 agreement was completed in essence in 2015 at that time.
 6 And the value that was placed -- that you are placing on
 7 it is based on the transaction that was agreed in 2015?
 8 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe that's true. However, the
 9 fact that the cash flows were not exchanged hampers the
 10 ability to rely on that transaction.
 11 Q. Is it your understanding that no money was paid under
 12 that transaction at all?
 13 A. (Mr Acklam) No. We understand some money was paid but
 14 not the full agreement.
 15 Q. Okay. Before looking at those -- I'm going to call them
 16 "transactions" for simplicity, but I take your point
 17 about the Gulf Shores one in particular not having been
 18 completed.
 19 But before we look at those further, do you accept
 20 that any view of value that may have been expressed over
 21 nine years ago is potentially out of date and things may
 22 have changed in the meantime?
 23 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I think your question needs
 24 a clarification whether we are talking about the actual
 25 or the but-for world. Until then I don't think I can

Page 163

14:46 1 answer it.
 2 Q. I'm making a general point that if you are looking at
 3 a transaction that took place nine years ago in order to
 4 ascertain a value of something today, you would need to
 5 take into account that there may have been changes or
 6 events in those nine years that would affect that
 7 valuation?
 8 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes. We account for that using the
 9 FTSE index.
 10 Q. And do you accept, now looking at this case, that if
 11 further analysis had taken place on the licence areas,
 12 which had resulted -- and I'm talking hypothetically --
 13 in the prospects being better defined, this would be of
 14 interest to someone who was looking to buy this today?
 15 A. (Mr Acklam) Sorry. Could you repeat that question?
 16 Q. Would you accept that if any further analysis on the
 17 licence areas had taken place in the meantime, and which
 18 had resulted in the prospects being better defined, that
 19 would be of interest to someone who was looking to buy
 20 it today?
 21 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes. Do you have -- which specific analysis
 22 are you talking about, please?
 23 Q. I was talking hypothetically, if that had happened.
 24 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
 25 Q. Now talking specifically, do you accept that if further

Page 164

14:48 1 processing and interpretation of seismic data had taken
 2 place, that that would potentially affect the position
 3 of someone looking to buy it today?
 4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It depends on whether such further
 5 analysis and reprocessing has led to increased value or
 6 not. We heard from Mr Longman that what happened in
 7 this property was actually not increasing value.
 8 Q. So your position: that the work that may have been
 9 undertaken since 2015 or since each of these
 10 transactions took place added no further value is based
 11 on Dr Longman's assessment?
 12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Not just that. There was also,
 13 I think, a shrinkage of licence area, for example.
 14 Q. Yes. But otherwise, your view as to whether the data
 15 itself, or the further analysis, sorry, that's taken
 16 place has added any value, is based on Dr Longman's
 17 assessment that it did not?
 18 A. (Mr Acklam) I don't believe we've seen any testimony,
 19 Dr Longman or Mr Howard or anywhere else, that indicates
 20 any reprocessing added value to the asset after these
 21 transactions.
 22 Q. Well, I think Mr Lewis' testimony suggests otherwise,
 23 but I am not going to take that there for the moment.
 24 But would you accept that as a starting point, any
 25 view on value which was expressed nine years ago must be

Page 165

14:50 1 treated with some caution until you have been able to
 2 ascertain whether any events or analyses that have taken
 3 place have added any additional value?
 4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I agree that anything that would add
 5 value should be considered. I don't agree that we've
 6 seen any evidence that there was such addition of value.
 7 And also, I mean we -- I think today was the first time
 8 we saw a table, or yesterday, a table with subsequent
 9 events that happened and were summarised in that table.
 10 Q. But that table, just to confirm, you're talking about
 11 Exhibit CD-10, which sets out the source of almost all
 12 that information, is either Mr Lewis' testimony or
 13 exhibits that have been submitted by the Claimant. So
 14 that information has been available to you.
 15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I mean in the context of any purported
 16 increase in value. It's the first time I'm hearing that
 17 articulated.
 18 Q. And are you aware that the oil price had collapsed
 19 significantly between June 2014 and early 2016?
 20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't have those numbers in front of
 21 me.
 22 Q. Okay. Could we bring up C-41, please.
 23 So this is an exhibit, I don't know if you have seen
 24 this before, which shows the oil prices from 2012 to
 25 2022; have you seen that before?

Page 166

14:51 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 2 Q. And you will see there the rather dramatic drop that
 3 occurs at the end of 2014 and into 2016?
 4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 5 Q. And so would you agree that this is another reason why
 6 a valuation that may have taken place in particularly
 7 early 2015 coming off such a large drop may be cautious?
 8 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't agree with that. That is the
 9 market value at the time, and we accounted for the
 10 passage of time and oil prices using the FTSE index from
 11 the time of the transaction until the ex-ante date,
 12 until the ex-post date. So this is fully reflected in
 13 our analysis and doesn't require more caution.
 14 Q. But would you accept that somebody who was buying or
 15 selling an asset at that date may have a different view
 16 on it, in light of the fact that the price had crashed
 17 so significantly at that time?
 18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) People are allowed to have different
 19 views. This is the objective, unbiased view of all
 20 market participants. And it shows the price was low.
 21 And I recall, I mean, at the time, there was a lot
 22 of discussion that oil prices are going to be low for
 23 a long time.
 24 Q. So if we turn to the first transaction, the San Leon
 25 ORR, and you've explained already that this was

Page 167

14:52 1 purchased back by Discovery in January 2015 for
 2 £120,000; yes?
 3 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) That's right.
 4 Q. And you understand that it's the Claimant's position
 5 that this was not a fair market value transaction, which
 6 I will come to shortly, but assume for a moment that it
 7 was.
 8 San Leon sold AOG to Discovery in March 2014; right?
 9 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 10 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
 11 Q. And there is no reason to believe that they would have
 12 been aware of or in possession of any additional
 13 analysis work that had taken place by AOG since they
 14 sold it, is there?
 15 A. (Mr Acklam) I'm not aware of what San Leon would have
 16 had at their disposal when they were evaluating the ORR
 17 transaction.
 18 Q. But for the purposes of considering what they may have
 19 thought as to value, would you agree it's likely to have
 20 been based at most on the knowledge they had when they
 21 sold AOG in March 2014?
 22 A. (Mr Acklam) That knowledge being seven years of
 23 institutional knowledge at Aurelian Oil & Gas, yes.
 24 Q. Yes, although San Leon had not been the owner of
 25 Aurelian for that entire period, had it?

Page 168

14:54 1 A. (Mr Acklam) No, although Aurelian was still part of San
 2 Leon.
 3 Q. Mr Lewis' evidence, which has not been challenged, is
 4 that only initial processing and interpretation of the
 5 seismic data had been carried out by the time that
 6 Discovery bought AOG; are you aware of that?
 7 A. (Mr Acklam) I'm not aware of the specifics of Mr Lewis'
 8 testimony, but ...
 9 Q. Okay. I'll bring this up. If we could look at
 10 Mr Lewis' first witness statement, please, at page 9.
 11 I'll just wait for that to come up on the screen.
 12 If we could go to page 9, please. Yes, it's at
 13 paragraph 24. You will see Mr Lewis states there that:
 14 "After AOG was granted the rights to explore ...
 15 770 km of ... seismic was acquired ... between 2008 and
 16 2011 [that's when it was owned by Aurelian], with only
 17 initial processing and interpretation of those data
 18 carried out. After Discovery acquired AOG, we completed
 19 the processing of these data, and commenced
 20 interpretation in 2014 and 2015."
 21 Do you see that?
 22 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes.
 23 Q. And Mr Lewis' evidence on that has not been challenged.
 24 So on this basis, would you accept it's likely that
 25 San Leon would not have been aware of this additional

Page 169

14:55 1 analysis work that had been carried out?
 2 A. (Mr Acklam) It may not have been aware of this
 3 additional analysis work. There's no indication here as
 4 to whether or not the completion of processing, as
 5 Mr Lewis states it, would have had any effect on the
 6 value of the data that was in its possession.
 7 Q. But you simply don't know?
 8 A. (Mr Acklam) No.
 9 Q. So we were talking just then on the basis that the sale
 10 of the ORR was assumed to be a fair market value
 11 transaction, but you understand the Claimant's position
 12 is that it was not; yes?
 13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, and that position, as we
 14 understood from Mr Howard's expert reports, was based
 15 solely on an alleged compulsion to sell based on being
 16 a fire sale. We are hearing now there might have been
 17 other things.
 18 Q. So if we look at the second witness statement of
 19 Mr Lewis. It's at paragraph 50, which is on page 14.
 20 Paragraph 50. I'm not going to ask you to read the
 21 whole thing, I know you've read it before, but Mr Lewis
 22 explains here about San Leon's petition, and in the
 23 middle of the paragraph sets out:
 24 "By the end of 2014, San Leon was in a dire
 25 financial position."

Page 170

14:57 1 And you've seen that before, yes?
 2 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, we see that.
 3 Q. And he goes on in paragraph 52, on the next page, to say
 4 that in respect of the price, you have the figure of
 5 £120,000, and just after that:
 6 "This price was not based on any valuation of the
 7 royalty at the time and it did not represent its real
 8 value in the open market. It was, in a sense, a fire
 9 sale, and they had no one else they could possibly sell
 10 it to."
 11 Do you see that?
 12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 13 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes.
 14 Q. Now Mr Lewis' evidence in this regard was also not
 15 challenged in his cross-examination, were you aware of
 16 that?
 17 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) No.
 18 Q. But there is no basis other than what you have set out
 19 in your second report, which I will come to in a moment,
 20 for saying that what Mr Lewis has described about the
 21 circumstances of that sale are wrong, is there?
 22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) We are here to answer about our
 23 opinions, but if you are asking us what happened in this
 24 hearing, I think we're not the best people to tell you.
 25 Q. But if the Tribunal accepts that what Mr Lewis has said

Page 171

14:58 1 about the circumstances of that transaction is true,
 2 would you agree that this would then not be
 3 an appropriate transaction for purposes of
 4 a market-based valuation?
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Fair market value assessment needs to
 6 be between a willing buyer and a willing seller, under
 7 no compulsion to sell. If the Tribunal believes there
 8 was a compulsion to sell, then it's not a fair market
 9 value transaction.
 10 Q. Thank you. And to confirm, you had no involvement in
 11 that transaction at the time, did you?
 12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I did not.
 13 Q. And you have had no evidence about that transaction
 14 since, other than what Mr Lewis has set out in his
 15 witness statement, have you?
 16 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I'm not sure what you mean by
 17 "evidence about that transaction". The evidence we have
 18 about that transaction has been listed in our expert
 19 reports.
 20 Q. But you have not had any evidence from anyone else that
 21 was involved in that transaction at the time, other than
 22 what Mr Lewis has said, have you?
 23 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) No, but we have actual data and
 24 evidence that we rely on. That is also evidence about
 25 that transaction.

Page 172

14:59 1 Q. And you do not know what San Leon's CEO, Mr Fanning,
2 with whom the deal was negotiated and agreed at the
3 time, believed when he entered into this transaction, do
4 you?
5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe that it is fair to assume
6 that Mr Fanning is a rational economic actor and would
7 try to sell it for the highest value possible. And even
8 if they were in a dire financial situation, which we
9 dispute, and show they were not, then they could still
10 try to sell it to other people. They don't have to sell
11 it to Mr Lewis' company.
12 Q. But these are assumptions you are making on what you
13 think a rational businessman would have done. You don't
14 actually know what Mr Fanning thought at the time?
15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe that Mr Fanning is rational.
16 Q. But you have no evidence on which to base that, other
17 than the fact that he is a businessman?
18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes. He's a rational human being and
19 he is an executive of a company.
20 Q. You said just now and you say in your report as well
21 that you don't accept that the company was in a dire
22 financial position, and you give a number of reasons for
23 this in your second report. One of the reasons is that
24 directors' salaries totalled €2.8 million across 2014
25 and 2015; correct?

Page 173

15:01 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, we say that.
2 Q. Do you know who those salaries were paid to?
3 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't recall. But you can show me,
4 if you want.
5 Q. Can we look at Exhibit C-259, please. And if we could
6 turn to page 24 of the PDF. On the left side of the
7 screen there you have the table of the directors'
8 salaries. And so you have at the top Mr Fanning, who
9 was the executive chairman of San Leon; right?
10 A. Yes.
11 Q. And then second you have Paul Sullivan, who was the
12 managing director?
13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
14 Q. And do you agree that the bulk of the salary payments
15 were paid to those two individuals?
16 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
17 Q. So would you agree that these high salaries do not
18 necessarily reflect a thriving company, but simply the
19 heads of the business paying themselves very large sums?
20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Are you implying that they're paying
21 themselves too much? I'm not sure what your question
22 is.
23 Q. Well, you have relied on the fact that large amounts
24 were paid to the directors as an indication that the
25 company was therefore financially stable.

Page 174

15:02 1 I'm suggesting to you that all this shows is that the
2 directors were paying -- these two individuals were
3 paying themselves large amounts of money.
4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Well, it's not that simple. So first,
5 there's a number of reasons that we can go over why the
6 company was not in a dire financial situation, instead
7 of just focusing on this one. If --
8 Q. Well, we'll come to some other reasons in a moment.
9 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) If you want to focus on this one,
10 I will tell you that these numbers that you are pointing
11 here are correct, as to my best understanding, and that
12 I imagine that as a publicly listed company, there are
13 checks and balances and that there is probably
14 a compensation committee, that I actually read about,
15 I think, a compensation committee of the board of
16 directors that examines this and pays them the amounts
17 that it deems fair, just like in any other publicly
18 traded company.
19 Q. One of the other --
20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) So if your question is whether it's
21 excessive, I have no reason to believe it's excessive.
22 MR DRYMER: I think the question is strictly whether
23 compensation is an indication of the solvency and the
24 financial situation of the company?
25 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It is certainly consistent with

Page 175

15:03 1 a company that is not in dire straits. And if we're
2 talking about £120,000 that the company was desperate to
3 get, according to the Claimant, so much that it sold it
4 for just £120,000, that is contrasting highly with these
5 amounts being paid in the other points that we made,
6 such as the €30 million that they had in loan
7 facilities, the £30 million that they raised from
8 investors in 2015. I mean, those -- that's a real
9 market indication that the company was not in dire
10 financial straits. I mean, the company raised
11 £30 million -- £29 million five months after the
12 transaction of the ORR. Just by investors for new
13 shareholders.
14 MR NEWING: Well, let's look at some more numbers. You note
15 in your report, which I note doesn't mention the
16 position you just stated, but you note in your report as
17 another indication of company solvency that it had taken
18 out loans of €5.8 million in 2014. And my understanding
19 is you suggest that this indicates that it was a stable
20 enough business to be able to obtain that financing;
21 correct?
22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's one of the reasons, as well as,
23 for example, the line of credit that was, I think,
24 €30 million. One of the reasons.
25 Q. Okay, but if you look at page 45 of the PDF. So this

Page 176

15:05 1 sets out on the top left the loans and borrowings. And
 2 you will see the first was a €3.3 million loan from --
 3 in fact it was \$3.2 million, it says in the note -- from
 4 YA Global Masters SPV Limited; do you see that?
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 6 Q. And the note to this says that this had an arrangement
 7 fee of \$800,000, so 25% of the loan value. That's
 8 a very steep arrangement fee, isn't it?
 9 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's what -- the arrangement fee it
 10 had.
 11 Q. But does this not indicate that in fact it was not easy
 12 for it to obtain financing, if it had to resort to
 13 seeking loans on such steep terms?
 14 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's the first time I'm hearing this.
 15 I would have to analyse this. I don't know if it's
 16 a high arrangement fee or not.
 17 And you have to remember, this is an oil exploration
 18 company. It's a company that, it's not surprising,
 19 that's going through, like, these arrangement fees and
 20 so on, and ...
 21 Q. You said this is the first time you're hearing this.
 22 But is it not the case that it is your second expert
 23 report which sets out the fact that the company had
 24 €5.8 million in loans? So surely you must have looked
 25 at this in order to get those figures?

Page 177

15:06 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, we looked at this. Yes.
 2 Q. But you simply ignored the fact that --
 3 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I'm making the point that saying the
 4 arrangement fee is too high, it's the first time
 5 I'm hearing it.
 6 Q. So you just didn't consider that point at all when you
 7 looked at this before?
 8 THE PRESIDENT: Well, do you think it's a high fee --
 9 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I have no opinion of this.
 10 THE PRESIDENT: -- to pay 800,000 to get 3.2, a loan of 3.2?
 11 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I would have to know the terms of
 12 that. I mean, it's a considerable percentage. Now,
 13 whether it's high or low depends really on the market
 14 conditions at the time.
 15 And, I mean, it seems like a high -- I would say it
 16 is a somewhat high arrangement fee, but I'm sure it was
 17 negotiated -- not "I'm sure". We can make a default
 18 assumption that it was fairly negotiated. And so
 19 reflects the conditions of those loans and the
 20 conditions of an oil and gas exploration company.
 21 MR NEWING: The second loan is listed as being from
 22 a company called Palomar Holdings Limited, which was
 23 San Leon's business partner in relation to some of the
 24 projects at that time. And the note says it was repaid
 25 post year end; correct?

Page 178

15:07 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
 2 Q. Alright. Now I would like to turn up CRA-63, which is
 3 the 2015 annual report. And if we can go to page 78,
 4 please. So we have ... You can scroll down ... (Pause)
 5 So we can see the loans here in 2015, and so we see
 6 the same YA Global Masters loan is still there, that's
 7 not been repaid. The Palomar loan has been repaid and
 8 we have a new loan from LPL Finance, and then other;
 9 correct?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And you will see in the note number 3 that in relation
 12 to the new loan from LPL Finance, it says that
 13 Mr Fanning has personally guaranteed that loan; do you
 14 see that?
 15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I see that.
 16 Q. So doesn't this again suggest that the company was not
 17 able to obtain financing without Mr Fanning himself
 18 personally guaranteeing that financing?
 19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I disagree with that. They had a line
 20 of credit of €30 million.
 21 Q. If we could now turn --
 22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) And also they raised £29 million from
 23 external shareholders.
 24 MR DRYMER: So what, if anything, does this indicate, in
 25 your opinion? If you were asked to guarantee personally

Page 179

15:09 1 a loan taken out by your company?
 2 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It doesn't indicate much to me because
 3 it's a quite small amount really in the grand scheme of
 4 things. It doesn't show at all that the company was in
 5 a dire financial situation. I would have to know more
 6 about this loan. There's nothing here about it.
 7 MR NEWING: So if we turn to page 83, please. And under
 8 item 29 you will see just under the table, the second
 9 paragraph it says:
 10 "Mr Fanning had personally guaranteed the loan from
 11 Palomar Holdings ... which was repaid during the
 12 year..."
 13 So the other loan of \$3 million was also personally
 14 guaranteed by Mr Fanning; right?
 15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe so, from what I'm reading.
 16 Q. So from the loans taken out, we have seen that two were
 17 personally guaranteed by Mr Fanning and the other one
 18 had a 25% arrangement fee. Correct?
 19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) That's what you're telling me, that's
 20 what I read, yes. I still would need to know more about
 21 these loans. I mean often these loans are, for example,
 22 assessed, are attached to a specific asset, and so they
 23 might have specific conditions that require the personal
 24 guarantee. It's not really a reflection of the company
 25 as a whole.

Page 180

15:11 1 Q. But it was in your second report that you put forward
 2 the fact it was able to obtain financing as a suggestion
 3 that this was an indication of the company's financial
 4 performance.
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) And the company was able to obtain
 6 financing, as I've been telling you, through the line of
 7 credit, and through even raising almost £30 million from
 8 external shareholders. So yes, they were able to. And
 9 you're pointing me to some personal guarantees in
 10 a small loan of, I don't know, \$2 million or something.
 11 Q. Okay, let's turn to page 34 of the PDF. While that's
 12 happening, you've placed a lot of emphasis this
 13 afternoon on the fact that there was this line of
 14 credit. Why was that not raised in your second report
 15 as the main reason, or any reason, as to why you didn't
 16 believe San Leon was in a dire financial position?
 17 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I would have to check that in my
 18 second report, if you would like.
 19 Q. We can go to it in a moment, but it is not mentioned at
 20 all in there. Is there a reason why?
 21 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I thought it was mentioned. I'd have
 22 to look. There's no reason why it wouldn't be
 23 mentioned.
 24 Q. If we look at this page now on the right-hand side, if
 25 we can scroll up a little bit, there's an item called

Page 181

15:13 1 be a going concern, really, is in its market value and
 2 willingness to invest in the company and so on. And
 3 we've seen that they could raise almost £30 million from
 4 external shareholders, residual claimants. They have no
 5 claim, no collateral, nothing, and have just invested
 6 £30 million into this company, in the middle of the
 7 year. And you're telling me that at the end of the
 8 year, there was a going concern? I find that wholly
 9 irrelevant to whether, at the time of the ORR
 10 transaction, they were in dire financial straits.
 11 And, even if they were, they could have shopped
 12 around.
 13 Q. So your position is the fact that they may have been
 14 able to raise money in the middle of the year, but
 15 six months later or so they are facing a going concern
 16 risk, is irrelevant to the question of whether the
 17 company was in a good or bad financial position?
 18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) If the company was in such dire
 19 straits, I find it hard to believe that they would have
 20 been able to raise that amount from external
 21 shareholders, a few -- five months later.
 22 Q. I think, would you agree, however, that the fact that
 23 we're having all of these discussions -- and as you have
 24 yourself acknowledged, you would need to know more about
 25 a lot of these things, and presumably we would need to

Page 183

15:12 1 "Going concern risk"; do you see that? And it says:
 2 "There are a number of assumptions underlying the
 3 group's cash flow projections which indicate the
 4 existence of a material uncertainty which may cast
 5 significant doubt on the group and the company's ability
 6 to continue as a going concern."
 7 That's a serious statement about the risk of the
 8 company's ability to operate and pay its debts, isn't
 9 it?
 10 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's -- well, a few things. So one
 11 is, again, this is an oil and gas exploration company.
 12 They often get these going concerns risks that are --
 13 that are issued. This is, I believe, as of -- here in
 14 2015, right, I think that's what we're talking about?
 15 Q. Yes.
 16 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Okay. So the ORR transaction we are
 17 always talking about was in January 2015, right? So
 18 we're talking about the beginning of the year and the
 19 end of the same year.
 20 If you look at year-end 2014, I don't believe you
 21 see any such going concern. So a month prior to the
 22 transaction, I believe you see no such going concern.
 23 So you're talking to me about something that happened
 24 a year later.
 25 The other point is, the proof whether it's going to

Page 182

15:15 1 also know more about exactly the circumstances in which
 2 that funding was raised that you refer to -- that we
 3 simply cannot, today, know for sure what position San
 4 Leon really was in at that time?
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) We don't need to know more. The
 6 shareholders that invested in the company are the proof.
 7 They looked at the company and they showed us that the
 8 company was worth investing in. And you're pointing out
 9 to me to that the going concern appeared a year later?
 10 I don't think that's relevant at all. You're pointing
 11 me to a loan that was personally guaranteed for
 12 \$1 million or \$2 million?
 13 And this is all -- I need to remind the Tribunal,
 14 this is all in comparison to supposedly the company
 15 being so desperate for cash that they need to sell the
 16 licence for £120,000 when according to Mr Howard's DCF
 17 it would be worth at least \$60 million. It just defies
 18 credulity.
 19 Q. And to confirm, I'm not pointing you to loans or
 20 anything because those are the things that I think are
 21 relevant; I'm pointing to them because they were the
 22 things that you said were relevant in your second
 23 report.
 24 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I showed them as evidence that the
 25 company was not in dire financial straits.

Page 184

15:16 1 Q. In asserting a value based on this -- I'm going to move
 2 on from these accounts if you had a question?
 3 MR DRYMER: I just want to be clear. I understand your
 4 point about dire financial straits. You're treating
 5 this as though it's a binary question: dire/not dire.
 6 I think the suggestion is -- well, I don't know what
 7 counsel will tell us the suggestion is in due course,
 8 but let me put it to you that the suggestion is that the
 9 company was in less than ideal financial straits, or was
 10 facing certain financial difficulty, something a lot
 11 more nuanced than dire or not dire, and that these
 12 factors that counsel is pointing up are indications of
 13 these somewhat difficult financial straits.
 14 Do you accept that more nuanced description, or
 15 would you still say it's not relevant to a consideration
 16 of the financial strength of the company at the time of
 17 the sale of the royalty?
 18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I believe it's more nuanced than just
 19 binary. I believe that I am putting the emphasis in
 20 that term because in that extreme condition we could
 21 think of a company selling such a valuable asset,
 22 according to the Claimant, for just £130,000. That's
 23 why I'm putting the emphasis there, because only in that
 24 situation could we start to think of that.
 25 MR DRYMER: That's the point. Only in what you -- in a dire

Page 185

15:18 1 financial circumstance could you conceive of a fire sale
 2 of the magnitude that is being suggested; is that
 3 accurate?
 4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) That's right.
 5 MR DRYMER: Very good.
 6 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) and there's evidence against those
 7 dire financial straits -- I apologise for repeating that
 8 term.
 9 MR DRYMER: No, don't apologise.
 10 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I keep talking about, we don't need to
 11 be assessing every point here --
 12 MR DRYMER: I understand.
 13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) -- because shareholders a few months
 14 later just invested that money. And at the month prior,
 15 at the end of 2014, there's no going concern opinion.
 16 MR DRYMER: Very good. Thank you.
 17 MR NEWING: At the time of the San Leon ORR sale, Discovery
 18 had a 50% share in the licence areas; correct?
 19 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
 20 Q. But for the valuation you've taken a 25% share on the
 21 basis, as I understand it from your second report, that
 22 in the but-for scenario, Discovery would have only had
 23 the 25% share; correct?
 24 A. (Mr Acklam) That's correct, yes. Based on the
 25 Claimant's experts' instructions that in the but-for

Page 186

15:19 1 scenario the Claimant would have owned 25%.
 2 Q. Yes, and that's on the basis that a transaction such as
 3 Gulf Shores or Akard or something equivalent would have
 4 resulted in a 25% share to Discovery?
 5 A. (Mr Acklam) I believe the wording was that some
 6 investment would have been available and the Claimant's
 7 share would have been 25%.
 8 Q. But at the time of the ORR sale it's accepted that that
 9 hadn't yet happened. They still had a 50% share.
 10 A. (Mr Acklam) At the time of the ORR sale the Claimant
 11 owned 50%. But our valuation is not at the date of the
 12 ORR sale. The relevant valuation dates for our analysis
 13 are at the ex-ante valuation date in June 2018, and at
 14 the ex-post valuation date, which our latest ex-post
 15 valuation date is October 2023. On both of those dates
 16 in the but-for situation the Claimant only owns 25%.
 17 Q. And so if you are assessing value based on that 25%
 18 share on those two dates, would it not be more
 19 appropriate to use a transaction that took place after,
 20 or at least resulted in Discovery reducing its interests
 21 in that way, rather than one prior to it?
 22 A. (Mr Acklam) I don't believe the adjustment from 50% to
 23 25% is controversial. So I don't believe it makes
 24 a difference, all else being equal.
 25 Q. In respect of the other two transactions, Gulf Shores

Page 187

15:20 1 and Akard, these took place in March and October 2015;
 2 right?
 3 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct. The attempted transactions.
 4 Q. Well, the attempted Gulf Shores transaction and the
 5 completion of the agreement with Akard in October 2015
 6 took place in March and then October 2015.
 7 A. (Mr Acklam) I'm not fully up to date on the legal
 8 position of the Akard agreement. But from what
 9 I recollect from the evidence, there was actually no
 10 agreement that was ever signed between Akard and
 11 Discovery.
 12 Q. Well, that's actually incorrect. I can take you to it
 13 if you need to, but I don't think -- it's not been
 14 something that I think is challenged. There is
 15 an agreement which has been signed and is on the record.
 16 A. (Mr Acklam) From memory there was an initial agreement
 17 which was intended to be translated into a full final
 18 agreement, which never actually occurred.
 19 Q. That is correct. That is correct. But there was
 20 an initial investment agreement. And, again, both of
 21 those took place in 2015, so some nine years or so ago.
 22 Or --
 23 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes, or three years prior to the ex-ante
 24 valuation date.
 25 Q. And, again, if the analyses that had taken place after

Page 188

15:22 1 that date have added value, which I appreciate you do
2 not accept, based on Dr Longman's assessment, it is
3 likely that if those had added value, that those
4 transactions would no longer be appropriate; is that
5 correct?
6 A. (Mr Acklam) I don't think that's correct, no. I don't
7 think "no longer appropriate" is a correct analysis for
8 that.
9 Q. So if the analyses that took place after those
10 transactions added value to the licence areas, you
11 consider it would still be appropriate to use the
12 transactions before that date which had a lower value?
13 A. (Mr Acklam) The transactions before that date could
14 potentially still indicate a fair market value after
15 that date, if there was any evidence or quantification
16 as to whether or not any value had been added.
17 So it would be possible to adjust those transactions
18 if it were the case that any value had been added by
19 work done.
20 Q. Could we please turn to Exhibit C-247. This is
21 a Macquarie Equities Research briefing paper on Aurelian
22 published in April 2010; do you see that?
23 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
24 Q. If we turn to page 2, at figure 1 there is a breakdown
25 of the price per share attributable to different assets;

Page 189

15:23 1 do you see that?
2 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I do.
3 Q. And you will see that 19p per share has been attributed
4 to the Smilno prospect; yes? I know it's quite small,
5 but...
6 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's called exploration upside, 19
7 pennies.
8 Q. 19 pence?
9 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.
10 Q. You will also see on the left-hand side if we scroll up
11 a little bit that there were at that time 339.5 million
12 shares issued; do you see that?
13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I do.
14 Q. Would you agree, therefore, that this could be used to
15 imply a potential valuation of the Smilno prospect at
16 that time, by multiplying the 19p per shares by the
17 number of shares?
18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) No, of course not. Of course not.
19 This is -- I mean, just look at the result on the
20 right-hand side. 156, right?
21 Q. Yes.
22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Okay. How does that compare to the
23 price up there, 44 pence? On the left you have the fair
24 market value of this company, up there, 44 pence. On
25 the right, down there, you have what this analyst quite

Page 190

15:25 1 optimistically thinks this is always worth, and the
2 market is telling him: you're wrong, you're dead wrong.
3 Q. But isn't this, as you say, an estimate of what the
4 person who is looking at this thinks this would be worth
5 at the time?
6 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes. This person is wrong. The
7 market is telling them: you're wrong.
8 Q. But you make no reference to this valuation in your
9 report, do you?
10 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) To which valuation?
11 Q. Or, rather, to this briefing profile?
12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I didn't think it was relevant at all.
13 I don't see how this would be relevant to our opinion.
14 Q. If we turn now to look at the alternative valuations
15 based on what you've described as comparable companies,
16 you've conducted this on an ex-ante basis using your
17 ex-ante date of 7 June 2018, and an ex-post basis of the
18 date of the award, although, as you mentioned in your
19 second report, at the moment that is 31 October 2023;
20 yes?
21 So if we could turn up your first report, please, at
22 paragraph 64. That's on page 20. (Pause)
23 You say here that you considered eight potential
24 companies for your valuations, yes?
25 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes.

Page 191

15:26 1 Q. And then you proceed to consider the ex-ante approach
2 and then two pages over, page 22, you have a graph which
3 sets out the position for seven of those companies;
4 correct?
5 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
6 Q. But you don't use any of those companies on the ex-ante
7 basis, on the basis that you have assumed that as at
8 7 June 2018, which is your ex-ante date, AOG would not
9 have had any reserves; correct?
10 A. (Mr Acklam) That's not our assumption. That's
11 Dr Longman's assumption that as of the ex-ante dates the
12 project would only have prospective resources.
13 I believe that's also the opinion of Dr Moy and
14 Mr Howard.
15 Q. Well, I'll come to that. The ex-ante date that we're
16 talking about here is 7 June 2018, which is one you've
17 been instructed to use, or chosen? I'm not sure.
18 A. (Mr Acklam) We were instructed to use that date.
19 Q. But it's not a date that the Claimant has used, is it?
20 A. (Mr Acklam) I'm not aware of whether or not the Claimant
21 uses that date.
22 Q. And you understand that the but-for scenario in which
23 the Claimant's experts have prepared their analysis is
24 that drilling would have commenced by 1 January 2017?
25 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes.

Page 192

15:27 1 Q. And so you understand that in the but-for scenario,
 2 drilling would have been taking place for 18 months by
 3 the time of reaching your ex-ante date of 7 June 2018?
 4 A. (Mr Acklam) And based on Dr Longman's testimony the
 5 project would have prospective resources at that date.
 6 Q. Yes. I think the position you've stated in terms of
 7 what Mr Howard and Dr Moy have said is that at that date
 8 when it actually happened, because no drilling had taken
 9 place, there were prospective resources. But in the
 10 but-for scenario, their position is that drilling would
 11 have taken place and a discovery would have been made;
 12 do you understand that?
 13 A. (Mr Acklam) I don't remember the exact quotation, but
 14 I believe there was somewhere in Mr Howard's report
 15 where he said it would be absurd to assume that there
 16 would be anything other than prospective resources on
 17 an ex-ante basis.
 18 Q. But that's on the basis of his ex-ante, which was before
 19 the but-for scenario. He's not using your date of
 20 7 June 2018, is he?
 21 A. (Mr Acklam) I'm not aware of what ex-ante date Mr Howard
 22 is using.
 23 Q. But if that was in his first expert report, that was
 24 prior to you having set out your date of 7 June 2018?
 25 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes -- well, potentially, although I don't

Page 193

15:29 1 think I've actually seen the ex-ante date which
 2 Mr Howard is using to make that assumption.
 3 Q. So, in fact, when you're making a comparison and saying
 4 you believe Mr Howard has said that there would only be
 5 prospective resources on an ex-ante basis, you're making
 6 an assumption that that is the same thing as your date,
 7 but you in fact don't know?
 8 A. (Mr Acklam) Again, Mr Howard uses the terminology on
 9 an ex-ante basis. I don't know the ex-ante date that
 10 he's using in his analysis.
 11 Q. But you accept that in the but-for scenario, by the time
 12 of your ex-ante date, drilling would have been taking
 13 place for at least 18 months?
 14 A. (Mr Acklam) And the project would still have prospective
 15 resources, yes.
 16 Q. Well, that's Dr Longman's assessment. Yes?
 17 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes. Correct. Yes.
 18 Q. And so on that basis you have compared AOG with only one
 19 company at that date, ADX Energy.
 20 A. (Mr Acklam) That's correct, yes. All the other
 21 companies in the Claimant's list of comparable companies
 22 had 2P reserves by that date.
 23 Q. And you maintain your reliance on that one company only
 24 in your second report; right?
 25 A. (Mr Acklam) That's correct.

Page 194

15:30 1 Q. And so in using just one company in this way, would you
 2 agree that it's even more important to ensure that the
 3 assets themselves are actually comparable?
 4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) They were deemed comparable by the
 5 company itself.
 6 Q. Well, the group of companies that you're referring to
 7 may have been deemed comparable for a particular
 8 purpose, but if we're looking here at comparing one
 9 company only, surely it is important to ensure that the
 10 assets of that company are actually comparable, isn't
 11 it?
 12 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) The company defined each of those
 13 eight companies as comparable, and then we used the one
 14 that had prospective resources in the reserves. Just
 15 like Mr Howard defended should be done. Except he made
 16 a mistake with Cub Energy, instead of ADX.
 17 Q. And you've calculated a dollar per boe value based on
 18 the unrisks volumes that ADX had of prospective
 19 resources; correct?
 20 A. (Mr Acklam) We've calculated a dollar per barrel value
 21 on the prospective and contingent resources.
 22 Q. But the prospective resources would have been unrisks;
 23 correct?
 24 A. (Mr Acklam) I can't recall off the top of my head, I am
 25 afraid.

Page 195

15:31 1 Q. So is it the case that you don't know what you have used
 2 to perform your calculation?
 3 A. (Mr Acklam) I can't recall this. In the weeds of the
 4 exhibits, I am afraid.
 5 Q. Would you agree that the calculation should be performed
 6 on risks volumes?
 7 A. (Mr Acklam) The calculation should be performed on the
 8 basis of prospective or, in the case of ADX, contingent
 9 resources, on the resources that it has compared to the
 10 resources of the project.
 11 Q. But with unrisks volumes, you simply do not know how
 12 much of that will be recoverable, do you, as you don't
 13 know what the geological chance of success is, do you,
 14 or anything like that?
 15 A. (Mr Acklam) I think it's correct to say with prospective
 16 resources full stop, you don't know how much of that
 17 will be recoverable.
 18 Q. And that is why all of the other calculations are done
 19 on the basis of risks volumes which have taken into
 20 account the geological chance of success, isn't it?
 21 A. (Mr Acklam) Sorry, what do you mean by "all the other
 22 calculations"?
 23 Q. The other companies. The other seven companies which
 24 have reserves and that you have not used, those are
 25 based on risks volumes?

Page 196

15:33 1 A. (Mr Acklam) They're based on reserves.
2 Q. Which have obviously taken into account, because they've
3 been found, the geological chance of success?
4 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) You keep raising whether they were
5 risked or not risked, and the very fact that there isn't
6 an explicit source that shows they're risked or unrisked
7 should tell you about the speculative value of
8 prospective resources. It should tell you that -- and
9 that's also consistent with the fact that, as mentioned
10 earlier, the Australian Stock Exchange doesn't even
11 allow financial forecast if it's of prospective
12 resources. Risked, unrisked, it doesn't really matter.
13 They don't even allow it.
14 Q. But you would agree that if they are unrisked, and the
15 calculations you've performed are on unrisked volumes,
16 then the appropriate calculation to make using the
17 Claimant's volumes would be also against its unrisked
18 volumes?
19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Look, it has to be apples to apples,
20 right? So even if we did relative to unrisked, or
21 risked, we get to a result shown in our slide 7 of
22 \$40,000.
23 Q. But that's on the basis that you have taken the
24 Claimant's risked volumes?
25 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Even if we are wrong by ten times,

Page 197

15:34 1 you're talking about \$400,000. Even if it's ten times
2 higher.
3 Q. But that is on the assumption that ADX has comparable
4 assets?
5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It's not an assumption. The company
6 defined it as comparable. Mr Howard looked at the
7 companies and selected one of them based, "I'll find the
8 one that has prospective resources", which is what we
9 did after correction -- after performing that
10 correction.
11 Q. But Mr Howard's opinion is that ADX does not have
12 comparable assets; do you agree? Do you accept that's
13 his opinion?
14 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) It has contingent and prospective
15 resources. So we're comparing prospective to
16 prospective. Further, ADX also has contingent. So
17 that's an even higher value.
18 And again, even if we're wrong by a factor of 10,
19 you are talking about \$400,000 in value.
20 Q. Well, there are two factors of 10 we're talking about
21 here. There's a factor of 10 of risked and unrisked,
22 and there's a factor of 10 you refer to in your second
23 report of if the prospective resources are of a nature
24 which makes them more valuable because they are of
25 a different asset and easier to extract. So in fact, in

Page 198

15:35 1 that scenario, you would be up to 4 million already?
2 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I don't think so. I would dispute
3 that. And as an audit we have introduced this. And the
4 only -- as I noted at the end of our presentation,
5 Mr Howard had plenty of opportunity to calculate the
6 valuation based on market approach, and the only thing
7 we've heard of is \$36 million based on ex-ante multiple
8 and ex-post reserves. So there was ample chance to
9 that, and so we're here to comment on the claims being
10 made, but there's no claims being made, and now we're
11 just explaining what we did. But there's nothing for us
12 to rebut here.
13 Q. In your presentation earlier, you mentioned that in the
14 ex-post scenario, the valuation that you had carried out
15 would come initially to 11.1 million; correct? I think
16 that was the number.
17 A. (Mr Acklam) Could you remind me of the slide, please?
18 Q. I am afraid your slides didn't have numbers, so I can't
19 remember.
20 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) They were on the left-side.
21 A. (Mr Acklam) On the bottom right.
22 Q. I didn't see them, sorry.
23 MR DRYMER: I think it might be 9. Maybe I'm wrong.
24 MR NEWING: Correct. Yes, it was too small on my screen.
25 Number 9, yes.

Page 199

15:36 1 A. (Mr Acklam) Was it the 11.9 million?
2 Q. It was the 11.9 million, sorry, 11.9 million. It was
3 the 1.1 million that confused me.
4 And then what you have done is you've discounted
5 that down to 5-10% of that value; correct?
6 A. (Mr Acklam) Correct.
7 Q. And this is on the basis again that in your view, based
8 on Dr Longman's assessment, they would still be
9 prospective resources and so should be discounted to
10 take that into account; correct?
11 A. (Mr Acklam) Because those prospective resources are
12 worth less than reserves, correct.
13 Q. Would you agree, however, that if the Tribunal has found
14 that in the but-for scenario a discovery has been made,
15 such an adjustment would not be appropriate?
16 A. (Mr Acklam) If there are reserves in the but-for
17 scenario then the \$1.44 per barrel is based on a ratio
18 of enterprise value to reserves. So yes, in that case
19 no adjustment would be required.
20 Q. But isn't it the case that an adjustment is not
21 appropriate anyway if the valuation is being carried out
22 on risked volumes where a discount has already been
23 applied to them by way of the geological chance of
24 success?
25 A. (Mr Acklam) They are still prospective resources in that

Page 200

15:38 1 scenario, so they're still worth less than reserves.
 2 Q. But if they've already been discounted to take into
 3 account the geological chance of success, aren't you
 4 applying a double discount to then also discount them
 5 further, because they've already been taken into account
 6 that they are prospective resources?
 7 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) That requires examining the discount
 8 that we're applying to determine if that discount is
 9 double-counting or not. What we have seen is we have
 10 applied a 5-10% discount, based on the SPE paper that we
 11 cite.
 12 Q. But that's a 5-10% discount that you've applied after
 13 the geological chance of success has already been
 14 applied. So you are applying two levels of discount
 15 here. You haven't applied the first, that's been
 16 applied to the volumes that are used, but you are then
 17 applying a second discount?
 18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) That's your view.
 19 Q. Can we turn, please, to the second report of Mr Howard.
 20 On page 26.
 21 So here Mr Howard has shown in his table that in
 22 fact, taking into account the GCOS that has already been
 23 applied in the P50 scenario is the equivalent of having
 24 applied a 9% RAF factor, i.e. a discount of over 90%; do
 25 you see that? It says at the bottom:

Page 201

15:39 1 "RAF equivalent (P50 Scenario)".
 2 A. (Mr Acklam) Sorry, could you expand a little bit on what
 3 we're looking at here?
 4 Q. So here in his second report, Mr Howard sought to
 5 explain why a further discount was not necessary, and
 6 showed that in fact by already having taken into account
 7 the geological chance of success, this was the
 8 equivalent to having already applied a reserve
 9 adjustment factor of 9.19%.
 10 A. (Mr Acklam) There's a lot of numbers here and I'm not
 11 following where they match up or ... or exactly the
 12 calculation.
 13 Q. So you did not review this for the purposes of your
 14 second report?
 15 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I just don't recall these numbers
 16 right now, but ...
 17 Q. But you didn't comment on this at all in your second
 18 report?
 19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) On these particular numbers, no. We
 20 applied a 5-10% discount based on the SPE paper. And
 21 also the fact that even that is conservatively high.
 22 Q. So even though Mr Howard had an entire section in his
 23 report challenging the use of that factor and explaining
 24 why it was not relevant, you did not review or comment
 25 on that to explain why you disagreed with him?

Page 202

15:41 1 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) We didn't have to. We have the SPE
 2 paper instead of Mr Howard's calculations. And like
 3 I said, even that is conservatively high if you consider
 4 that the Australian Stock Exchange doesn't allow even
 5 forecasting based on it.
 6 We presented to Mr Howard an academic paper showing
 7 that they're not even factored in market valuations of
 8 oil companies. You can even look on an ex-ante basis.
 9 Look at the ADX multiple, just on contingent and
 10 prospective, and compare it to the multiple on the other
 11 companies that have reserves. It's less than 5%.
 12 So these things are highly uncertain. There's very
 13 little value. We're applying a 5-10% discount. That's
 14 not really pessimistic.
 15 Q. Well, I put it to you that that is a double discount and
 16 is inappropriate. I understand you don't accept that,
 17 but I'll put it to you that that's what you've done.
 18 I'd like to look now, finally, at the Claimant's
 19 alternative claim for sunk costs. And paragraph 70 of
 20 your second expert report, please, this is on page 23.
 21 So you state here that:
 22 "... the evidence used to substantiate this claim...
 23 is unreliable."
 24 As you mentioned in your presentation earlier.
 25 And you state:

Page 203

15:43 1 "... we understand that the annual reports submitted
 2 in evidence are not audited, but simply sent to the
 3 Ministry of Environment."
 4 Do you see that?
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I do.
 6 Q. So this is your reference to the reports which AOG sent
 7 to the Ministry of Environment, setting out what it had
 8 incurred. And your basis that it's unreliable is that
 9 those reports were unaudited; correct?
 10 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) They were unaudited.
 11 Q. You don't make any reference in this paragraph to AOG's
 12 own financial statements, do you?
 13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) No.
 14 Q. Mr Fraser's evidence is that the amounts in the Ministry
 15 reports correspond with those financial statements; do
 16 you recall that?
 17 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I recall that, yes.
 18 Q. Did you review those financial statements?
 19 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I looked through them.
 20 Q. Mr Fraser states that those were prepared by Baker Tilly
 21 initially and Grant Thornton latterly. They are both
 22 reputable accounting companies, aren't they?
 23 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I'm not going to comment on whether
 24 they're reputable, but I will tell you that Mr Fraser
 25 said they are unaudited.

Page 204

15:44 1 Q. But you would have no reason to believe that those
 2 financial statements, which had been prepared by
 3 external accountants, of those firms would be incorrect,
 4 do you?
 5 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Without auditing, there's no guarantee
 6 that those companies did anything but organise the
 7 numbers that they received and put them into a financial
 8 statement. They just put the numbers together. There's
 9 no signing at the end: this is audited. Meaning there's
 10 no verification these numbers are accurate.
 11 MR NEWING: No further questions. Thank you.
 12 MR DRYMER: Is there any indication that they're inaccurate?
 13 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) No. They just received the numbers
 14 and put them together.
 15 MR DRYMER: And when you say that the calculation is
 16 unreliable, remind me, please, what the standard for
 17 reliability is that you apply, that you use?
 18 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) For sunk costs to have been incurred
 19 there should have been disbursement of amounts. There's
 20 no indication they were disbursed.
 21 I would expect, if the evidence is going to be based
 22 on financial statements, for those financial statements
 23 to be audited. They are not audited. Meaning they're
 24 not verified for accuracy.
 25 MR DRYMER: You know this as well as anybody; this is the

Page 205

15:45 1 sort of argument that occurs regularly in this sort of
 2 context.
 3 Is there a standard for reliability or
 4 unreliability? I don't know the answer to that
 5 question. I'm asking you as an expert.
 6 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) In almost all cases where in
 7 arbitrations a claimant makes a claim for costs
 8 incurred, we expect to see proofs of payment of those.
 9 And I've worked in numerous arbitrations where actually
 10 the bulk of the work was checking the proofs of payment.
 11 And there is no proof of payment here.
 12 MR DRYMER: So is it that one is unable to determine the
 13 reliability, or that it is unreliable? Maybe that's
 14 a lawyer's question, not a financial expert's question,
 15 but I put it to you anyways, as somebody who has been in
 16 this situation many times before.
 17 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) I'm going to hesitate now to use the
 18 word "reliable" based on that question. But I would say
 19 I look at these numbers and I don't know if they're true
 20 or not.
 21 MR DRYMER: Very good.
 22 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) And I don't know, if for example they
 23 were invoiced for a thousand dollars, did they actually
 24 pay those thousand dollars, or are they just trying to
 25 get those thousands now.

Page 206

15:46 1 MR DRYMER: There's just no back-up?
 2 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) There's no back-up, yes.
 3 MR DRYMER: Thank you.
 4 MR NEWING: I have no further questions, thank you.
 5 (3.47 pm)
 6 Re-direct examination by MR PILAWA
 7 Q. I just have one question on re-direct, and this is to
 8 Mr Acklam.
 9 You were being asked questions about a part of
 10 Mr Howard's second expert report about prospective
 11 resources and ex-ante; do you remember that?
 12 A. (Mr Acklam) I do, yes.
 13 Q. Okay. Can we pull up Mr Howard's second expert report,
 14 and if we can go to page 16, paragraph 62.
 15 Mr Acklam, is paragraph 62 what you were trying to
 16 recall?
 17 A. (Mr Acklam) Yes, it is.
 18 MR PILAWA: Thank you.
 19 No further questions from me, Madam President.
 20 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 21 (3.48 pm)
 22 Questions from THE TRIBUNAL
 23 THE PRESIDENT: I have questions, which in large part have
 24 been asked, about the sunk cost reliability. There's
 25 three categories of sunk costs claimed, right: there is

Page 207

15:48 1 the amount paid to acquire AOG. That is not disputed.
 2 Or is that disputed?
 3 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) We are not disputing that.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: No. Then the second one is the payment for
 5 the royalty in January 2015. That is not disputed
 6 either, or is it?
 7 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) We're not disputing it.
 8 THE PRESIDENT: So what you have said about the lack of
 9 reliability is about the third category. That is the
 10 expenditures. Do I understand this correctly?
 11 A. (Mr Duarte-Silva) Yes, that is correct. And slide 11
 12 perhaps explains that more clearly than the report
 13 itself. It says:
 14 "The sunk cost calculation of 2.8 million ... is
 15 unreliable."
 16 So it's that third category.
 17 THE PRESIDENT: Good. And I think you've explained why you
 18 consider it unreliable, so I will not belabour that.
 19 So that leads us, then, to the end of your
 20 examination, gentlemen. Thank you.
 21 DR DUARTE-SILVA: Thank you.
 22 MR ACKLAM: Thank you.
 23 THE PRESIDENT: So today we were extremely -- you were
 24 extremely efficient, I would say. We could barely
 25 follow the pace.

Page 208

15:50 1 No, so I think we need to briefly discuss now what
2 we do tomorrow. There's a few points that the Tribunal
3 would like, indications that the Tribunal would like to
4 give you.
5 First, there's a question and it's a simple question
6 for the Respondent, but it's a clarification: your
7 request for relief, paragraph 737 of the Rejoinder, says
8 simply dismiss the claims. Do you mean dismiss the
9 claims as a matter of merit? I understand that you also
10 seek a declaration that there is no jurisdiction. It's
11 just to have clarity on what the requests are.
12 MR ANWAY: Is that a question that you would like us to put
13 on the agenda for tomorrow?
14 THE PRESIDENT: You could say "Yes" now, if that's right.
15 Or if it requires an explanation, then you will give the
16 explanation tomorrow.
17 MR ANWAY: To be clear, we request dismissal of the claim on
18 jurisdictional grounds. We also request that the claim
19 be denied on the merits. Even if there is jurisdiction
20 and liability found, we request that it be denied on
21 causation. And even if that were all wrong, we still
22 request that the claim be rejected because there have
23 been no damages.
24 THE PRESIDENT: Fine.
25 MR ANWAY: In addition, of course, to our request for costs.

Page 209

15:51 1 THE PRESIDENT: That is in your request for relief.
2 Absolutely.
3 Fine, so that is clarified, and we now have it in
4 the transcript.
5 For the rest we have asked ourselves on whether
6 we have specific questions, and we don't think we have
7 specific questions because you covered the ground quite
8 well in your written submissions and in the course of
9 the hearing.
10 But we have a number of areas on which it would be
11 helpful for us if you would like to focus on those
12 areas. We do not expect you to address -- it's not
13 a prohibition, but it's an indication that we think
14 we have what we need to rule on these points: no
15 specific interest in jurisdiction; none in issues of
16 attribution, and; none in issues of technical and
17 quantum evidence.
18 Now, where it may be helpful that you address us
19 would be -- and I take the list of measures that we were
20 presented in opening, there's a chart that will be well
21 known. We would appreciate if you could summarise your
22 positions, including of course by adding what is new as
23 a result of the evidence on the measures numbered 8, 9
24 and 10, which is: the MoA's failure to approve the lease
25 extension, the refusal by the MoE to grant the

Page 210

15:53 1 compulsory access order under Article 29 of the Geology
2 Act, and then; the suspension of the Article 29
3 proceedings. That is one topic.
4 Another topic is the EIA, and that covers measures
5 11-14, and there we have been struck by two aspects on
6 which you may want to give us more clarification, but of
7 course you may have other aspects about the EIA that you
8 wish to stress. On the one hand Mr Lewis explained in
9 his oral evidence that the EIA issue was, I think you
10 said the nail in the coffin or the death blow, or
11 however you want to call it. And on the other, we have
12 also heard that the Claimant made a voluntary offer to
13 conduct preliminary EIAs, and how can we fit this
14 together, we are not certain about that.
15 And the third and last point is the Smilno -- now
16 I've covered Krivá Ol'ka, and then the EIA which covered
17 everything, and now I'm going to Smilno -- is the road
18 issue. We have heard a lot about the road issue this
19 week, so you don't have to repeat all of what we heard.
20 However, we noted that the courts have ruled on this
21 issue. The Claimant's legal expert -- both experts have
22 given their views on the road characterisation. But
23 we've also noted that the Claimant's legal expert said
24 there is no reason to doubt the independence of the
25 courts in making these decisions. We're not here to

Page 211

15:56 1 decide on the domestic law issue of what type of a road
2 this is. We're here to decide whether whatever the
3 state did was a breach of an international standard.
4 And so how do we bring these issues together with the
5 international standard; what exactly is being
6 challenged, and obviously what is disputed on the other
7 side.
8 I think that is all we had to say in terms of
9 substance, and we can discuss how we proceed. But let
10 me just turn to my co-arbitrators to make sure I have
11 covered the discussion we had over lunch.
12 PROFESSOR SANDS: You have indeed, Madam President.
13 For both parties, just in relation to the last
14 point, it's Day 4 of the transcript, page 34, in which
15 Mr Fogaš says at lines 24 and 25 onwards in relation to
16 the question of the status of this thing -- I'm not
17 going to call it anything myself: it is one of several
18 questions to which there is no clear answer.
19 On the basis of --
20 THE PRESIDENT: This is, of course, the Respondent's expert.
21 PROFESSOR SANDS: Yes, the Respondent's expert, Mr Fogaš,
22 I think it was.
23 On the basis of that answer, what's the theory of
24 the case on the side of the Respondent in relation to
25 that issue -- and obviously for -- sorry, what is the

Page 212

15:58 1 Claimant's view on that, on the theory of the case; how
 2 do you make a case, that being the evidence? And it
 3 would be good also obviously to hear from the Respondent
 4 on the same point.
 5 THE PRESIDENT: And of course the Claimant will also include
 6 the evidence of the Claimant's expert on this issue.
 7 Professor Števček was the ...
 8 PROFESSOR SANDS: Yes.
 9 THE PRESIDENT: Good.
 10 So we had said an hour. That has been reserved for
 11 tomorrow. Maybe you don't need an hour. It's up to
 12 you. And as we mentioned already yesterday, we don't
 13 look for slide presentations. If it's helpful to you to
 14 have a few slides, of course you're not barred from
 15 doing it.
 16 Should we start at 9.30, as we had scheduled, then
 17 first hear the Claimant, and then hear the Respondent,
 18 and then wrap up with procedural issues?
 19 And I can say that what you have mentioned this
 20 morning about no procedural -- no post-hearing briefs is
 21 fine with the Tribunal. And the deadlines for the
 22 corrections of the transcript and the marking
 23 confidential of the recording and the transcript is, of
 24 course, fine, and costs statement as well. We didn't
 25 see any other point with respect to further process that

Page 213

16:01 1 MR NEWING: 10.30 would be good with us.
 2 MR ANWAY: I promise we won't be preparing slides, but yes,
 3 I think 10.30 would be helpful. A little extra time.
 4 THE PRESIDENT: That's fine.
 5 MR NEWING: Thank you very much.
 6 THE PRESIDENT: No objection from this side.
 7 Good. Is there anything else that you wish to
 8 raise?
 9 MR NEWING: No, not from my side. Sorry, Mr Tushingham is
 10 sitting behind me so just making sure I have taken his
 11 view.
 12 MR ANWAY: Nothing from Respondent.
 13 THE PRESIDENT: Nothing from your side.
 14 Then I wish everyone a good evening and we'll see
 15 each other tomorrow at 10.30.
 16 MR NEWING: Thank you very much.
 17 THE PRESIDENT: Thank you.
 18 (4.02 pm)
 19 (The hearing adjourned until 10.30 am the following day)
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 215

16:00 1 we need to address.
 2 So that would be the programme for tomorrow. If
 3 there's anything that you would like to raise now, or
 4 any clarification that you need.
 5 PROFESSOR SANDS: Just to come in on this issue, it was
 6 Professor Števček who made that statement, my mistake,
 7 not Professor Fogaš. It was the Claimant's expert.
 8 THE PRESIDENT: So your reference was Števček.
 9 PROFESSOR SANDS: Števček, yes, Day 4, pages 33-35.
 10 My apologies.
 11 MR DRYMER: Is the hour total, or half hour each?
 12 THE PRESIDENT: We had said an hour each.
 13 MR DRYMER: Okay.
 14 THE PRESIDENT: So maybe we stick to the rules that we have
 15 set, unless you want to change them, and that's by
 16 agreement.
 17 MR NEWING: I don't intend to change that rule, and this is
 18 something I haven't yet had a chance to raise with the
 19 other side. But on the basis that we're not having
 20 post-hearing briefs, we were wondering whether we might
 21 be able to start a little later tomorrow, to just give
 22 ourselves a bit more time in the morning to finalise any
 23 preparation, on the basis that it's only an hour each
 24 anyway?
 25 THE PRESIDENT: Yes. 10.00, 10.30?

Page 214

A AA-002 99:15 AA-037 45:15 AA-11 8:13 AA-37 47:2 abbreviate 40:4 ability 51:10 80:20 114:12 163:10 182:5,8 able 36:15 38:20 51:13 61:4,8 72:9 78:20 104:2 114:10 115:6 120:14 121:4 122:7,8 123:20 166:1 176:20 179:17 181:2,5,8 183:14,20 214:21 about 1:13 5:6 10:25 15:22 17:7 23:13 25:10 30:9 32:3 33:19 36:22 38:22 40:12,23,24 42:3,4 42:5 47:18 49:7,13 50:3,5 51:3,7 52:2 59:6 65:9 67:3 68:5 68:21 69:3,21,22,25 73:13,15 80:23 86:2 88:21 91:19 94:15 95:19,22 97:22 103:7 119:25 127:12 128:25 132:18 140:5 147:2 148:23 150:8,10 153:9 154:22 155:16 157:1 161:6 163:17,24 164:22 166:10 170:22 171:20,22 172:1,13 172:17,18,24 175:14 176:2 180:6 180:6,20 182:7,14 182:17,18,23 183:24 184:1 185:4 186:10 192:16 197:7 198:1,19,20 207:9,10,24 208:8,9 211:7,14,18 213:20 above 8:15 12:21 13:10 absolutely 52:12 104:21 109:8 142:18,18 210:2 absurd 193:15 academic 203:6 accept 28:16 31:12 43:14 73:3 90:11 103:3 107:23 108:2 111:22 112:19 114:4 120:5 121:3 126:2,14 128:13 131:6 157:22 160:15,18 162:1,23 163:19 164:10,16 164:25 165:24 167:14 169:24 173:21 185:14 189:2 194:11	198:12 203:16 accepted 104:8 163:3 187:8 accepting 27:19 104:1 accepts 171:25 access 37:20 38:1,2,14 54:19 211:1 accordance 4:17,20 56:11,15 87:11 145:3,6,9 161:7 according 152:19 176:3 184:16 185:22 account 5:22 12:14 23:4 36:13,16 44:2 51:2 89:19 108:12 122:24 129:21 143:2 164:5,8 196:20 197:2 200:10 201:3,5,22 202:6 accountants 205:3 accounted 94:17 167:9 accounting 204:22 accounts 61:3 185:2 accumulated 121:19 accumulation 21:13 accumulations 98:11 accuracy 116:17 205:24 accurate 186:3 205:10 achieve 115:1 achieved 122:20 Acklam 4:2,4 144:15 144:18,19,21,25 145:5 146:21 147:14 148:10 157:18 162:12,15 163:13 164:15,21 164:24 165:18 168:10,15,22 169:1 169:7,22 170:2,8 171:13 186:19,24 187:5,10,22 188:3,7 188:16,23 189:6,13 192:5,10,18,20,25 193:4,13,21,25 194:8,14,17,20,25 195:20,24 196:3,7 196:15,21 197:1 199:17,21 200:1,6 200:11,16,25 202:2 202:10 207:8,12,15 207:17 208:22 acknowledge 124:23 acknowledged 154:6 183:24 acknowledgments 107:17 acquire 91:16 153:21 208:1 acquired 59:21 60:4 82:17 91:12 114:9 114:24 115:5 131:11 169:15,18 acquisition 59:13	60:12 68:21 82:16 114:5 across 7:14 8:25 96:13 106:13 116:14 117:12 151:20 173:24 Act 211:2 actions 21:4 active 114:20 activities 3:4 12:24 138:17 activity 96:19 112:20 actor 173:6 actual 21:13 63:12 112:20 163:24 172:23 actually 17:20 20:13 22:20 23:7 26:21 33:24 43:23 50:8 53:21 61:8 62:2,9 63:17,23 65:7 67:4 73:12 75:7 89:8 91:25 93:3 96:24 103:6 105:18 106:13 107:24 113:23,24 121:14 126:25 128:21 131:21 149:20 161:7 165:7 173:14 175:14 188:9,12,18 193:8 194:1 195:3 195:10 206:9,23 add 138:1 166:4 added 70:13 165:10 165:16,20 166:3 189:1,3,10,16,18 addendum 58:14 65:22 adding 210:22 addition 10:15 90:16 166:6 209:25 additional 27:13 28:12 80:23 81:15 91:10 108:12 111:9 166:3 168:12 169:25 170:3 address 1:18 17:10 53:12,12 160:9 210:12,18 214:1 addressed 50:7 adequately 50:7 adjacent 94:19 adjourned 144:10 215:19 adjust 79:4 189:17 adjusted 64:19 78:1 79:9 adjusting 78:25 adjustment 65:1,6 187:22 200:15,19 200:20 202:9 adjustments 152:4 adopting 74:16 advanced 53:25 ADX 63:13,16,21 64:21 150:18,19,23 151:4,7 161:13	194:19 195:16,18 196:8 198:3,11,16 203:9 AFE 92:9 102:9 AFEs 38:19 102:13 103:18 104:4,9 105:1 affect 164:6 165:2 affected 51:11 148:4 afraid 195:25 196:4 199:18 Africa 5:14 after 20:16 60:13 82:16 129:21 145:4 165:20 169:14,18 171:5 176:11 187:19 188:25 189:9,14 198:9,9 201:12 afternoon 144:5 146:4 157:11 181:13 afterwards 60:16 again 14:6,12 22:12 30:11 44:16 62:3,9 62:16 64:22 67:11 90:6,14 91:1 92:8 92:16,23 94:4,12 95:3,15,17 96:16,19 103:3 118:24 119:16,25 120:15 120:25 121:8 122:2 122:23 123:1 124:15 130:1,6,6 132:11 135:20 149:15 152:10 155:19 160:23 162:20 179:16 182:11 188:20,25 194:8 198:18 200:7 against 9:11 63:9 97:5 97:13 110:1 117:20 117:21 118:9 121:20 128:20 186:6 197:17 age 11:2 agenda 209:13 aggressive 96:16 ago 60:25 163:21 164:3 165:25 188:21 agree 39:1 82:9 102:3 102:14 111:11,15 113:11 122:4,20 135:4 137:23,24 138:13 139:15 140:3 142:15 166:4 166:5 167:5,8 168:19 172:2 174:14,17 183:22 190:14 195:2 196:5 197:14 198:12 200:13 agreed 2:5,11 3:6,7 103:13 163:7 173:2 agreement 2:1 28:9 149:9,11 162:25 163:2,3,5,14 188:5	188:8,10,15,16,18 188:20 214:16 agreements 25:14 Akard 58:23 62:9 149:9,11,20,22,25 150:3,4 162:10,25 163:1 187:3 188:1,5 188:8,10 ALEXANDER 2:5,10 alive 14:16 alleged 21:4 154:17 170:15 allocate 145:25 allocated 119:11 135:17 145:14 allow 19:25 120:10 197:11,13 203:4 allowed 167:18 allows 18:1 all-time 97:8 ALMEIDA 1:22 14:10 almost 76:16 148:24 166:11 181:7 183:3 206:6 alone 103:23 131:11 133:24 along 33:1 54:15 59:15 Alpine 153:24 Alpine's 153:24 already 37:20 49:4,5 54:17 65:2 109:23 146:24 155:10 160:23 167:25 199:1 200:22 201:2 201:5,13,22 202:6,8 213:12 alright 143:12 146:18 179:2 alternative 80:19 106:9 148:17 191:14 203:19 although 10:7 14:1 62:11 89:19 105:15 131:18 139:11 151:20 162:10 168:24 169:1 191:18 193:25 always 130:11 142:10 182:17 191:1 amalgam 31:17 amount 17:21 22:10 33:3,24 38:9 60:12 64:10 116:4,5,10,13 124:19 128:1 129:19 143:22 149:2 153:21,22 180:3 183:20 208:1 amounts 17:17,22 33:25 127:1 148:19 153:20 154:12 156:4 174:23 175:3 175:16 176:5 204:14 205:19 ample 199:8 analogue 89:14,24	90:16 93:12 97:16 128:9 analogues 89:17 90:8 analyse 177:15 analysed 9:3,6 69:10 94:14 152:2 analyses 112:11 166:2 188:25 189:9 analysis 16:22 17:20 18:11 19:18 25:10 62:21 64:20 65:16 67:5,6 75:5 76:8 77:12 84:23 92:10 92:16 93:10,19,20 94:11,17 95:1,5,19 95:21 97:7 105:3 119:17 129:14 133:6 134:24 135:6 135:11 136:2 138:12,13 139:16 139:17 141:13 152:9 161:4 164:11 164:16,21 165:5,15 167:13 168:13 170:1,3 187:12 189:7 192:23 194:10 analyst 190:25 Anne-Marie 1:24 announcements 71:15 annual 61:3,6 80:10 80:21,25 146:13 154:5,8 179:3 204:1 another 1:25 19:15 79:1 94:15 97:1 122:14 123:23 156:7,7 167:5 176:17 211:4 Anshof 13:17 answer 51:18 119:12 145:13,18,18 160:22 164:1 171:22 206:4 212:18,23 answered 86:5 160:23 anticipate 33:20 anticipates 30:14 35:4 antiformal 99:18 101:4 ANWAY 2:9 1:23 2:15 3:3 209:12,17 209:25 215:2,12 anybody 205:25 anymore 15:21 anyone 72:21 78:9,13 172:20 anything 43:20 49:8 75:9 154:16 166:4 179:24 184:20 193:16 196:14 205:6 212:17 214:3 215:7 anyway 122:12 200:21 214:24 anyways 206:15 anywhere 110:25 165:19
--	---	--	--	---	--

<p>AOG 25:13 28:2,25 30:9,14,18,20 69:6 69:8,15,18,19 109:19,25 110:5,16 168:8,13,21 169:6 169:14,18 192:8 194:18 204:6 208:1 AOG's 29:18 153:23 204:11 apart 80:8 113:21 apologies 37:13 44:6 79:12 214:10 apologise 186:7,9 apparent 8:18 65:17 88:8 apparently 30:7 appear 61:8,24 64:25 83:5 139:25 148:16 APPEARANCES 2:1 appeared 61:10,23 113:20 184:9 appendices 156:23,25 appendix 106:24 108:8 147:1 156:18 apples 197:19,19 applicability 7:11 applicable 14:21 109:1,2,2 applied 200:23 201:10 201:12,14,15,16,23 201:24 202:8,20 applies 154:17 apply 62:8 65:1 155:19 205:17 applying 78:2 84:13 201:4,8,14,17 203:13 appraised 63:4 appreciate 55:5 137:23 189:1 210:21 approach 23:5 49:9 68:13 71:3 137:10 146:23,24,25 147:3 150:11 152:11 153:6 157:16 158:9 159:5,7 160:21 161:14 192:1 199:6 appropriate 6:22 14:22 63:4 65:19 78:24 101:7 122:5 142:5 147:11 156:11 157:15 172:3 187:19 189:4 189:7,11 197:16 200:15,21 appropriations 46:20 approvals 47:7,10,11 47:19,25 48:2,6 approve 210:24 approved 81:13 approximate 78:1,18 155:24 April 189:22 aquifer 7:17 arbitrarily 122:11,12 arbitration 1:1,1</p>	<p>71:10 arbitrations 206:7,9 ARB/21/51 1:3 area 8:1 18:3 45:9 47:13 48:1 49:5,25 57:15 58:1 61:23,25 62:4,17 63:5 89:9 90:2,10,20 92:24 93:1,2,2,15 100:17 100:18 101:1 107:19 111:6,18,24 112:2 113:16 114:20 116:11,14 116:18,23 117:12 117:23,24,25 118:10 119:5 131:23 139:8,18,20 140:4 165:13 areas 5:25 8:18 16:23 17:13 19:2 42:19 91:6 93:5 98:12,16 100:22 104:20,23 106:14 110:23 111:2,5 112:19,21 113:6 116:7,14 117:21 118:1,4,10 118:14,25 119:1 120:10,19,24 121:7 125:24 126:25 133:18 139:4,7,9 140:4 164:11,17 186:18 189:10 210:10,12 argues 155:23 arguing 155:24 argument 154:22 155:7,21 206:1 arguments 148:20 arise 37:2 around 32:12,18 52:21 61:23 85:2,3 95:19 101:12 124:12 127:19 139:8 183:12 arrangement 177:6,8 177:9,16,19 178:4 178:16 180:18 arrival 54:18 arrive 52:13 76:22 78:25 arrives 76:22 84:19 article 13:24 14:2,6 15:22 211:1,2 articulated 166:17 ascertain 164:4 166:2 Asia 5:14 aside 64:7 asked 17:10 18:25 22:24 51:6 54:23 179:25 207:9,24 210:5 asking 15:14 86:3 97:23 157:12 171:23 206:5 aspect 80:1 141:19 aspects 211:5,7 asserting 185:1</p>	<p>assess 62:2 99:24 104:19 106:22 107:24 143:10 160:13 assessed 64:14 97:4 105:15,18 108:6,25 133:9,13 136:12 180:22 assessing 111:10 137:1 186:11 187:17 assessment 16:16 27:22 57:21 59:3,8 61:20 62:17 94:8,10 98:16 101:14 105:8 105:9 106:10,19 109:9 110:7,16,18 110:22 133:12 140:4,7 161:2,2 165:11,17 172:5 189:2 194:16 200:8 assessments 62:14 107:15 110:19 asset 58:19 59:6,20 60:4 77:19,24 81:24 81:25 82:13 83:7,8 83:9 85:4,9 165:20 167:15 180:22 185:21 198:25 assets 57:4 85:7,14 152:5 157:2,23,24 160:2 162:6 189:25 195:3,10 198:4,12 assigned 106:5 134:15 Assistant 1:23 associated 13:25 30:6 30:13,15,21,24 33:20 34:7 35:5 51:7,12,13 58:7 65:8 Associates 2:15 60:7 74:17 144:20 assume 37:15,19,22 38:3 78:8 124:25 143:1 168:6 173:5 193:15 assumed 37:8 92:25 129:8 170:10 192:7 assumes 19:6,10 120:21 assuming 21:2 43:10 44:15,18 127:13 129:15 assumption 118:4 125:5 178:18 192:10,11 194:2,6 198:3,5 assumptions 173:12 182:2 Atkinson 17:16 18:22 19:11,23 21:12 57:11 62:14 75:24 76:4 89:23 90:3 91:18 92:4,23,25 94:5 100:4,19,25 101:9 108:3 109:11 109:18 110:2 112:7</p>	<p>116:6 119:18 120:12 121:21 122:7 123:2 130:17 137:3,6 141:12 Atkinson's 5:20 57:20 75:7 91:13,24 92:10 94:8 98:20 100:23 107:4 117:1 118:23 120:6 132:4,10,10 133:4,6 138:11 attached 154:8 180:22 attempted 149:7 162:17,21 188:3,4 attributable 189:25 attributed 190:3 attribution 210:16 audio 2:17,17 audit 199:3 audited 154:6 204:2 205:9,23,23 auditing 205:5 auditor 80:14 auditors 61:11 August 69:22 Aurelian 153:21 168:23,25 169:1,16 189:21 Australian 71:13 72:1 72:20,22,23 73:4 197:10 203:4 Austria 13:18 authorisations 16:6 35:10 available 10:7,15 46:25 59:9 62:7 81:16 93:10 98:23 105:7 112:9 114:5 119:11 121:9,12,13 121:17,18 122:11 131:17 132:19 139:12,23 142:2 148:18,22 166:14 187:6 average 8:7,11 9:1,16 12:6 65:18 94:12 124:19 128:2,22,24 129:25 130:3 133:1 133:17 137:25 138:8,9 151:19 152:11 averages 128:4 averaging 8:6 award 57:5 64:19 155:9,16 156:7,15 191:18 aware 16:5,18 21:8 22:21 25:13,16 26:3 26:5 29:18 38:16,18 38:19 44:13,17 48:14,17,18,23 49:16 70:11 80:18 80:20 81:4,6 90:23 103:17,21,25 105:12 110:20 111:3 127:9,16 166:18 168:12,15 169:6,7,25 170:2</p>	<p>171:15 192:20 193:21 axis 63:9 <hr/>B<hr/>b 46:18 117:24 135:13 135:21 136:15,15 back 15:17 20:16 23:12 26:16 30:25 31:5 33:21 34:12 36:21 58:22 60:6 65:9 67:4 70:20 73:20 101:11 105:5 109:14 115:20 119:3 122:17 135:1 153:3 168:1 background 56:24 88:4 back-up 207:1,2 bad 183:17 Baker 204:20 balance 7:3,11,13,22 8:8,10 9:3,6 14:21 126:21 balances 77:20 175:13 bara 32:14 barely 208:24 barred 213:14 barrel 150:25 151:11 151:23 152:13,17 195:20 200:17 barrels 10:5 12:13 63:10,22 64:17 95:20,22 123:15,18 128:3 129:4 146:15 146:16,17 barriers 43:24 base 101:2,4 173:16 based 6:14 19:19 23:2 24:3 62:14,19 64:2 73:21 74:20 98:19 101:2 102:4 107:5 114:15 132:25 147:3,5 148:2 150:23 156:9 157:19 158:8,11 159:7 163:7 165:10 165:16 168:20 170:14,15 171:6 185:1 186:24 187:17 189:2 191:15 193:4 195:17 196:25 197:1 198:7 199:6,7 200:7,17 201:10 202:20 203:5 205:21 206:18 basic 67:5 basically 52:13,14,25 99:19 119:6 160:15 161:14 basis 21:1,3 43:13 67:9,11 86:4 105:6 112:5,12 114:2 116:9 129:11 131:16 135:6 139:15 150:19</p>	<p>153:6 159:22 169:24 170:9 171:18 186:21 187:2 191:16,17 192:7,7 193:17,18 194:5,9,18 196:8,19 197:23 200:7 203:8 204:8 212:19,23 214:19,23 basket 85:14 Bayfield 5:13 bear 5:25 9:22 36:19 63:2 85:6 become 27:14 63:6 88:8 becomes 59:9 129:17 129:18 before 1:10 1:10 2:3 12:8,9 31:10 38:4 38:17 44:13 52:19 54:23 55:19 69:5 73:13 88:11,24 89:22 91:12 94:19 111:18 127:20 131:7,11,14 145:11 146:6 150:2 153:14 158:10 161:3 163:15,19 166:24 166:25 170:21 171:1 178:7 189:12 189:13 193:18 206:16 begin 1:10 28:2 52:10 beginning 107:3 156:17 182:18 begins 32:4 behalf 97:23 157:12 behind 136:22 215:10 being 13:15 33:20,21 43:25 46:20,21 47:15,16 49:17 84:7 84:8 88:9 95:16 102:10 103:3 114:10 115:6 128:18 132:12 133:5 142:5 154:13 164:13,18 168:22 170:15 173:18 176:5 178:21 184:15 186:2 187:24 199:9,10 200:21 207:9 212:5 213:2 belabour 208:18 belief 4:17,21 56:12 56:16 87:12 145:3,7 145:10 believe 21:12 22:3 25:5 32:23,24 34:23 37:12 47:24 51:18 60:18,24 61:14,21 62:17 63:18,24 64:22 65:19 68:22 79:16 80:16 82:3 89:12 99:13 141:12 158:24 162:25 163:1,8 165:18</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

<p>168:11 173:5,15 175:21 180:15 181:16 182:13,20 182:22 183:19 185:18,19 187:5,22 187:23 192:13 193:14 194:4 205:1 believed 82:5 173:3 believes 63:3 172:7 below 58:11 127:17 131:19 147:5,7 BEN 2:5 benchmark 95:16 119:17 benchmarking 6:6,17 9:8,10,20 14:23 90:12 93:10 115:10 115:25 116:2 beneficial 2:2 benefit 2:3 40:6 114:16,17 115:4 best 82:10 90:8 93:22 151:21 160:13 171:24 175:11 better 90:5 148:24 161:2 164:13,18 between 11:24 14:24 43:4 64:10 77:14 84:11 94:16 95:13 100:21 101:15 104:13 105:4,8 109:17 119:17 124:18 126:21 133:1 150:3 153:1 153:25 154:24 166:19 169:15 172:6 188:10 beyond 22:19,23 biased 148:3 151:12 bid 117:20 bigger 93:3,21,23 129:9 binary 185:5,19 bit 1:23 5:6 35:19 38:22 45:25 52:16 52:21 53:7,9 68:20 76:8 78:3 85:2 89:1 89:2 90:25 95:14 112:18 150:9 181:25 190:11 202:2 214:22 bits 53:1 130:9 blew 6:1 blobs 117:3,8,10,11 blocks 8:4,25 blow 35:19 211:10 blue 36:2 88:13 90:14 blunt 78:4 BM01 132:10 BM03 32:12 BM04 132:4,11 board 111:13 175:15 boe 64:14 65:19 74:11 74:25 195:17 Boggs 2:9,9,10,10,11 2:11,12 bonds 156:13</p>	<p>borrow 156:3 borrowed 156:4 borrowing 155:25 156:5,9 borrowings 177:1 both 2:10 6:18 7:15,25 14:23 18:24 19:22 31:6 39:4 59:3,21 65:6 85:22 103:17 104:2 132:9 133:25 142:8 144:13,20 145:16 147:22 151:6,7 187:15 188:20 204:21 211:21 212:13 bottom 11:8,10 25:3 35:7 45:19 88:18 94:18 97:12 100:25 109:16 134:11 199:21 201:25 bought 169:6 bracket 10:17 breach 212:3 break 1:20 55:3,4,5,8 55:10,17,22 86:11 86:20 143:18 breakdown 189:24 brief 1:11 56:23 briefing 189:21 191:11 briefly 1:16,18 5:19 65:15 141:17 209:1 briefs 1:14 2:6,12 213:20 214:20 bring 26:25 30:2 53:3 86:14 125:10 166:22 169:9 212:4 broad 102:16 broadly 129:5 broken 114:21 brooks 24:21 brought 98:5 build 29:3 building 25:11 50:5 built 28:25 33:11 35:2 49:24 76:18 85:20 bulk 117:6 153:23 174:14 206:10 bullet 66:8 98:4,8 burn 29:15 30:7 34:9 burned 52:1 burning 51:14,20,20 burnt 14:1 30:11 Burren 5:13 busiest 13:7 business 156:16 174:19 176:20 178:23 businessman 173:13 173:17 but-for 21:1,3 23:1 30:14,19 33:9 34:3 40:22 42:3,4,12,14 42:19 43:10,22 44:10,22,24 45:3 57:6 62:21 63:6 67:6 69:11,18,18</p>	<p>73:23,24 74:7,25 77:8,12,12 78:24 147:4,25 149:18 152:15,25 153:8 163:25 186:22,25 187:16 192:22 193:1,10,19 194:11 200:14,16 buy 153:22 164:14,19 165:3 buyer 148:25 172:6 buying 167:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <p>C 106:24 108:8 calc 133:10 calculate 57:3,14 58:8 67:24 94:6 140:24 158:25 159:6 161:21,24,25 199:5 calculated 6:25 8:10 10:16,17 20:3 74:3 74:5 99:10 106:11 132:25 133:20 134:4,5 136:1 151:22 195:17,20 calculating 17:21 67:8 152:11 159:9 161:20,21 calculation 6:9 8:8 61:16 64:4 71:23 74:3,8 97:4 116:9 116:17,24 133:3,7,8 133:11,17,22 151:14 154:2 196:2 196:5,7 197:16 202:12 205:15 208:14 calculations 6:15 64:24 66:9,17 134:1 196:18,22 197:15 203:2 calculator 137:24 call 38:23 67:16 162:18 163:15 211:11 212:17 called 3:4,16,21 4:1,2 3:18 24:6 52:14 56:1 63:13 64:13 86:23 142:21 144:14,15 178:22 181:25 190:6 calling 27:22 calls 109:12 came 106:18 119:12 campaign 6:12 18:15 20:16 23:5 Canadian 138:15 cap 7:17 capacities 33:8 capacity 61:7 capital 153:16,18 159:3,3,10 161:22 161:24 Carlo 57:23 75:8 76:4 76:10 106:17 Carpathian 6:19 8:12</p>	<p>9:11 10:13 12:4 88:14 97:6,6 119:21 Carpathians 9:22 11:6 115:16 carried 98:24 99:3 110:17 115:11 131:22 132:20 134:6 169:5,18 170:1 199:14 200:21 carry 79:12 carrying 102:5 case 1:3 23:1 26:10 29:20 33:8 42:12 43:10,22 53:25 61:1 62:21 63:6 73:23,25 74:7,25 77:8 78:24 82:12 83:5,5 92:25 101:18 104:22 105:2,16,17,20 106:4,6,10,14,17 108:5,6 130:11 142:7 153:19,24 155:18 156:7 164:10 177:22 189:18 196:1,8 200:18,20 212:24 213:1,2 cases 206:6 cash 57:10,17,20 60:20,21,22 65:23 74:21 75:4,12 77:20 149:4 163:9 182:3 184:15 cash-strapped 61:2 casing 52:15 53:6,8 cast 182:4 categories 207:25 categorisation 5:12 category 208:9,16 causation 209:21 causes 8:3 caution 166:1 167:13 cautious 167:7 caveating 131:20 caving 52:21 CDL-008 134:7 CDL-14 125:11 CD-10 68:24 166:11 CD-8 11:1,5 CD-9 12:22 central 35:1 centrally 32:11 centre 1:2,5 117:11 cents 151:1 century 113:6 CEO 61:7 173:1 Ceranka 8:13 certain 71:2 85:17 86:1 101:11 160:24 185:10 211:14 certainly 28:7 39:3 102:1 144:3 175:25 cetera 6:17 24:23 71:15 91:11 chairman 174:9 challenge 99:2</p>	<p>challenged 60:25 99:4 136:16 169:3,23 171:15 188:14 212:6 challenging 202:23 chance 5:21,22 18:4 19:22 21:13 42:22 42:25 57:11,22 59:4 65:4 94:4,6,9,15,21 94:24 114:13 131:1 132:21 134:6,16 135:3,8,20 136:5,10 136:24 137:16 140:8,8,24 196:13 196:20 197:3 199:8 200:23 201:3,13 202:7 214:18 chances 114:10 115:5 115:7 change 4:2 79:23 123:10,21 130:9 143:3 214:15,17 changed 3:24 79:20 104:13,15,18 163:22 changes 59:11 77:24 143:10 164:5 characterisation 21:19 71:4 211:22 charged 3:4 139:18,20 140:6 154:13 Charles 2:15 60:7 74:17 144:20 chart 78:5 84:23 94:18 96:5,21,25 97:3,12 123:6 124:15 128:21 129:8 210:20 charts 84:24 85:10 96:17 check 181:17 checking 206:10 checks 175:13 choice 58:15 choose 84:22 chose 57:8 76:16 77:23 137:10 chosen 79:6 118:18,19 158:12,14 192:17 Chris 3:21 86:23,25 88:2 CHRISTINA 2:12 circle 88:13 circles 91:25 110:11 110:13 circumstance 157:16 186:1 circumstances 171:21 172:1 184:1 cite 24:6 155:5 201:11 cited 48:9 146:8,9 citizens 48:15,18 claim 61:1 63:14 104:4 147:9,9 153:9 153:20 154:23,24 156:12 157:15 158:8,11 183:5</p>	<p>203:19,22 206:7 209:17,18,22 claimant 1:16 2:2 3:6 71:10 74:15 90:12 91:13,15 97:24 101:17 103:7,8 104:7,8,11,17,25 105:3,11,13,19 106:5 147:6,15 149:10 150:3,15 152:3,14 153:16 155:5,23 156:2,3,15 157:12 158:5,21 159:9,12 161:1 166:13 176:3 185:22 187:1,10,16 192:19,20 206:7 211:12 213:5,17 claimants 154:22 183:4 Claimant's 88:25 89:3 89:6,9,11 90:1,9,20 90:25 92:1 94:17 95:21 98:11 101:14 104:13,15 105:9,14 105:16 106:4,16 117:23 119:20 128:7,19,23 147:8 147:20 149:12,14 149:21 150:20 151:3 152:18 153:19 155:21 156:6 158:7 168:4 170:11 186:25 187:6 192:23 194:21 197:17,24 203:18 211:21,23 213:1,6 214:7 claimed 154:12 155:8 207:25 claims 199:9,10 209:8 209:9 CLAIRE 2:14 clarification 37:9 42:13 163:24 209:6 211:6 214:4 clarified 51:20 210:3 clarify 51:23 clarity 209:11 classification 5:11 39:13,15,22,25 40:16 41:3,25 42:9 44:12 classifications 41:21 102:10 classified 43:3 101:24 clear 2:7 14:1 46:1 51:18 74:11 76:7 127:18 153:13 185:3 209:17 212:18 clearly 14:3,16 29:20 82:25 83:7 145:14 208:12 clerk 161:10 close 32:24 61:5 closely 58:3</p>
---	--	---	---	---	--

<p>closer 138:10 closings 1:14 clustered 91:6 code 71:13 73:8,9 codes 71:2 coffin 211:10 Colin 2:4 3:16,17 56:1 56:2,21 collapsed 166:18 collateral 183:5 collateralised 148:14 colleague 5:19 50:24 147:13 153:3 colleagues 74:24 83:14,21 107:16 141:7 collect 35:3 colour 89:5 colours 115:16 column 59:20,21 76:7 81:10 132:22 combined 57:23 come 11:14 20:16 23:12 24:7 25:23 58:20 59:15 60:2 62:19 74:24 75:1,7 76:14 77:23 79:8 83:22 87:15 92:15 95:5 96:13 115:20 119:3 127:1 128:14 135:1 142:21 148:5 159:16 168:6 169:11 171:19 175:8 192:15 199:15 214:5 comes 61:17 77:12 128:2 133:11 138:9 142:3 comfort 55:21 102:11 141:25 comfortable 27:19 71:4 75:20 111:20 coming 54:15 63:11 79:15 114:23 128:16 167:7 commence 37:16 commenced 169:19 192:24 comment 70:12 132:18 199:9 202:17,24 204:23 commented 161:5 comments 2:23 147:10 commercial 40:13 41:11 43:5,11,25 90:24 115:3 commerciality 43:14 44:8,15,18 45:20 46:4,18 commercially 39:19 committed 61:24 139:3 committee 175:14,15 common 40:9 45:4 85:25 161:23 commonly 29:9</p>	<p>compaction 7:17 companies 39:4 62:23 63:1 68:12 74:14 77:19 78:16 83:18 85:7 142:4,14 147:6 150:10,12,16 151:20 152:3,8 157:20 158:2,12,20 159:8,11,20,23 160:1,19 161:6,8,23 161:24 191:15,24 192:3,6 194:21,21 195:6,13 196:23,23 198:7 203:8,11 204:22 205:6 company 5:12 16:7 61:8 63:13,14 96:10 143:9 158:1 159:8 160:7,12,25,25,25 161:3 173:11,19,21 174:18,25 175:6,12 175:18,24 176:1,2,9 176:10,17 177:18 177:18,23 178:20 178:22 179:16 180:1,4,24 181:5 182:11 183:2,6,17 183:18 184:6,7,8,14 184:25 185:9,16,21 190:24 194:19,23 195:1,5,9,10,12 198:5 company's 181:3 182:5,8 comparable 9:15 10:13 14:14,24 62:23 68:11,13 77:18 83:18 85:6,8 112:6,14 122:19 133:5 147:6 150:10 150:12,16 151:20 152:3,7 157:19,22 158:2,13,18 159:8 159:10,11,20,21 160:2,8,11,14,16,20 160:24 161:1,6,8,16 161:23,24 191:15 194:21 195:3,4,7,10 195:13 198:3,6,12 comparables 62:20 65:16 159:7 compare 96:18 101:7 110:1 112:8,16 115:20 116:4 117:20,21 118:9 121:20 123:2 128:20 149:4 150:13 190:22 203:10 compared 11:7 100:4 119:18 122:6 128:17 132:6 133:4 148:3 194:18 196:9 compares 95:8 120:22 comparing 63:1 112:11 118:2,5,13 118:25 120:25</p>	<p>121:10 129:10 195:8 198:15 comparison 6:18 11:23 12:12 92:2 95:18 100:21 101:7 109:17 122:2,5,12 124:18 125:8,17 126:3 128:6 137:1 138:12 184:14 194:3 compelled 148:12 compensation 175:14 175:15,23 competent 40:2,5 44:14,17,19,23 45:3 45:5 completed 13:5 62:13 131:8 162:17,24 163:1,5,18 169:18 completely 51:16 159:4 completion 170:4 188:5 complex 88:22 complicated 24:20 component 34:2 components 116:19 compressed 32:14 compulsion 170:15 172:7,8 compulsory 211:1 conceive 186:1 concept 96:6,9 concepts 107:10 conceptual 141:14 conceptually 77:17 concern 61:12,12 80:15 182:1,6,21,22 183:1,8,15 184:9 186:15 concerned 137:20 concerning 1:14 concerns 47:9 48:13 49:1,7 50:5,6 182:12 concluded 99:6 concludes 54:23 143:15 conclusion 14:18 65:12 98:9 108:10 108:16,16 110:4 118:15 119:16 conclusions 143:3 condensate 63:17 condition 185:20 conditions 81:2 178:14,19,20 180:23 conduct 28:17 107:15 158:5 211:13 conducted 98:16,22 101:14 106:9,19 191:16 conducting 120:2 130:6 158:18 conductor 52:18,20 54:1,17</p>	<p>confidence 115:9 confidential 213:23 configuration 7:5,23 confirm 66:15 73:3 86:24 115:21 134:9 166:10 172:10 184:19 confirmed 8:21 21:12 41:18 confirms 58:11 83:4 conform 42:1,10 confused 200:3 confusion 52:2 connect 28:10 30:1 33:1 connected 28:25 connecting 30:21 connection 24:21 conscience 4:19 56:14 87:11 145:5,9 consecutively 96:10 conservatively 202:21 203:3 consider 35:8 46:13 54:9 61:15 106:1 140:14,15,18,19,20 160:10,16,19 161:16 178:6 189:11 192:1 203:3 208:18 considerable 60:12 178:12 consideration 185:15 considered 20:19 39:19 43:3 68:8 102:14,25 103:4,15 103:19 104:3,9,10 105:1 106:8,13 112:2 139:25 140:10 151:24 159:21 166:5 191:23 considering 12:7 168:18 considers 105:19 consistent 2:21 95:13 149:8 175:25 197:9 consolidate 52:23 construct 22:12 constructed 34:6 49:3 constructing 30:20 37:1 construction 28:2 Consulting 2:14,14 87:2 contact 8:2,19,19 contain 17:13 19:21 20:6 42:19 contained 125:9 contains 8:13 34:20 66:16 125:13 contemporaneous 109:19 context 70:22,24 71:8 71:12,16,21 72:21 72:23 82:6 166:15 206:2</p>	<p>contingent 40:7 43:3,4 85:12 151:6,7,10 195:21 196:8 198:14,16 203:9 continue 182:6 continued 60:15 62:5 67:12 continuing 60:13 continuous 8:17 contracts 48:3,3 contractual 47:6 48:2 contradicted 148:22 contrary 40:18 41:1 41:20 contrast 156:11 contrasting 176:4 controversial 142:20 187:23 Conversely 64:6 convert 42:14 converted 148:14 copy 68:24 98:3 102:19 109:15 113:3 115:14 119:15 124:11,13 138:20 corollary 94:22 corporate 61:4 67:25 corrected 77:20 96:21 161:12,14 correction 198:9,10 corrections 2:16,19 146:7 213:22 correctly 37:10 67:24 85:15 116:20 141:20 208:10 corrects 145:22 correspond 204:15 corresponds 117:24 147:18 cost 96:2 147:8 153:9 153:20 154:2 159:2 159:3,9 161:22,24 207:24 208:14 costs 2:25 58:7 61:11 146:24 148:4 153:11 154:18 155:25 156:10 203:19 205:18 206:7 207:25 209:25 213:24 cost-sensitive 2:10 counsel 54:3 185:7,12 counted 37:10 counting 38:1 couple 13:13 50:13 51:19 60:24 86:13 87:16 113:21 course 1:22 2:12 27:21 29:3,25 36:4 36:10 58:6 59:2,15 62:21 63:3 64:18 65:11 74:7 77:8,21 78:19 82:6 85:5,11 145:23 157:5 158:1 185:7 190:18,18 209:25 210:8,22</p>	<p>211:7 212:20 213:5 213:14,24 courts 211:20,25 cover 9:17 89:6 139:18 covered 210:7 211:16 211:16 212:11 covers 211:4 co-arbitrators 212:10 CPR 40:4 94:11 130:18 CPRs 40:9 CRA 60:7 61:1,20 62:24 63:7,12,24 64:1 66:21 71:12 74:12,22 75:14 77:18 78:2 79:7 84:17 85:23 crashed 167:16 CRA's 71:1 78:5 84:10 CRA-35 72:7 CRA-63 146:9 179:2 create 20:13,22 created 28:20 46:11 91:18 100:16 credit 176:23 179:20 181:7,14 credulity 184:18 crisis 60:20,23 criteria 40:19 41:3 43:6,11,25 44:8 45:21 cross 143:21 cross-examination 3:6 3:18,23 4:5 15:10 66:2 97:21 157:9 171:15 cross-sections 8:14,16 8:22 Cub 152:4 161:9,11 195:16 cumulative 9:12,17 93:13 curious 26:8 current 34:9 currently 13:15 curves 7:3,4 cut 142:7 C-247 189:20 C-259 81:9 174:5 C-41 166:22 C.1 106:24 C.3 107:3 108:17,25</p>
---	---	--	---	---	--

D

damage 12:16
damages 155:22 158:8 158:11 209:23
dark 8:18
darker 89:5
database 91:1 126:7
dataset 105:13 107:19 120:5 127:12,14 128:15
date 11:9 12:9 57:5 60:9,11 61:21,22

62:4,23 64:19 74:4 74:5,9,14,17,19 77:2,4,13,21,22 78:6,11,13,17,19 79:3,8 81:17 84:10 84:12,13,21,22 101:13 122:17 134:9 147:22 149:16 150:14,17 150:25 151:4,15,18 151:25 152:5,7,18 152:20,25 154:21 158:7 163:21 167:11,12,15 187:11,13,14,15 188:7,24 189:1,12 189:13,15 191:17 191:18 192:8,15,18 192:19,21 193:3,5,7 193:19,21,24 194:1 194:6,9,12,19,22 dates 69:2 77:14 84:11 147:23 149:17 187:12,15,18 192:11 dating 91:9 DAVID 2:10 day 1:8 1:17,25 84:23 155:6 212:14 214:9 215:19 days 2:16,20,23 3:1,2 3:5 13:6 60:24 87:16 115:3 DCF 33:24 58:7 67:19 68:9 73:22,24 75:18 75:19,21,22 76:23 77:1 83:20 97:4 154:25 155:13 159:4 184:16 dead 191:2 deadlines 213:21 deal 44:22,23 61:18 138:19 173:2 dealt 18:12 33:20 51:8 51:12 death 211:10 debate 91:19 debt 77:20 debts 182:8 December 4:3 87:5 138:25 144:23 decide 145:24 212:1,2 decided 103:22 105:22 decision 42:21 57:23 104:14 105:17 106:6,7 142:12 decisions 51:3 211:25 decision-tree 19:16,18 19:23 92:16 95:1 declaration 4:18 40:19 44:15,18 56:13 87:9 145:4 209:10 declarations 78:25 declare 4:19 56:14 87:10 145:5,8 declared 63:2	decline 8:3 declining 8:4 deductions 148:5 deemed 147:6 150:16 152:3 159:11 160:7 160:13 195:4,7 deems 175:17 deep 10:24 125:23 deeper 11:16,25 53:10 126:14,18,19,24 127:2,3,6,9,16 128:21 default 156:14 163:4 178:17 defended 195:15 defies 184:17 definable 9:2 define 116:18 defined 7:3 91:21 92:19 101:1 107:5 108:18 164:13,18 195:12 198:6 Definitely 131:6 definition 86:2 dehydrated 29:14 delays 36:13,25 37:6 delegate 145:13 deliberately 137:7 demonstrated 93:1 130:15 demonstrating 48:21 demonstrations 48:17 48:22 demonstrative 11:1 12:22 31:3 59:18 demonstratives 68:22 denied 209:19,20 density 93:19 115:20 116:15,17,24 117:16 depend 7:1 85:23 dependency 94:16 dependent 59:5 85:19 depending 55:20 130:8 depends 30:19,20 54:11 59:3 116:18 118:24 129:24 139:17 165:4 178:13 Depletion 8:24 depth 8:20 11:2,9 107:9,21,23 108:1,2 108:4,6,7,9,19,21 108:24 109:4,5,8 depths 11:18,20 13:2 128:23 129:4 derive 8:6 64:1,13 derived 6:10 66:20 72:13 74:12 75:12 75:22 79:19 derives 75:4,6 deriving 65:18 describe 43:9 described 7:7 13:15 18:4,8 22:12 29:8 30:23 34:7,11,15	47:15 151:21 171:20 191:15 description 9:18 10:2 45:5 78:12 101:12 131:18 185:14 designed 135:11 desperate 176:2 184:15 despite 8:16 104:1 113:23 151:16 detail 7:8 24:16 57:18 58:15 59:17 88:7 89:3 102:6 105:21 105:21 108:22,23 133:21 details 16:12 26:5 31:23 48:20 57:16 141:13 deteriorate 126:20 determination 45:20 46:18 determine 6:11 7:6 80:11 98:17 117:16 139:3 201:8 206:12 determined 20:20 137:15 develop 26:23 43:24 96:1 developed 7:1 9:9 10:17 13:11,16,19 17:16 22:7,9,9 63:5 67:13 developer 142:22 143:5 developer's 141:18 development 6:6,6,21 9:24 12:20,23,25 13:22 14:16,25 16:7 19:3,6 20:13,23,25 21:4,16,18,23,25 22:17,24 23:25 25:18,25 27:9,11,13 27:14,18 31:13 32:21 33:9 34:3,20 34:23 35:18,22 43:8 43:16,18 46:6,9,10 46:12,13 47:15 49:1 49:7,20 50:6 58:5 67:16 76:18 95:23 96:2,8,9,15,19 140:9 developments 5:9,10 15:2 26:15 32:3 34:22 49:22 devoted 38:12 diagram 88:14,18 90:3 diagrams 50:23 89:22 diameter 32:13 diameters 53:9 differ 162:3 difference 42:12 43:4 46:1 92:7 97:14 101:15 105:4 113:18 129:19 130:4 142:17 187:24	differences 92:7 different 8:3,4 34:22 59:19 71:17 74:14 94:6 95:7 104:7 105:8 109:24 112:11 115:15,16 116:14 117:23 119:2 128:23 134:1 134:1,2 135:23 146:8 159:4 161:18 161:20 162:1 167:15,18 189:25 198:25 differently 22:5,14,16 130:14 difficult 29:10 77:15 90:11 115:8 185:13 difficulties 3:11 difficulty 87:19 185:10 diligence 5:14 61:22 dipping 65:3 dire 148:16 170:24 173:8,21 175:6 176:1,9 180:5 181:16 183:10,18 184:25 185:4,5,11 185:11,25 186:7 direct 137:1 directly 77:16 85:8 director 174:12 directors 148:19 173:24 174:7,24 175:2,16 dire/not 185:5 dirty 89:5 disagree 132:16 134:24 159:19 179:19 disagreed 202:25 disbursed 154:13,18 154:20,20 205:20 disbursement 205:19 disclosure 138:16 disconnect 77:14 84:11 discount 200:22 201:4 201:4,7,8,10,12,14 201:17,24 202:5,20 203:13,15 discounted 57:10,16 57:20 65:22 74:21 75:4,12 132:12 133:25 149:4 200:4 200:9 201:2 discounting 75:10 106:1 discover 18:15,16,20 19:8 114:18 discoverable 18:2 20:1 43:1 76:15 discovered 6:9,11 9:24 27:6 40:12 41:7,17 57:25 58:1 63:4 64:15 65:3 74:23 75:6 76:2,17 84:20 114:16	discoveries 6:22 9:4 12:25 13:1 14:22,25 22:8 90:24 discovery 1:15 5:22 13:19 14:7,12 19:10 21:24 22:20 23:23 25:13 26:3 35:9 37:20 38:16 43:12 43:22,23 44:1 58:22 60:4,6,10 67:12 69:6,10,14,17 70:3 70:8 77:4 78:7,19 82:5,6,7,16,25 83:6 83:23 88:11 111:16 114:6 115:3 131:8 132:1,9 150:17 155:25 158:12,15 159:24 160:2 168:1 168:8 169:6,18 186:17,22 187:4,20 188:11 193:11 200:14 Discovery's 21:8 26:10 41:25 48:16 48:19 53:14 57:4 62:11 64:16 110:20 discuss 1:16,17,20 3:9 3:11 68:12,20 209:1 212:9 discussed 27:17 35:5 48:6 50:17 79:16,18 109:23 130:17 158:10 162:6 discusses 24:16 discussing 1:24 2:4 70:25 83:17 discussion 3:3 4:13 1:12,12 45:20 167:22 212:11 discussions 183:23 dismiss 209:8,8 dismissal 209:17 disposal 80:24 168:16 disposed 34:8 dispute 1:4 173:9 199:2 disputed 208:1,2,5 212:6 Disputes 1:2 disputing 208:3,7 Distance 24:19 distribution 8:20 11:2 28:9,10 30:1,16,22 33:22 34:13 57:24 84:5 distributions 8:14,17 8:22 9:5 57:21 divide 138:2,2 divided 96:23 doable 13:10 43:18 Doctor 141:11 document 23:8 24:5 25:3 72:7,25 81:7 99:15 102:19 132:20 138:14,22 146:8 documentation 128:8	documented 110:14 documents 24:3 44:9 109:19,25,25 130:16 doing 30:8 62:25,25 71:22 83:1 93:15 105:3 118:22 213:15 dollar 65:19 156:12 195:17,20 dollars 63:9 82:1 206:23,24 dollar-denominated 156:13 domestic 32:9 33:5 212:1 done 3:12 6:18 27:20 28:24 29:9 30:18 38:4 43:15,20 49:11 50:2 62:24 66:9 67:24 78:3,5,21 83:21 84:15 86:16 88:10 89:20 90:12 95:16 97:11,17 99:5 104:1 121:21 130:7 136:2 173:13 189:19 195:15 196:18 200:4 203:17 double 65:3 93:5 95:25 201:4 203:15 doubled 93:1 double-counting 201:9 doubt 182:5 211:24 Douglas 2:11 15:14 down 18:23 24:13 31:2 43:5 45:19 47:2,3,4 53:8,10 77:25 85:4 128:11 129:13 136:13 142:3,21 179:4 190:25 200:5 Dr 3:4,5,21,22 4:1,3 1:7,9 3:15,18,21,23 4:1,3,5,9,14,19,25 5:3,4 6:20 7:20 10:21 14:8,11 15:12 15:18 23:7 26:22 31:24 32:16 40:23 45:10 47:4 50:17 54:25 55:2 57:12,20 58:5 63:2 75:7,23 75:24 76:4,18 86:11 86:14,23,24 87:1,3 87:6,10,15,24,25 97:12,22 106:25 125:20 127:18 128:11 129:1 143:14,16 144:14 144:17,24 145:8,16 145:23 146:1,4,11 146:13,21,22 148:8 152:19 153:4 156:22,24 157:5 165:11,16,19 189:2 192:11,13 193:4,7
---	---	--	--	---	---

<p>194:16 200:8 208:21 draft 25:14 138:15,22 drafts 48:3 dramatic 97:14 167:2 draw 109:17 110:5 drawing 108:17 drill 18:3,20 19:10 20:1 21:9 36:15 38:20 52:16,21 53:1 53:1,5,7,7,8,9,10 54:15 78:20 91:16 94:20,23 96:6 103:9 107:7 111:5 127:5 132:2 140:15,20 141:19 drilled 10:23 12:7,9 12:15 13:4,11 21:24 27:14 37:7 42:21,24 90:19 91:7 96:15 113:9 114:15,17 117:12 120:15 125:14 126:12 127:20 drilling 9:25 12:15 13:8,9 14:16 18:15 18:19 19:7,9 20:17 20:21 21:9 23:2,5 23:10 36:8,17 37:15 37:23 38:9,12,18 41:17 42:23 48:18 52:10,11,12,13,19 53:3 54:9 83:25 91:7 96:4,9,17,18 102:5,7 112:20 114:4,8 136:3 192:24 193:2,8,10 194:12 drills 36:4 126:8 drill-ready 102:24 103:3,14 104:3 drive 7:16 driven 52:18,22 54:1 54:17 125:1 drives 7:17 driving 52:15 drop 167:2,7 DRYMER 1:11 3:2 15:22 16:1 26:8,12 26:18,20 34:15,18 51:18,23,25 52:3,5 59:23 60:1 87:16 123:9,14,16,19,23 123:25 124:3,5 125:2 141:11,23 142:6,14,19,24 143:8,12 175:22 179:24 185:3,25 186:5,9,12,16 199:23 205:12,15 205:25 206:12,21 207:1,3 214:11,13 due 5:13 6:1 61:22 63:3 109:8 185:7 Dukla 89:1,5,12,18 90:6,21 93:23 94:1 99:7,11,19,20 100:8</p>	<p>101:2 130:2 during 1:19 91:17 180:11 duty 4:16 56:11 145:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <p>each 6:13 7:7,22 8:19 11:10 18:17,18 19:19,20,21 22:6 37:20 67:21 88:16 88:20 93:6 94:13,20 95:7,22 116:5 135:9 135:25 136:24 137:4 150:25 165:9 195:12 214:11,12 214:23 215:15 earlier 27:17 31:1 32:2 33:19 51:19 67:5 68:10 96:5 124:16 129:1 141:20 197:10 199:13 203:24 early 1:24 55:3 91:9 166:19 167:7 easier 35:17 38:24 198:25 easiest 116:21 Eastern 63:1 85:8 159:23 easy 177:11 economic 47:9 48:13 147:11 155:22 173:6 Ecuador 156:8 EC4M 1:6 effect 67:25 95:25 170:5 effectively 134:2 efficient 208:24 efforts 111:21 EGI 62:5,13 98:22 100:3 101:12 107:6 109:23 131:14 EGI's 101:8 EIA 16:15,19 27:18 27:21,23 37:11 48:7 211:4,7,9,16 EIAs 211:13 eight 9:9 20:9,19,22 21:1 92:15 95:10 97:8 100:19 101:8 101:14 105:14,22 106:5,7 150:16,18 152:3 158:2 191:23 195:13 either 15:18 18:8 20:10 27:15 46:20 51:14 66:11 107:6 145:13 166:12 208:6 elaborate 141:17 electrical 29:16 element 94:2 142:10 elements 6:4,5 7:2,7 43:17 elsewhere 43:15 50:2 155:5</p>	<p>Emma 1:25 emphasis 181:12 185:19,23 enable 140:19 enabled 60:22 encompasses 49:2 end 20:17 21:17 32:5 32:13 37:7 58:13 65:21 95:7 97:9 100:11 120:16,17 129:9 138:24 142:4 163:4 167:3 170:24 178:25 182:19 183:7 186:15 199:4 205:9 208:19 ends 86:7 energy 5:13,13 13:24 51:21 60:3 150:18 150:19 151:7 152:4 161:9,11 194:19 195:16 Energy's 150:23 151:5 engine 29:15 engineer 5:7 52:9 engineering 6:14 57:13 engineers 5:16 152:22 engines 51:24,25 enough 33:2 103:4 104:10 111:20 115:2 120:23 176:20 ensure 22:11 195:2,9 enter 28:8 52:16 53:1 entered 173:3 enterprise 63:8 64:10 64:13 74:13 85:10 150:22,24 151:5 152:9 200:18 enters 32:25 entire 119:5 168:25 202:22 entirely 1:15 63:19 118:24 143:23 entirety 34:20 106:13 116:23 117:15 139:9 entity 72:12 entries 10:25 11:3 69:23 Environment 204:3,7 environmental 13:21 16:15 43:7 47:6 48:6 envisage 143:20 envisaged 23:23 equal 84:8 187:24 equally 94:22 126:19 equate 132:1,7 equates 64:17 129:5 132:4 equilibrium 8:2,23 equipment 12:15 13:12 Equities 189:21 equality 159:3 equivalent 11:20</p>	<p>63:10,22 84:24 187:3 201:23 202:1 202:8 erroneously 96:23 error 64:25 essence 163:5 essentially 62:25 65:8 73:9 80:13 113:7 Essex 2:3 established 57:24 established 62:4,16 88:2 estimate 12:13 18:14 19:19,25 42:23,25 50:18,25 72:13 191:3 estimated 18:2 19:23 32:17 119:18 129:3 129:20 150:23 estimates 59:10 99:17 116:6 118:23 estimating 123:3 estimation 152:17 estimations 17:17 et 6:17 24:23 71:15 91:11 Europe 5:15 47:17 49:12,13 63:1 85:9 159:23 European 13:13,19 15:2 euros 61:5 EV 151:16,19 152:12 evaluated 134:3,5 evaluating 168:16 evaluation 5:16 61:25 62:12 91:14 104:6 111:20 139:2,6 152:21 evaluations 5:18 even 36:24,25 37:5 41:25 42:9 50:23 92:19 93:21 97:7 101:25 103:22 117:16 125:4 128:7 128:14 131:11,14 142:14 154:18 173:7 181:7 183:11 195:2 197:10,13,20 197:25 198:1,17,18 202:21,22 203:3,4,7 203:8 209:19,21 evening 215:14 event 3:1 81:13 96:7 events 59:19 164:6 166:2,9 ever 10:1 35:8 38:16 96:13 154:12,14 188:10 every 76:7 111:17 186:11 everyone 1:3,4 2:7 25:2 215:14 everything 111:23 112:2 113:16 114:21 155:17 211:17</p>	<p>ever-decreasing 53:9 evidence 26:13 42:16 44:11 46:8,10,20,23 47:6,10,11 48:9 141:11,20 148:22 154:5,12 156:3,4 166:6 169:3,23 171:14 172:13,17 172:17,20,24,24 173:16 184:24 186:6 188:9 189:15 203:22 204:2,14 205:21 210:17,23 211:9 213:2,6 evident 93:21 evolving 62:5 EWAN 2:14 exact 193:13 exactly 1:4 21:2 31:18 36:2 53:23 76:7,16 86:12 118:21 184:1 202:11 212:5 examination 3:13 4:11 50:16 54:24 55:21 86:8 143:15 207:6 208:20 examine 9:20 13:2 153:19 examined 154:2 examines 175:16 examining 201:7 example 7:19,20,24 13:17,18 14:5 21:22 23:8 29:6,11 30:8 37:1 45:2 68:5 69:15,18 92:21 110:9 116:13,20 119:1 148:13 153:13 155:14,15 157:1 165:13 176:23 180:21 206:22 examples 6:19 9:2 13:13 34:9 exceed 118:23 exceeded 65:11 exceeds 110:7,16 Excellent 2:15 except 101:3 158:9 195:15 excessive 61:10 175:21,21 exchange 71:14,20 72:1,20,22,23 73:4 197:10 203:4 exchanged 163:9 exclude 122:7 excluded 48:24 exclusive 68:6 excuse 45:11 executive 173:19 174:9 exercise 76:14 120:2 exercises 115:11 130:7 exhibit 8:13 11:1 12:22 45:15 59:18 166:11,23 174:5</p>	<p>189:20 exhibited 48:2 exhibits 9:13 166:13 196:4 exist 10:8 49:11 110:22 111:18,23 112:2 116:6 120:18 122:13 126:24 existed 82:15 114:1 existence 41:18 182:4 existing 32:9 113:14 119:21 120:25 exists 81:4 121:7,14 expand 57:16 202:2 expect 3:10 77:24 122:21 205:21 206:8 210:12 expected 6:25 48:9 119:20 150:24 expenditures 153:25 208:10 experience 5:8 13:4 15:3 36:23 38:18 39:10 73:11 98:25 expert 4:11,15,15,18 15:19 16:21 17:3,8 23:15 31:6,21,24 41:24 42:8 45:10,13 45:24 46:17 48:14 56:4,6,10,12 57:7 58:12,12,20 66:11 67:3 68:14,17 70:16 70:18 72:16 75:25 87:7,8 98:1 100:2 101:13 102:18 103:12 109:14 119:14,15 130:19 144:22 145:1,2,4 158:4 159:13 170:14 172:18 177:22 193:23 203:20 206:5 207:10,13 211:21 211:23 212:20,21 213:6 214:7 expertise 47:13 48:1 experts 57:13 60:8 128:19 158:7 186:25 192:23 211:21 expert's 206:14 explain 2:13 23:21 42:17 50:20 51:10 58:15 77:15 127:5 202:5,25 explained 84:10 127:25 129:1 137:6 167:25 208:17 211:8 explaining 71:1 125:25 199:11 202:23 explains 160:3 170:22 208:12 explanation 155:4,9 209:15,16 explicit 197:6</p>
---	--	--	---	---	--

<p>exploration 6:12 9:23 16:7 18:21 19:6,11 21:9 27:12 35:22,24 36:4 38:13 48:19 76:14 83:24 89:16 90:17 96:6,18 98:12 107:10 112:18 113:5 117:14 118:11 142:9 153:24 177:17 178:20 182:11 190:6 explore 169:14 explored 117:22 121:16 explorer 143:6 exploring 96:10 export 22:12 29:8,10 43:18 exported 14:1 exporting 51:14 exposed 156:16 expressed 163:20 165:25 extends 32:6 extension 210:25 extensive 39:10 extent 21:8 38:21 80:18 90:11 106:11 109:3 142:11,12 external 179:23 181:8 183:4,20 205:3 extra 215:3 extract 51:10 124:6 198:25 extraction 24:19 extreme 7:20 8:16 185:20 extremely 2:9 7:14 96:16 98:10 208:23 208:24 ex-ante 60:9 61:21,22 62:20,23 63:11,14 64:1 74:4,9,14,15 74:17 77:2,4,13,22 78:10,19 79:2 84:10 84:21 147:22 149:16 150:6,14,17 150:19,24 151:4,15 151:17,25 153:6 167:11 187:13 188:23 191:16,17 192:1,6,8,11,15 193:3,17,18,21 194:1,5,9,9,12 199:7 203:8 207:11 ex-post 57:6 62:21 65:16 74:7 79:3 84:13,25 147:23 149:16 150:6 152:2 152:5,7,8,15,18,20 152:25 153:6 167:12 187:14,14 191:17 199:8,14 eyeballing 66:20 eyes 35:17 104:11</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <p>F 156:25 facilities 176:7 facility 28:13,17 35:1 80:24 81:3,15 facing 183:15 185:10 fact 7:21,21 10:1,18 11:18 14:14 60:14 61:1,4,6 63:12 65:7 67:15 80:13 84:24 100:2 103:8,23 104:8,22,24 106:2 108:5,8,10,12 110:25 112:14 113:23 114:15 117:8 118:11 124:25 128:2,5 130:22 138:10 144:2 149:20 151:16 159:17,18 163:9 167:16 173:17 174:23 177:3,11,23 178:2 181:2,13 183:13,22 194:3,7 197:5,9 198:25 201:22 202:6,21 factor 65:1,7 79:4 198:18,21,22 201:24 202:9,23 factored 203:7 factors 5:21 10:16 185:12 198:20 fails 35:9 94:21 failure 210:24 fair 19:17 21:18 23:3 24:2 25:19 29:22 33:2 47:20 57:3 60:18 61:15 67:8,13 68:6 71:22,23 80:1 80:4,11,16 147:4,7 147:25 148:4 149:8 149:13,15,18 150:6 150:10 151:2 153:1 153:8,12 158:8,11 158:25 161:20 168:5 170:10 172:5 172:8 173:5 175:17 189:14 190:23 fairly 40:9 178:18 familiar 16:4,11,14,15 24:9 39:4 familiarity 16:2 Fanning 61:7 173:1,6 173:14,15 174:8 179:13,17 180:10 180:14,17 far 25:13 29:18 32:13 49:15 105:12 110:7 111:3 118:23 126:24 127:8,15 137:20 fault 8:4,25 faulted 114:21 faulting 8:17 88:23 faults 7:25 feasibility 24:7 25:11</p>	<p>feasible 19:3 43:19 46:8 feature 92:8,9 113:19 features 9:25 99:9 102:9 February 1:8 1:1 fed 32:10,14 34:12 fee 177:7,8,9,16 178:4 178:8,16 180:18 fees 177:19 felt 82:25 83:8 92:18 few 1:13 15:14 69:2 87:17 123:23 158:4 182:10 183:21 186:13 209:2 213:14 field 9:10,21 13:17 34:22 89:24 97:5 113:20 119:20 120:5 121:2,4,5 123:7,9,13,15,22,25 124:7 fields 7:21 8:13 9:11 9:15,24 10:1,5,10 10:14,18 14:13,21 14:25 63:17 68:7 85:7 97:7 113:21 119:22 120:6,14,18 122:6 123:5 128:9 figure 35:14 65:9 75:1 96:22 112:6 128:21 128:24 129:5,7 130:2 171:4 189:24 figures 66:8 70:14 95:3,9 132:23 136:15,17,17,20 177:25 file 2:9,17,17 filing 138:16 filled 18:7 20:10 43:2 final 31:13 49:23 67:19 188:17 finalise 214:22 finally 2:25 150:2 155:21 203:18 finance 2:12,13,13 26:4 43:6 61:4,9,10 80:22 179:8,12 financial 39:7 46:20 59:24 72:12,24 73:1 75:10 148:16 170:25 173:8,22 175:6,24 176:10 180:5 181:3,16 183:10,17 184:25 185:4,9,10,13,16 186:1,7 197:11 204:12,15,18 205:2 205:7,22,22 206:14 financially 174:25 financing 39:23 46:16 148:14 176:20 177:12 179:17,18 181:2,6 find 18:7 26:24 63:20 63:23 80:19 85:16 90:11 113:24</p>	<p>114:10 115:6 154:3 157:22 183:8,19 198:7 finding 114:14 136:3 136:5,10 fine 3:9 14:11 31:19 44:7 55:9,24 83:10 86:6 139:19 144:12 146:2 209:24 210:3 213:21,24 215:4 fire 148:15 170:16 171:8 186:1 firm 3:24,25 firms 205:3 first 2:23 4:12 5:5 7:8 12:22 13:17 17:3,10 19:7,8,19 22:23 23:15 24:15 27:5 31:24 38:10 43:15 45:10,13 46:4,17 48:13 53:2,13 56:7 56:23 63:7 64:22 66:23 70:20 87:4 94:23 95:9 97:25 98:8,15,20 100:2,23 101:13 102:18 103:12 108:18 109:14 112:25 113:1 119:13,14 133:7 143:11 147:14 154:5 155:6 156:2 158:4 161:5 161:16 162:5 166:7 166:16 167:24 169:10 175:4 177:2 177:14,21 178:4 191:21 193:23 201:15 209:5 213:17 firstly 150:12 fit 151:22 211:13 fits 59:14 five 9:9 13:1 33:10 86:17 92:20 95:11 96:23 99:6,9 100:3 100:18 101:8,14 105:18,21 106:7,12 106:15,22 108:21 108:25 109:5 133:12 135:16 136:3,4 139:13,18 150:1 176:11 183:21 five-well 23:6 fixed 93:14 flag 111:8 flaring 30:10 51:21,22 51:22 flipping 148:8 floor 15:6 flow 7:6 57:10,17,20 60:20 65:23 74:21 75:4,12 149:4 182:3 flows 163:9 fluid 7:4 fluids 28:14 focus 7:10 35:18 61:23</p>	<p>89:17 111:6,21 140:6 175:9 210:11 focused 92:15 100:17 146:23 focusing 175:7 Fogaš 212:15,21 214:7 folding 8:16 follow 5:19 17:8 71:20 114:19 118:17 142:5 208:25 followed 161:14 following 6:12 43:11 82:16 138:21 202:11 215:19 follows 112:8 123:4 footnote 138:24 146:8 146:14 forecast 72:12 197:11 forecasting 72:24 73:1 73:7 75:10 203:5 foremost 27:5 forest 24:20 141:15 forgive 124:5 form 28:8,17 40:1 105:16 107:7 formal 65:20 formation 12:16 126:9 126:11 formations 126:13 formed 106:3 formerly 3:23 forthcoming 47:8,23 47:24 forward 33:10 78:23 79:3 112:13 137:21 181:1 forwards 102:12 found 21:25 85:24 116:5 117:4,6,17 118:9,12 119:19 161:12 197:3 200:13 209:20 four 2:25 6:5 20:3 40:15 41:15 96:24 131:16,21,22 134:6 136:14 138:1 149:24 fourth 24:25 59:20 four-fold 125:1 129:15,16,21 four-year 96:16 fractured 114:21 fractures 114:23 fracturing 88:23 framework 16:3 Fraser 2:5 154:6,17 204:20,24 Fraser's 154:3 204:14 friends 1:12 141:12 front 17:4 64:6 77:16 159:15 166:20 FTSE 78:2 79:1,4 84:14 147:24 164:9 167:10 fulfil 163:1 full 27:23 61:25 62:3 110:22 120:21</p>	<p>163:2,14 188:17 196:16 fully 62:6 167:12 188:7 fulsome 23:2 27:22 function 128:5 141:18 fund 26:14 fundamental 64:25 fundamentally 85:23 funding 46:25 62:10 80:19 148:17 149:10 184:2 funds 80:19 102:5 further 2:13 50:10 51:17 61:19 83:11 86:7 89:7 107:25 111:12 112:16 141:2 143:14 163:19 164:11,16 164:25 165:4,10,15 198:16 201:5 202:5 205:11 207:4,19 213:25 Furthermore 148:23 151:19 fuss 14:3 future 22:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>G 47:2 GABRIELLE 1:11 gain 54:19 gained 127:11 game 142:9 gap 82:4 gas-processing 35:1 gauge 93:16 gave 79:17 94:12 129:6 GCOS 5:21 59:10 94:11 95:3 133:7,8 133:11,17,18,20,22 133:23 134:1,4,17 134:23,25 136:1 137:2,21,25 138:11 201:22 general 16:10 30:2 31:15 40:24 90:7 98:9 164:2 generalities 16:10 generally 16:5,13,14 27:3 29:23,24 31:12 39:25 53:12 86:17 151:10 152:21 153:11 generate 5:24 19:1 22:24 29:16 30:12 51:11 generated 6:13 21:17 27:6 52:1 generating 29:1,7 107:9,21 generator 29:13 generic 7:23 78:12 gentlemen 208:20 geographic 134:4 geographical 16:22</p>
---	---	---	--	---	---

<p>geological 5:21 19:22 20:4 42:22 57:11,12 57:22 59:4 65:4 69:12 88:15 94:3,9 130:25 132:21 134:16 140:8 196:13,20 197:3 200:23 201:3,13 202:7 geologist 88:4 geology 91:11 140:1 211:1 gets 95:7 getting 36:17,17 give 5:5 15:6 18:13 42:25 45:11 68:15 115:8 126:25 173:22 209:4,15 211:6 214:21 given 1:24 2:18 3:5 9:18 10:2 20:9 63:4 63:23 123:25 148:25 211:22 gives 19:18 42:22 130:2 Global 1:15 19:10 25:14 26:3 38:16 69:6,10,14,17 70:3 70:9 77:4 88:12 177:4 179:6 globality 153:7 go 6:3 15:17 18:3,23 24:25 25:1 26:24 29:14 30:25 35:13 44:7 45:11,13,18 47:2,3,3 48:10 56:24 57:17 59:17 66:5 69:15 72:7 76:1 77:25 82:7 88:7 92:22 97:4 102:11 105:5 107:20 109:14,20 112:16 113:24 126:14,18,19,24 129:13 130:22 134:8,10 145:14 148:10 169:12 175:5 179:3 181:19 207:14 goes 29:15 59:14 138:21 155:17 171:3 going 6:3 7:10 18:15 24:4 27:1 28:1 31:5 31:5,20,23 33:15 37:24 40:4 44:7 45:11,24 58:14 59:17 61:12 64:8 69:3 73:20 80:15 82:7 85:4 93:2 94:22 98:1 101:11 102:22 109:23 111:18 115:13,19 118:8 121:15 123:21 125:10 130:16 132:7 142:4 142:10,12 163:15</p>	<p>165:23 167:22 170:20 177:19 182:1,6,12,21,22,25 183:1,8,15 184:9 185:1 186:15 204:23 205:21 206:17 211:17 212:17 gone 18:1 good 1:3,8,9 3:19 4:2 4:10 15:12,13 44:4 54:21 55:13 66:4 87:21,25 97:22 120:13 143:13,18 144:13 145:21 146:2,4 153:11 157:11 183:17 186:5,16 206:21 208:17 213:3,9 215:1,7,14 government 47:7 govern 138:16 GPOS 134:17 grabbed 161:8 gradient 64:12 74:12 75:13 grand 180:3 grant 204:21 210:25 granted 147:15 169:14 graph 63:7,13 64:6 66:21 74:12 75:13 78:14 79:7 120:21 192:2 graphically 11:2 graphing 63:8 GRASSI 2:4 gravity 69:23 91:10 114:7 great 23:20 27:16 31:4 59:17 greater 84:7,7 119:21 126:14,17 GRECH 2:4 green 117:3,8,10,11 grey 89:5,6 grid 29:17 grids 107:6 109:4,4,5 gross 142:6 ground 17:18 52:19 54:1 210:7 grounds 209:18 group 11:21,24,25 12:13,14 81:15 182:5 195:6 group's 182:3 guarantee 179:25 180:24 205:5 guaranteed 179:13 180:10,14,17 184:11 guaranteeing 179:18 guarantees 181:9 guess 34:3 142:19 guidance 72:2,3 73:14 157:1 guidelines 39:2 40:10</p>	<p>40:18,24 41:2,20 42:2 Gulf 58:23 61:17,22 162:10,11,23 163:17 187:3,25 188:4 <hr/>H<hr/>half 1:25 11:19 36:19 117:9,11,16,25,25 118:3,5,12,15,18,19 129:7,23 143:24 144:1,3 214:11 halfway 92:13 hammer 53:6 hammered 52:22 hampers 163:9 hand 68:24 211:8 handed 70:4 hands 1:15 happen 73:12 happened 164:23 165:6 166:9 171:23 182:23 187:9 193:8 happening 181:12 happy 29:23 57:16 58:16 70:23 86:13 hard 98:3 102:19 109:15 113:3 115:14,25 119:15 124:11,13 138:20 183:19 having 3:12 10:5 43:23 46:21 84:22 148:8 163:17 183:23 193:24 201:23 202:6,8 214:19 head 195:24 heads 174:19 health 55:20 hear 1:19 213:3,17,17 heard 3:24 4:15 16:20 56:10 87:7 145:1 157:14 165:6 199:7 211:12,18,19 hearing 1:9 1:25 155:2,7 166:16 170:16 171:24 177:14,21 178:5 210:9 215:19 heavily 131:19 held 91:17 Hello 5:4 help 21:21 26:9 helpful 107:24 157:2 210:11,18 213:13 215:3 helps 39:22 hence 77:25 hesitate 206:17 high 5:17 32:8 33:4 46:21 151:12 174:17 177:16 178:4,8,13,15,16 202:21 203:3 higher 10:19 12:1,2</p>	<p>84:6 93:19 126:18 126:21 128:3 135:8 135:9 151:11 198:2 198:17 highest 173:7 highlighted 9:16 highly 46:24 176:4 203:12 High-level 6:21 hills 24:20 him 125:24 126:1 137:11,12 191:2 202:25 himself 179:17 historic 9:21 11:7 12:4 95:18 113:21 149:1 150:9 historical 6:1 91:4 95:21 96:19 97:2,5 97:13,16 114:25 121:24 122:17 130:1 historically 93:21 124:8 history 89:16 93:16 112:18 113:6 hitting 135:8,9 hold 53:15,19 105:3 Holdings 178:22 180:11 honour 4:19 56:14 87:10 145:5,8 hooked 13:5 29:17 52:1 hope 39:8 hopefully 55:23 hoping 39:9 horizons 127:15 host 37:1 hour 143:24 144:1,3 213:10,11 214:11 214:11,12,23 Howard 3:16,17 50:24 55:11,19 56:1,2,3,5 56:9,14,21,22 59:25 60:2 65:14 66:4 70:19 72:9 86:8,9 141:12 148:21 151:14,19,24 152:6 159:14,18 160:24 161:3,5 162:1 165:19 192:14 193:7,21 194:2,4,8 195:15 198:6 199:5 201:19,21 202:4,22 203:6 Howard's 6:8 19:15 33:24 68:22 70:16 70:18 149:4 152:11 152:17 154:25 155:13 160:4,15,18 161:2 162:3 170:14 184:16 193:14 198:11 203:2 207:10,13 hub 32:11 human 173:18</p>	<p>hydrocarbons 17:11 17:13 18:7 19:21 39:16 41:18,21,25 42:10 45:8 49:16 73:16 98:17 113:14 113:15,18,19 114:16,18 hypothetical 22:25 156:5 hypothetically 17:12 164:12,23 <hr/>I<hr/>idea 27:3 33:25 67:11 145:21 ideal 141:24 185:9 ideally 31:22 identifiable 10:6 identification 50:20 identified 6:24 18:22 19:12 20:10 92:2,5 93:7,17,25,25 99:9 100:3,4,11,18,19 101:8,9,24 104:24 106:12 109:11,18 110:2,5,8,18 112:7 119:18 120:13 131:16,20 132:15 135:21 137:2,3 identify 17:11 58:3 100:13 111:4,12 122:7 127:14 131:21 137:7 identifying 50:18 111:17 IDRC 1:5 ignored 178:2 II 156:8 illustrate 13:14 107:10 illustration 32:16 155:19 image 24:25 31:10,18 images 31:2 54:14 imagine 143:25 175:12 immediate 61:23 immediately 74:1 impact 16:15 136:2 implement 46:22 implied 61:19 149:8 150:8,10 implies 60:8 78:14 149:5 153:1 156:8 imply 150:20 190:15 implying 174:20 important 2:18 5:20 8:5 39:15 76:9 88:21 89:20 90:6,22 91:15 112:12 157:24 195:2,9 Importantly 6:15 impossible 155:13 improve 83:1 94:24 114:10,12,13 115:5 115:7 improved 83:9 122:25</p>	<p>124:24 improvement 82:21 122:21 125:1 129:16,22 improvements 82:21 inaccurate 205:12 inappropriate 10:22 112:5 125:22 126:2 203:16 include 61:18 213:5 included 65:7 120:2 128:4 includes 7:25 36:7 43:6 120:5 126:23 151:5 including 6:19 7:16 9:11 13:20 120:22 122:13 210:22 income 71:3 81:25 146:25 155:16 158:9 income-based 57:9 incomparable 63:19 incorporation 42:22 incorrect 64:5 188:12 205:3 increase 11:11 95:24 96:20 124:1 129:19 166:16 increased 165:5 increasing 165:7 incremental 67:23 incurred 153:25 204:8 205:18 206:8 indeed 212:12 independence 211:24 independent 40:1 94:10 132:14 index 3:1 78:3 79:1,1 79:5 84:14 147:24 149:17 164:9 167:10 indicate 8:23 77:19 90:7 177:11 179:24 180:2 182:3 189:14 indicated 10:23 115:15 150:7 indicates 165:19 176:19 indicating 93:18 indication 127:16 154:15 170:3 174:24 175:23 176:9,17 181:3 205:12,20 210:13 indications 185:12 209:3 individual 67:14,22 68:3 94:13 95:15 123:6 134:15 135:16 136:1,24 137:8,13,22 142:4 143:9 individually 135:10 individuals 98:24 142:14 174:15 175:2</p>
---	---	--	---	--	---

<p>industry 7:9 14:18 39:2 71:2 88:5</p> <p>industry-standard 6:10</p> <p>inferred 11:13</p> <p>inflated 125:5 129:22</p> <p>information 5:6 15:18 54:13 59:9,14 61:3 71:13 72:13 76:10 77:16 80:10 89:24 91:3 96:12 97:2 98:19 105:6,10,11 108:11 112:15 119:11 127:1,11,13 142:2 166:12,14</p> <p>informed 148:23</p> <p>infrastructure 28:12 28:19 48:4</p> <p>inherited 69:11,15,18</p> <p>initial 22:19 111:5,6 149:24 169:4,17 188:16,20</p> <p>initially 149:22 199:15 204:21</p> <p>initials 76:6</p> <p>input 8:8 58:7 75:21 94:7</p> <p>inputs 57:19 116:10</p> <p>inside 53:7</p> <p>insights 11:8</p> <p>instance 1:20 19:7 50:4</p> <p>instead 146:16 175:6 195:16 203:2</p> <p>institutional 168:23</p> <p>institutions 39:7</p> <p>instructed 37:15,19 104:19 192:17,18</p> <p>instruction 37:19 57:3 146:22</p> <p>instructions 186:25</p> <p>instrument 78:4</p> <p>insufficiently 105:23</p> <p>integral 5:8</p> <p>integrate 96:11</p> <p>integrated 21:18 62:6 67:16,19 68:8</p> <p>integrity 76:9</p> <p>intend 214:17</p> <p>intended 26:14 103:7 103:8 112:1 188:17</p> <p>intention 111:22 112:3</p> <p>intentions 53:14</p> <p>interact 7:4 19:15</p> <p>interacting 7:2</p> <p>interconnector 32:11 32:15,25</p> <p>interest 60:5 147:11 154:17,21 155:22 155:23 156:9,11,12 164:14,19 210:15</p> <p>interested 13:23</p> <p>interesting 141:22</p> <p>interests 56:25 187:20</p> <p>internal 8:17 98:2 130:19</p>	<p>international 1:2,4 212:3,5</p> <p>interpretation 59:13 60:15 69:24 70:11 91:24 92:12 107:18 109:10 131:7 165:1 169:4,17,20</p> <p>interpretations 62:14</p> <p>interpreted 59:21 92:24 114:6 131:12 139:12</p> <p>interrupting 14:8</p> <p>interruption 44:6 79:13</p> <p>intervals 10:24 125:23</p> <p>intra-Dukla 101:3</p> <p>introduced 199:3</p> <p>invalid 148:21</p> <p>inherited 183:2</p> <p>invested 147:14 153:14 183:5 184:6 186:14</p> <p>investing 153:16 184:8</p> <p>investment 1:2 58:23 58:24 61:18 62:9 149:24 150:2 187:6 188:20</p> <p>investor 92:1,3 110:9 110:12,14 111:7,18 112:9</p> <p>investors 85:13 176:8 176:12</p> <p>invoiced 206:23</p> <p>invoices 154:8</p> <p>invoicing 3:5</p> <p>involved 172:21</p> <p>involvement 172:10</p> <p>involving 157:23</p> <p>in-place 17:25 19:20</p> <p>IPOs 5:12</p> <p>IPR 7:3</p> <p>irrelevant 183:9,16</p> <p>issue 9:8 14:3 48:10 80:15 94:15 96:4 211:9,18,18,21 212:1,25 213:6 214:5</p> <p>issued 67:4 131:4 182:13 190:12</p> <p>issues 2:24 36:23,25 37:2 55:20 79:18 80:7 210:15,16 212:4 213:18</p> <p>item 61:11 180:8 181:25</p> <p>items 162:18</p> <p>i.e 10:5 57:25 59:1 64:15 201:24</p>	<p>JARA 1:22</p> <p>JESKO 1:23</p> <p>JESKOVÁ 2:13</p> <p>JKX 64:8 152:6</p> <p>joint 145:16</p> <p>JORDAN 2:14</p> <p>Journal 14:6</p> <p>judgment 102:4 145:19</p> <p>JULIAN 2:12</p> <p>July 69:22</p> <p>June 64:18 166:19 187:13 191:17 192:8,16 193:3,20 193:24</p> <p>jurisdiction 209:10,19 210:15</p> <p>jurisdictional 209:18</p> <p>justify 27:9,11 102:6</p> <p>justifying 44:11</p>	<p>known 120:3 210:21 Krivá 21:10 29:22 103:9,14,17,23 104:2 211:16</p> <p>KUPKA 2:12</p>	<p>left-hand 7:19 10:10 11:5 190:10</p> <p>left-side 199:20</p> <p>legal 47:6,10,11,19,25 71:9 85:17 86:2 188:7 211:21,23</p> <p>lending 45:2</p> <p>length 33:1 55:20</p> <p>Leon 58:22 60:2,3,4,4 60:17,20,21 61:3,8 61:15 69:8,11 79:15 80:3,18 81:22 82:3 82:7,9 147:16,17 148:15,24 149:1 153:14,15 162:10 167:24 168:8,15,24 169:2,25 170:24 174:9 181:16 184:4 186:17</p> <p>Leon's 61:12 80:9 146:13 170:22 173:1 178:23</p> <p>less 10:5 11:15,19,19 13:3,5,8 36:20 89:15 96:1 123:21 129:17,18 130:4 144:2 150:5 185:9 200:12 201:1 203:11</p> <p>let 27:2 30:18 31:8 37:24 53:19 55:22 55:24 67:4 77:15 80:8 82:8 103:22 131:11 133:24 143:20 185:8 212:9</p> <p>letter 46:18</p> <p>let's 3:11 9:20 12:3,20 26:24 46:16 55:14 70:20 86:16 99:14 123:15 153:19 176:14 181:11</p> <p>level 67:25 132:18 140:23</p> <p>levels 128:22 201:14</p> <p>Lewis 2:6 60:19,24 80:2,9 165:22 166:12 169:3,7,10 169:13,23 170:5,19 170:21 171:14,20 171:25 172:14,22 173:11 211:8</p> <p>LEŠOVÁ 2:13</p> <p>liability 209:20</p> <p>LIBOR 155:24 156:5 156:6</p> <p>licence 5:25 16:23 17:13 18:3 19:2 42:19 57:15 61:25 62:11,17 63:5 89:9 90:1,9,20 91:1,2,17 98:16 106:14 110:23 111:2 112:19,21 113:6 116:7 117:23 118:1 118:3,9,14 120:9,19 120:24 121:7 125:24 126:25</p>	<p>133:18 139:6,9 140:4 164:11,17 165:13 184:16 186:18 189:10</p> <p>licences 88:9,10,12,15 88:25 89:3,6,11 90:13 97:15 105:4 147:16,20 149:13 149:22 150:21 151:3</p> <p>lie 98:11</p> <p>lies 17:9 117:6</p> <p>light 167:16</p> <p>like 1:15 5:5,19 13:13 22:1 25:1 26:22 29:12 31:14 33:10 36:24 38:17,22 40:1 40:6 44:9 84:19 115:10 141:14 175:17 177:19 178:15 179:2 181:18 195:15 196:14 203:2,18 209:3,3,12 210:11 214:3</p> <p>likelihood 46:21</p> <p>likely 10:8 17:11 18:7 18:14,16,20 19:25 21:5 46:24 58:2 76:15 83:25 84:6 92:25 95:6 114:10 114:17 120:16 168:19 169:24 189:3</p> <p>limited 139:15 140:4 177:4 178:22</p> <p>line 22:12 25:4,6 32:21,23 36:1,2 44:21 64:12 151:21 176:23 179:19 181:6,13</p> <p>linear 64:8 65:17</p> <p>lines 139:12,18,19,23 212:15</p> <p>list 20:19 44:8 125:13 128:8,9 159:19 161:6,8 194:21 210:19</p> <p>listed 172:18 175:12 178:21</p> <p>listing 71:14 72:2</p> <p>Litigation 2:3,4,4,5</p> <p>little 5:5 14:3 24:16 35:17,19 38:22 45:25 52:9 55:3 68:20 89:1,2 90:25 93:11 94:10,17 95:14 97:16 113:24 150:9 181:25 190:11 202:2 203:13 214:21 215:3</p> <p>LLC 1:15</p> <p>loan 80:22,23 81:2,15 176:6 177:2,7 178:10,21 179:6,7,8 179:12,13 180:1,6</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

<p>180:10,13 181:10 184:11 loans 176:18 177:1,13 177:24 178:19 179:5 180:16,21,21 184:19 local 48:15,18 located 32:11 114:3 location 90:18 134:4 locations 37:21 38:14 68:1,4 logic 64:5 logical 119:4 logistical 1:13 LONDON 1:6 long 122:18 167:23 longer 49:16 87:17 124:6 189:4,7 Longman 3:21,22 6:20 10:21 86:11,23 86:24,25 87:1,3,6 87:10,15,24,25 88:2 97:12,22 141:8 143:14,16 152:19 165:6,19 Longman's 7:20 86:14 106:25 165:11,16 189:2 192:11 193:4 194:16 200:8 look 13:7 22:1 26:22 29:12 31:14 34:19 45:24 59:23 62:22 63:16 64:6 70:23 74:23 92:11,17 95:24 97:1 98:1 102:22 107:2 109:23 112:18,23 115:10,13 127:25 130:8,16 136:2 153:5,7 157:24 159:8,13 162:5,9 163:19 169:9 170:18 174:5 176:14,25 181:22 181:24 182:20 190:19 191:14 197:19 203:8,9,18 206:19 213:13 looked 10:2 25:1 92:20 105:10,15,21 105:21 108:13,21 108:22,23 109:5 133:19,21,24 139:8 160:25 177:24 178:1,7 184:7 198:6 204:19 looking 10:4,10,20 17:6 23:7 31:20 40:21 63:20 70:19 80:9 89:10,24 93:9 93:13 95:14 98:2,3 100:7,10 102:19 105:6 107:17 115:23 124:20 125:2 130:10,12 132:21 136:23 137:1 139:5,20</p>	<p>157:19,22 159:10 163:15 164:2,10,14 164:19 165:3 191:4 195:8 202:3 looks 96:24 109:10 159:8,9 lost 118:7 147:9 154:22,23 155:8,10 lot 38:18,24 89:14 95:20 98:24 111:16 113:15 114:22,22 114:24 128:6 129:17,18 144:2 167:21 181:12 183:25 185:10 202:10 211:18 lots 88:22 Lovell 1:25 low 7:18 21:13 129:9 167:20,22 178:13 lower 189:12 LPL 179:8,12 lunch 1:20 3:10 143:18 212:11 LUO 2:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>Macquarie 189:21 madam 1:10 3:16 5:1 5:4 44:7 50:10,14 53:15 54:7 56:22 66:3 83:11,13 86:9 87:25 141:6 207:19 212:12 made 12:12 14:7,12 21:1 30:25 32:2 40:1 43:23 44:14 68:20 84:12 112:9 116:9 127:18 139:14 160:9 161:15 176:5 193:11 195:15 199:10,10 200:14 211:12 214:6 magnetic 91:10 magneto-telluric 60:14 82:17 91:12 magnitude 78:13 186:2 MAGNUS 1:23 Magura 89:1,4,11,18 90:5,20 93:23,25 99:20,25 100:13,15 101:2 130:2 main 6:5 54:22 91:6 181:15 mainly 10:22 maintain 194:23 major 37:6 49:2,20 majority 13:3,10 107:4 108:7,10 113:12,13 122:16 127:23 make 4:16 5:20 12:23 31:7 35:17 38:24 40:18 41:2,20,24 42:9 44:1 56:11</p>	<p>59:8 64:25 71:25 76:7 80:16 96:14 110:15 117:19 119:16 132:18 137:17 142:12 145:2,19 146:6 154:22 178:17 191:8 194:2 197:16 204:11 212:10 213:2 makes 1:21 44:18 115:8 187:23 198:24 206:7 making 51:3 118:14 122:2,12 164:2 173:12 178:3 194:3 194:5 211:25 215:10 Management 38:23 managing 174:12 manipulate 119:7,9 manner 70:8 many 9:24 13:21 48:15 110:22 113:9 120:6 125:21 206:16 map 89:2 90:18 91:5 91:23 101:2 115:15 115:20 116:3,22 117:3 mapped 17:24 19:20 42:20 93:3 101:3 120:10,24 122:8 maps 17:1 100:16 107:8,9,21,23 108:1 108:1,2,4,6,7,8,9,9 108:13,19,21 March 61:20 69:6,23 87:5 144:23 147:17 168:8,21 188:1,6 mark 2:3 2:20 marked 10:12 35:6 market 57:3 60:18 61:16 67:8 68:6 71:22,23 80:1,4,12 80:16 146:23 147:3 147:4,7,25 148:4,11 149:8,13,15,18 150:6,10,11 151:2 153:1,6,8,12 158:9 158:11,25 161:20 167:9,20 168:5 170:10 171:8 172:5 172:8 176:9 178:13 183:1 189:14 190:24 191:2,7 199:6 203:7 market-based 85:18 86:5 157:16 158:6 158:14,18,22,24 159:7 160:20 172:4 marking 213:22 Masters 177:4 179:6 match 202:11 matches 58:3 76:17 material 7:3,10,13,21 8:8,10 9:3,6 14:20</p>	<p>36:13,25 50:23 182:4 materiality 61:13 80:15 mathematically 138:8 matter 1:1 118:13 197:12 209:9 matters 3:3 4:13 1:13 2:2,4 mature 46:6,8,14 maximising 12:17 may 2:2 5:1 8:4,24 10:8 19:21,21 42:17 51:8 52:8 55:21 110:10 111:18 116:6 118:15 120:18 121:5 122:24,25 124:25 126:15,19 131:4,5,6 134:3,9,9 137:9 138:8 142:15,21 146:2 163:20,21 164:5 165:8 167:6,7 167:15 168:18 170:2 182:4 183:13 195:7 210:18 211:6 211:7 maybe 1:18 4:8 21:21 28:1 35:17 42:13 86:15 118:4 123:24 123:25 199:23 206:13 213:11 214:14 mean 26:23 30:4 50:22 51:20 69:12 74:16 77:17 105:12 107:14 112:16 121:23 124:5 129:25 130:11 133:14 137:8 139:17 140:22 149:13 153:17 154:14 161:19 166:7,15 167:21 172:16 176:8,10 178:12,15 180:21 190:19 196:21 209:8 Meaning 205:9,23 means 3:2 27:4 41:17 74:11 81:8 140:13 140:18 meant 71:11 measurable 142:15 measure 153:12 measures 210:19,23 211:4 mechanisms 7:16 median 58:2 meet 104:25 member 5:15 members 1:23 2:8 5:4 87:25 146:4 Memorial 154:24 155:5 memory 99:14 188:16 mention 34:16 162:11</p>	<p>176:15 mentioned 13:22 15:22 38:25 67:5 68:10 88:24 109:11 115:12,24 117:2 122:16 124:24 181:19,21,23 191:18 197:9 199:13 203:24 213:12,19 merely 74:21 merit 209:9 merits 1:9 209:19 Messrs 141:12 met 40:20 41:3 43:11 43:14,25 44:15 45:21 method 6:10 7:11,13 8:6,10 9:3,7 14:21 19:24 50:25 57:9 65:18 74:22 79:6 84:17 157:15 methodologies 14:19 methodology 6:4 57:8 57:23 58:16 62:20 94:5 methods 7:8 metres 11:15,19,20 13:3,9 36:20 metric 150:12,22 151:16 MICHAEL 2:6 middle 72:9 81:10,12 170:23 183:6,14 mid-scale 67:17 might 1:11 16:14 17:17,19,21 25:1,3 27:13 29:5 36:14 47:11,19 83:3 84:20 84:25 85:24 98:17 111:23 112:2 123:13 140:15 142:16 143:7,9,10 170:16 180:23 199:23 214:20 Mike 38:18 million 58:10 60:9 61:5,20 64:2,17,18 65:9 66:19,24 68:9 68:11,12,16 73:21 74:3,19 75:4,19 76:21 78:15,18,22 79:8 80:23 81:2,16 82:4 83:17 84:19 95:20 123:15,18,23 147:5,7,19,20,25 148:1 149:5,10,14 149:18,19,22 151:5 151:15,25 152:16 153:2,8,14 154:3,25 155:1,7,17,18,18,20 155:20 158:10 173:24 176:6,7,11 176:11,18,24 177:2 177:3,24 179:20,22 180:13 181:7,10 183:3,6 184:12,12</p>	<p>184:17 190:11 199:1,7,15 200:1,2 200:2,3 208:14 millions 63:9,10 82:1 mind 6:1 9:22 36:19 63:2 85:6 111:21 minded 138:8 mine 162:4 MINGUEZ 14:10 minimal 28:15,16 minimising 12:16 mining 73:8,9 Ministry 2:12,13,13 204:3,7,14 minor 146:6 minute 14:9,9,10 65:11 minutes 4:23,24 55:7 55:14 56:19 65:10 86:14,17,17 87:14 87:17,22 112:10 146:3 156:21 mirror 50:23 misleading 137:19 159:20 mismatch 128:12 miss 141:15 missed 4:8 mistake 126:4 161:10 161:15 195:16 214:6 mistaken 54:3,3 misunderstand 85:21 mix 50:1 mixture 85:11 mm 32:12 MMstb 12:5 Mm-hm 23:14,17 33:16 36:3 41:10,12 46:3 MoA's 210:24 model 19:10 30:14,19 31:13 32:21 33:9 34:3,12,19 35:4,8 36:24 37:5 48:8 57:10,14,17,20 58:7 67:21,21,21 73:22 73:24 74:21 75:13 75:19,21,22 76:23 77:1 128:23,25 149:5 154:25 155:13 159:4 modelled 9:14 34:16 67:23 96:7 modelling 19:16 models 14:20 modern 12:15 122:22 123:1,10,20 MoE 210:25 moment 11:5 12:21 15:17 24:8 37:25 45:6,7,11 70:18,23 98:5 102:23 109:24 116:22 135:1 141:1 159:16 165:23 168:6 171:19 175:8 181:19 191:19</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---

<p>monetary 70:14 monetises 33:24 money 83:6 111:12,17 149:2 163:11,13 175:3 183:14 186:14 Monte 57:22 75:8 76:4,10 106:17 month 182:21 186:14 months 62:12 82:16 176:11 183:15,21 186:13 193:2 194:13 more 7:23 14:11 24:16 26:12 27:22 36:22 53:12 67:2 82:8,8 82:17 89:2 95:14,25 110:5 121:25 122:5 123:1 129:14 133:5 136:25 137:10 141:14 143:24 144:3 149:20 150:4 151:10 155:12 167:13 176:14 180:5,20 183:24 184:1,5 185:11,14 185:18 187:18 195:2 198:24 208:12 211:6 214:22 morning 1:3,8,9 15:12 15:13 50:17 51:7 66:4,4 87:25 88:3,7 97:22 125:21 127:18 130:15 213:20 214:22 most 11:13,15 12:10 53:25 58:2,3 76:15 83:25 84:6 88:21 89:25 92:25 93:10 95:6 113:20 114:10 119:4 128:13 129:11 156:12 168:20 mostly 73:8 88:25 most-likely 19:1 Mountains 88:14 mouth 141:23 move 12:20 33:15 46:16 58:18 78:22 79:3,25 85:2,3,5 86:10,13 147:21 185:1 moved 146:25 moving 43:5 44:10 84:13 88:19 90:25 149:15 Moy 3:4,5 1:6,7,9 3:15 3:18,20,21,23 4:1,3 4:5,9,14,19,25 5:3,4 5:6 14:8,11 15:12 15:18 23:7 26:22 32:16 40:23 50:17 54:25 55:2 57:12 58:5 63:2 75:23,24 76:18 96:5 127:18 128:11 129:1</p>	<p>141:12 192:13 193:7 Moy's 31:24 45:10 47:4 75:7 125:20 Mstb/well 12:6 MT 114:7 131:11 much 4:25 12:1 15:4 15:11 24:9,14 25:2 31:4 32:1 54:25 55:1 62:8 86:8 119:7 121:6,20 128:3 129:9 138:10 141:25 143:13,17 143:20,23 155:10 174:21 176:3 180:2 196:12,16 215:5,16 multiple 8:21 14:12 49:24 199:7 203:9 203:10 multiples 161:22,25 multiplied 75:11 151:23 152:17 multiplier 78:3 multiplying 190:16 Murphy 156:8 must 27:18 40:12,15 45:21 46:7,19 47:5 72:12,22 165:25 177:24 myself 5:6 74:24 83:21 94:5 212:17 MÍNGUEZ 1:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>naïl 211:10 name 5:6 15:23 97:22 157:11 nappe 88:25 89:1,1,4 89:5,7,13,19,19 90:5,8,21 93:22 99:7,12,19,20,21,25 100:9,13,15 101:2,3 116:5,21,23 117:5,9 117:15,22,23 118:3 119:12 126:5,9,13 127:5,8,17 129:24 nappes 88:16 89:12,16 89:18 90:1,6,17,21 93:14,22,23,24 94:1 115:16 116:1 117:13 118:24 124:20 national 29:17 naturally 159:10 nature 70:11 157:24 198:23 near 28:18 128:10 nearly 97:9 necessarily 71:22 85:8 111:19 114:13,19 121:13 123:12 126:18 153:17 154:14 174:18 necessary 25:15 47:12 47:20 55:22 147:21 202:5 need 13:25 15:21</p>	<p>22:11 24:10 27:2,6 27:8,12,13 28:4,5,8 28:16,19 29:7,25 30:12 31:6 34:5 35:2 41:15 51:13,15 55:21 67:2 71:20 86:10 92:22 96:1 116:10 117:21 123:13 144:5 146:6 150:11 164:4 180:20 183:24,25 184:5,13,15 186:10 188:13 209:1 210:14 213:11 214:1,4 needed 43:20 47:25 48:4 60:20 80:18 86:14 needs 16:7 27:20 86:16 163:23 172:5 negates 126:11 negative 117:25 118:19 negotiated 173:2 178:17,18 Neil 2:3 97:22 157:11 neither 71:10 net 57:14 58:8 155:16 network 24:19 28:9 32:9 never 73:12 107:8 110:5 121:15 188:18 new 3:25 23:23 32:10 59:9,14 66:8,16 91:16 148:20 176:12 179:8,12 210:22 Newing 2:3 3:13,23 4:5 3:16 50:12,13 50:16 51:17 54:7 55:9,12,19 83:12,13 86:13 97:19,21,23 124:9 125:4 141:1 143:22 144:2,7 157:7,9,11 176:14 178:21 180:7 186:17 199:24 205:11 207:4 214:17 215:1,5,9,16 next 18:23 32:6 47:3 55:11 86:11 107:14 108:19 115:19 116:4 135:12 139:1 143:21 148:10 153:10 159:25 171:3 nice 13:23 NICOLE 2:15 nine 95:10 163:21 164:3,6 165:25 188:21 NIOC 155:6 none 210:15,16 nonetheless 104:4 117:15 non-controversial</p>	<p>39:9 non-sealing 7:25 north-east 89:7 north-eastern 88:12 north-west 90:19 note 15:23 57:2,5,19 58:25 59:12 60:11 60:17 62:3,20 63:21 65:15,21 71:8,24,25 72:2,3,19 73:14 76:6 77:8 90:8,22 91:15 93:7 96:21 107:4,13,13 139:11 139:22 150:13 151:14 156:20 176:14,15,16 177:3 177:6 178:24 179:11 noted 52:3 57:7 61:11 90:4 156:17,19 199:4 211:20,23 notes 59:20,21 60:19 nothing 49:9 50:10 104:13 180:6 183:5 199:11 215:12,13 notice 107:13 noting 128:7 notion 141:17 notional 151:21 notionally 102:24 103:3,14 104:3 NPV 57:15 NS 13:24 nuanced 185:11,14,18 number 2:5,9,15,20 2:25 8:14 10:25 31:3 58:13 60:15 63:23 64:4 66:22,24 70:17 82:23 109:17 110:18 111:9 112:6 123:12 128:11,11 134:24 173:22 175:5 179:11 182:2 190:17 199:16,25 210:10 numbered 210:23 numbers 68:14 85:22 112:13 134:19 138:1,4,7 147:21 154:11 166:20 175:10 176:14 199:18 202:10,15 202:19 205:7,8,10 205:13 206:19 numerous 206:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <hr/> <p>objection 215:6 objective 142:15 167:19 objectivity 142:10 observation 102:8 observed 8:12 15:1 obtain 35:9 176:20 177:12 179:17 181:2,5 obtained 11:9</p>	<p>obviously 28:19 29:7 29:16 30:5 84:5 86:1 94:22 104:13 141:25 143:1 197:2 212:6,25 213:3 occur 36:14 occurred 12:8 21:5 22:9 188:18 occurs 19:7 167:3 206:1 October 56:7 149:11 187:15 188:1,5,6 191:19 off 167:7 195:24 offer 211:12 offshore 5:10 63:17 off-the-shelf 28:23 often 39:22 107:10 126:22 180:21 182:12 Oh 3:24 22:4 133:14 oilfield 13:12 oilfields 13:14 33:15 33:20 35:7 65:8 68:3 119:17,25 120:3,21 125:19 128:22 okay 15:21 16:13,18 16:25 17:2 21:7,16 22:19,23 23:12,19 23:20 25:6,9,13,17 25:21,23 26:2,6,12 26:18 27:3,5,8,11 27:16 28:1,19 29:3 31:16,18,20 32:1,7 33:7,9,13 34:25 35:4,12 36:10 37:24 38:16 41:7 42:19 44:9 45:19 46:16 50:9 55:23 66:11,14 67:1,8,18 68:1,9,19 69:1 70:8 72:15 74:6 75:3,15 77:2,7 81:7,9 82:24 98:8 99:14 100:23 102:17 107:20 117:20 135:1 142:24 145:19 160:15 163:15 166:22 169:9 176:25 181:11 182:16 190:22 207:13 214:13 old 113:9 122:24 123:17 older 113:25 126:5,9 126:11 oldest 10:1 Ol'ka 21:10 29:22 103:9,14,17,23 104:2 139:4 211:16 OMV 14:7,12 once 6:24 7:1 28:24 53:5 63:3 130:6 ones 20:22 33:15 38:6 47:16 64:15 73:25 89:6,25 97:14</p>	<p>100:11 120:22 122:8 123:20 133:24,25 134:19 ongoing 26:15 38:5 62:12 online 13:23 14:5 only 4:16 11:24 17:1 22:1 33:11 46:10,23 48:8 53:21 56:11 61:22 63:14 77:4 84:12 94:3 99:11 100:3,7,10 105:24 110:13 111:8 112:15 115:21 116:1 118:3,4 120:23 123:18 129:10 133:18,20 139:5,12 148:2 150:14,17 151:8 152:19,24 156:6,14 161:9,12 169:4,16 185:23,25 186:22 187:16 192:12 194:4,18,23 195:9 199:4,6 214:23 onshore 5:9 13:4,14 13:19 14:16 15:2 onto 32:6 onwards 212:15 Opcom 112:10 open 23:15 41:5 113:1 171:8 opening 210:20 operate 182:8 operates 45:3 operating 67:12 159:23 operational 36:23 37:6 operator 29:21 82:14 operators 30:8 34:9 opinion 46:24 89:17 95:4 104:12 105:8 122:15 140:24 145:16 148:21 160:4,5,24 178:9 179:25 186:15 191:13 192:13 198:11,13 opinions 162:3 171:23 opportunity 96:11 136:1 142:5 147:9 154:23,23 199:5 opposed 48:15,18 152:10 optimistically 191:1 option 29:20 34:10,11 61:19 options 29:5 oral 1:14 211:9 order 28:21,23 58:20 67:24 79:24 119:7 164:3 177:25 211:1 orders 2:22 organised 205:6 organised 145:15 orient 25:2</p>
--	--	---	--	--	--

<p>oriented 31:7 origin 64:8 original 23:25 119:3 150:1 ORR 147:17 148:18 149:3,9,17 153:22 162:10 167:25 168:16 170:10 176:12 182:16 183:9 186:17 187:8 187:10,12 ORR's 148:25 other 1:13 2:22 11:25 15:1 16:6 28:14 29:5 33:14 49:17,19 51:3 54:22,22 60:17 63:24 65:2 78:16 80:10 81:11,11 88:17 93:4,6 94:2 94:20,21,24 100:14 101:20 118:18,23 124:12 130:13 132:4 138:14 145:4 145:13,15,22 148:5 148:22,25 158:10 162:24 170:17 171:18 172:14,21 173:10,16 175:8,17 175:19 176:5 179:8 180:13,17 182:25 187:25 193:16 194:20 196:18,21 196:23,23 203:10 211:7,11 212:6 213:25 214:19 215:15 others 95:13 otherwise 165:14,22 ourselves 210:5 214:22 out 6:1 12:5 18:3 20:20 29:10 36:17 37:22 40:5,7 42:23 53:7 76:12 90:22 92:15 98:24 99:3,21 102:5 110:17,21 113:5 115:11 119:12 127:7 128:2 132:23 133:12,14 135:9 137:25 138:1 138:10 140:9 141:14 155:7,8 159:2 163:21 166:11 169:5,18 170:1,23 171:18 172:14 176:18 177:1,23 180:1,16 184:8 192:3 193:24 199:14 200:21 204:7 outcome 58:2 95:6 outline 19:3 56:24 89:3 91:2 outlined 116:22 outlines 90:15 output 95:5,8 106:17 outside 47:13 139:20</p>	<p>over 3:10 4:9 11:19 12:18,24 14:9 19:13 36:4 49:25 58:11 70:4 77:24 88:16 92:22 96:4 97:10 109:20 113:6 119:20 121:19 122:17,18 125:13 130:22 135:12 148:19 163:20 175:5 192:2 201:24 212:11 overall 70:2 85:3 overcome 49:9 60:22 overestimated 95:3,4 overlie 89:8 94:20 overly 142:19 overlying 88:20 93:6 override 88:17 overriding 58:22 60:2 60:5,22 61:15 79:15 147:15 overspeaking 51:4 own 61:9 106:9,20 107:6 111:21 133:11 158:6 204:12 owned 169:16 187:1 187:11 owner 69:8,19 81:23 81:23 102:11 153:13 168:24 ownership 149:1 157:2 owns 187:16 o'clock 1:4</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>pace 96:16 208:25 package 70:2 page 3:2 17:3 23:15 24:14,25 31:25 32:6 35:14,16 45:13,18 47:3,4 53:16 70:17 70:18,24 72:8,17,18 81:9,11 98:1,2,7 99:15 100:24 102:18,19 106:23 106:24,25 107:2 109:15,20 112:23 115:14,14,19 116:4 119:14,15 124:11 130:19,20,22 134:10 135:12,13 138:20,21 139:1 146:9 159:14,17 169:10,12 170:19 171:3 174:6 176:25 179:3 180:7 181:11 181:24 189:24 191:22 192:2 201:20 203:20 207:14 212:14 pages 192:2 214:9 paid 149:24 153:21,22 154:14 163:11,13 174:2,15,24 176:5</p>	<p>208:1 Palomar 178:22 179:7 180:11 panel 58:17 paper 50:23 189:21 201:10 202:20 203:2,6 papers 18:9 paperwork 43:7 paragraph 17:2,9 18:23 23:18,22 24:6 24:13,15 31:25 32:2 46:17 47:4 48:13 53:13,15,17 68:17 70:17,19 71:7 72:17 73:13,20,25 74:10 75:15 76:20 98:3 100:24 102:17,20 103:6 107:2,14 108:17,25 109:16 119:13 124:23 138:20 139:1,11 140:10 154:7 159:17,25 169:13 170:19,20,23 171:3 180:9 191:22 203:19 204:11 207:14,15 209:7 paragraphs 131:19 160:19 parameters 90:4 126:22 Pardon 123:9 part 5:8 16:21 24:17 37:18,22 38:2 48:12 70:2,22 71:5 76:1,3 76:5,12 79:25 99:21 100:12 101:17 105:16 106:3 111:23 119:1 122:11 128:17 141:18 148:15 169:1 207:9,23 participants 167:20 particular 3:10 47:2 49:20 59:7 76:20 98:25 100:17,22 102:13 130:25 133:23 163:17 195:7 202:19 particularly 108:22 167:6 parties 2:5,11,15,20 32:17 82:9 156:9 212:13 partly 85:9 113:16 128:5 partner 178:23 parts 26:11 31:5 49:18 49:19 99:20 127:2,2 party 2:5,6 2:24 pass 153:3 passage 167:10 passive 81:25 past 105:9 112:21 147:3 Paternoster 1:5</p>	<p>path 25:1 patient 87:16,17 Patton 2:9,9,10,10,11 2:11,12 Paul 174:11 Pause 6:23 24:11 37:25 40:8 45:12 69:1 87:18,20 98:6 107:1 140:25 141:1 179:4 191:22 pay 81:25 82:8 156:1 156:15 178:10 182:8 206:24 paying 61:10 148:19 174:19,20 175:2,3 payment 154:15 206:8 206:10,11 208:4 payments 174:14 pays 175:16 PDF 45:18 72:8,18 81:9 98:2,7 99:15 102:18 106:23 107:2 109:15 112:24 113:3 115:14 119:14 124:11,12 130:19 134:10 138:20 174:6 176:25 181:11 peak 9:16 12:8 PEKAR 2:9 pence 190:8,23,24 penetrating 8:21 pennies 190:7 people 51:3 130:13 167:18 171:24 173:10 per 9:12,17,21 11:23 12:13 64:14 65:19 74:11,25 95:20,22 128:3 145:24 151:11,16,20,23 152:13,16 189:25 190:3,16 195:17,20 200:17 percentage 178:12 perception 59:5,7 85:14 142:3,17 perfect 32:1 perform 125:17 139:16 158:21 196:2 performance 9:11 12:19 14:24 123:6 181:4 performances 124:25 performed 161:3 196:5,7 197:15 performing 198:9 perhaps 2:4 83:4 123:23 208:12 period 91:17 96:16 148:20 168:25 permeability 6:16 7:5 7:18 permissions 63:4 permits 16:6 25:15</p>	<p>35:9 permitting 13:21 person 145:24 191:4,6 personal 15:2 61:7 180:23 181:9 personally 69:12 107:15 140:13 179:13,18,25 180:10,13,17 184:11 person's 40:2,5 44:14 44:17,19,23 45:3,5 perspective 152:2 pessimistic 203:14 petition 170:22 PETRA 2:13 petroleum 5:16 38:22 113:17 114:20 152:21 PGNiG 6:19 10:20 11:6 PHAROAH 2:5 phase 35:25 PHILIPPE 1:12 phone 28:21,23 photographs 54:14 Phrasing 143:2 pick 158:3 picture 65:17 85:3 piece 59:9 99:5 pieces 59:14 80:10 PIETRO 2:4 PIIP 17:16 Pilawa 2:11 3:6,18 4:11 15:6,7,10,14 16:2 26:21 34:19 37:14 38:12 44:5,7 50:9 55:5,8,15 65:25 66:2 79:14 83:10 86:12 141:5 144:8 207:6,18 Pilawa's 51:19 pink 89:3 116:22 pinky-purple 91:2 pipeline 23:24 24:1,16 24:19,22 25:4,7,11 25:15,17 28:3,6,24 29:3,10,25 30:4,6 30:13,20,23 32:13 33:5,11 34:8 pipelines 34:5 35:4 49:3,4,24 place 25:14 36:10 41:17 46:21 47:7,22 47:22 52:11 82:10 98:17 112:19 114:4 114:11,13 143:11 162:13,19 164:3,11 164:17 165:2,10,16 166:3 167:6 168:13 187:19 188:1,6,21 188:25 189:9 193:2 193:9,11 194:13 placed 82:19 163:6 181:12 placing 81:13 163:6 plan 20:14,23 21:18</p>	<p>21:23,25 22:17,24 22:25 25:18 29:18 34:5,20 35:18,22 43:18 46:6,9,10,12 46:13 49:1,7 50:6 55:11 planning 22:20 26:3 132:2 plans 6:6 22:21 43:8 plateau 32:5,8 33:4 play 148:5 please 4:17 5:25 9:22 13:2,7 15:8 32:4 36:19 41:4 42:18 45:15 55:24 56:12 56:19 66:5 72:17 79:12 97:25 98:7 99:15 106:22 109:14 112:23 115:13 119:13 123:8 124:10 134:7 134:8,10 145:3 146:19 148:10 159:14 164:22 166:22 169:10,12 174:5 179:4 180:7 189:20 191:21 199:17 201:19 203:20 205:16 plenty 144:4 199:5 plot 9:21 10:2,4,11 11:7,8,9,10 93:13 plots 9:14,18 11:4 plotted 97:5 123:5 plotting 11:17 97:12 121:24 plus 88:5 138:2,2,2 155:24 156:5,7 pm 141:9 144:9,10,11 146:20 157:8 207:5 207:21 215:18 point 5:20 6:8 12:23 13:9 26:8 27:19 32:23 33:1 34:16 35:8 40:6 43:2 52:25 59:7 60:17 64:7 66:8 76:9 78:23 80:14 90:7 98:8,22 102:15 110:15,20 111:4,11 111:13 115:21,23 118:21 122:1 123:9 133:7 158:4 160:1 163:16 164:2 165:24 178:3,6 182:25 185:4,25 186:11 211:15 212:14 213:4,25 pointing 175:10 181:9 184:8,10,19,21 185:12 points 68:20 79:21,22 80:5,6,13 85:2 98:4 131:1 160:9 176:5 209:2 210:14 poking 99:21 Poland 89:15 90:18</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--

<p>93:14 97:6 116:5 119:11,19 120:22 121:1,6,18,24 125:14 127:12,17 129:11,25 Poland-Slovakia 32:25 Poland-Slovakian 32:10,14 Polish 6:18 8:12 9:11 9:15,22 10:13,18 11:6 14:21,24 90:17 97:6 115:16 119:21 120:3,5 122:16,23 124:19 poor 93:8 113:10 poorer 126:21 poorly 92:19 porosity 90:4 portfolio 51:1 portions 145:14 Poruba 21:10,14 92:8 103:9 position 53:11 62:1 82:10 101:21,25 103:12 119:4 160:15,18 165:2,8 168:4 170:11,13,25 173:22 176:16 181:16 183:13,17 184:3 188:8 192:3 193:6,10 positioned 148:24 positions 210:22 positive 117:25 possession 168:12 170:6 possibility 25:24 possible 8:17 31:21 55:6 62:22 155:17 160:13 173:7 189:17 possibly 171:9 post 11:12 178:25 post-hearing 1:14 2:1 2:6,11 213:20 214:20 potential 24:17 25:6 88:9 93:20 96:2 99:7,17 100:3 113:19 190:15 191:23 potentially 94:20 103:20 163:21 165:2 189:14 193:25 power 14:1 29:6,7,13 29:16 30:12 34:10 52:1 powerful 11:8 preceding 3:1 74:1 predict 83:2 prefer 1:17 preferred 84:17 preliminary 16:19 27:18,21 37:11 48:7 140:3,5 211:13</p>	<p>preparation 16:21 36:7 37:23 38:3 214:23 preparatory 38:9 prepare 36:16 prepared 52:13 109:19 138:22 146:25 192:23 204:20 205:2 preparing 38:13 52:15 71:8,18,19 215:2 presence 5:23,23 6:2 8:20 present 5:25 13:13 18:9 57:14 58:8 61:2 84:22 125:23 130:14 presentation 3:5,17 3:22 4:3 4:23 5:3,20 6:3 15:16,21 38:25 56:18,21 58:13 65:20,21 66:16 68:21 79:17 85:1 87:14,24 88:3 92:1 92:4 110:9,11,12,14 111:7 115:12,24 117:2 124:16 125:20 127:18,25 129:1 145:11 146:21 156:18 199:4,13 203:24 presentations 110:21 111:1,4,14 112:1,9 213:13 presented 6:23 13:18 14:13 44:11 57:11 58:5 66:21 75:13 77:18 85:22 107:8 203:6 210:20 presenting 130:13 presents 11:2 press 71:15 pressure 7:4 8:1,3,4,7 8:11,23 9:1 126:17 126:19,21 pressures 8:9,25 12:1 presumably 183:25 presume 29:2 presumed 38:8 pretty 28:15 62:8 previous 69:8,19 70:24 72:19 81:23 81:23 82:14 88:17 110:19,21 pre-1946 11:14,17 12:3,19 128:1 price 77:24 85:4,13 147:24 166:18 167:16,20 171:4,6 189:25 190:23 prices 62:22 77:19 166:24 167:10,22 primary 91:3 99:4 principal 3:3 principally 2:6 principles 6:14 prior 38:9 54:17 58:18</p>	<p>162:6,18,19 182:21 186:14 187:21 188:23 193:24 private 50:1,3,4 PRMS 38:23 39:2,5,7 39:10,13 40:9,18,24 41:2,5,20 42:1,5,11 44:21 45:16 46:7 48:14 73:18 91:21 107:8 probabilistic 57:21 probability 44:2 57:24 84:5,7,8 probably 16:11 26:9 28:18 92:19 132:3 143:22,23 175:13 problem 37:14 79:14 problems 93:5 procedural 3:3 4:13 2:22 213:18,20 proceed 56:19 62:9 83:6 192:1 212:9 proceeded 83:23,23 proceedings 92:17 211:3 proceeds 149:12,21,23 150:1,5 process 10:21,25 17:23 18:1,5,8,12 19:24 37:23 42:21 50:18,21,21 51:2 52:17 59:12 62:5 96:14 107:9,21 213:25 processed 131:12 processing 28:13 60:13 131:7 165:1 169:4,17,19 170:4 produce 12:1 29:4 33:3 51:21 75:25 84:24 95:25 123:13 123:18 produced 1:24 9:12 9:21 10:5 12:4 13:20 17:12,22 19:16 32:10 43:10 49:17 50:24 75:24 79:7 84:2 113:22 123:5 127:7,7 producing 16:19 34:20 48:7,8 49:2 49:23 123:17 127:15 product 20:17 21:17 49:23 67:20 production 6:5,13,25 8:3,24 11:7,11,11 11:14,16 12:5,8,10 12:17 13:25 14:20 19:1 22:1 26:25 30:3 49:16 51:16 93:14 95:15 122:19 122:25 123:7,10,25 124:4 126:15 127:3 127:4,9,16 128:2,13 128:16,18 129:15 129:16</p>	<p>productivity 11:23 professional 73:11 Professor 1:11,12 212:12,21 213:7,8 214:5,6,7,9 profile 191:11 profiles 6:5,13 14:20 19:2 profits 155:8,10 programme 21:9 23:2 23:10 25:25 26:4 49:20 83:24 84:1 214:2 prohibition 210:13 prohibits 72:24 73:4 project 16:8 31:1 35:10 36:24 38:17 39:16,18,23 46:22 47:20 48:4,16 49:21 67:13,17,17,22,23 68:8,23 108:3 147:14 149:1 150:5 150:13 151:8,13,17 151:24 152:19,24 153:13,15,25 156:16 158:21 192:12 193:5 194:14 196:10 projections 182:3 projects 5:14 67:14,15 67:22 73:8,9,11 107:17 178:24 project's 153:12 PROKOPOVÁ 2:10 promise 215:2 promotes 5:17 proof 182:25 184:6 206:11 proofs 154:15 206:8 206:10 properly 52:1 properties 7:5 property 6:15 165:7 proposal 2:14 propose 56:24 57:17 74:22 proposed 24:21 35:21 49:10 58:23 124:20 128:18 proposition 142:20 prospect 6:13 21:23 21:24 23:12,13,21 29:12,23 102:4,10 103:4 104:10 109:7 111:17 134:12,14 134:23,25 135:4,14 135:22,25 136:7,9 136:25 137:13,17 137:22 140:21 190:4,15 prospective 40:7 42:20 45:9 59:1 63:16,21 64:3 70:25 71:3 72:13,24 73:5 77:5 85:12 90:1 139:3 142:21 146:16,17 150:15</p>	<p>151:6,7,8,11 152:20 152:22,24 161:9,13 192:12 193:5,9,16 194:5,14 195:14,18 195:21,22 196:8,15 197:8,11 198:8,14 198:15,16,23 200:9 200:11,25 201:6 203:10 207:10 prospectivity 62:3,18 141:18 143:4 provide 147:10 149:10 provided 4:11 44:1 46:24 47:11,22 66:23 90:3 92:13 105:13 108:2 provides 30:14 providing 74:18 102:5 public 50:1 71:9,18,19 publicly 175:12,17 published 189:22 pull 24:4,5 31:2,24 45:10,15 72:7 81:9 138:23 207:13 pumped 33:21 purchased 69:6,15,17 70:3 149:20 150:4 168:1 purchasing 149:12 purely 75:10 purple 10:12 90:14 purported 166:15 purporting 110:21 purpose 44:20 125:11 136:9 158:15,16 160:20 161:18,20 195:8 purposes 32:16 71:14 71:18 138:17 158:13,18 159:3 168:18 172:3 202:13 pursued 83:8 pursuing 83:7 102:6 put 33:10 44:9 52:21 65:4 70:16 82:23 96:5 112:4,13 113:25 114:11,12 128:9 130:23 132:7 135:20,25 136:24 137:21 138:9 141:23 181:1 185:8 203:15,17 205:7,8 205:14 206:15 209:12 putting 64:7 83:6 111:7 185:19,23 P50 6:9 18:1,4,14 19:25 20:2,6 50:18 50:20 58:2,4 64:16 76:14,17 83:24 84:5 95:6 101:18 105:16 105:17,20 106:4,6 106:10,14,16 201:23 202:1</p>	<p>QC 10:24 quadrant 88:12 qualified 70:12 quality 45:1 91:21 92:20 105:23 quality 5:23 83:1 93:8 115:7 quantification 189:15 quantified 79:22 quantity 82:22 quantities 27:8,11 85:16,19 quantity 50:25 85:23 quantum 60:8 210:17 question 16:24 17:10 115:7 42:8 52:8 54:8,23 81:22 86:3 108:15 141:15,22 145:17 145:24 157:25 160:17,22 163:23 164:15 174:21 175:20,22 183:16 185:2,5 206:5,14,14 206:18 207:7 209:5 209:5,12 212:16 questions 3:7,8,9,10 3:11,12,14,15,19,20 3:24,25 4:6,7,8,9,10 4:12 15:14 50:12,13 51:6,17,19 52:4,5,7 54:22 58:16 83:11 83:13,14,16 86:7 97:23 141:2,4,5,7 141:10 143:14 145:12 157:12 205:11 207:4,9,19 207:22,23 210:6,7 212:18 quick 58:25 59:23 quickly 13:11 60:21 quite 16:24 19:18 67:15 110:8 118:17 140:22 154:4 180:3 190:4,25 210:7 quotation 72:19 193:13 quote 71:12 quoted 77:21,22 137:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>RAF 65:1 201:24 202:1 raise 61:4,9 183:3,14 183:20 214:3,18 215:8 raised 80:14 148:20 176:7,10 179:22 181:14 184:2 raising 181:7 197:4 range 7:14,16 8:25 10:17 120:21 121:1 128:24 132:25 ranges 9:17 rapid 11:11 rapidly 13:19 rate 12:2 33:4 96:18</p>
---	---	--	---	--	---

<p>124:4 147:11 155:22 156:6,11,12 rates 7:6 8:5 9:16 32:5 32:8 33:4 rather 89:18 93:11 96:23 107:13 108:18 134:17 167:2 187:21 191:11 ratio 64:13 150:22 152:9 200:17 rational 173:6,13,15 173:18 ratios 151:20 RD-002 31:4 RD-2 31:4 re 3:3 4:13 reach 147:4 151:25 reached 2:1 39:18 65:10 reaching 156:20 193:3 read 4:18 26:10,13,16 32:4 37:10,25 56:12 72:11 87:8 132:17 145:4 146:14 157:14 170:20,21 175:14 180:20 reading 61:5 180:15 ready 1:4,6 17:7 86:22 104:9 107:7 144:12 144:13 real 24:20 171:7 176:8 realistic 7:23 86:18 reality 121:3 really 17:15 18:10 26:17 65:12 89:23 96:13 116:1 178:13 180:3,24 183:1 184:4 197:12 203:14 reason 2:11 3:3 4:6 22:3 33:2 38:20 48:20,24 93:15 99:2 120:9 136:22 156:2 167:5 168:11 175:21 181:15,15 181:20,22 205:1 211:24 reasonable 12:12,19 43:19 102:8 reasonably 58:1 reasons 2:7 65:22 85:17,18 173:22,23 175:5,8 176:22,24 rebut 199:12 recall 21:14,15 24:23 100:1,5 110:10 127:20,21 137:10 137:12 167:21 174:3 195:24 196:3 202:15 204:16,17 207:16 recap 12:3 received 4:22 59:18 66:15 68:22 87:13 149:23 150:1 205:7 205:13</p>	<p>receiving 2:17 149:25 155:16 recent 14:6,12 90:17 91:7 recognise 1:23 68:15 101:21 recollect 188:9 recommend 71:2 74:22 record 32:4 72:11 86:24 87:9 188:15 recording 213:23 recoverable 40:13 41:9 196:12,17 recovered 124:19 128:1 129:12 recoveries 7:7 10:19 recovering 95:22 recovery 10:15 65:6 129:3 red 11:12 32:21,23 91:25 redactions 2:21 reduce 51:15 94:22 reduced 10:25 96:3 155:11,11,12 reducing 128:11 187:20 red-dotted 25:6 refer 184:2 198:22 reference 30:25 32:2 57:1 68:15 72:1 90:7 126:6 137:18 139:14 156:6,25 191:8 204:6,11 214:8 referenced 15:23 90:13 91:11 92:3,8 92:17,23 94:4,12 96:6 107:16 130:18 136:20 references 63:23 referencing 109:3 referred 100:2 109:18 referring 80:22 195:6 refers 109:24 159:18 reflect 15:1,2 59:15 96:11 174:18 reflected 25:18,24 48:14 125:19 167:12 reflection 180:24 reflects 85:13 178:19 refresh 99:14 refusal 210:25 regard 171:14 regarding 26:14 48:6 58:18,19 80:14,15 regardless 143:5 refresh 99:14 regard 171:14 regarding 26:14 48:6 58:18,19 80:14,15 region 11:8 49:14,15 49:19,21 98:25 regularly 206:1 regulations 16:10,12 regulatory 16:3 47:7 138:16 reinforce 89:23 reinterpretation</p>	<p>70:14 reinterpreted 70:9 82:18 rejected 209:22 Rejoinder 209:7 relate 63:19 125:22 related 123:6 relation 90:13 97:2 101:20 178:23 179:11 212:13,15 212:24 relationship 64:10 relative 17:25 90:9 93:14 151:12 197:20 relatively 55:4 releases 71:15 relevant 89:25 93:24 116:11 156:14 184:10,21,22 185:15 187:12 191:12,13 202:24 reliability 205:17 206:3,13 207:24 208:9 reliable 154:11 206:18 reliance 194:23 relied 174:23 relief 209:7 210:1 rely 64:21 72:2 80:2,5 80:6 138:15 163:10 172:24 relying 80:8 remaining 40:13 41:13 92:20 105:24 152:7 remember 16:1 54:14 55:25 66:6 99:13 125:24 126:1 131:5 140:2 177:17 193:13 199:19 207:11 remind 184:13 199:17 205:16 removal 126:10 remove 35:18 removed 128:6 152:4 152:6 repaid 178:24 179:7,7 180:11 repeat 41:4 146:15 160:17 164:15 211:19 repeating 186:7 rephrase 108:15 Reply 154:24 reported 90:24 113:13 113:15 reporting 71:9,13,18 71:19 72:20,21 73:17 128:12 reports 4:11 7:8,20 15:19,24 16:21 19:15 41:24 42:8 56:6 57:8 66:11 69:24 75:25 80:21 84:25 87:4 144:22</p>	<p>145:14 154:5,9 157:14 158:5 170:14 172:19 204:1,6,9,15 represent 8:10 20:5 111:1 155:10 171:7 representative 2:5,6 8:7 9:1 19:1 121:10 121:13 148:11 represents 7:21 12:24 31:13 39:2 79:23 124:18 reprocess 83:3 reprocessed 70:9 82:18 reprocessing 70:14 82:25 83:3,9 165:5 165:20 reproduced 134:20 Republic 1:17 2:12,13 2:13 reputable 204:22,24 request 209:7,17,18 209:20,22,25 210:1 requesting 156:9 requests 209:11 require 58:17 167:13 180:23 required 13:8 16:19 28:13 35:10 36:16 48:7 200:19 requirement 46:4 47:5 48:25 requirements 42:6 43:14 104:25 requires 30:23 201:7 209:15 requiring 49:10 Research 189:21 reserve 39:12 65:1 78:24 85:16 202:8 reserved 213:10 reserves 39:15,20,22 39:25 40:8,12,15,19 41:2,21,24 42:9,15 43:5,10 44:12,14,18 63:2,6,10 64:11 73:21,24,25 75:17 75:19,21,23,25 76:22,24 78:6,10,13 78:17,21 79:2 83:19 84:9,12 85:9,12,20 85:24 150:14,18 151:16,17,23 152:8 152:10,12,15,18,21 152:23 192:9 194:22 195:14 196:24 197:1 199:8 200:12,16,18 201:1 203:11 reserves-based 45:2 reservoir 5:7,17,22 6:14,16 7:2,14 8:7 8:11 9:1 52:9 57:12 90:4 94:13 115:2 126:20,21 136:25 137:4</p>	<p>reservoirs 7:15,18 134:15 135:3,16,24 135:24 136:4,6,11 137:8,9 residual 183:4 Resolution 1:5 resolved 14:3 resolving 47:8 48:12 resort 177:12 resource 5:17 38:23 39:12 42:16 93:20 95:2 115:20 116:15 116:17,24 117:16 resources 3:22 5:12 40:8 42:15,20 43:3 43:4 58:23 59:1 63:15,17,21 64:3,15 70:25 71:3 72:14,25 73:5 74:23 76:2,17 77:5 84:12 85:12,13 139:3 146:16,17 150:15,23,24,25 151:6,9,10,11 152:10,20,22,25 161:10,13 192:12 193:5,9,16 194:5,15 195:14,19,21,22 196:9,9,10,16 197:8 197:12 198:8,15,23 200:9,11,25 201:6 207:11 respect 138:14 171:4 187:25 213:25 respectively 148:1 149:19 respond 2:23 155:3 160:5 Respondent 1:18 2:8 209:6 212:24 213:3 213:17 215:12 Respondent's 31:3 58:20 60:8,9 61:21 77:2,13 212:20,21 responding 71:1 response 160:14 responsibility 76:5 responsible 5:9,11 rest 61:25 99:25 100:13,15 102:23 139:6,19 210:5 result 8:24 9:23 83:25 116:15 119:2,6,8,9 123:10 130:10 150:4 151:2 152:14 190:19 197:21 210:23 resulted 164:12,18 187:4,20 resulting 8:24 14:19 results 12:25 83:2 147:24 149:17 152:12 resume 143:19 144:6 retained 60:5 return 62:10 revealed 10:21 revenue 51:11</p>	<p>revenues 27:5 29:1 147:16,19 148:2,13 148:15 149:5 revert 1:21 3:11 reverting 150:2 review 70:7,8 98:19 106:7 202:13,24 204:18 reviewed 70:6 98:21 105:24 reviewing 88:9 139:19 revise 59:10 reward 142:9,17 re-direct 3:13 4:11 50:12,16 141:4,5 207:6,7 Richard 4:2 144:15,18 rid 30:13 51:13 82:2 rig 13:5 36:21 52:11 52:13 53:3,6 54:15 54:18,19 rights 37:20 38:1,2 169:14 right-hand 7:24 10:4 11:18 32:24 35:7 88:13 117:3 132:22 181:24 190:20 rigorous 6:10 9:10 14:23 18:13 rigs 42:24 52:12 risk 142:3,9,17,22 143:6 156:14,14 182:1,7 183:16 risked 65:2 76:2 196:6 196:19,25 197:5,5,6 197:12,21,24 198:21 200:22 risks 106:12 156:16 182:12 River 2:15 60:7 74:17 144:20 road 54:15 211:17,18 211:22 212:1 robust 14:19 19:24 109:10 Rockflow 3:22,23 56:4 57:12 93:17 97:13 124:21 129:20 Rockflow's 93:20 110:6,16,18 125:5 rocks 5:24 88:23 role 70:7 Romanian 14:5 room 2:8 ROSTISLAV 2:9 rough 64:8 roughly 10:22 11:1 94:9 round 95:22 route 24:17,17 25:6 29:8 33:2 43:18 129:13 royalty 58:22 60:3,5 60:22 61:15 79:15 79:18 80:3,8 81:23 82:2,11,20 147:15</p>
---	--	--	--	--	---

<p>148:2,6,12 171:7 185:17 208:5 RPS 94:11 130:18 131:2,4,16 132:23 132:25 133:23 134:5,7 137:14,15 137:21 rule 210:14 214:17 ruled 211:20 rules 1:1 71:20 72:2 214:14 run 19:24 88:3,6,8 95:4,7 Ruská 21:10,14 103:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p>salaries 173:24 174:2 174:8,17 salary 174:14 sale 58:21 60:17,21 80:1,3,12 82:6 148:15,18,24 170:9 170:16 171:9,21 185:17 186:1,17 187:8,10,12 same 11:8 29:25 30:2 31:21 45:14,14,25 62:8 73:1 76:3,10 77:1 78:16 90:1 94:5,18 100:18 103:6 105:10,12 116:13 118:1,6 121:4,10 122:6 134:3,17 135:13,25 149:17 152:3 155:16 161:23 179:6 182:19 194:6 213:4 sample 121:20 sampled 93:2 samples 121:10 San 58:22 60:2,3,4,4 60:17,20,21 61:3,8 61:12,15 69:8,11 79:15 80:3,9,18 81:22 82:3,7,9 146:13 147:16,17 148:15,24 149:1 153:14,15 162:10 167:24 168:8,15,24 169:1,25 170:22,24 173:1 174:9 178:23 181:16 184:3 186:17 SANDS 1:12 212:12 212:21 213:8 214:5 214:9 Sapphire 155:6 satisfied 40:15 saw 66:14 148:20 166:8 saying 4:6 24:18 63:1 65:12 73:14 77:11 78:12 79:6 106:2 121:25 126:1 135:2 137:11,12 155:14 171:20 178:3 194:3</p>	<p>says 36:2 46:5,7 47:5 53:24 72:25 74:10 75:15 107:13 159:20,25 177:3,6 178:24 179:12 180:9 182:1 201:25 208:13 209:7 212:15 scale 49:10 scenario 25:17 26:23 30:17,19 44:10 45:4 57:6 67:18 95:23 152:15 186:22 187:1 192:22 193:1 193:10,19 194:11 199:1,14 200:14,17 201:1,23 202:1 scenarios 20:4 schedule 6:7 35:21 76:18 scheduled 213:16 schedules 6:21 scheme 12:21 13:22 15:1 19:3,6 20:25 21:4,16 29:8 33:9 34:3,4 58:5 180:3 schemes 6:21 scope 139:2 screen 7:19 11:4 12:21 17:6 31:6 44:9 56:18 66:14 68:23 98:6 159:16 169:11 174:7 199:24 screens 24:8 scroll 24:13 136:13 179:4 181:25 190:10 seal 5:23 sealing 7:25 second 4:7,12 7:8 9:18 10:3 11:21 14:5 18:9 22:13 34:7,11 35:13 38:7 46:16 50:22 56:7 57:2 58:12 59:19 64:21 67:3 68:10,14,17 70:16,18 72:16 79:25 87:5 95:10 96:22,25 103:22 104:19 106:23,24 106:25 112:25 115:13 123:8 124:10 129:2 130:19 132:14 136:13 137:16 138:19 146:7,10 154:7 159:13 160:6 161:11 170:18 171:19 173:23 174:11 177:22 178:21 180:8 181:1 181:14,18 184:22 186:21 191:19 194:24 198:22 201:17,19 202:4,14 202:17 203:20 207:10,13 208:4</p>	<p>Secondly 13:2 Secretary 1:22 section 53:2 72:8 99:16 118:8 127:6,8 127:17 202:22 secure 16:7 39:23 60:20 secured 46:21 61:6 securing 38:2,13 security 138:17 see 1:4 10:16 24:14 31:22 32:22 37:24 43:24 45:21 56:18 64:7 70:24 72:4,9 81:7,14 88:18 89:4 89:20 91:5 92:6 93:4,18 94:8 95:8 97:7,14 98:8,13 99:16 100:24 101:5 101:23 103:1 107:11 108:8 109:20 112:8 116:4 116:21 120:14 123:14,19 130:20 131:18 134:8,11,23 134:24 135:13,14 136:13,17 137:15 142:4 144:8 155:14 155:15 159:17 160:3,4 167:2 169:13,21 171:2,11 177:2,4 179:5,5,11 179:14,15 180:8 182:1,21,22 189:22 190:1,3,10,12 191:13 199:22 201:25 204:4 206:8 213:25 215:14 seeing 54:14 seek 99:24 138:14 209:10 seeking 109:16 110:4 177:13 seeks 100:12 seem 52:8 seemed 119:4 139:22 seems 77:13 128:12 178:15 seen 8:15 9:14 10:11 17:1 24:3 25:3 31:10 43:20 71:21 73:12 85:1 89:22 97:2 100:7 114:24 117:1 125:20 153:5 165:18 166:6,23,25 171:1 180:16 183:3 194:1 201:9 seeps 9:25 114:22 seismic 10:7 18:22 69:18 82:18 91:4,8 91:16 93:8 107:17 114:6 131:8 139:12 139:23 165:1 169:5 169:15 select 58:1 150:12 selected 150:15 158:2 158:20 198:7</p>	<p>selecting 122:11 selection 17:23,25 18:6 20:7,8 sell 148:12 170:15 171:9 172:7,8 173:7 173:10,10 184:15 seller 148:12,23 172:6 selling 30:15 167:15 185:21 sense 1:21 85:25 96:14 117:19 118:21 142:6 171:8 sense-check 95:16 sensible 111:8 sent 204:2,6 sentence 24:15 32:4 70:20 73:10 102:22 separate 7:21 28:14 67:23 68:3 134:16 135:24 137:4,13 separated 68:1 separately 7:22 18:24 22:7 separation 28:17 September 4:8,12,13 56:8 58:10 sequence 22:7 series 20:4 27:1 34:22 49:22 88:6,15,19 91:3,18 100:16 137:3 serious 182:7 set 58:3,6 76:16 110:21 113:5 121:6 121:7 122:13,14 125:18 132:23 138:1 140:9 171:18 172:14 193:24 214:15 sets 109:25 112:11 166:11 170:23 177:1,23 192:3 setting 88:15,22 204:7 Settlement 1:2 seven 43:5,17,25 44:8 45:21 110:6,8,13 168:22 192:3 196:23 several 61:5 62:12 212:17 shade 58:10 shaded 8:1 shallow 12:10 13:11 127:23 130:5 shallower 126:12 127:2,22 128:1,14 128:17,20 129:3,10 129:12 share 57:4 60:10 62:11,22 64:16 77:19,25 85:13 147:20 149:13,14 149:21 150:2,20 151:3 153:24 186:18,20,23 187:4 187:7,9,18 189:25 190:3</p>	<p>shareholders 176:13 179:23 181:8 183:4 183:21 184:6 186:13 shares 190:12,16,17 shopped 183:11 Shores 61:17,22 162:10,11,23 163:17 187:3,25 188:4 short 4:24 6:3 13:20 14:4 50:13 55:4,17 55:21 86:10,20 shorten 26:9 shortly 168:6 show 8:4 9:5 61:3 67:2 111:23 112:1 118:22 135:11 147:1,3,5,8 173:9 174:3 180:4 showed 61:6 124:15 161:11 184:7,24 202:6 showing 8:14 64:9 203:6 shown 8:16,18,22 11:4 11:12,21 14:20,24 47:19 63:12 74:12 88:11 154:24 155:4 197:21 201:21 shows 9:21 11:9,10,18 89:2 90:18 91:24 94:18 113:5,20 114:24 121:1 134:14,22 156:19 166:24 167:20 175:1 197:6 shrinkage 165:13 Sicily 63:18 side 1:13 2:22 7:24 10:4,11 11:5,18 32:24 35:7 81:11 117:3 174:6 181:24 190:10,20 212:7,24 214:19 215:6,9,13 sides 2:10 signalled 4:7 Signature 2:3,4,4,5 57:3 signed 163:3 188:10 188:15 significant 95:24 96:20 98:10 121:1 148:19 149:2 182:5 significantly 93:19,23 129:14 166:19 167:17 signifies 39:18 signing 205:9 Silesian 89:7,13,18,19 90:5,8,21 93:22 116:21,23 117:5,22 118:2 126:5,8,13 127:5,8,17 similar 9:4,5,17 13:14 16:11 64:20 65:16 85:3 106:19 118:14</p>	<p>121:5 122:2,3 143:22,24 159:24 simplicity 92:6 Simon 3:4 3:18,20 5:6 simple 10:21 13:5 52:9 137:10 175:4 209:5 simplicity 163:16 simply 38:8 47:15 54:13 118:5 120:12 121:3,23 122:13 126:10 137:10 140:23 142:21 145:21 170:7 174:18 178:2 184:3 196:11 204:2 209:8 simulate 64:15 simulation 57:23 75:8 76:14 simultaneously 28:2 since 2:17 90:19 101:13 114:5,9 125:14 165:9,9 168:13 172:14 sincere 4:17,20 56:12 56:15 87:12 145:3,6 145:10 single 8:2,19,20 12:23 67:21 68:8 80:14 sir 1:8 56:2 59:23 144:16 site 29:4,10,19 36:7,16 37:23 38:2 52:12 53:4 54:16,20 142:20 sites 37:1 38:13 53:22 103:14,18,24 104:2 sitting 81:25 215:10 situation 39:20 40:21 40:22,23 42:3,4 44:22,24 54:2 148:17 173:8 175:6 175:24 180:5 185:24 187:16 206:16 six 12:24 152:7 183:15 size 6:22 10:6,8,13 14:13,15 43:16 94:3 97:5 116:10 119:20 121:2,4,5 122:6 123:15,22 124:1 sized 116:14 SKAF 2:15 slide 6:8,24 7:13,24 8:15,15 9:8,20 10:20 11:4 12:3,20 13:17 14:11,18 15:17 56:23,23 57:2 57:2,7,19 58:9,22 58:25 60:3,19 61:17 62:8,19 63:7 64:7 64:20 65:16 66:5,6 66:16 67:2 88:6,7 88:11 89:2,22 90:16 90:25 91:18 92:11 93:9 94:2 95:1,14 96:4 97:1,15 147:1 147:2,16 148:10,10</p>
---	---	---	---	---	---

<p>149:7 150:7,8,11 151:2 152:2 153:5 153:10 154:23 155:21,24 156:17 197:21 199:17 208:11 213:13 slides 58:14 65:22 66:15 86:14,15 146:23,25 148:8 199:18 213:14 215:2 slightly 10:19 22:14 Slovak 1:17 2:12,13 2:13 10:11 16:2 27:17 48:15 Slovakia 9:4 10:9 14:14 16:8,9,12,18 21:4 32:25 47:18 49:3,5,14,18,19,21 63:20 67:12 88:13 89:15 121:5 122:9 153:21 156:15 Slovakian 5:25 6:17 7:11 8:9 10:7,18 14:22,25 24:2 25:4 28:9,10 30:1,16,21 33:21 34:13 57:4 125:24 126:25 156:13 SLR 2:14,14 87:2 107:4,13 108:22 small 10:6 33:8 34:2 36:21 38:8 67:15 118:13 120:10,22 123:17 159:22 180:3 181:10 190:4 199:24 smaller 84:8 116:15 120:6,17,18 122:8 Smilno 21:10,22,22,24 22:1,2,3,16 23:12 23:21 24:1,6 26:24 53:11,21 54:2,6 68:5,6,7 99:18 101:1 103:9,13,17 103:23 104:2 131:23 132:9,9 133:23,25 136:15 136:15,16 190:4,15 211:15,17 smooth 59:13 SM-019 24:5 SM-51 9:13 SM-54 9:13 social 47:8 48:12 49:1 49:7 50:5,6 society 5:15,16 soils 52:23 sold 33:25 34:8 60:6 147:17 149:3 152:5 153:15 168:8,14,21 176:3 solely 170:15 solemnly 4:19 56:14 87:10 145:5,8 solution 7:16 14:2 solvency 175:23</p>	<p>176:17 some 10:1 26:11 28:8 28:13,16 30:8 31:22 33:1 37:1 38:5,8 40:1 50:23 51:6 55:20 60:13,14 70:9 77:14 78:13 82:17 90:11,17,20,21 91:4 92:6,6 93:9,16 95:12,17 97:23 108:4,9,24,24 109:4 109:5 115:10,12 118:15 122:21,24 128:8 142:12 148:20 154:9,9 157:12 163:13 166:1 175:8 176:14 178:23 181:9 187:5 188:21 somebody 167:14 206:15 someone 111:13 140:20 164:14,19 165:3 something 78:2 85:21 96:13 102:3,10 114:11,11,12,14 127:24 128:3 136:6 154:13 164:4 181:10 182:23 185:10 187:3 188:14 214:18 sometimes 83:3 141:14 somewhat 31:13 178:16 185:13 somewhere 32:11,18 95:19 128:10,12 138:23 193:14 soon 97:11 sorry 14:8 17:5,7 22:4 28:22 30:11 34:5 35:16 41:1 44:16 45:14 51:24 52:2 53:15 71:24 75:23 95:20 108:14,15 111:25 113:2 115:22 118:7,17 124:13 129:16,18 133:10 140:17,22 141:1 148:9 158:16 164:15 165:15 196:21 199:22 200:2 202:2 212:25 215:9 sort 28:13 64:9 84:19 89:5 93:10 95:16 117:3,10 154:16 206:1,1 sorted 37:22 sought 100:1 202:4 sound 6:14 27:3 sounds 142:6 source 5:24 166:11 197:6 sources 31:17 80:19 148:17</p>	<p>southwards 88:16 sovereign 156:13 so-called 75:25 77:18 span 122:18 SPE 50:22 201:10 202:20 203:1 speak 53:13 86:2 142:16 150:9 speaking 16:5,13 31:12 39:25 speciality 107:19 specific 16:9 21:25 25:11 26:12 140:6 164:21 180:22,23 210:6,7,15 specifically 31:25 35:14 42:5 45:15,18 47:18 49:13 57:9 66:18 67:19 71:25 73:4 74:8 81:6 140:7 146:7 164:25 specifics 169:7 specify 3:25 speculative 197:7 SPEE 5:15 spending 111:11 spent 111:16 SPE-PRMS 72:4 73:15 spoken 150:8 SPP 32:9 spread 12:24 spreadsheet 69:2,16 76:4,6,11 125:9 spudding 52:14 SPV 177:4 square 16:23 squared 93:15 Squire 2:9,9,10,10,11 2:11,12 stable 174:25 176:19 stack 99:18 101:4 stacked 135:23 137:4 137:9 stage 39:18 46:15 108:18,19 142:13 Stallard 1:24 stand 64:4 standalone 22:16 25:24 standard 7:9 13:12 14:19 50:21,25 205:16 206:3 212:3 212:5 standards 5:17 standpoint 147:12 start 1:5 3:15 5:1 17:2 31:20 35:24 45:19 52:14,17,19 55:19 86:22 92:13 93:5 144:12 145:11 146:2,6,18 154:21 155:2 185:24 213:16 214:21 started 28:4,25 54:9 starting 6:8 47:10 52:25 165:24</p>	<p>starts 2:4 59:14 145:22 state 17:9 42:15,16 71:7 72:2 140:23 157:14 160:1 203:21,25 212:3 stated 63:3 98:9 107:3 139:24 160:18 176:16 193:6 statement 56:15 60:19 71:11 87:11 145:6,9 154:3,7 169:10 170:18 172:15 182:7 205:8 213:24 214:6 statements 4:16,20 26:14 56:11 145:2 204:12,15,18 205:2 205:22,22 states 100:25 169:13 170:5 204:20 statistical 18:1,12 19:24 23:5 50:17 95:5 106:17 136:2 statistically 20:20 status 61:12 161:12 212:16 steep 177:8,13 step 39:15 107:9,20 Stephen 1:11 2:9 1:22 steps 27:1 29:25 30:2 stick 214:14 Sticking 72:16 still 1:24 9:2 13:25 31:22 37:6 42:16 60:12 62:12 64:21 66:4 113:1 115:8,8 125:5 128:16 129:14 140:22 142:16 143:7 154:19 169:1 173:9 179:6 180:20 185:15 187:9 189:11,14 194:14 200:8,25 201:1 209:21 stock 71:14,14 72:1,20 72:22,23 73:4 147:24 197:10 203:4 stop 43:24 51:16 156:22 196:16 straits 176:1,10 183:10,19 184:25 185:4,9,13 186:7 stratigraphic 10:24 125:23 stratigraphy 126:6,7 127:4,10 stream 148:13 strength 185:16 stress 211:8 strictly 175:22 Stromy 139:4 struck 211:5 structural 88:22 structure 9:5 101:2</p>	<p>115:1 structures 10:8 17:24 18:21 100:3,8,10,13 100:15,19 101:8 107:6 study 16:25 24:7 62:6 62:13 98:22,24 99:3 99:6,24 100:7 131:14 subject 2:12 subjective 142:7 subjectivity 142:11 submissions 2:25 26:10 210:8 submitted 3:1 56:6 58:10 87:4 144:22 154:5 158:8 166:13 204:1 subsequent 23:25 166:8 substance 212:9 substantiate 203:22 substantiation 155:23 subsurface 5:8 14:19 115:9 succeed 33:11 success 5:21 19:22 42:22 57:11,22 59:4 65:4 94:4,6,9,15,21 94:23,24 96:7 117:14 131:1 132:21 134:6,16 135:7,17,21 136:5 136:10,24 137:16 140:8,24 196:13,20 197:3 200:24 201:3 201:13 202:7 successful 19:16 20:5 20:20 22:6 31:1 33:14 43:12 117:20 135:4 successfully 57:25 successive 88:17 suddenly 129:16 sufficient 22:11 27:8 54:12 102:6,11 108:11 140:14,19 sufficiently 85:17 86:1 101:24 suggest 43:21 108:5 176:19 179:16 suggested 129:17,20 186:2 suggesting 130:7 175:1 suggestion 181:2 185:6,7,8 suggests 165:22 Sullivan 174:11 sum 153:20 summaries 154:9 summarise 58:9 131:2 136:14 210:21 summarised 166:9 summarises 130:25 summary 97:15 130:22 134:11</p>	<p>sums 174:19 sunk 146:23 147:8 153:9,11,19 154:2 203:19 205:18 207:24,25 208:14 superficial 105:24 superimposed 110:11 supplied 6:20 9:13 10:20 158:5 supplier 154:14 supports 133:3 suppose 118:19 142:3 supposedly 184:14 sure 16:24 17:6 20:15 31:7,10 32:7 41:5 42:17 54:5 68:17 69:4,14 77:11 82:12 100:10 121:22,23 140:22 141:15 142:25 143:23 172:16 174:21 178:16,17 184:3 192:17 212:10 215:10 surely 117:21 118:4 177:24 195:9 surface 7:2 9:25 52:15 52:18,20,23 53:6,8 54:1,16 88:24 91:11 101:3,4 114:23 140:1 surprising 26:13 177:18 surveys 69:24 suspension 211:2 switch 86:15 switched 149:25 system 24:2 25:4 28:10 30:1,16,22 33:5,22 34:13 38:23 113:17 114:20 systems 3:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>tab 107:1 table 11:22 12:21 58:11 109:20 113:5 116:3 118:22 128:4 129:2 130:23 131:19 132:22,22 134:11,20,22 135:12 136:13,21 137:16 138:1 149:3 166:8,8,9,10 174:7 180:8 201:21 tabulated 110:10 take 24:9,18 31:2 33:2 55:3,10,14,21 58:16 64:14 70:23 78:5 79:2 86:16 90:8 99:14 100:23 116:20 118:8 119:4 124:6 130:13 142:22 143:1,6 145:12 163:16 164:5 165:23 188:12 200:10</p>
--	---	---	---	---	---

<p>201:2 210:19 taken 6:17 7:19 11:5 12:22 25:7 41:17 51:2 58:11 67:15 69:19 91:25 108:11 112:19 114:4 118:25 120:12 138:6 164:11,17 165:1,15 166:2 167:6 168:13 176:17 180:1,16 186:20 188:25 193:8,11 196:19 197:2,23 201:5 202:6 215:10 takes 3:4 5:22 36:10 taking 11:17 12:14 30:15 36:16 61:14 67:6 89:19 118:10 122:23,23 129:21 129:24 130:12 138:4 193:2 194:12 201:22 talk 38:22 69:3 147:2 153:9 157:1 talked 33:19 161:6 talking 23:13 30:9 32:3 36:22 40:12,23 40:24 42:3,4,5 47:18 49:13 50:3 59:24 65:9 67:3 69:21,22,24 73:13 80:23 103:6 119:25 153:7 163:24 164:12,22,23,25 166:10 170:9 176:2 182:14,17,18,23 186:10 192:16 198:1,19,20 talks 155:16 target 137:5,22 targeting 142:1 targets 94:13 101:22 137:13 TATIANA 2:10 tax 67:25 taxation 67:25 taxes 148:5 TD 126:10 127:6 TDs 126:9 TD'd 126:8 teams 5:9 technical 59:23,25 70:7 76:8 85:18 210:16 technically 46:6,8,13 techniques 12:16 13:21 113:10 123:10 technology 49:11 113:10,25 122:22 124:23 125:1 technology-driven 129:22 tectonic 99:21 tell 1:19 16:2 70:13 71:11 108:20</p>	<p>171:24 175:10 185:7 197:7,8 204:24 telling 18:19 128:15 180:19 181:6 183:7 191:2,7 ten 86:17 197:25 198:1 tens 82:1 term 185:20 186:8 terminology 194:8 terms 22:7 75:11 86:1 89:10 102:16 143:3 149:6 157:3 177:13 178:11 193:6 212:8 terrain 16:25 24:20 testimony 49:6 50:4,7 60:24 80:2,9 137:6 141:20 165:18,22 166:12 169:8 193:4 thank 3:13 4:2,22,25 15:4,5,11 16:1 17:15 22:15 24:11 24:14 25:2 26:2,8 26:20,21 31:4,9 32:1,16 34:18 35:16 35:20 37:13 38:11 39:22 44:4,5 50:11 50:13 51:6,17 52:3 54:8,21,25 55:1,2 55:15 56:17,22 60:1 65:23,24 66:3,5 69:16 72:6,15 73:19 79:10 83:12 86:8,9 85:13 97:18 124:9 125:2 141:3,11 143:13,16,17 144:7 146:12 153:4 157:4 157:10,13 162:5 172:10 186:16 205:11 207:3,4,18 207:20 208:20,21 208:22 215:5,16,17 thankful 39:1 thanks 3:12 40:5 their 9:12 11:18 17:25 22:21 26:14 58:20 61:9 64:1,20 74:14 77:19,19 78:6 80:21 80:24,25 82:5 83:9 84:25 95:23 101:18 102:7 105:5 106:6,7 110:25 111:21,21 111:23 112:3,9 128:9 136:10 140:24 142:17 154:18,24 158:5 168:16 192:23 193:10 211:22 themselves 88:23 91:1 174:19,21 175:3 195:3 theory 212:23 213:1 thing 63:20 88:21 90:22 97:1 134:17 170:21 194:6 199:6 212:16</p>	<p>things 26:9 60:11 62:8 82:2 118:6 122:3 163:21 170:17 180:4 182:10 183:25 184:20,22 203:12 thinking 2:3 68:5 thinks 191:1,4 third 56:4 208:9,16 211:15 Thornton 204:21 though 28:15 41:25 42:9 76:20 81:22 117:16 128:13 185:5 202:22 thought 2:2 82:3 111:8 142:24 144:2 161:1 168:19 173:14 181:21 thousand 206:23,24 thousands 206:25 three 2:8,20 7:1,7,10 11:25 17:9 19:14 21:9 22:6,19,23 33:17,19 38:19 48:19 53:22 54:5 58:21,24 62:10 68:3 68:13 91:6 92:9,18 94:9 95:11 97:3 101:20 103:8,21 105:15 56:17,22 60:1,3,8 109:24 128:22,22 132:11 133:8,12 134:5,14,19 135:3,9 153:20 162:9,13,18 188:23 207:25 thriving 174:18 through 6:4 8:21 9:25 18:1,12 19:9,25 26:7,16,21 27:1 29:24 48:10 56:24 57:17 58:14 59:17 64:9 76:22 83:18 88:3,6,7,8 92:14 95:5 126:8,12 127:5 177:19 181:6,7 204:19 thrust 88:16 thrusters 88:17,19 Tiago 4:1 144:14,16 Tilly 204:20 time 1:25 3:4 22:11 24:9 31:21 36:16 37:10 45:14,14,25 56:25 59:6,7 65:13 66:23 77:24 78:10 78:23 80:20 82:3,10 82:15 93:2 95:7,9 95:10 97:10 98:15 105:2,5 107:5 108:1 108:8,9,24 109:4,8 111:10,17 140:13 143:18,20,22,23 144:4 148:18 151:8 163:5 166:7,16 167:9,10,11,17,21 167:23 169:5 171:7</p>	<p>172:11,21 173:3,14 177:14,21 178:4,14 178:24 183:9 184:4 185:16 186:17 187:8,10 190:11,16 191:5 193:3 194:11 214:22 215:3 timeframe 13:20 14:4 36:14 timeline 59:19 157:1 times 94:9 119:21 125:6 129:23 149:24 150:1 158:4 197:25 198:1 206:16 timescales 15:1 timing 154:18 tiny 120:14 title 135:14 today 15:15 96:5 104:14 108:20 115:12 122:20 123:3 147:2 148:21 162:6,11 164:4,14 164:20 165:3 166:7 184:3 208:23 together 7:6 47:8 61:14 67:16 111:7 112:4 130:23 205:8 205:14 211:14 212:4 told 14:9 tomorrow 209:2,13,16 213:11 214:2,21 215:15 top 2:9 11:7,9 35:24 36:1 76:7 81:11,14 88:13 91:24 96:17 97:3,8 128:16 135:13 174:8 177:1 195:24 topic 211:3,4 topics 88:6 total 34:22 101:9 116:10 124:4 134:22,25 135:17 214:11 totalled 110:12 173:24 totals 128:10 towards 32:5 117:10 track 24:21 traded 175:18 tranches 67:23 transaction 60:11,18 68:13 70:4 80:17 147:22 148:7,11 149:7,9,16 158:19 162:17,20 163:7,10 163:12 164:3 167:11,24 168:5,17 170:11 172:1,3,9,11 172:13,17,18,21,25 173:3 176:12 182:16,22 183:10 187:2,19 188:4 transactions 58:19 59:20 147:4 150:9</p>	<p>157:3,19,23 158:13 162:6,9,13,17,19,21 163:16 165:10,21 187:25 188:3 189:4 189:10,12,13,17 transcript 1:24 2:19 37:25 158:17 210:4 212:14 213:22,23 transcripts 2:16 transfer 53:7 translated 188:17 translations 2:18 transport 32:8 trap 5:23 83:4 trapped 113:19 traps 99:7,17,25 treated 22:5,13,15 166:1 treating 185:4 tree 42:21 105:17 trees 57:24 141:16 trend 64:8 65:17 89:11,12 97:16 trends 20:3,4,7,8 89:10 Tribunal 1:22,23 3:7 3:8,9,10,11,12,14 3:15,19,20,24,25 4:6,7,8,9,10,12 1:21 1:23 2:3,8 3:10 5:5 13:23 40:6 52:7 83:16 88:1 141:10 145:20 146:5 157:3 171:25 172:7 184:13 200:13 207:22 209:2,3 213:21 Tribunal's 2:12,22 125:11 146:22 tried 54:19 118:22 127:4 triggers 27:24 Trinidad 5:10 trouble 148:8 truck 36:21 true 94:23 107:7 118:1 148:4,25 163:8 172:1 206:19 try 31:23 77:15 93:16 113:24 137:7 160:23 173:7,10 trying 2:10 17:16 18:10 20:12 21:21 73:3 86:4 89:23 92:22 95:15 107:24 110:15 112:8 115:1 118:17 141:23 160:22 206:24 207:15 tubing 7:4 Tuesday 1:8 1:1 Tunisia 63:18 Turkmenistan 5:10 turn 27:21 72:17 97:25 102:17 106:23 119:13 123:8 124:10 134:7</p>	<p>135:12 147:13 157:7 167:24 174:6 179:2,21 180:7 181:11 189:20,24 191:14,21 201:19 212:10 turned 27:12 turning 9:8 106:22 112:18 Tushingam 2:3 1:10 1:22 3:6,8,13 215:9 Twenty 2:3 twice 14:15 two 2:6,9,15 4:11 5:12 6:1 9:15 11:20 14:15 19:13 20:7,8 22:13 31:3 36:11,15 38:3,6 44:9 49:2 56:6 60:11 61:18,19 61:23 75:25 80:13 87:4 93:24 94:19 95:13 97:7 100:22 103:7,21 104:22,23 112:11 116:10,14 131:23 132:11 133:14 135:23 139:3,5,8 142:14 144:22 145:18 146:6 152:4 153:5 162:17,21,24 174:15 175:2 180:16 187:18,25 192:2 198:20 201:14 211:5 two-way 107:5 109:3 TWT 107:8,8 type 6:22 13:4 36:24 63:19 69:25 212:1 types 7:14 16:5</p>
U					<p>UK 30:8 ultimate 7:6 22:21 25:18 ultimately 20:12 24:1 26:25 130:8 unable 206:12 unattainable 43:21 unaudited 204:9,10 204:25 unaware 155:2 unbiased 167:19 uncertain 203:12 uncertainty 18:11 155:11,12,12 182:4 uncontroversial 37:2 under 1:1 4:16 7:15 27:17 39:13 41:2 46:7,18 56:10 61:19 91:21 93:18 107:7 153:8 163:11 172:6 180:7,8 211:1 underappraised 49:15 undergo 27:18 underlie 89:8 underlying 81:24 82:13 91:25 92:11</p>

<p>99:5,7,11,20 100:8 182:2 underneath 99:20 126:5 underpinned 72:3 73:15 understand 16:24 17:8,15 19:14 20:25 21:3,16,22 22:15 27:20 36:22 37:24 39:7,12 42:14 48:24 69:5,14,17 70:2 74:8,16 75:3,18 76:19,20 80:2 81:4 85:15 86:4 97:10 98:21 99:19 100:17 108:16 110:4 112:12,13 116:20 141:13,19 143:12 143:12 161:19 163:13 168:4 170:11 185:3 186:12,21 192:22 193:1,12 203:16 204:1 208:10 209:9 understanding 12:18 37:18 142:1 163:11 175:11 176:18 understood 26:18 110:15 142:25 170:14 undertake 16:22 25:10 139:6 140:7 undertaken 5:13 14:23 18:13 27:2 47:16 75:9 76:3 95:2 111:20 165:9 undertaking 38:17 undertook 9:10 18:15 undeveloped 152:22 undiscounted 149:6 undiscovered 41:22 42:1,10 45:7 undoubtedly 59:2 unexpected 64:11 unified 67:19 unknown 154:19 unless 214:15 unlikely 45:1 98:10 unreasonable 43:17 43:21 unreliability 206:4 unreliable 147:9 154:4 203:23 204:8 205:16 206:13 208:15,18 unrisked 63:24 64:3 64:23 76:1,13 195:18,22 196:11 197:6,12,14,15,17 197:20 198:21 unsubstantiated 147:10 unsupported 156:1 until 111:12 121:15 144:10 149:23 150:1 155:2 163:25</p>	<p>166:1 167:11,12 215:19 unusual 43:16 uplift 12:18 upside 190:6 upstream 5:7 88:5 upwards 148:3 use 25:14 28:6 30:12 53:5 57:9 60:7 63:12,13 65:18 73:18 74:22 77:1 78:2 85:18 107:14 115:19 121:16 125:22 126:2,11 130:9 136:16,17 150:19,22 152:9 157:15 161:22,23 187:19 189:11 192:6,17,18 202:23 205:17 206:17 used 6:15 7:9,13,15,17 7:22 14:18 20:22 23:10 29:6 44:20 50:21 57:9,14,22 58:19 73:10 80:11 80:13 83:19 84:17 91:13 94:5 107:10 110:1 116:3,23 117:15 120:13 125:8,16,18 126:23 147:23 151:19 158:25 159:2 190:14 192:19 195:13 196:1,24 201:16 203:22 useful 156:19 uses 74:15 76:4 95:2 151:15 192:21 194:8 using 7:3 8:5 9:3,6 12:15 13:12,21 53:7 53:9 57:10 65:22 71:2 73:5 74:18,25 75:16,17 79:1,7 83:19 84:21 95:19 121:6,8,12 122:21 123:1 149:17 152:10 158:22 164:8 167:10 191:16 193:19,22 194:2,10 195:1 197:16 usually 29:13 40:3,21 41:23 45:5 52:20,22 53:5 utilise 39:5 40:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>v 1:16 155:6 156:8 vaguely 21:15 valid 11:23 101:21 105:22 validity 109:9 VALMIN 71:12 73:8 valuable 185:21 198:24 valuation 57:5,8 58:9</p>	<p>58:15,25 59:3,11,15 61:20 62:19 63:11 63:11 64:1 65:23 68:11 71:9,19 73:2 73:21 74:18,20 75:2 75:3,18 76:21 77:23 78:11,25 79:6,19 82:5 83:9,17 84:25 85:19,22 86:5 147:23 149:16 150:14,17,20,25 151:4,15,18,25 152:1,16,20,25 157:15 158:6,14,19 158:21,22,25 160:21 164:7 167:6 171:6 172:4 186:20 187:11,12,13,14,15 188:24 190:15 191:8,10 199:6,14 200:21 valuations 58:18,21 191:14,24 203:7 valued 151:10 values 6:16 64:9 74:13 75:17,19 77:20,25 77:25 85:5,10 147:25 148:3 149:18 150:6 value/2P 64:13 various 31:17 102:9 vast 13:3 113:12 122:16 verifiable 142:16 verification 10:21 205:10 verified 205:24 version 95:12 versus 11:9 91:19 vertical 63:9 very 1:11,16 2:7 4:25 12:10 13:23 15:4,11 16:11 21:13 24:14 24:15 25:2 46:4 49:25 54:25 55:1 56:23 57:16 59:23 67:17 78:1,18 86:8 86:17 88:22 92:19 93:8,11 94:10 102:22 103:6,13 104:6 105:7 107:3 115:25 118:13 119:2 120:13,22 125:9 139:15 140:3 142:6,6 143:13,17 146:6 174:19 177:8 186:5,16 197:5 203:12 206:21 215:5,16 via 7:4 32:11 34:8 viable 39:19 113:19 115:1 video 2:21 view 13:9 76:9 91:20 94:7 104:15,18 105:5 111:16 125:4 125:21 133:5 143:7</p>	<p>143:10 162:1 163:20 165:14,25 167:15,19 200:7 201:18 213:1 215:11 viewed 92:18 views 2:12 167:19 211:22 virtually 127:22 volume 9:17,21 17:11 18:2,5 20:1,2,2,6 25:22,23 57:21 58:4 59:3,4,10 63:24,25 64:14,23 76:15,17 76:24 78:16 83:22 83:25 84:20 99:17 120:16,17 124:4 volumes 6:9 17:25 18:14,16 19:20 43:1 43:9 57:10,25,25 65:2,3 75:6,11 76:1 76:2,13,15 95:2 99:10 106:11 123:17 195:18 196:6,11,19,25 197:15,17,18,24 200:22 201:16 voluntary 211:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>WACCs 159:24 wait 98:5 169:11 waiting 87:15 walk 26:7,21 27:1 29:24 walkway 23:6 want 23:12 26:7,21,25 31:7 41:5 43:23 46:1 51:23 52:21 55:4 58:18 68:20 69:3 70:23 81:7 82:2 83:6 119:8 129:13 130:9 140:15 141:24 174:4 175:9 185:3 211:6,11 214:15 wanted 27:5 119:10 140:20 142:24 wasn't 15:20 17:6 81:6 83:7 100:9 106:6 111:4 water 8:2,19 way 18:3 19:14 78:1 78:18 95:24 100:14 105:25 123:2 124:12 126:8 134:2 136:12 143:2,3 155:15 159:6 160:13 187:21 195:1 200:23 ways 142:8 153:5 weeds 196:3 week 211:19 weighted 65:18 151:19 152:11 wellbore 12:16 wellhead 28:18 29:14</p>	<p>wells 6:1 8:21,25 11:10,15,16,17 12:4 12:7,9,11,14 13:2,4 13:8 18:21 20:17 21:9 22:19,23 34:21 34:23,25 35:3 36:15 36:18,19 37:6 38:13 38:19,19 48:7,8,19 49:2,4,23 61:18,19 61:24 62:10 90:19 90:23 91:4,5,16 92:9 96:1,6,8,9,12 96:15,23 102:13 103:7,8 113:13,25 114:2,15,17,25 117:12 122:16,19 122:24 123:12,17 123:21 125:13,16 125:18,21 126:11 126:24 127:12,14 127:19,22,23 128:2 128:6,8,10,10,14,18 129:3,10,12 130:5 132:11 139:4,5,8 well's 127:7 well-defined 105:23 well-drilling 26:4 well-enough 91:21 went 42:23 weren't 38:20 western 117:8,11 we'll 3:9 25:23 38:23 68:12 86:15 117:20 144:6 175:8 215:14 we're 24:4 31:5,7,20 31:23 33:15 42:3 44:10 45:24 59:24 62:25 63:8 86:22 87:15 88:8 89:24 90:23 98:1 102:19 115:13 119:25 144:12 148:8 171:24 176:1 182:14,18 183:23 192:15 195:8 198:15,18,20 199:9 199:10 201:8 202:3 203:13 208:7 211:25 212:2 214:19 we've 1:12 18:13 20:9 27:22 88:2 91:3 95:11,17,19 100:7 109:11,23 124:20 130:1,12 157:14 165:18 166:5 183:3 195:20 199:7 211:23 whichever 95:24 while 26:16 28:1 29:22 90:7 181:11 whole 17:23 22:10 37:1 38:7 99:17 101:11 113:17 118:10 129:25 132:17 136:9 137:17 170:21</p>	<p>180:25 wholly 156:1 183:8 WHYTE 2:14 wide 7:14 willing 143:6 172:6,6 willingness 141:19 142:22 183:2 window 99:22 wish 77:21 86:10 119:7 211:8 215:7 215:14 wished 111:5 witness 26:13 55:11 60:19 86:11 87:7 169:10 170:18 172:15 witnesses 145:1,2 wonder 1:11 wondering 214:20 word 140:5 206:18 wording 187:5 words 63:25 65:2 76:23 141:23 work 3:12 6:4 34:4,5 38:9 75:8 76:1,3,5 76:12,12 83:21 99:2 99:4,5 137:25 142:2 143:2 159:2 165:8 168:13 170:1,3 189:19 206:10 worked 107:16 206:9 working 88:5 works 12:5 world 141:24 163:25 worldwide 5:14 worry 125:10 worse 96:24 worth 69:21 78:15,18 78:22 82:4,8,25 83:7 128:7 149:5 150:5,25 153:17 184:8,17 191:1,4 200:12 201:1 wouldn't 45:1 82:1 96:13 101:9 111:15 111:15 122:5 123:9 124:1 181:22 wrap 213:18 wrestling 18:10 written 210:8 wrong 79:17 171:21 191:2,2,6,7 197:25 198:18 199:23 209:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>Xodus 4:1 x2 12:18 x3 12:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>YA 177:4 179:6 year 4:9 13:7,7 38:7,7 162:22 178:25 180:12 182:18,19 182:24 183:7,8,14 184:9</p>
--	---	---	--	---	---

<p>years 5:7 9:23 12:24 19:13 36:11,15 38:3 38:6 60:15 88:4 90:23 95:13 96:23 96:24 121:19 122:17,18 123:23 163:21 164:3,6 165:25 168:22 188:21,23 year-end 182:20 yellow 10:12 25:3 97:5 yesterday 21:12 90:3 90:14 91:19 92:8,23 93:1 94:4,12 117:2 130:17 137:6 166:8 213:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <p>Zborov 133:24 134:12 135:13,21 136:15 136:15 zoom 81:10 141:14 ZUZANA 2:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Š</p> <p>Števec 213:7 214:6,8 214:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">\$</p> <p>\$0.15 64:2 \$1 184:12 \$1.1 147:7 153:2 \$1.29 147:20 \$1.44 152:13 200:17 \$1.66 148:1 \$1.82 147:25 \$10.1 61:20 \$11.9 152:16 \$133 58:10 68:9 \$2 147:5 153:8 181:10 184:12 \$3 180:13 \$3.2 177:3 \$3.7 149:10,22 \$30 80:23 81:2 \$36 64:18 68:11 73:21 74:3,19 75:4 76:21 78:15,18,22 151:25 158:10 199:7 \$4.375 64:14 74:11,25 151:22 \$4.375/boe 75:16 \$40,000 151:4 197:22 \$400,000 198:1,19 \$46 155:17 \$5 155:20 \$5.15 147:19 \$5.2 149:19 \$5.7 149:18 \$60 184:17 \$61 149:5 \$7.6 153:14 \$800,000 177:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>0.5 153:1</p>	<p>0.6 151:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>1 1:5 3:3 37:16 65:11 98:2 147:2 189:24 192:24 1b 11:21,24 12:13 1,000 11:15 36:20 93:15 1,200 16:23 1,414 64:3 1,414,000,000 63:22 146:17 1,577,000,000 146:15 146:16 1.02 141:9 1.07 144:9 1.1 200:3 1.44 152:16 1.8 60:9 10 11:4 60:3 93:9 115:14 125:5 153:5 198:18,20,21,22 210:24 10-20 129:22 10.00 214:25 10.08 50:15 10.10 52:6 10.15 55:16 10.30 55:18 214:25 215:1,3,15,19 10.31 56:20 10.48 66:1 100% 147:19 103 146:14 107.2 100:24 109 119:13 11 12:3 45:18 53:16 60:19 92:2,3 94:2 110:12,13 153:10 208:11 11-14 211:5 11.1 199:15 11.20 83:15 11.26 86:19 11.35 86:21 11.39 87:23 11.56 97:20 11.9 200:1,2,2 115 23:18,22 12 7:21 12:20 61:17 90:19,23 95:1 112:23 113:2,3 130:19 138:2,2 139:12,22 12% 133:1 120,000 60:6 147:18 149:3 153:23 168:2 171:5 176:2,4 184:16 123 3:24 13 13:17 62:8 95:14 154:23 130,000 185:22 133 154:25 155:20 14 13:6 14:18 87:5 96:4 138:20,25</p>	<p>144:23 155:21 170:19 141 3:25 143 12:13 129:4 144 4:1,2 146 4:3 15 3:6,7 4:8,13,23,24 23:23 55:7,14 56:19 62:19 65:10 87:14 87:22 97:1 146:3 155:24 156:21 15-minute 55:5,8,10 150 9:23 121:19 122:17,18 153,000 153:16,22 156 190:20 157 4:5 16 63:7 64:7 72:8 97:15 102:19 112:23 113:3 124:11,13 134:24 135:2 138:2 156:17 207:14 16% 134:23 136:17 137:17 17 115:14 138:21 17.5 138:10 175 4:6 178 4:7 179 4:8 18 56:8 58:10 70:18 91:23 97:13 109:15 193:2 194:13 185 4:9 1850 125:14 19 64:20 66:5 190:6,8 19p 190:3,16 1910 12:9 1930 12:8 1945 11:12 1946 127:20 1998 91:7 114:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 56:23 66:22 88:6 98:3 147:16 154:3 155:7,8,18 189:24 2b 11:21,24 12:14 2D 91:8 114:6 2P 63:2,6,9,15 78:6,10 78:16 85:9 151:16 151:20 152:8,9,12 194:22 2,000 10:22,22 11:1,3 11:10 2.15 143:19 144:6,10 2.18 144:11 2.22 146:20 2.37 157:8 2.8 154:3 173:24 208:14 20 36:2,2 38:6 42:24 95:20 102:18 111:12 125:5 130:1 191:22 20th 113:6 20,000 95:20</p>	<p>20-plus 90:23 20.6 133:4 138:11 200 129:5,13 200-700 128:25 2000 90:19 2000s 91:9 2008 69:19 169:15 2010 189:22 2011 69:19 169:16 2012 69:22 94:11 131:4,5,6 134:9 166:24 2013 69:23 153:15 2014 69:6 81:18,19,20 109:25 138:22 147:17 153:25 166:19 167:3 168:8 168:21 169:20 170:24 173:24 176:18 182:20 186:15 2015 58:24 59:2 60:6 61:11 109:25 146:13 147:18,22 149:11 153:23 162:13,19,20 163:4 163:5,7 165:9 167:7 168:1 169:20 173:25 176:8 179:3 179:5 182:14,17 188:1,5,6,21 208:5 2016 166:19 167:3 2017 36:5 37:16 38:12 92:1,3 110:1 192:24 2018 36:5 37:7 38:12 187:13 191:17 192:8,16 193:3,20 193:24 2020 154:1 2021 13:7 62:6 2022 4:3,5,12 56:7 95:8 166:25 2023 4:4,6,8,13 56:8 87:5,5 95:9 97:4 144:23,23 187:15 191:19 2024 1:8 1:1 205 4:10 207 4:11,12 31:25 32:2 208 4:13 21 65:16 22 66:16 91:23 109:15 192:2 220,000 12:13 129:4 224.2 46:17 224.7 47:4 48:13 23 124:11,12 203:20 24 169:13 174:6 212:15 24.7 66:19,24 25 212:15 25% 149:14 177:7 180:18 186:20,23 187:1,4,7,16,17,23 26 3:8 201:20 27 5:7 29 23:15 119:15</p>	<p>176:11 179:22 180:8 211:1,2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 3:4 6:8 56:7 57:2 88:11 148:10 179:11 3b 11:25 3,700 128:10 3-4 11:22 129:2 3.2 178:10,10 3.3 177:2 3.47 207:5 3.48 207:21 3.5 147:15 3.7 149:14 30 2:16,20,23 3:1,5 4:12 81:16 111:12 119:21 138:2 176:6 176:7,11,24 179:20 181:7 183:3,6 30% 135:18,20 136:17 137:17 31 87:5 144:23 191:19 318 107:1 32 81:9 105:24 138:20 33 34:23 119:14 139:1 33-35 214:9 338 68:17 339.5 190:11 34 3:9 91:5 181:11 212:14 35 140:10 350 78:2 79:5 147:24 36 35:14,16 65:9 75:19 79:8 83:17 84:19 100:24 151:15 362 159:17 37 3:10 374 73:25 375 72:17 73:20,20 74:10 75:15 76:23 38 3:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> <p>4 6:24 57:7 89:2 138:2 138:3 149:7 199:1 212:14 214:9 4% 155:18,19,24 156:5,7 4,000 10:25 125:13 4.02 215:18 4.375 75:12 40 18:19,21,21 19:11 20:1,17,21 36:4,15 36:19 37:6,21 38:13 88:4 91:18 92:4,12 96:6,9,12 100:4 101:9 109:12 110:2 112:7 120:15 40% 154:25 155:3,3,4 155:7,8 400 11:20 128:24 129:7,21 400,000 95:22 42 3:12 43 13:8</p>	<p>44 190:23,24 45 13:8 176:25 46 155:18 47 53:13,16,18,19 48 102:17,20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 1:8 3:5 7:13 17:3 57:19 68:16 89:22 98:1,7 130:20 150:8 155:7,8 5% 203:11 5-1 35:14 5-10 65:5 152:23 200:5 201:10,12 202:20 203:13 5.10 68:12 5.28.6 72:8 5.8 176:18 177:24 50 3:13 170:19,20 50% 62:10 93:1 149:12,21 150:4 186:18 187:9,11,22 50/50 42:25 150:2 500 32:12 500,000 10:5 51 3:14 51-101 138:15 52 3:15 154:7 171:3 53 31:25 146:8 155:1 155:32:17 55.5 32:19 56 3:16,17 57 45:13 59 106:23,25 107:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>6 1:1 8:15 58:9 90:16 134:19,19 150:11 6th 1:8 6% 133:1 61 109:16 62 207:14,15 64 146:9 191:22 65% 149:25 66 3:18 34:23 124:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>7 9:8 64:18 90:25 151:2 191:17 192:8 192:16 193:3,20,24 197:21 7BQ 1:6 7.5 133:3,11,22 138:11 70 203:19 700 129:9 71.5 12:5 72 70:17,19 71:7 73 12:6 73,000 128:3 737 209:7 75 32:18 99:15 75km 32:12 77 3:19 770 13:9 91:8 169:15 78 179:3</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

<p>8</p> <p>8 9:20 17:2,9 58:22 91:18 101:1 130:2 134:19 151:5 152:2 210:23</p> <p>8.24 64:17</p> <p>8.59 1:2</p> <p>80 32:14</p> <p>80% 149:23</p> <p>800 11:19</p> <p>800,000 178:10</p> <p>820 13:3</p> <p>83 3:20 180:7</p> <p>86 3:21</p> <p>87 3:22</p> <p>87% 11:14 12:4 127:19</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 1:4 10:20 17:2 58:25 92:11 99:16 169:10 169:12 199:23,25 210:23</p> <p>9b 11:25</p> <p>9% 94:13 133:1 201:24</p> <p>9.02 3:17</p> <p>9.04 5:2</p> <p>9.19 15:9 202:9</p> <p>9.30 213:16</p> <p>90 3:2</p> <p>90% 12:7 201:24</p> <p>9000 24:20</p> <p>91 134:10</p> <p>94 159:14</p> <p>95 159:17</p> <p>96% 11:19 127:24</p> <p>97 3:23 72:18</p> <p>977 11:17 12:3</p> <p>99 34:20,23,25 48:8 49:2,23 72:17 96:8 96:15,23</p>					
---	--	--	--	--	--