

**Part 3**

10:46:11 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:46:14 2

experience and their perspectives to try to

10:46:17 3

provide some suggestion, guidance,

10:46:20 4

recommendations back to management as to how to

10:46:25 5

deal with this inventory of volumes that looked

10:46:25 6

troublesome.

10:46:28 7

Q. As part of your role in Project

10:46:31 8

Rockford, were you ever asked whether or not

10:46:33 9

various -- certain volumes of proved reserves

10:46:36 10

should be de-booked?

10:46:44 11

A. Continuing on with that -- with that

10:46:46 12

discussion, yeah, I mean part of what I would

10:46:48 13

say is when they brought a set of circumstances

10:46:51 14

in front of me, I could apply -- I could say

10:46:54 15

well, were this in the US, this is how we would

10:46:56 16

treat it. And when they brought a set of

10:46:58 17

circumstances that was indeed complete and

10:47:01 18

conclusive, well, then my answer would have been

10:47:03 19

in the US we would have done this.

10:47:06 20

But again, that had to be put in the

10:47:08 21

context of an international setting, and others

10:47:12 22

had to assist with judgments of things I didn't

10:47:14 23

know about how international situation may be

10:47:17 24

different from my experiences in the US.

25

Q. Do you recall any of the specific

10:47:20 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:47:25 2

OUs for which you recommended volumes of proved

10:47:27 3

reserves be de-booked?

10:47:29 4

MR. SMITH: Objection to form. Lack

10:47:36 5

of foundation.

10:47:44 6

A. The two that I remember are there

10:47:46 7

were -- and I don't remember individual field

10:47:48 8

names, just the circumstances -- there were some

10:47:55 9

circumstances in Nigeria where it appeared that

10:47:58 10

projects, once planned, were not then going to

10:48:05 11

be done, and in a situation like that in the US,

10:48:07 12

it wasn't in our plan, we weren't planning to do

10:48:10 13

it, we would have removed the volumes.

10:48:11 14

There were some situations in Oman

10:48:17 15

where the volume estimates were based on very

10:48:23 16

immature project understandings, without really

10:48:25 17

a clear and specific plan for how those volumes

10:48:28 18

would be developed and produced.

10:48:29 19

And again, if that occurred in the

10:48:34 20

US, then I would feel uncomfortable with calling

10:48:36 21

those proved reserves. They wouldn't seem to

10:48:37 22

meet the criteria.

10:48:40 23

Q. Did you do any work in connection

10:48:43 24

with Gorgon as part of the efforts in Project

25

Rockford?

10:48:43 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:48:45 2

A. No. Not actually. I had very

10:48:48 3

little contact with it.

10:48:51 4

Q. With respect to the reserves that

10:48:54 5

you looked at in Nigeria, was that in connection

10:48:57 6

with the SPDC OU?

10:48:58 7

A. Yes, it was.

10:49:01 8

Q. Do you recall the approximate volume

10:49:05 9

of proved reserves at issue?

10:49:12 10

A. I don't remember an exact number,

10:49:12 11

no.

10:49:15 12

Q. Do you recall if proved reserves

10:49:18 13

were actually de-booked in connection with SPDC,

10:49:20 14

at the conclusion of Project Rockford?

10:49:21 15

A. Yes, I believe they were.

10:49:24 16

Q. Do you recall the volume of --

10:49:24 17

A. No, I don't.

10:49:35 18

Q. During the course of your efforts in

10:49:40 19

connection with Project Rockford, did you ever

10:49:45 20

consider whether the various issues that called

10:49:49 21

into question, in your mind, the viability of --

10:49:53 22

or the propriety of the reserves bookings at

10:49:58 23

SPDC should have come to light in a group audit?

10:50:02 24

MR. SMITH: Objection to form.

25

A. Could you ask the question again,

10:50:04 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:50:04 2

please?

10:50:06 3

Q. I'll rephrase the question. Sure.

10:50:08 4

While you were looking or reviewing

10:50:10 5

the proved reserves bookings at SPDC, did it

10:50:15 6

ever occur to you that some of the issues or

10:50:19 7

problems to those reserves should have come to

10:50:21 8

light in a group audit?

10:50:22 9

MR. SMITH: Objection to form. Lack

10:50:28 10

of foundation.

10:50:34 11

A. Given my relative inexperience with

10:50:38 12

the group audit structure, and how it was done,

10:50:40 13

other than the single example that I had in the

10:50:42 14

US, it was difficult for me to conclude what

10:50:46 15

should or should not have been done in that

10:50:48 16

audit structure.

10:50:54 17

Q. Were you ever asked whether the

10:50:59 18

problems with the proved reserves at SPDC should

10:51:03 19

have been picked up or caught during the group

10:51:05 20

audit?

10:51:07 21

A. I don't recall that being asked.

10:51:07 22

No.

10:51:12 23

Q. Did you ever indicate to anybody

10:51:17 24

that you thought there were issues that came

25

up -- withdrawn.

10:51:17 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:51:19 2

Did you ever indicate to anybody

10:51:23 3

that any of the problem issues connected to the

10:51:27 4

proved reserves at SPDC should have been brought

10:51:30 5

to light in a group audit?

10:51:31 6

MR. SMITH: Objection to form.

10:51:42 7

A. I don't recall that I did. No.

10:51:45 8

Q. I would like now, sir, to direct

10:51:48 9

your attention to the page ending with Bates

10:51:53 10

number 069.

10:51:58 11

A. 069. I have it.

10:52:02 12

Q. Directing your attention to the

10:52:08 13

fourth paragraph from the bottom of the page,

10:52:09 14

beginning with the words "stricter application

10:52:10 15

of SEC guidelines."

10:52:11 16

Do you see that, sir?

10:52:12 17

A. I see it.

10:52:15 18

Q. Mr. Barendregt talks about stricter

10:52:18 19

application of the SEC guidelines and revision

10:52:21 20

of the group guidelines and the effect they had

10:52:32 21

on SNEPCO -- well, in connection with Bonga and

10:52:34 22

Erha.

10:52:35 23

Do you know what Mr. Barendregt was

10:52:38 24

referring to there when he references stricter

25

application of SEC guidelines?

10:52:53 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:52:54 2

A. He makes reference to stricter

10:53:00 3

application of SEC guidelines and consequent

10:53:02 4

revision of group guidelines. Exactly what he

10:53:04 5

was referring to, what sections or what change,

10:53:09 6

I don't know.

10:53:11 7

Q. If I could ask you now, sir, to turn

10:53:16 8

to page 071.

10:53:18 9

A. 071, okay. All right.

10:53:23 10

Q. A little bit from the top of the

10:53:25 11

page you'll see number 7, Reasonable Certainty

10:53:27 12

of Development. Do you see that, sir?

10:53:28 13

A. I see it.

10:53:30 14

Q. Mr. Barendregt writes, "During 2001

10:53:34 15

the SEC re-clarified their interpretation of the

10:53:38 16

FASB rules regarding the booking of proved

10:53:45 17

reserves" -- references -- or "(Refs 4.5)."

10:53:48 18

Do you know what Mr. Barendregt is

10:53:51 19

referring to when he talks about the

10:53:56 20

re-clarification of the interpretation of FASB

10:53:59 21

rules?

10:54:01 22

A. I'm not sure I know exactly what he

10:54:05 23

was referring to, but given the date of 2001,

10:54:07 24

and our discussions yesterday about the March

25

2001 guidance that the SEC has made available, I

10:54:10 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:54:13 2

think it's logical to speculate that that's what

10:54:13 3

he meant.

10:54:18 4

Q. Are you referencing the -- we looked

10:54:21 5

at yesterday an exhibit that was the proposed,

10:54:22 6

or draft --

10:54:26 7

A. Yes. Finalized with a March 2001

10:54:28 8

version that expanded the draft we saw

10:54:31 9

yesterday, and that's what the official guidance

10:54:35 10

was, that was prepared. Now, whether that's

10:54:37 11

exactly what he meant here or if he meant

10:54:40 12

something else, I don't know.

10:54:42 13

Q. The next sentence in that paragraph

10:54:44 14

reads: "One of the stipulations was that proved

10:54:47 15

reserves could only be booked for projects whose

10:54:51 16

development was not subject to 'reasonable

10:54:59 17

doubt.'"

10:54:59 18

A. I see that.

10:55:03 19

Q. Okay. Based on your understanding

10:55:08 20

of the SEC rules, could proved reserves have

10:55:12 21

ever have been booked for projects that were

10:55:14 22

subject to a reasonable doubt?

10:55:16 23

MR. SMITH: Objection to form.

10:55:30 24

A. Well, certainly it's clear from the

25

SEC rules, especially from my understanding of



10:55:35 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:55:38 2

how they were applied within SEPCO, which is the

10:55:39 3

basis of my knowledge at that time, that

10:55:42 4

reasonable certainty was required. Exactly what

10:55:46 5

Anton means here by "reasonable doubt," he

10:55:49 6

doesn't define. So whether reasonable doubt is

10:55:52 7

enough to mean you're not reasonably certain, or

10:55:54 8

there's some doubt and you can still be

10:55:56 9

reasonably certain, is unclear. I'm not sure I

10:55:58 10

know exactly what he's meaning by the statement.

10:56:12 11

Q. If I could now direct your attention

10:56:17 12

to page 073 of that document, sir.

10:56:19 13

A. 073. All right. I have that.

10:56:24 14

Q. Number 11, it's toward the top of

10:56:27 15

the page, the second numeral down, reads Group

10:56:30 16

Guidelines - first time booking of new fields.

10:56:31 17

Do you see that, sir?

10:56:32 18

A. Yes, I do.

10:56:36 19

Q. If you look at that first paragraph,

10:56:39 20

and if you would just read that to yourself,

10:56:46 21

you'll see that Mr. Barendregt indicates that

10:56:49 22

all major projects of VAR 3 would need to be

10:56:51 23

passed before a -- before proved reserves could

10:56:58 24

be booked, and references FID in connection with

25

new gas markets.

10:57:04 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:57:05 2

My question -- well, let me know

10:57:07 3

when you're done reading that paragraph. I'm

10:57:07 4

sorry.

10:57:22 5

(Witness reviewing document.)

10:57:24 6

A. Okay. I've read the paragraph.

10:57:25 7

Q. Actually. The first sentence in the

10:57:27 8

next paragraph, if you could read that also,

10:57:32 9

where he opines on the VAR 3 review.

10:57:34 10

(Witness reviewing document.)

10:57:42 11

A. I've read it.

10:57:45 12

Q. Yesterday we talked a little about

10:57:49 13

the evolution of the standards under the group

10:57:52 14

guidelines. At some point you indicated that

10:57:55 15

you thought it was VAR 3 and then moved to

10:57:56 16

VAR 4.

10:57:59 17

But we had some trouble in terms of

10:58:02 18

the timing, I guess. Does this help refresh

10:58:07 19

your recollection as to when a VAR 3 was

10:58:09 20

appropriate as a milestone for the booking of

10:58:13 21

proved reserves?

10:58:15 22

A. The date of this document, I

10:58:19 23

believe, was early '03, so it would be looking

10:58:24 24

back at reviews done in '02. From that I would

25

conclude that the VAR 3 standard was in place

10:58:27 1

RODNEY SIDLE

10:58:33 2

with the 2002 guideline document, and that

10:58:36 3

subsequent changes to higher levels of VAR came

10:58:36 4

later.

10:58:40 5

Q. If you go back to the document, the

10:58:44 6

third paragraph under 11, Mr. Barendregt

10:58:50 7

recommends passage of -- I'm sorry -- yeah,

10:58:52 8

passage of FID, or another strong public

10:58:58 9

commitment by the OU concerning development as a

10:58:59 10

milestone.

10:59:07 11

My question is: Do you recall,

10:59:10 12

prior to 2004, whether or not the group

10:59:14 13

guidelines ever required passing of FID as a

10:59:16 14

milestone before proved reserves could be

10:59:17 15

booked?

10:59:25 16

A. Well, we know they didn't have it in

10:59:31 17

2002, so prior to 2004, it would only mean 2003,

10:59:33 18

and I would have to go look at the guidelines in

10:59:36 19

2003 and see whether it occurred there or later.

10:59:38 20

Q. Throughout this period SEPCO

10:59:41 21

required FID as a milestone prior to the booking

10:59:44 22

of proved reserves on major projects. Correct?

10:59:45 23

A. That's what we discussed yesterday.

10:59:46 24

That is correct.

25

Q. Do you know why it was that SEPCO

10:59:53 1  
10:59:58 2  
11:00:00 3  
11:00:03 4  
11:00:09 5  
11:00:10 6  
11:00:14 7  
11:00:20 8  
11:00:24 9  
11:00:28 10  
11:00:31 11  
11:00:35 12  
11:00:42 13  
11:00:45 14  
11:00:46 15  
11:00:51 16  
11:00:53 17  
11:00:55 18  
11:00:59 19  
11:01:02 20  
11:01:06 21  
11:01:10 22  
11:01:12 23  
11:01:15 24  
25

RODNEY SIDLE

utilized FID as a milestone for major projects  
in connection with proved reserves bookings?

A. Yes, I do. Yes, I do. Our  
experiences in developing the deepwater Gulf of  
Mexico were such that the projects were  
extremely costly, literally a billion or  
billions of dollars, and at the time that SEPCO  
was entering into the developments in the  
deepwater portion of the Gulf of Mexico, crude  
oil prices and natural gas prices were at a  
particularly weak state. So the economics of  
those ventures were challenged, given the cost  
that it -- that it would require.

Because of that, there was  
considerable uncertainty with the new projects,  
whether or not they really would be funded by  
the corporation, because of the questions of  
profitability. And so the leadership at the  
time said well, we can't be certain that these  
very costly projects with challenged economics  
will be approved, just because we think there  
are good technical opportunities, we must wait  
until we're certain the corporation is going to  
approve this massive expenditure before we say

11:01:17 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:01:19 2

there is reasonable certainty and we go ahead.

11:01:21 3

11:01:23 4

11:01:26 5

And it was that experience in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico that led to the rule for very major projects, we need FID.

11:01:41 6

Q. Did SEPCO ever change that standard?

11:01:52 7

11:01:54 8

11:01:58 9

11:02:03 10

11:02:08 11

11:02:10 12

11:02:12 13

11:02:13 14

A. For the very large projects like TLP deepwater development, no, they never did. We recognize that there were smaller projects that were more routine, where that particular level of uncertainty wasn't the same, and so for smaller projects, then, we still required reasonable certainty, but we didn't necessarily require FID.

11:02:52 15

Q. Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

11:02:53 21

(Sidle Exhibit 12, series of e-mails with attached booklet, EP Global Processes - Hydrocarbon Resource Volume Management, April 2003, was marked for identification.)

11:02:53 22

11:02:53 23

BY MR. MacFALL:

11:02:55 24

25

Q. Mr. Sidle, you've just been handed a document that has been marked for identification

11:02:57 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:02:59 2

as Sidle Exhibit 12. I would like you to take a

11:03:01 3

look at it, sir, and tell me if you recognize

11:03:52 4

it.

11:05:31 5

(Witness reviewing document.)

11:05:32 6

A. I reviewed the document.

11:05:35 7

Q. Do you recognize these series of

11:05:38 8

e-mails -- or this series of e-mails, sir?

11:05:40 9

A. Yes, I do.

11:05:48 10

Q. And for the record, the document is

11:05:48 11

an e-mail string with the last of which is an

11:05:48 12

e-mail from Mr. Sidle to John Pay dated April 4,

11:05:54 13

2003. The subject is Organization Option:

11:05:58 14

Reserves Manager.

11:05:59 15

Mr. Sidle, I would like specifically

11:06:03 16

to direct your attention to the second e-mail

11:06:05 17

that appears on the first page of the document,

11:06:10 18

which is an e-mail from you dated April 4, 2003

11:06:17 19

to Gaurdie Banister, John Haines, Aidan McKay,

11:06:21 20

Bob Jefferis, Rob Ryan and Charlie Williams. Do

11:06:21 21

you have that, sir?

11:06:22 22

A. I do.

11:06:24 23

Q. First, could you identify Mr., or

11:06:25 24

Ms. Banister?

25

A. Mr. Banister --

11:06:26 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:06:27 2

Q. Thank you.

11:06:29 3

A. -- at that time was the

11:06:31 4

engineering -- the technical leader of the SEPCO

11:06:34 5

organization.

11:06:37 6

Q. Mr. Haines?

11:06:42 7

A. John Haines was the focal point for

11:06:53 8

the members of SEPCO that participated in the

11:06:57 9

T&OE discipline leads that were part of -- the

11:06:59 10

T&OE organization had dashed lines, if you will,

11:07:03 11

relationships to functional leads in each of --

11:07:08 12

in the OUs. Within SEPCO John Haines was the

11:07:11 13

focal point within SEPCO functional leads who

11:07:14 14

related to an T&OE functional lead.

11:07:17 15

Q. How about Mr. McKay?

11:07:23 16

A. Both Aidan and Bob Jefferis were

11:07:27 17

development managers within SEPCO.

11:07:29 18

Q. Mr. Ryan?

11:07:34 19

A. Rob Ryan was the business support

11:07:37 20

manager within SEPCO.

11:07:39 21

Q. And finally, Mr. Williams?

11:07:42 22

A. Charlie Williams was my supervisor

11:07:44 23

at the time.

11:07:47 24

Q. What position did Mr. Williams hold?

25

A. Let's see. What was his title?

11:07:51 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:08:02 2

(Pause.) Charlie was the manager of

11:08:06 3

a group that provided technical services to

11:08:14 4

SEPCO -- boy, I can't remember the name of it --

11:08:16 5

but I was part of that group. The reserves

11:08:18 6

manager reported to Charlie, who had a

11:08:20 7

collection of other folks that did technical

11:08:22 8

administrative sorts of things to support the

11:08:23 9

business.

11:08:26 10

Q. I would like to direct your

11:08:28 11

attention to the first full paragraph in that

11:08:31 12

second e-mail. You describe a diagram

11:08:35 13

containing an organizational structure with

11:08:42 14

regard to HC resources. Does HC stand for

11:08:42 15

hydrocarbon?

11:08:43 16

A. Yes, it does.

11:08:47 17

Q. You describe the various reporting

11:08:49 18

under that diagram, and you conclude with the

11:08:52 19

sentence, "This has been fine when all we want

11:08:59 20

is reporting of volumes."

11:09:02 21

What is it that you meant to convey

11:09:03 22

in that sentence, sir?

11:09:11 23

A. What this conveyed was my

11:09:17 24

observation that the staffing level and people

25

assigned to reserves, instruction, training,



11:09:23 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:09:26 2

determination, review, capture, reporting -- all

11:09:30 3

of that was limited to such a few number of

11:09:32 4

people that the only effective thing you could

11:09:36 5

do was just capture and report the data; that

11:09:41 6

the other functions of training, consulting,

11:09:45 7

elements like that, the precursors to the

11:09:50 8

capture of data, accurate data, didn't really

11:09:55 9

have people assigned sufficient to fully engage

11:09:58 10

in those responsibilities.

11:10:01 11

Q. Was one of the responsibilities also

11:10:10 12

the assessment of the proved reserves proposed

11:10:15 13

for booking?

11:10:17 14

A. It was a part of that overall

11:10:25 15

process in that it looked at the example that I

11:10:27 16

was familiar with, the role that I had within

11:10:31 17

SEPCO, as a model, saying that there is work

11:10:37 18

that can be done at the local OU level to

11:10:42 19

provide kind of a first order screening, if you

11:10:47 20

will, that could be used in addition to a

11:10:51 21

corporate -- a global audit function, to just

11:10:53 22

provide additional assurance that we had people

11:10:57 23

looking at things and getting it right.

11:11:03 24

Q. In the next paragraph you write:

25

"However, there is evidence to suggest we may

11:11:07 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:11:10 2

need to change our approach."

11:11:11 3

I'm sorry. I'm still on the first

11:11:12 4

page, sir.

11:11:12 5

A. Oh.

11:11:14 6

Q. It's the next paragraph in that same

11:11:15 7

e-mail.

11:11:18 8

A. Mine's on the next page.

11:11:20 9

Q. Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. We

11:11:22 10

have slightly different versions of that same

11:11:24 11

document. Okay. Well, the second paragraph

11:11:25 12

which appears on the second page of the document

11:11:31 13

in front of you states, "However" -- well, I've

11:11:31 14

already read it.

11:11:34 15

By that sentence, did you mean that

11:11:36 16

the approach described in the preceding

11:11:38 17

paragraph was the one that was currently in

11:11:45 18

place within the group?

11:11:50 19

A. What that approach in that sentence

11:11:54 20

refers to is the statement in the prior

11:11:55 21

paragraph that talks about current

11:11:58 22

organizational structure where you have John Pay

11:12:03 23

with links to OU staff, some of which are only

11:12:06 24

part-time resource coordinators. That was the

25

current structure, and that was the approach

11:12:08 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:12:10 2

that I was referring to.

11:12:14 3

Q. You then write, "Consider RRR for

11:12:17 4

2002 impacted by major reserve reduction for

11:12:21 5

volumes booked incorrectly (outside Group and

11:12:27 6

SEC guidelines)," and then it continues.

11:12:33 7

Do you recall what reserve reduction

11:12:35 8

you were referring to in that sentence?

11:12:38 9

A. I don't remember specific ones.

11:12:45 10

This was written in the early part of 2003,

11:12:47 11

about the time that our annual results were

11:12:53 12

being made public for 2002, so I'm sure this

11:12:56 13

refers back to the disclosed values from 2002.

11:13:00 14

Q. Do you recall what the RRR impact

11:13:03 15

was that you reference here?

11:13:12 16

A. I don't recall a numeric value, no.

11:13:14 17

Q. Do you remember if it was an adverse

11:13:15 18

impact?

11:13:16 19

A. Yes. I believe it was an adverse

11:13:17 20

impact.

11:13:20 21

Q. I would like now to direct -- that

11:13:22 22

was the first bullet point that appeared under

11:13:24 23

the sentence "However."

11:13:25 24

I would like now to direct your

25

attention to the third paragraph, you'll see a

11:13:28 1

RODNEY SIDLE

11:13:30 2

star there, "A recent survey."

11:13:31 3

A. Yes.

11:13:34 4

Q. You wrote: "A recent survey of 20

11:13:37 5

larger OUs on reserve reporting processes shows

11:13:40 6

some OUs do not understand the fundamental SEC

11:13:44 7

'proved area' concept (and one OU believes it

11:13:49 8

does not apply to them!)"

11:13:50 9

And then the sentence continues.

11:13:57 10

Now, with respect to that first

11:13:59 11

part, what survey were you referencing in that

11:14:00 12

sentence?

11:14:07 13

A. Okay. It was one that I did, as the

11:14:13 14

focal point for the reserves subgroup of the

11:14:17 15

T&OE reserves functional leads, we broke down

11:14:20 16

into subgroups to address a variety of topics,

11:14:22 17

one being reserves, and I was the chairman of

11:14:27 18

that subgroup -- we developed a list of, I don't

11:14:30 19

remember how many, of 20, 30 questions, just on

11:14:39 20

situations, practices, elements of reserves

11:14:41 21

determination, data capture reporting review,

11:14:44 22

all of those sorts of things, and then several

11:14:48 23

of us called the larger OUs, the people who were

11:14:51 24

the reserves focal points in those, and asked

25

those questions to get their responses.

11:14:54 1  
11:14:56 2  
11:14:58 3  
11:15:02 4  
11:15:04 5  
11:15:06 6  
11:15:09 7  
11:15:10 8  
11:15:12 9  
11:15:15 10  
11:15:19 11  
11:15:22 12  
11:15:25 13  
11:15:28 14  
11:15:30 15  
11:15:33 16  
11:15:36 17  
11:15:37 18  
11:15:40 19  
11:15:44 20  
11:15:46 21  
11:15:47 22  
11:15:53 23  
11:15:55 24  
25

RODNEY SIDLE

Our intent was simply to compare where people were in terms of their depth of understanding, good practices, bad practices, things that we could learn. We had to survey the land -- the landscape for what people need to be educated about before you decide how to train them.

So that was an attempt to get information on a variety of things, and one of the questions related to an understanding of proved area.

Q. Do you recall the OUs -- the specific OUs that did not understand the SEC proved area concept?

A. I don't remember the specific ones, except the one that said it did not apply to them, because I didn't understand that response at that time, but later I came to understand it.

Q. Could you identify the one OU that indicated that it believed it did not apply to them?

A. That was Abu Dhabi.

Q. Did the proved area concept in fact apply to Abu Dhabi?