

PERMANENT COURT OF ARBITRATION
ARBITRATION UNDER ANNEX VII OF THE 1982 UNITED NATIONS
CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

In the Matter of Arbitration Between:

THE REPUBLIC OF MAURITIUS,

and

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT
BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

PCA Reference MU-UK

Volume 9

HEARING ON JURISDICTION AND THE MERITS

Tuesday, May 6, 2014

Pera Palace Hotel
Mesrutiyet Cad. No:52 Tepebasi, Beyoglu
Conference Room Galata II & III
34430, Istanbul-Turkey

The hearing in the above-entitled matter convened at 9:30 a.m. before:

PROFESSOR IVAN SHEARER, Presiding Arbitrator

SIR CHRISTOPHER GREENWOOD, CMG, QC, Arbitrator

JUDGE ALBERT J. HOFFMANN, Arbitrator

JUDGE JAMES KATEKA, Arbitrator

JUDGE RÜDIGER WOLFRUM, Arbitrator

Permanent Court of Arbitration:

MR. BROOKS W. DALY
Registrar
MR. GARTH L. SCHOFIELD
PCA Legal Counsel
MS. FIONA POON
PCA Legal Counsel

Court Reporter:

MR. DAVID A. KASDAN, RDR-CRR
Certified Realtime Reporter (CRR)
Registered Diplomat Reporter (RDR)
Worldwide Reporting, LLP
529 14th Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
+001 202 544 1903
info@wwreporting.com

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Republic of Mauritius:

MR. DHEERENDRA KUMAR DABEE, GOSK, SC
Solicitor-General, Attorney General's Office
Agent of the Republic of Mauritius

MS. ARUNA DEVI NARAIN
Parliamentary Counsel, Attorney-General's Office
Deputy Agent of the Republic of Mauritius

Counsel:

PROFESSOR JAMES CRAWFORD, AC, SC
University of Cambridge

MR. PAUL S. REICHLER
Foley Hoag LLP

PROFESSOR PHILIPPE SANDS, QC
Matrix Chambers, London

MR. ANDREW LOEWENSTEIN
Foley Hoag LLP

MS. ALISON MACDONALD
Matrix Chambers, London

Advisers:

MR. SURESH CHUNDRE SEEBALLUCK, GOSK
Secretary to Cabinet and Head of the Civil Service, Republic of Mauritius

H.E. DR. JAYA NYAMRAJSINGH MEETARBHAN, GOSK
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the
Republic of Mauritius to the United Nations, New York

MS. SHIU CHING YOUNG KIM FAT
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade,
Republic of Mauritius

DR. DOUGLAS GUILFOYLE
University College London

MS. ELIZABETH WILMSHURST
Doughty Street Chambers (academic panel), London

MR. YURI PARKHOMENKO

Legal Researchers:

MR. REMI REICHHOLD
Legal Assistant, Matrix Chambers, London

MR. FERNANDO L. BORDIN

Assistants:

MR. RODRIGO TRANAMIL
MS. NANCY LOPEZ
Foley Hoag, LLP

On behalf of the United Kingdom:

MR. CHRISTOPHER WHOMERSLEY,
Deputy Legal Adviser, Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Agent for the United Kingdom

MS. MARGARET PURDASY
Assistant Legal Adviser, Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Deputy Agent for the United Kingdom

Counsel:

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE DOMINIC GRIEVE, QC MP
Her Majesty's Attorney General

SIR MICHAEL WOOD
20 Essex Street Chambers, London

PROFESSOR ALAN BOYLE
University of Edinburgh and Essex Court Chambers

MR. SAMUEL WORDSWORTH, QC
Essex Court Chambers, London

MS. PENELOPE NEVILL
20 Essex Street Chambers, London

MS. AMY SANDER
Essex Court Chambers, London

Legal Researcher:

MR. ERAN STHOEGER

Advisers:

MS. JO BOWYER

Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London

MS. MINA PATEL

Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London

MS. NEELAM RATTAN

Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London

MS. REBECCA RAYNSFORD

Attorney General's Office, London

MR. DOUGLAS WILSON

Attorney General's Office, London

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PRELIMINARY MATTERS.....	1072
MAURITIUS ARGUMENT ROUND 2:	
STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE REPUBLIC OF MAURITIUS:	
By Mr. Reichler.....	1074
By Professor Crawford.....	1091
By Mr. Loewenstein.....	1101
By Professor Crawford.....	1125
By Mr. Dabee.....	1131

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

3 Just before I ask Mr. Reichler to resume, just a few announcements.

4 I take it that today we will follow the schedule as laid down, and we take two
5 15-minute breaks, and we end at around 13:00.

6 And the second thing is to remind you that we have a photographic session, and I
7 see that some of you have come along with your best ties on, at the end of this morning's session.
8 And the next thing is that, on Thursday, the Tribunal wonders if we should start at half past one,
9 13:30, between 13:30 and 14:00, if it takes that long for Mauritius to reply to the United
10 Kingdom on documents, if that's all right, and then we continue at 14:00 with the UK Argument
11 Round 2.

12 And then, the final thing is that the Tribunal would ask both Parties if they could
13 present their final formal submissions in writing before the close of the Hearing, at the end of
14 this week. That is to avoid any possible discrepancy between your formal statement and the
15 Transcript. We would like to have those in writing, if that's possible.

16 All right. Is there anything else?

17 (Pause.)

18 I think not.

19 No?

20 All right. Yes, Mr. Reichler.

21 MR. REICHLER: Good morning, Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal.

22 First, let me say in response to the President's proposals that everything that you
23 have proposed is perfectly acceptable to Mauritius in terms of scheduling and the written
24 submissions.

1 Before I resume my presentation this morning, I would like to provide Mauritius'
2 answer to one of the questions that Judge Greenwood put last Wednesday – I believe it was
3 addressed to both Parties. This concerned whether the maritime boundaries drawn by Mauritius
4 and the UK around the Chagos Archipelago are, and if I'm quoting the Judge correctly, “roughly
5 the same or is there any significant difference between the two Parties over what maritime
6 entitlement appertains to these islands.” I will be providing Mauritius' answer to this question.

7 There is one other question that Mauritius has not yet answered from the
8 Arbitrators, and that question will be answered during the presentation of Mr. Loewenstein,
9 which follows mine. I believe with that answer, all of the questions that have been put to
10 Mauritius thus far will have been answered.

11 In regard to Judge Greenwood's question regarding maritime boundaries, there are
12 some differences between the EEZ outer limit as drawn by Mauritius and the limit of the
13 Environmental Protection and Preservation Zone, the EPPZ, for the “BIOT” drawn by the United
14 Kingdom. These differences can be seen from the map at Figure 9 of Volume 4 of Mauritius'
15 Memorial, where we have superimposed the UK's EPPZ limit on top of the EEZ limit of
16 Mauritius.

17 The reasons for these differences are substantially the same as those already
18 explained by my good friend Sir Michael Wood in his answer to the question on Thursday last
19 week.

20 First, no median line had been drawn yet by Mauritius with Maldives.

21 Secondly, unlike the UK, Mauritius has, in the northeastern sector, relied on
22 outermost base points taken from Blenheim Reef, as supported, in Mauritius' view, by Article 6
23 of the Convention.

24 Finally, Mauritius has drawn archipelagic baselines in line with Article 47 of the
25 Convention, unlike, it would seem, the UK. We do wish to point out that we do not have the

1 base points relied on by the UK for the purpose of drawing its EPPZ limit around the
2 Archipelago, so there is some uncertainty on our part in regard to exactly where their respective
3 outer limits differ.

4 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Reichler, thank you.

5 The real point I wanted to establish, and I think you and Sir Michael Wood have
6 now established it for us, is that each of the two countries has taken essentially the same position
7 about which land features generate what form of maritime entitlement. There is no difference
8 about what is a rock and what is an island in this case.

9 MR. REICHLER: In terms of that aspect, Judge Greenwood, I think that's
10 correct, but we do rely on base points taken from Blenheim Reef, and the UK appears not to.
11 But I am not sure that differs from the assertion that you have just made about the
12 characterizations under Article 121 of these variety features. They do appear to be the same for
13 both Parties.

14 **THE LEGALLY BINDING CHARACTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM'S**
15 **UNDERTAKINGS AND MAURITIUS' STATUS AS A COASTAL STATE**

16 **PAUL S. REICHLER**

17 **6 MAY 2014**

18 63. Counsel for the United Kingdom argued on Friday that the "MPA" was not a violation of the
19 UK's 1965 undertaking on fishing rights, but a revocation of it.¹ That's an interesting
20 distinction. Where is there an official, or even unofficial, act formally, or even informally,
21 revoking the UK's 1965 undertaking on fishing rights? There is none. The declaration of the
22 "MPA" simply did away with it. Can the UK really argue seriously that a violation of a binding
23 legal obligation, automatically constitutes a lawful revocation of it?

¹ Wordsworth, Day 7, page 860, lines 11-24.

1 64. But let us assume *quod non* that, even whereas here, there was a *quid pro quo* rather than a
2 unilateral declaration, that a non-arbitrary revocation of the UK’s 1965 undertakings could get
3 them off the hook. In the circumstances here, the United Kingdom cannot show that its
4 declaration of an MPA was anything but arbitrary.

5 65. What was the need for a ban on all fishing within 200 M of the Chagos Archipelago? There
6 was none. One would expect, before such a step were taken, that findings would have been
7 made, based on scientific evidence, that there were dangers to coral reefs and inshore fish
8 species, or that there were dwindling stocks of migratory and other ocean species like tuna. No
9 such findings were made. No such evidence existed at the time the “MPA” was declared. To
10 the contrary, for 19 years, between 1991 and 2010, the “BIOT” Administration had in place a
11 200 M Fish Conservation and Management Zone. Its purpose was to prevent overfishing by a
12 licensing system, which it enforced during the entire period. The FCMZ was managed by
13 MRAG, which recommended strongly against a no-take MPA. In regard to inshore fishing,
14 MRAG advised in July 2009: “Catches recently have been below a quarter of the level that
15 could be sustained (10.8% in 2007).”² In regard to ocean fishing, MRAG explained that:
16 “Fixed maritime protected areas (closed areas) are of limited applicability to highly migratory
17 species such as tunas, which, in the Indian Ocean, follow an annual migration around the ocean
18 and are in abundance in the BIOT FCMZ in the period November to February. Instead of
19 providing protection of tunas, the result of closure is likely to be the displacement of the
20 fishing fleets and concentration of fishing elsewhere.”³

² Email dated 9 July 2009 from Development Director of MRAG to Joanne Yeadon, Head of “BIOT”& Pitcairn Section, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, & “MRAG Comments on the proposal to designate the BIOT FCMZ as a marine reserve” at p. 8, MR Annex 137, Round 1 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 5.25.

³ Email dated 9 July 2009 from Development Director of MRAG to Joanne Yeadon, Head of “BIOT”& Pitcairn Section, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, & “MRAG Comments on the proposal to designate the BIOT FCMZ as a marine reserve” at p. 7, MR Annex 137, Round 1 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 5.25.

1 66. Last week, Ms. Nevill took you to a document, which I have included for your convenience at
2 Tab 5.⁴of your folders for my presentation yesterday and this morning. This document is the
3 product of an August 2009 workshop including senior FCO officers and environmental
4 scientists on, as you will see on the first page “Marine conservation...” – does everyone have
5 one? I'm terribly sorry. Might I hand you mine, Judge Hoffman? Did I misstate it? Oh, I'm
6 terribly sorry. I'm terribly sorry. I misread it. I intended to say 5.4. As I said, this is the
7 product of an August 2009 workshop which included senior FCO officers and environmental
8 scientists, and all the names are listed toward the end of the document. The subject, as you
9 can see from the first page “Marine conservation in the BIOT: science issues and
10 opportunities.” There is a section on “Fishery issues,” beginning at our page 97. And in this
11 section, you will see MRAG's objections to the ban on fishing. Because they're rather
12 lengthy, I don't propose to take you through them now, but I am sure the Tribunal will want to
13 read all of this, if you have not already done so. Where I would like to call your attention is to
14 the two concluding paragraphs of the section on fisheries at our page 98. in the right-hand
15 column, at the top of the page, and this follows the discussion of MRAG's criticisms of a
16 no-take Marine Protected Area. And these paragraphs, I quote: “Ultimately the decision on
17 the extent of the open ocean no-take zone within a potential BIOT MPA will be a *political*
18 one.” Not a *scientific* one. Not an *environmental protection* one. A *political* one. And then
19 this: “There is undoubted attractiveness in the simplicity – and greater *presentational* impact –
20 of a large, no-take MPA. For either a scaled-down version or an internally zoned one, more
21 subtle justifications would be needed, with the risk that such options might *appear to be* no
22 different from business-as-usual.”

23 67. Then this: “The workshop also considered the issue of Mauritian fishing rights to be a
24 political one, that could only be resolved by negotiation and international agreement.”

⁴ National Oceanography Centre final report of workshop held on 5-6 August 2009, UKCM Annex 102, UK Arbitration Folder Tab 17.

1 Mauritian fishing rights are here acknowledged. The recommendation is that they be addressed
2 by negotiation and agreement with Mauritius, not a unilateral declaration of a Marine
3 Protected Area, in violation of Mauritius' rights.”

4 68. And finally, there is this: “Full protection of the BIOT area as a no-take MPA would also need
5 to apply to recreational fishing by visiting yachtsmen and on Diego Garcia.”

6 69. Despite this recommendation, we know that an exception was made, excluding Diego Garcia
7 from the MPA's protections.

8 70. Now would you please follow me to Tab 5.5.⁵ And you will see the words of the British High
9 Commissioner in Port Louis, in his communication of 31 March 2010 – that's the day before
10 the “MPA” was suddenly declared – this is a communication addressed to Joanne Yeadon,
11 Colin Roberts and numerous other FCO officials whose names have been redacted, and I refer
12 you to the second paragraph: “The Foreign Secretary should be made aware that the timing
13 could absolutely not be worse locally than to declare a full no-take MPA today. The only thing
14 that could darken things further would be if any announcement also excluded Diego Garcia
15 from the MPA.”

16 71. This might be an appropriate moment for me to comment on the UK's answer given yesterday
17 to Judge Hoffman's question, whether there were any studies or data supporting the UK's
18 exclusion of Diego Garcia and the water surround it from the “MPA”. UK's answer was no,
19 there are no such studies. But, as we have just seen, there was a workshop convened by the
20 FCO which included many environmental scientists and which produced the recommendation
21 that "full protection of the BIOT area as a no-take MPA would also need to apply on Diego
22 Garcia.”

⁵ Email dated 31 March 2010 from John Murton, British High Commissioner to Mauritius, to Colin Roberts, Director, Overseas Territories Directorate and Joanne Yeadon, Head of “BIOT” & Pitcairn Section, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, MR Annex 156.

1 72. Mr. Whomersley's invocation of UK environmental laws applicable to the land territory and
2 the lagoon, which is internal waters, does not solve the problem of pollution of the territorial
3 sea and coral reefs by American and British military vessels and personnel.

4 73. Please turn next to Tab 5.6⁶ This is a communication from Ms. Yeadon to Mr. Roberts and to
5 the Private Secretary to the Foreign Secretary, dated 31 March 2010. I call your attention in
6 particular to paragraph 8 of this document, on our page 112, and where Ms. Yeadon writes: "I
7 should stress the point that we have not secured funding and will have no means of enforcing a
8 full no-take MPA."⁷ How was this funding obtained? Mr. Roberts supplied the answer in his
9 First Witness Statement, at Annex 70 of the UK Rejoinder, at paragraph 26: "the BIOT
10 Administration would lose the benefit of private sector donations which are conditional on the
11 closure of the fishery."

12 74. Judge Greenwood asked the UK to comment on Mr. Roberts' statement. They avoided doing
13 so last week, but they were pressed again for an answer yesterday. Mr. Whomersley
14 confirmed that the "MPA" is funded by the Bertarelli Foundation which insisted on a full
15 no-take Marine Protected Area. There is little, if any, other funding because the ban on
16 fishing deprives the "BIOT" of license fees. Mr. Whomersley told us the Contract with
17 Bertarelli postdates the declaration of the "MPA", but surely, when the UK declared the
18 "MPA", it had already negotiated with Bertarelli and was aware of its conditions. Mr.
19 Whomersley admitted this. He said that Bertarelli's insistence on a full no-take MPA as a
20 condition of its financing "did facilitate the choice that was made."

⁶ Minute dated 31 March 2010 from Joanne Yeadon, Head of "BIOT" & Pitcairn Section, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office to Colin Roberts, Director, Overseas Territories Directorate and the Private Secretary to the Foreign Secretary, "British Indian Ocean Territory: MPA: Next Steps: Mauritius", MR Annex 158.

⁷ Minute dated 31 March 2010 from Joanne Yeadon, Head of "BIOT" & Pitcairn Section, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office to Colin Roberts, Director, Overseas Territories Directorate and the Private Secretary to the Foreign Secretary, "British Indian Ocean Territory: MPA: Next Steps: Mauritius", MR Annex 158, page. 151, para. 3.

1 75. So, here we have another reason for the “MPA”. In addition to political and presentational
2 reasons, we now have money. The no-take “MPA” is driven by private funders because this
3 was what they demanded in return for their funding. What we have here is another serious
4 case of detachment. The United Kingdom has detached itself from its own foreign
5 policy-making. It has ceded its sovereign prerogatives to people with deep pockets, however
6 well motivated, allowing them to pursue their own private agendas at Mauritius' expense. Let
7 us all hope sovereignty over the FCO will eventually revert to the United Kingdom and that
8 Bertarelli will not cede it to a third State.

9 76. But despite these embarrassments, all is put right by the noble democratic exercise of the
10 public consultation, so proudly invoked as the saving grace by Professor Boyle and Ms.
11 Nevill.⁸ The consultation document was published in November 2009 and it is there and then
12 that Mauritius first learned that the proposed MPA would include a ban on fishing, in violation
13 of its rights. This is at Tab 5.7,⁹ and I will just stop on it briefly. On our page 117, you can see
14 that the very first option given to the consultees was a full no-take MPA, a total ban on fishing.
15 We are told by Ms. Nevill that there were more than 250,000 respondents and that the majority
16 favored the total fishing ban. But this only begets the question of who these multitudes of
17 respondents were, and what information they had when they expressed their views. And this
18 calls to mind an article I read last week in the International New York Times, by Nicholas
19 Kristof. An opinion poll was taken of the American people – a form of public consultation.
20 They were asked to identify certain historical figures. An astonishing percentage of the
21 respondents identified Joan of Arc ... as the wife of Noah. So this leads me to ask: how
22 many of the two hundred fifty thousand respondents to the UK’s public consultation were
23 Americans? How many were aware that there was no scientific evidence to justify a ban on

⁸ Boyle, Day 7, page 793, lines 16-20.

⁹ “Consultation on whether to establish a Marine Protected Area in the British Indian Ocean Territory”, UKCM Annex 111, Arbitration Folder Tab 19.

1 fishing? How many were aware that the UK had made a legally binding undertaking to
2 Mauritius to respect its fishing rights? How many thought Mauritius was an art museum in
3 The Hague?

4 77. I now come to the final part of my presentation, on Mauritius' rights as a coastal State, deriving
5 from the legally binding undertakings given by the UK to Mauritius in 1965, and the conduct
6 of the United Kingdom in fulfillment of those undertakings. We say that those undertakings
7 and that conduct have vested in Mauritius certain attributes of a coastal State under the 1982
8 Convention. Counsel for the United Kingdom disagree, pointing out that the words "coastal
9 State" appear in no less than 64 articles of the Convention¹⁰, and stating, with a heavy dose of
10 sarcasm: surely Mauritius cannot claim to be a coastal State for all purposes under all of these
11 provisions.

12 78. We have two answers to that. First, as Professor Crawford and Professor Sands have argued,
13 Mauritius is *the* coastal State for all purposes because it is the lawful sovereign over the
14 territory of the Chagos Archipelago. The second answer is the one I shall give you. Should you
15 decide, *quod non*, that Mauritius is not sovereign over that land territory, or should you decide
16 not to decide that matter, Mauritius in that case derives its status as a coastal State, at least in
17 regard to certain of the Convention's provisions, from the United Kingdom's legally binding
18 undertakings and its conduct over the past 45 years. These specific provisions include Article
19 56(1)(b)(iii) and Article 76(8). I turn to both the merits of our "attributes of a coastal State"
20 argument, and your jurisdiction in regard to it.

21 79. Mauritius does not concede that it is vested with the attributes of a coastal State *only* for
22 purposes of Articles 56(1)(b)(iii) and Article 76(8). Its position is that its specific claims
23 against the United Kingdom in this case only call upon this Tribunal to decide whether it can
24 be considered a coastal State for purposes of those two articles. Mauritius' claims do not

¹⁰ Wordsworth, Day 6, page 672, lines 11-16.

1 require you to consider whether it enjoys coastal State status in regard to any of the other
2 provisions of the Convention that address the rights or obligations of a coastal State.

3 80. Article 56(b)(1)(iii), as you know, endows a coastal State with jurisdiction with regard to the
4 protection and preservation of the marine environment in the exclusive economic zone. If
5 Mauritius is *the* coastal State for purposes of this Article, or if Mauritius and the United
6 Kingdom are *both* coastal States for these purposes, then the United Kingdom may not
7 unilaterally impose any measures for the protection or preservation of the marine environment
8 of the Chagos Archipelago; this can only be done with Mauritius' consent and the "MPA" is
9 legally invalid because it was adopted absent that consent. Indeed it was adopted over
10 Mauritius' protest. The legal question of whether two different States may each be regarded as
11 a coastal State for purposes of any of the Convention's provisions, or in respect of the same
12 maritime zones, will be addressed by Professor Crawford this morning.

13 81. In this case, the principal basis of Mauritius' claim that it is at least *a* coastal State in respect of
14 the Chagos Archipelago, for purposes of Article 56(1)(b)(iii), such that an MPA cannot be
15 declared without its consent, is that it undisputedly has reversionary sovereign interest in the
16 Archipelago and its maritime zones. The basis of its reversionary sovereign interest is the UK's
17 1965 undertaking that: "if the need for the facilities on the islands disappeared the islands
18 should be returned to Mauritius". In 1976, as you know, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of
19 State gave his "assurances" in these words: the islands "will be returned to Mauritius when
20 they are no longer needed for defence purposes¹¹ in the same way as the three ex-Seychelles
21 islands are now being returned to Seychelles."¹² As you know, this assurance has been
22 repeated and reaffirmed by the UK at the highest level many times since.

¹¹ Reichler, Day 3, page 273, lines 16-23 (MM-Annex 78). *See also* Reichler, Day 2, page 156, lines 15-18; page 157, lines 23-24 and page 158, lines 1-2; page 159, lines 1-3, 12-18.

¹² Letter dated 15 March 1976 from Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, to the Mauritius High Commissioner, London, MM Annex 78, Round 1 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 8.9.

1 82. It is irrefutable, therefore, that any measures to protect or preserve the marine environment of
2 the Chagos Archipelago over the long term, for the benefit of future generations, affect
3 Mauritius and its ultimate sovereignty over the islands and their surrounding waters and
4 seabed. The United Kingdom itself, in explaining the benefits of the proposed MPA in 2009,
5 repeatedly defended it on the ground that Mauritius would be the long-term beneficiary,
6 because of its reversionary sovereignty. According to the UK's own record of the July 2009
7 talks, which I have included at Tab 8, and to which I ask respectfully that you now turn, and
8 specifically to paragraph 9, at our page 133, there you will find paragraph 9, which states as
9 follows – again, this is the UK's record of the 21 July 2009 bilateral talks with Mauritius:
10 “There were powerful arguments in the UK to establish a Marine Protected Area. However,
11 many questions still needed to be worked through. The UK delegation explained the
12 advantage to Mauritius that through a marine protected area, the value of the Territory would
13 be raised and this resource would eventually be ceded to Mauritius.” Ms. Nevill emphasized
14 this last week.¹³ On 22 October 2009, and this you will find in the footnote to my presentation
15 rather than in a tab – on 22 October 2009, the British High Commissioner reported to the FCO
16 on his meeting that day with Prime Minister Ramgoolam, in which he assured the Prime
17 Minister that: “when the islands were eventually ceded to Mauritius, they would be of greater
18 benefit if their unique environmental value had been maintained.”¹⁴

19 83. The UK went out of its way, repeatedly, to assure Mauritius that the declaration of an MPA
20 would not affect its commitment to return the Archipelago to Mauritius. The public
21 consultation document, which is at Tab 5.7, our page 124 – I'm not encouraging you to turn
22 back. It's a short quote, but of course that is your decision. At page 124 of Tab 7: “The UK
23 has confirmed to the Mauritians that the establishment of a marine protected area will have no

¹³ Nevill, Day 5, p. 560, lines 4-8.

¹⁴ Record of meeting between British High Commissioner and Mauritian Prime Minister on 22 October 2009, UKR Annex 60, UK Arbitration Folder Tab 15.

1 impact on the UK's commitment to cede the territory to Mauritius when it is no longer needed
2 for defence purposes.”¹⁵ Even in the announcement of the “MPA” on 1 April 2010, the
3 Foreign Secretary took pains to “emphasise that the creation of the “MPA” will not change the
4 UK's commitment – commitment – to cede the territory to Mauritius when it is no longer
5 needed for defence purposes...”¹⁶

6 84. That undertaking standing alone, we say, vests Mauritius with the attributes of a coastal State
7 for purposes of Article 56(1)(b)(iii). But it does not stand alone. It is reinforced by the two
8 other undertakings. Measures to protect or preserve the marine environment in the EEZ
9 inevitably impact Mauritius' fishing rights, which did not await the reversion of sovereignty to
10 Mauritius, but were recognized and respected by the UK immediately and continuously for 45
11 years, and especially in the entire 200 M maritime zone since it was declared in 1991. It bears
12 emphasis that the progressive enlargement of the “BIOT”'s declared maritime zones, from 3 M
13 to 12 M and then to 200 M was always accompanied, immediately, by the UK's recognition
14 and respect for Mauritius' fishing rights throughout the zone. My friend Sir Michael attempted
15 to belittle Mauritius' fishing rights. He said there is nothing unusual about one State granting
16 another fishing licences under a fishing agreement.¹⁷ But that is not our situation.

17 85. We don't have a mere fishing agreement. What we have, in the UK's long-held view, is a
18 package of mutually binding commitments. Fishing rights were obtained by Mauritius, along
19 with other rights, in exchange for what the UK regarded as its consent to the detachment of a
20 part of its territory. As I explained yesterday, Mauritius alone enjoyed the right to fish within
21 the Archipelago's 3 M territorial sea, and after a 12 M limit was established, only Mauritian

¹⁵ Consultation on whether to establish a Marine Protected Area in the British Indian Ocean Territory, UKCM Annex 111, p. 7. UK Arbitration Folder Tab 19.

¹⁶ MM Annex 165, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office Press Release, 1 April 2010, “New Protection for marine life.”

¹⁷ Wood, Day 6, page 721, lines 12-16.

1 vessels could fish within those 12 miles. Only Mauritius has been recognized repeatedly as
2 enjoying historical fishing rights throughout the 200 M “BIOT” maritime zone.

3 86. By contrast, not even British-flagged vessels have been given licences to fish in this zone. The
4 UK, although the purported sovereign, has shown no interest in the fish or other living
5 resources. Never. The only State with a permanent, perpetual interest in them is Mauritius.

6 87. And the same is true in regard to the non-living resources of the seabed and the subsoil. Only
7 Mauritius can benefit from these. No other State, not even the UK, can benefit from oil or
8 minerals discovered in the Archipelago or beneath its surrounding waters. And these rights,
9 too, are impacted by measures introduced to protect or preserve the marine environment under
10 Article 56(1)(b)(iii) by preventing all extraction of any oil or minerals under any
11 circumstances.

12 88. So what we do have here is a completely unique, one-of-a-kind situation. Normally, there is a
13 single State that is sovereign over land territory, and which enjoys exclusive, sovereign rights
14 to the living and non-living resources of its EEZ and continental shelf. Here, by contrast, the
15 UK claims sovereignty over the territory, but recognizes that it is no more than a temporary
16 freeholder, and that sovereignty will ultimately reside in Mauritius. Even my friend Sir
17 Michael ended up agreeing that “temporary freeholder” is, what he called, a pretty apt
18 description of the UK status for a lay person.¹⁸ His effort to identify other situations around the
19 world that are similar to ours does not stand scrutiny. Professor Crawford will address this, and
20 show you how our situation materially differs, in major respects, from the examples presented
21 by Sir Michael. This is a one-of-a-kind situation, calling for recognition of Mauritius as a
22 coastal State under Article 56(1)(b)(iii), to protect its long-term sovereign interests, including
23 its undisputed future sovereign interests in the Chagos Archipelago and its marine
24 environment.

¹⁸ Wood, Day 6, page 724, lines 13-14.

1 89. I turn to my final point regarding Article 76(8) provides that information on the limits of the
2 continental shelf beyond 200 M “shall be submitted by the coastal State to the Commission on
3 the Limits of the Continental Shelf set up under Annex II.” We submit that, in the unique
4 circumstances of this case, Mauritius has been vested by the UK with the attributes of a coastal
5 State for purposes of Article 76(8).

6 90. The same considerations apply here as in my discussion of Mauritius’ status as a coastal State
7 under Article 56(1)(b)(iii). First, Mauritius’ reversionary sovereignty; the fact that it *will be*
8 sovereign over the Chagos Archipelago, and therefore entitled to the enjoyment of a
9 continental shelf to the full extent permitted by international law. Second, Mauritius’ exclusive
10 entitlement to the benefits of the oil and mineral resources embedded in the continental shelf
11 including the extended continental shelf. Although the UK purports to be sovereign, it has
12 already ceded to Mauritius the benefits of all of these resources. The UK, even as it exercises
13 the sovereignty it purports to enjoy, cannot, even now, obtain any benefits from these
14 resources; they have been pledged to Mauritius since 1965. The 1965 undertaking gives
15 Mauritius a present right to prevent the UK from exploiting the benefits of any oil or mineral
16 resources.

17 91. Moreover, since January 2009, the UK has acted in a manner that reflects its acceptance that
18 Mauritius is a coastal State for purposes of Article 76(8). The facts are recorded in the
19 contemporaneous aide-memoires prepared by both Parties in regard to their bilateral talks on
20 14 January and 21 July 2009. As we have observed, the respective contemporaneous records
21 are remarkable for their consistency with one another. There appear to be no major
22 discrepancies as to what occurred in either of these rounds of talks. Sir Michael has
23 acknowledged this too.

24 92. Therefore, it is agreed that at the January talks: the UK said that it had no interest in the outer
25 continental shelf; that it had no intention of making its own submission to the CLCS; that it

1 proposed a joint submission be made to the CLCS; that Mauritius expressed concern that its
2 rights in the outer continental shelf could be lost permanently if a submission were not made
3 within the requisite 10-year period which would expire on 13 May; and that, in response, the
4 UK advised that only a simple filing of preliminary information was required to stop the
5 clock.¹⁹ That much is undisputed.

6 93. What the Parties disagree about is whether the UK then encouraged Mauritius to make its own
7 submission of preliminary information to stop the clock. We do agree on the operative
8 language, just not on what it means, so I will focus on that, just as Sir Michael did last week.
9 He pointed you to the Mauritian record of the January meeting, and specifically to page 24 and
10 the comments of Doug Wilson. At Tab 5.9, you will find from that Mauritian record, the cover
11 page, list of participants and page 24 to which Sir Michael referred. The entire document has
12 been presented in the tabs of both States previously. So, to save your effort, I have simply
13 extracted the relevant portions for these purposes. So I ask you to turn to Page 24, which
14 bears our page number 139, and I will do my best to read Mr. Wilson's words with the same
15 emphasis that Sir Michael did – of course without his elegant elocution: “On the deadline, *we*
16 can put an outline submission and following that *we* may proceed.” To this, Sir Michael added,
17 with great emphasis: “*We* means *we*.” It means, he said, a joint submission of preliminary
18 information, not one filed solely by Mauritius. Then Sir Michael took you to the comments
19 immediately following, those of Colin Roberts, who was Head of the Overseas Territories
20 Directorate and Commissioner of the “BIOT”, and the head of the UK's delegation to these
21 talks, and he followed up on the remarks of Mr. Wilson, and I will read those as Sir Michael
22 did: “Can I just clarify one aspect. We have no expectation of deriving any benefit from what

¹⁹ MR Annex 129, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade, Mauritius, “Meeting of the Officials on the Chagos Archipelago/British Indian Ocean Territory held at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London, Wednesday, 14 January 2009, 10 am,” 23 January 2009 in Round 2 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 5.9; United Kingdom record of meeting of 14 January 2009 dated 15 January 2009, MR Annex 128, UK Folder Tab 40.

1 we will get. [Now, presumably Sir Michael would agree that, here at least, “we” means the
2 UK]. We have no expectation of deriving any benefit from what we will get. It will flow to
3 Mauritius when the territory will be ceded to you. [You, here, clearly refers to Mauritius, and I
4 don’t think Sir Michael would disagree]. It is one of the reasons why we have not invested
5 resources to collect data. We recognize the underlying structure of this discussion. [Again,
6 “we”, as used here, can only mean the UK. And then the final sentence]. *You* may wish to take
7 action and *we* will provide political support.”

8 94. Now, what does Sir Michael have to say about this? Well, we already know, “*We* means *we*.”
9 But here, he tells us that when Mr. Roberts says “you,” it *also* means “we”. And that is the
10 basis of the Parties’ disagreement. Now, we may be a bit old-fashioned. But we respectfully
11 submit that “you” does not mean “we”. “You” means “you”. And this is also clear from the
12 context. By reading the entire comment of Mr. Roberts, it can be seen that he consistently used
13 “we” to refer to the UK, and “you” to refer to Mauritius. In the last sentence, Mr. Roberts told
14 Mauritius, and Mauritius correctly understood him to say, that “you – Mauritius” may wish to
15 take action, by filing preliminary information, and that “we – the UK” will provide political
16 support.

17 95. Now, this leads us to ask: how could Mr. Roberts encourage Mauritius to file preliminary
18 information with the CLCS, if he, as FCO Director, “BIOT” Commissioner, head of the UK
19 delegation to these talks, was not recognizing Mauritius’ status as a coastal State, at least with
20 respect to Article 76(8)?

21 96. The UK's recognition of Mauritius' status as a coastal State for these purposes was further
22 recognized at the next set of bilateral talks in July 2009. Here again, the Parties’
23 contemporaneous written records are in synch with one another, and there should be no
24 disagreement over what occurred. It is demonstrated that Mauritius advised the UK that it had
25 filed its preliminary information with the CLCS on 9 May; that the UK made no objection

1 whatsoever; and that the UK proposed to work together with Mauritius on what it called a
2 “coordinated” submission under a sovereignty umbrella.²⁰ And if you will now kindly turn
3 back to Tab 5.8, at page 132, and this is the UK's contemporaneous aide memoire on the 21
4 July 2009 bilateral talks, and I refer you to paragraph 7, again at page 132, and here you will
5 note the difference between the “joint” submission proposed by the UK in January,²¹ and what
6 in this document in July is proposed as a “coordinated” submission.²² This was no longer
7 intended, following Mauritius's submission of preliminary information on its own, this was no
8 longer intended by the UK as a submission that both States would make jointly, but one that
9 Mauritius would make, in coordinated fashion, with the UK’s support. As you can see,
10 beginning at the eleventh line of paragraph 7: “The UK delegation also explained that we were
11 not proposing UK funding extensive analysis and surveys, which are of course necessary for a
12 full submission, but could facilitate access to the technical sources and help with the legal
13 process.”

14 97. Again, I ask, how could the UK contemplate a full CLCS submission by Mauritius, with its
15 support, without acknowledging that Mauritius has standing to make such a submission as a
16 coastal State for purposes of Article 76(8)? Sir Michael had absolutely nothing to say about
17 this last week. He made no mention whatsoever of the July 2009 meeting and none of the UK's
18 other counsel addressed this aspect of the July 2009 meeting.

19 98. One thing we do hope Sir Michael will clarify in the second round is the UK’s position on what
20 they mean by the statement, at paragraph 8.39 of the Rejoinder, that: “Mauritius is not the
21 coastal State in respect of BIOT and as such it has no standing before the CLCS with respect to

²⁰ UKCM Annex 101, Overseas Territories Directorate record of discussion in Port Louis on 21 July 2009 dated 24 July 2009, Round 2 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 5.8; Information Paper by the Prime Minister of Mauritius dated 12 August 2009, MR Annex 144, UK Folder Tab 41.

²¹ MR Annex 128, UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Overseas Territories Directorate, “British Indian Ocean Territory: UK/Mauritius Talks”, 14 January 2009, Round 1 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 8.10 at page 391.

²² UKCM Annex 101, Overseas Territories Directorate record of discussion in Port Louis on 21 July 2009 dated 24 July 2009, Round 2 Mauritius Arbitration Folder Tab 5.8.

1 BIOT.” No such statement appears in the Counter-Memorial. We saw this statement of
2 position for the first time in the Rejoinder earlier this year. What does this mean? For
3 Mauritius, it means trouble. If we have no standing before the CLCS, then what is the status of
4 our submission of preliminary information? Is it a nullity, *void ab initio*, in which case it was
5 insufficient to stop the 10-year clock from expiring on 13 May 2009, or from shutting the door
6 forever on Mauritius’ right to claim an extended continental shelf in respect of the Chagos
7 Archipelago? If that is the UK’s position, then we clearly have a dispute over Mauritius’s
8 standing as a coastal State under Article 76(8).

9 99. Perhaps, because he recognizes this, Sir Michael was uncharacteristically imprecise in how he
10 described, or failed to describe, the UK’s position. He told you that *Mauritius* interprets the
11 UK position as to regard the submission of preliminary information as a nullity, and the clock
12 as to have run out. Then he said: “That is not the position.”²³ But he never told you what the
13 position is! What is it? If, in the UK’s view, Mauritius lacks standing to make submissions to
14 the CLCS, then how, in the UK’s view, could our submission be anything other than a nullity?
15 Either we have standing to file or we don’t. We say we do. They say we don’t. That is a
16 textbook definition of a dispute.

17 100. And it is one over which you plainly have jurisdiction, as is the dispute over whether
18 Mauritius has the attributes of a coastal State for purposes of Article 56(1)(b)(iii). Professor
19 Sands has already addressed you on the question of your jurisdiction to hear Mauritius’ claim
20 that the UK is not the coastal State, and thus not entitled to declare an MPA. Professor Sands
21 invited you not to write an exception into UNCLOS, at the behest of the UK, to preclude
22 jurisdiction over disputes which necessarily involve questions of land sovereignty.

23 101. But in regard to the aspects of our claim that I have been addressing, you do not have to
24 consider whether Part XV excludes all, or any, disputes related to land sovereignty. These

²³ Wood, Day 6, page 735, line 7.

1 aspects of our claim do not require you to consider which State is currently exercising
2 sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago. We are proceeding here on the basis that the
3 Archipelago will be returned to the sovereignty of Mauritius when it is no longer needed for
4 defence purposes and because of the exclusive rights in regard to the living and nonliving
5 resources with which Mauritius has already been vested. Our claims of entitlement to be
6 regarded as a coastal State for purposes of Articles 56(1)(b)(iii) and 76(8), because of the
7 attributes of a coastal State which Mauritius acquired as a result of the UK's undertakings,
8 are indisputably matters calling for your interpretation and application of those two provisions
9 of the Convention, and the meaning of the words "coastal State" under them and, as such, they
10 plainly fall within your jurisdiction under Article 288(1).

11 102. In closing – and I expect those words are music to your ears – in closing, I will tell you
12 about my sojourn to the Grand Bazaar. I spent the entire time at the book stalls, looking for
13 some light and pleasant reading I could unwind with at night, preferably something with a
14 connection to Turkey. I came across Graham Greene's classic, *Stamboul Train*. As I leafed
15 through it, I knew that it was fate – *kismet* as they say in this country – that I should find this
16 book. It begins with a quote from Santayana: "Everything in nature is lyrical in its ideal
17 essence, tragic in its fate, and comic in its existence." He was describing the "MPA"!

18 103. "Lyrical", in the ideal sense that preservation of the marine environment, when that is what
19 is truly intended, is a noble objective. It is in fact Mauritius's objective.

20 104. "Tragic", in the fate of breaching a longstanding, binding legal obligation, eliminating
21 Mauritius's legal rights, violating obligations of good faith consultation under the 1982
22 Convention, and, to recall the infamous, if not tragic, phrase of Colin Roberts, "putting paid" to
23 any hopes of the Chagossians to resettle in their homeland.

24 105. And "Comic", in the sense that the UK prefers public consultation with unknown and
25 uninformed multitudes over serious bilateral negotiation and agreement with Mauritius, allows

1 private parties to control its foreign policy and accepts their demands to violate its international
2 obligations solely to obtain their financing, and executes the “MPA” with a single boat that has
3 been found by the UK's own environmental consultants to cause more pollution than it
4 prevents.

5 106. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, for all of these reasons, Mauritius invites you to
6 “put paid” to the “MPA”.

7 107. It has been a distinct honour for me to appear before each and every one of you in these
8 proceedings. I thank you sincerely for your kind courtesy and generous patience.

9 I ask that you call Mr. Andrew Loewenstein to the podium, perhaps after coffee
10 break.

11 Oh, I'm sorry. Even better. I ask that you call Professor Crawford to the podium.

12 Thank you.

13 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you very much, Mr. Reichler.

14 And so I do call upon Professor Crawford to address us.

15 Thank you.

16 PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. I won't delay you long
17 for coffee.

18 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you. You just pause when it's a convenient
19 moment.

20 PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I think I'll go straight through. It will only take me
21 20 minutes.

22 PRESIDENT SHEARER: All right. Very, very good, then.

23 Thank you.

24 **Mauritius v United Kingdom**

25 **Reply of Mauritius**

1 He qualified this in one respect, and I quote again:

2 "One can conceive of very limited exceptions where there is an openly and expressly
3 agreed sharing of the jurisdiction of a coastal State, such as in a condominium, or in the
4 very special case of the European Union... But even if Mauritius' case were taken at its
5 highest – that it somehow" – I emphasise the word 'somehow' – "had a reversionary
6 interest in the BIOT – there is nothing in the Convention to suggest it may establish a
7 situation where there are two coastal States vying over the assertion of rights in a
8 somehow shared maritime zone".²⁵

9 4. Now there must be a question whether this second passage with its reference to an
10 'openly and expressly agreed' sharing of jurisdiction, and the qualification it contains does not
11 contradict the first passage. For if you have no jurisdiction to determine who is the coastal
12 State beyond looking for ten seconds of actual control, then you have no jurisdiction to decide,
13 and it will take you a lot more than ten seconds to decide, whether the terms of what I may call a
14 divided coastal State jurisdiction arrangement are settled or not, let alone 'openly and expressly
15 agreed'. All the State in actual occupation has to do is to assert its exclusive authority, to assert
16 that it is the solitary State, and then a Part XV court or tribunal must lay down its pen. The
17 actual occupier can do this whatever it may have earlier expressly agreed. That is the black
18 hole – or the 64 black holes in the Convention. You saw the black hole in operation last Friday
19 when the usually fluent Mr. Wordsworth was quite unable to answer a simple question – can the
20 UK cede the Archipelago to a third State? If that was 'expressly agreed', as we thought it was
21 and HM's Attorney-General thought it was in opening the British case, then either Mr.
22 Wordsworth's concession about the exception to the solitary State thesis is wrong or you have
23 jurisdiction to determine whether our right of reversion is inconsistent with the international

²⁵ Transcript, Day 6, p. 694, lines 22-24 and p. 695, lines 1-5.

1 establishment of an MPA. And if that is the position for right of reversion, it is the position
2 equally for the other agreed rights based on the continuing conditions linked to excision.

3 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal:

4 5. International law is not a thing of shreds and patches, of ballad songs and snatches: you
5 are entitled, in considering whether to grant a remedy for actual or threatened breach of the
6 Convention, to apply the whole of international law including the international law relating to
7 sovereignty. The only remedy we seek in this part of our case is a determination that the
8 “MPA” is unlawful because Mauritius has the attributes of a coastal State and must be treated as
9 such, together with certain consequential rulings. And the validity or the legality of the “MPA”
10 is a law of the sea matter, governed by the constitutional instrument of the law of the sea, the
11 1982 Convention. True, like other constitutions, the Convention has to cover a multitude of
12 situations, and the phrase ‘coastal State’ assumes the normal case of a State in undisputed,
13 undivided sovereignty over the relevant coast. The normal situation is that there is a single
14 State in relation to any issue. But like other constitutions, the 1982 Convention has to be
15 adapted to deal with special situations across the wide world, and doing so is always an exercise
16 of interpretation or application of the Convention. It's true that the land governs the sea, but the
17 Convention also governs the sea and in interpreting and applying the Convention you are
18 allowed to know and apply the law of the land as well as the law of the sea.

19 6. It may assist you in assessing these contentions if I take you briefly to a number of cases
20 of divided coastal jurisdiction, where more than one State has coastal State rights in respect of a
21 given coast. I do this for two purposes, first to show there are no floodgates because there are
22 not a large number of cases out there waiting to disturb the tranquillity of Part XV tribunals, but
23 also to show you that the word "coastal State" can't support the solitary State thesis. I am going
24 to cite three examples, but I could have cited more, for example, the ‘bare’ coast that appears to
25 exist in the vicinity of the Peru-Chile maritime boundary, where Peru arguably has the land up to

1 the – well, whatever point would remain to be determined, and Chile has the sea from that point
2 onwards. In those situations, both would be *pro tanto* coastal States in relation to that very
3 short stretch of coast. But together the three cases I will deal with show definitively that the
4 solitary State thesis is wrong.

5 **The UK's Sovereign Base Areas in Cyprus**

6 7. The first situation concerns the two Sovereign Base Areas (SBA) retained by the UK
7 when Cyprus became independent in 1960, Akrotiri and Dhekelia. I can't go into much detail
8 and unfortunately the literature on the Sovereign Base Areas is rather minimal, but I've given
9 you references to it. The essential position is as follows, and there are eleven propositions:²⁶

10 (1) By virtue of the Treaty of Establishment, a multilateral treaty concluded at the time of
11 Cyprus's independence, the UK retains sovereignty over the SBAs.²⁷

12 (2) The UK agreed at the same time to use the SBAs for military purposes only, and affirmed
13 that it has no intention of ceding the SBAs to any third State,²⁸ affirmation Mr. Wordsworth
14 was unable to make.

15 (3) Cyprus has a right of reversion, although it is not called that: it is referred to as 'transfer' in
16 the Exchange of Notes.²⁹ That makes the repeated use of the word 'reversion' in relation to
17 the Chagos Archipelago later than the treaty establishment even more significant. They could

²⁶ See 'Territorial Sea Boundary. Cyprus-Sovereign Base Area (UK)', *Limits in the Seas* No 49 (1972); A Jacovides, *International Law and Diplomacy: Selected Writings* (Martinus Nijhoff, 2011) 108-111; A Pellet, 'The British Sovereign Base Areas' [2012] *Cyprus YBIL* 57-72; T Scovazzi, 'Maritime Boundaries in the Eastern Mediterranean Sea', GMF Policy Brief, June 2012, available at <http://www.gmfus.org/archives/maritime-boundaries-in-the-eastern-mediterranean-sea/> (accessed 3 May 2014); A Gurel, F Mullen & H Tzimitras, *The Cyprus Hydrocarbons Issue: Context, Positions and Future Scenarios* (Peace Research Institute, Oslo, 2013) 9-26.

²⁷ Treaty (with annexes, schedules and detailed plans) concerning the Establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, Nicosia, 16 August 1960: 382 UNTS 10. See also Treaty of Accession, Athens, 16 April 2003, Protocol 3; S Shaelou, 'The principle of territorial exclusion in the EU: SBAs in Cyprus: a special case of *sui generis* territories in the EU' in D Kochenov (ed), *EU Law of the Overseas: Outermost Regions, Associated Overseas Countries and Territories, Territories Sui Generis* (Kluwer, 2011) 153-175.

²⁸ Exchange of Notes between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Cyprus Concerning the Future of the Sovereign Base Areas referred to in Article 1 of the Treaty of 16 August 1960 Concerning the Establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. Nicosia, 16 August 1960: 382 UNTS 172.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, at 174.

1 have used other language and they didn't. They only started using other language more
2 recently.

3 (4) In the Treaty of Establishment, lines are drawn delineating the lateral limits of the territorial
4 seas of the SBAs,³⁰ the lateral limits, not the outer limit.

5 (5) Cyprus agrees not to claim a territorial sea between those lines, in other words, it agrees not
6 to enclave the territorial sea of the SBAs, but it has made no equivalent commitment with
7 respect to the Exclusive Economic Zone in the continental shelf.

8 (6) In 1964, Cyprus extended its territorial sea to 12 M without reference to the SBAs.³¹

9 (7) In 1993, Cyprus declared a straight baselines system around its coast which was objected to
10 by the United Kingdom insofar as it impacted on the SBAs.

11 (8) In 2004, Cyprus declared an EEZ around its entire coastline; of course it also has a
12 continental shelf and there is continental shelf legislation.

13 (9) The United Kingdom has never extended the SBA's territorial sea areas beyond 3M,
14 although it has apparently reserved the right to do so. Nor has it declared an EEZ or
15 asserted continental shelf rights off the SBAs. And indeed, it must be very doubtful
16 whether it has the capacity to do so in view of its undertaking, not to use the SBAs for
17 non-military purposes.

18 (10) Cyprus has concluded delimitation agreements with Egypt³² and Israel³³ which cover
19 areas off the SBAs; in other words, they're close to those – those boundaries are closer to the
20 coastline of the SBAs than they are to the coastline of what I will call "the rest of Cyprus".

21 (11) The 1982 Convention is in force for Cyprus and there is no declaration with respect to
22 Article 298(1)(a)(i). By contrast, the UK has not extended the Convention to the SBAs, so

³⁰ Treaty of Establishment, Annex A, Section 3.

³¹ Territorial Waters Law, No 45 of 1964 (Cyprus).

³² Cyprus-Arab Republic of Egypt, Agreement on the Delimitation of the Exclusive Economic Zone, Cairo, 17 February 2003.

³³ Cyprus-Israel, Agreement on the Delimitation of the Exclusive Economic Zone, Nicosia, 17 December 2010, 2740 UNTS 1.

1 there is no immediate problem so far as the United Kingdom is concerned as to litigation.
2 The floodgates are dry – or the area below the floodgates is dry, I should say, more
3 accurately.

4 8. Now the situation is far from being fully defined, but it seems to be the case that Cyprus’
5 EEZ lies off SBA territorial seas, and that Cyprus is the relevant coastal State for EEZ and
6 continental shelf purposes whereas the UK is the relevant coastal State for the territorial sea. It
7 is also quite clear that, assuming the Convention had been applied to the SBAs, a court or
8 tribunal sitting under Part XV would have jurisdiction to determine disputes as to the allocation
9 of maritime authority as between the SBAs and Cyprus, including but not limited to delimitation
10 disputes. In doing so the court or tribunal would have to apply the *lex specialis* of the 1960
11 Treaties and any relevant undertaking or practice of the parties, *lex specialis* would prevail over
12 the *lex generalis* or general international law. It would also have to have regard to the character
13 of the authority, and the limits upon it, exercisable by the UK over the SBAs in accordance with
14 those sources of obligation. All of this would take much longer than ten seconds.

15 **The Closing Line in the Gulf of Fonseca**

16 9. My second example concerns the closing line of the Gulf of Fonseca. In 1917 the
17 Central American Court of Justice, as it then was, held that the Gulf... ‘qualified ... as a “historic
18 bay,”... with a “littoral marine league” territorial sea internally’.³⁴ In 1992, a chamber of the
19 International Court in the *El Salvador/Honduras Case*, between different parties, with Nicaragua
20 maybe as an intervenor.³⁵ It confirmed that ‘the Gulf waters, other than that 3-mile zone were
21 historic waters, subject to the joint sovereignty of the three States’.³⁶

22 It further held that in the closing line, because it's a historic bay and the closing line is the
23 Gulf of Fonseca beyond 3 miles from each of the points on which the closing line is drawn, is

³⁴ See *El Salvador v Nicaragua*, Central American Court of Justice’ (1917) 11 *AJIL* 674, p. 715.

³⁵ *Land, Island and Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador/Honduras: Nicaragua intervening)* [1992] ICJ Rep 351.

³⁶ *Ibid*, p. 404.

1 jointly held, and I quote: "Since the legal situation on the landward side of the closing line is one
2 of joint sovereignty, it follows that all three of the joint sovereigns must have entitlement outside
3 the closing line to territorial sea, continental shelf and exclusive economic zone. Whether this
4 situation should remain in being is a matter for the three States to decide. Any delimitation of the
5 maritime areas beyond the closing line will fall to be effected by agreement on the basis of
6 international law.³⁷

7 10. So, as to the closing line across the Gulf, beyond 3 miles from each coast, the three States
8 are joint holders. This is a maritime condominium. So they're each, either individually coastal
9 States or collectively a coastal State with respect to the territorial baseline – and the maritime
10 zones attributable to that territorial baseline. Again, the solitary State thesis doesn't work.

11 **Land Condominium: The New Hebrides**

12 11. My third example is The New Hebrides. It is a historic example and it concerns a
13 condominium involving land sovereignty. Of course until independence, the New Hebrides,
14 which is now Vanuatu, was governed by condominium of France and the UK pursuant to a
15 Protocol of 1914 between the two States.³⁸ It is authoritatively described in a classic article by
16 DP O'Connell.³⁹

17 12. The basic principle was that France and the UK each retain jurisdiction, or 'sovereignty',
18 over its own subjects, and the other functions were committed to the high commissioners jointly
19 and were 'condominium' functions.⁴⁰ For internal purposes, there was a joint court for
20 condominium matters along with separate British and French courts.⁴¹ Coastal State jurisdiction
21 and third State fisheries would have been a condominium matter—in other words, there were
22 simultaneously two coastal States with respect to the coastline of New Hebrides. But the

³⁷ Ibid, p. 420.

³⁸ Protocol between Britain and France respecting the New Hebrides, 6 August 1914, 114 *British Foreign and State Papers* 212.

³⁹ DP O'Connell, 'The Condominium of the New Hebrides' (1968–9) 43 *BYIL* 71.

⁴⁰ Ibid, pp. 92–93.

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 122.

1 Protocol of 1914 was very far from regulating the whole gamut of maritime issues: there was, for
2 example, nothing about fishing. The main general provision in the protocol was Article XXX.

3 It dealt with vessels and it provided that, and I quote:

4 (1.) The High Commissioners shall jointly prescribe general rules applicable to all vessels
5 with regard to the conditions under which these vessels may use the ports and harbours of the
6 Group.

7 (2.) And rather quaintly: They shall jointly enforce these rules, either personally or through
8 the Resident Commissioners.

9 The idea of the personal enforcement of rules by the high commissioners conjures up an idea of
10 men in pith helmets carrying batons.

11 This is a long way from being the ‘openly and expressly agreed sharing of the jurisdiction of the
12 coastal State’ to which Mr. Wordsworth referred, yet there were two coastal States with respect
13 to the same coastline – or were.

14 **Conclusions: Rights of Reversion can qualify the Authority of a Coastal State**

15 13. In each of these cases, the attributes of a coastal State are distributed between several
16 States; in each of them disputes could arise which would be justiciable before a court or tribunal
17 having jurisdiction over Law of the Sea matters. Indeed there were in the case of the New
18 Hebrides and are, in the other two cases, simmering disputes or areas of disagreement; in none of
19 them is there any comprehensive or complete divided coastal State jurisdiction arrangement yet
20 there are two coastal States – or in one case three.

21 14. Let’s get closer to the facts of this case. I don’t suggest that these cases are directly the
22 same as ours but they show that the solitary State thesis doesn’t work. Assume that State A has
23 actual authority over a coastal territory but State B has a valid and admitted claim to reversion of
24 the territory after a defined period. It doesn’t matter whether the definition of that period is
25 fixed by reference to years – for example, 20 years – or events, for example, the closure of a

1 military base: the principle must be the same. State B also has certain rights over the territory
2 concerning access to or use or benefit of its marine and submarine resources during the
3 pre-reversion period and that too is agreed or, at least, appears from the documents; assume that
4 these rights derive from earlier understandings or undertakings given by State A as part of the
5 price for control of its territory during the interim period. Assume further that State B claims
6 that the circumstances in which State A acquired or retained its control over the coastal territory
7 were legally defective or unlawful under the international law at the time.

8 15. Now let us assume that State A acts in some maritime matter in a way which, according
9 to State B, disregards or annuls its claim to maritime rights in relation to the territory; or is
10 inconsistent with its claim to the territory; or is capable of affecting the value of its reversionary
11 interest in the territory or of its rights over the territory during the defined period. When
12 challenged, State A denies that State B is a coastal State or has any justiciable rights under the
13 Convention. Neither State has made a declaration under Article 298(1)(a)(i). Can it be right
14 in such a case to say that, just because, in determining the legality of State A's action, you have
15 to apply the law of the land – general international law – alongside the Convention, a Tribunal
16 under Part XV is impotent? Can it be right to say that such a Tribunal in the exercise of its
17 jurisdiction would have to determine that there is only one State holding all the attributes of a
18 coastal State? It is not right. But that has always been our case.

19 16. Of course, it is not the whole of our case. We also say that in declaring the “MPA” the
20 UK was in breach of various provisions of the Convention irrespective of coastal State status.
21 Unless there are any questions, Mr. President, I would ask you to call, after the break, on Mr.
22 Loewenstein to deal with that aspect of our case.

23 PRESIDENT SHEARER: There appear to be none.

24 Thank you very much, Professor Crawford.

1 We'll take the 15-minute break now, return at 11:00, and we will hear Mr.
2 Loewenstein at that time.

3 Thank you.

4 (Brief recess.)

5 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you, Mr. Loewenstein. You have the floor.

6 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Tribunal.

7 Before proceeding, I have one small housekeeping detail. My speech will run
8 approximately 75 minutes, and I propose, with the Tribunal's permission, that I push through
9 without taking a break. But, of course, if at any point the Tribunal wishes to take a break
10 during the speech, I would be more than happy to do so.

11 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, Mr. Loewenstein. You will be followed, I
12 think again by Professor Crawford again.

13 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: That's correct.

14 PRESIDENT SHEARER: And Mr. Dabee for the final closing remarks.

15 Well, I'm also conscious of the need for the Transcript writer to take a break.
16 Perhaps we will see if we get to a point around about an hour in, we might take a short break. I
17 think it would be a good idea, but just choose your moment for that.

18 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: Certainly.

19 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you, Mr. Loewenstein.

20 MR. LOEWENSTEIN: Certainly.

21 **The U.K. Breaches of the Convention:**

22 **Merits and Jurisdiction**

23 **Mr. Andrew Loewenstein**

24 **6 May 2014**

- 1 1. This morning it will be my task to address the third limb of Mauritius' case. This is the
2 alternative argument that Mauritius makes in the unlikely event you were to decide that
3 Mauritius is neither "the coastal State" nor "a coastal State" in relation to the Chagos
4 Archipelago. Except for Article 76, which Mr. Reichler already addressed, and Article 300,
5 which will be addressed by Professor Crawford, I will respond to the United Kingdom's
6 arguments regarding its breaches of the Convention, as well as the Fish Stocks Agreement, and
7 will show why this Tribunal has jurisdiction over these claims. I will begin with the merits
8 and conclude by addressing jurisdiction.
- 9 2. Before proceeding, I will answer Judge Greenwood's question regarding the internal British
10 correspondence referred to in Annex 20 of the United Kingdom's Rejoinder. These are not
11 our documents, and Mauritius does not have copies of them. With respect to the statement of
12 the Prime Minister of Mauritius that is the subject of Annex 20, we believe this refers to the
13 reply given by Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam to Parliamentary Question B/634 on the 29th of
14 November 1977, a copy of which was produced as Annex 83 to the Memorial.
- 15 3. I shall begin my discussion of the Merits by addressing the undertaking given by the United
16 Kingdom in 1965 that it would respect Mauritian fishing rights in the waters of the Chagos
17 Archipelago, and examining the relevant provisions of the Convention in light of this
18 undertaking. Mr. Reichler has already responded to the United Kingdom's claims that the
19 undertaking is not binding, so I can be brief. I will not repeat what he said about why those
20 claims are wrong, and will confine myself to showing that the undertaking is enforceable in
21 both the territorial sea and the EEZ by operation of Articles 2(3) and 56(2).
- 22 4. In the territorial sea, Article 2(3) provides that a coastal State's sovereignty "is exercised
23 subject to this Convention and to other rules of international law." Mauritius has explained
24 that this requires coastal States to comply both with the Convention and with other rules of
25 international law when exercising rights in the territorial sea. As Mr. Wordsworth states,

1 there are two points of disagreement – over the meaning of ‘is exercised,’ and over the scope of
2 ‘other rules of international law.’

3 5. On the first point, Mr. Wordsworth’s submissions that this is “merely descriptive of an element
4 of legal status,”⁴² and that it does not impose an obligation of compliance, if accepted, would
5 eviscerate not only Article 2(3) but also the many other provisions of the Convention that use
6 similar grammatical constructions to impose positive obligations.

7 6. Nor was Mr. Wordsworth correct in suggesting that interpreting 2(3) as establishing an
8 obligation of compliance would be redundant because States are already under this obligation.
9 The reference to “other rules of international law” cannot be redundant. The words in 2(3)
10 serve the important function of confirming the requirement that States must comply with rules
11 of international law when exercising rights in the territorial sea. Professor Sands showed this is
12 a long-standing obligation of general international law; the UK did not attempt to suggest
13 otherwise. The UK often suggests the Tribunal may only refer to rules of general
14 international law when there is a plain *renvoi* in the text referring to such rules. Yet when
15 confronted with a clear example of such a *renvoi*, the UK denies it has any operative effect. It
16 clearly does. By codifying the obligation to comply with international law in the territorial sea,
17 Article 2(3) subjects these other rules of international law to the dispute settlement procedures
18 set out in Part XV. Thus, if a dispute over their alleged breach cannot be resolved by peaceful
19 means, it may be settled in accordance with section 2.

20 7. On the second point – the scope of ‘other rules of international law – I refer you, in response to
21 the UK’s brief arguments, to paragraph 6.17 of Mauritius’ Reply. You will find there
22 confirmation of the interpretation by Mauritius – that the words are wider than simply rules of
23 general international law - by reference to the work of Birnie, Boyle and Redgwell. I need
24 not detain you by reading the specific reference, which the Tribunal can do at its leisure.

⁴² Wordsworth, Day 7, p. 868, line 23 and p. 869, line 1.

1 8. I turn now to Article 56(2). The undertaking to respect Mauritian fishing rights applies in the
2 EEZ, and the Tribunal will have noticed that the United Kingdom made no attempt to deny that
3 the undertaking, if binding, applies beyond the territorial sea. It did not respond to the
4 evidence showing that whenever the UK extended the maritime zones of the Chagos
5 Archipelago, it automatically, and out of a sense of legal obligation, treated Mauritius as “a
6 coastal State,” respecting Mauritian fishing rights in those zones as well. The United
7 Kingdom did so first to the limit of the 9 mile fisheries zone that it established contiguous to
8 the 3 mile territorial sea, and later, to the 200 mile limit of the EEZ. Thus, when Mr.
9 Wordsworth states that “We do not see Mauritius’ case on Article 56(2) as raising any discrete
10 issues on facts so far as concerns fishing rights,”⁴³ we understand him to accept that if the
11 undertaking is binding, it must pertain throughout *all* the waters of the Chagos Archipelago, to
12 the EEZ’s 200 mile limit.

13 9. We are left, then, with the question of whether Article 56(2) requires coastal States to respect
14 the rights of other States in the EEZ. The answer surely is that it does. As you know, 56(2)
15 requires a coastal State to “have due regard to the rights and duties of other States” when
16 exercising its own rights in the EEZ. I explained during the first round that both the Virginia
17 Commentary and the ILC interpret this language, or very similar language in the 1958
18 Convention, to mean that a coastal State must *refrain* from acts that will *interfere* with the
19 rights of other States. You will also recall that in its written pleadings, the United Kingdom
20 made no attempt to provide its own interpretation of this obligation. After Mauritius in the first
21 round challenged the UK to explain what it thinks the obligation actually requires, Professor
22 Boyle – finally – gave the United Kingdom’s answer. Due regard, he said, means “take
23 account of, give consideration to.”⁴⁴ Under these definitions, the obligation would appear to
24 entail nothing more than being aware of the rights of other States. Yet Professor Boyle also

⁴³ Wordsworth, Day 7, p. 874, lines 11-12.

⁴⁴ Boyle, Day 7, p. 822, line 12.

1 said that it could mean “do not ignore,” which suggests a more demanding obligation, and the
2 evidence shows that is precisely what the UK did, when, without meaningful consultation, it
3 purported to extinguish the fishing rights of Mauritius in the EEZ.

4 10. Regardless, it cannot be right that Article 56(2) has as limited a scope as the UK suggests, and
5 you will note that unlike Mauritius, the United Kingdom did not support its interpretation by
6 reference to the ordinary meaning of the words, as defined in standard dictionaries. Nor did
7 the United Kingdom explain why the interpretation given by the Virginia Commentary and the
8 ILC is wrong.

9 11. Significantly, when it comes to *applying* the obligation to have due regard, the United
10 Kingdom appears to concede that it imposes at least some substantive obligation beyond mere
11 awareness of other States’ rights. Professor Boyle said “If there are *good reasons* for
12 overriding the rights of other states in the EEZ, then Article 56(2) allows that.” Now, as I
13 said, Mauritius rejects this interpretation of “due regard,” which is contrary to its ordinary
14 meaning as elucidated by the Virginia Commentary and the ILC, both of which require States
15 to *refrain* from acting in ways that interfere with the rights of other states *regardless* of the
16 strength of the reasons for doing so. But it is important to note that, even under the standard
17 posited by the United Kingdom, the obligation plainly has been breached. The United
18 Kingdom did *not* – to use Professor Boyle’s formulation – have “good reasons for overriding
19 the rights” of Mauritius to fish in the EEZ. It had no reasons at all, and the evidence before you
20 shows there is no indication that Mauritius’ entitlement to fish, or its exercise of fishing rights,
21 had any adverse environmental impacts.

22 12. Professor Boyle said that applying this standard involves a balancing test under which the
23 United Kingdom’s reasons for abrogating the rights of Mauritius’ should be weighed against
24 the rights of Mauritius. Were such a balancing test to be employed, the result would be clear;
25 termination of the Mauritian right to fish is not warranted. Here, I can be brief.

1 13. On the Mauritian side of the scale is the commitment made by the United Kingdom to respect
2 the right of Mauritius to fish in the waters of the Chagos Archipelago. This is a right the UK
3 undertook to give to Mauritius as one of the conditions for detachment, and the UK's conduct
4 thereafter proceeded to allow Mauritius to fish initially up to three miles, and eventually up to
5 200 miles. It was one of the reasons why Mauritius supposedly consented. As such, in any
6 balancing exercise, it must be accorded great, if not decisive, weight. This is all the more so
7 given that the supposed consent was attached, was connected to negotiations over whether
8 Mauritius would attain independence. The UK's subsequent actions confirm the importance
9 of the Mauritian right to fish, which it treated with the utmost seriousness. To cite only one
10 example, on the 8th of February 1966, an official from the Colonial Office observed in
11 connection with the undertaking "[w]e are ... anxious to avoid anything in the nature of blanket
12 restrictions on activities by Mauritian fishermen."⁴⁵ For 45 years this remained the case.

13 14. Never, during all that time, did Mauritius exercise its rights in a manner that could justify their
14 restriction, even assuming *quod non* that the UK had any right to impose restrictions beyond
15 those connected to defence purposes, which it did not. Nothing in the UK's submissions
16 contains any hint that Mauritius ever did anything improper in exercising its rights. In fact,
17 the FCO's 1996 research paper, which Ms. Yeadon endorsed in 2009, confirmed the UK view
18 that the right of Mauritian vessels to fish in the waters of the Chagos Archipelago had "never
19 been abused by them."⁴⁶ And as I have said, there is no evidence of environmental harm.

20 15. Let's turn now to the UK's side of the scale, and see whether the environmental objectives it
21 has cited could provide a "good reason" for "overriding" Mauritian fishing rights. In this
22 regard, it is sufficient to note that Mauritian fishing did not present any plausible danger to the
23 fish stocks in the waters of the Chagos Archipelago. To the contrary, the evidence shows the

⁴⁵ MM Annex 41, Letter dated 8 February 1966 from K.W.S. MacKenzie, Colonial Office to A. Brooke-Turner, UK Foreign Office, FO 371/190790.

⁴⁶ MR Annex 101, "British Indian Ocean Territory" Proclamation No. 1 of 1991.

1 fish stocks were stable and *not* at risk. The fish stocks certainly were not endangered by
2 Mauritian fishing. Professor Boyle referred to the United Kingdom’s press release announcing
3 the public consultation. This press release said that the “fish stocks” of the “waters of the
4 Chagos Archipelago” are “amongst the least damaged in the world.”⁴⁷ Although Mauritian
5 vessels fished in the EEZ for decades, the amount of fish they caught was relatively small,
6 especially when compared to the much greater tonnage caught by non-Mauritian vessels
7 licensed by the United Kingdom. This is a point upon which the Parties agree, as indicated by
8 the chart the Attorney General showed. Thus, even on the United Kingdom’s own case,
9 Mauritian vessels would *not* threaten any plausible environmental objectives.

10 16. This is confirmed by the fact the United Kingdom *allows* recreational fishing to continue
11 throughout the EEZ, and exempts from the “MPA” the territorial sea of Diego Garcia, where
12 fishing is permitted. According to UK reports to the IOTC, fishing in the territorial sea of
13 Diego Garcia alone involved the landing of 28.4 tonnes of tuna and tuna-like species in 2010;⁴⁸
14 21.29 tonnes in 2011;⁴⁹ and 10.79 tonnes in 2012.⁵⁰ These statistics do *not* reflect the full
15 tonnage of fish taken, just the species reported to the IOTC. Nor do they include the tonnage
16 caught by recreational fishing throughout the EEZ. If fishing on this scale is acceptable to the
17 United Kingdom – where an undertaking to respect the rights of another State is *not* implicated
18 – how can the United Kingdom possibly claim by reference to environmental objectives that it
19 had “good reasons” for “overriding” the fishing rights of Mauritius?

20 17. On these facts, we would submit, the United Kingdom has plainly breached the obligation to
21 have due regard for the rights of Mauritius *even if* the standard posited by the United Kingdom
22 were applied, rather than the proper standard set out by the ordinary meaning of those words.

⁴⁷ UK Folder Tab 57.

⁴⁸ UK IOTC-2011-SC14-NR28.

⁴⁹ IOTC-2012-SC15-R[E].

⁵⁰ UK IOTC-2013-SC16-NR29.

1 18. Before leaving the 1965 undertaking, I will say a few words about the breach of Article 78 in
2 regard to the United Kingdom's prohibition on Mauritius from harvesting sedentary species.
3 I can be brief because the United Kingdom had almost nothing to say about this. Its only
4 defence was to argue that in 1965 there was no harvesting of sedentary species and that
5 licences for doing so were not issued.⁵¹ Even if true, neither of these assertions are relevant,
6 for the reasons Mr. Reichler explained in connection with the scope and nature of the
7 undertaking. It was *not* intended to be limited to the fishing practices in 1965, and it was *not*
8 implemented that way. As I showed in the first round, the United Kingdom took for granted
9 that the undertaking applied to sedentary species, including specifically mollusks and crayfish,
10 and accepted that it safeguarded the rights of Mauritius to harvest such species in the future.
11 The fact that sedentary species had not previously been exploited was irrelevant: what is
12 crucial is that the right to exploit such species was available if Mauritius wished. Now that
13 right has been extinguished.

14 19. I turn now to the United Kingdom's breach of its obligation to consult with Mauritius, which
15 applies to the territorial sea and EEZ by virtue of Articles 2(3) and 56(2). With regard to the
16 territorial sea, I have already shown that 2(3) imposes on coastal States the obligation to
17 comply with the rules of general international law. The obligation to consult when a State's
18 rights can be affected is such a rule. The precedents all support Mauritius. This is a constant
19 that runs from *Lac Lanoux*, where the riparians shared the right to make equitable use, to *Pulp*
20 *Mills*, where there was a shared watercourse, to the *Fisheries Jurisdiction* cases, where
21 competing fishing rights were at issue. Professor Boyle sought to narrow this principle by
22 suggesting it applies only where there is a possibility of transboundary harm. This is not
23 correct. The consultation required in these cases were specific applications of the more
24 general requirement to consult when the rights of another State may be affected. As the

⁵¹ Boyle, Day 7, p. 897, lines 10-11.

1 Tribunal in *Lac Lanoux* held: “communications [...] cannot be confined to purely formal
2 requirements, such as taking note of complaints, protests or representations made by the
3 downstream State. The Tribunal is of the opinion that, according to the rules of good faith, the
4 upstream State is under the obligation to take into consideration the various interests involved,
5 to seek to give them every satisfaction compatible with the pursuit of its own interests, and to
6 show that in this regard it is genuinely concerned to reconcile the interests of the other riparian
7 State with its own.”⁵²

8 20. Of course, transboundary harm was also not an issue in the *Fisheries Jurisdiction cases*, which
9 involved the duty to consult in relation to competing rights over access to fish stocks. There,
10 the ICJ made clear that the obligation to consult in such circumstances is derived from the UN
11 Charter, including important principles relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes. The
12 obligation is plainly *not* limited to circumstances where there is a risk of transboundary harm.

13 21. The United Kingdom has also sought to minimize the content of the obligation, suggesting it
14 requires only “prior and timely notification and relevant information,” and that consultations
15 need only occur at “an early stage” and be conducted “in good faith.” The evidence shows the
16 UK did *not* provide timely information, as Ms. Macdonald outlined yesterday morning, and
17 has *not* acted in good faith. But, in any event, the United Kingdom’s approach falls short of
18 what the ICJ required in the *Fisheries Jurisdiction cases*, where it ruled that the parties’
19 exchanges should seek the delimitation of their respective rights and interests and the
20 achievement of an equitable balance concerning such matters as catch limitations, share
21 allocations, and restrictions on closed areas.

22 22. Regardless, under any relevant standard, the United Kingdom failed to consult with Mauritius.
23 Ms. Macdonald has addressed you in detail on the unilateral manner in which the United
24 Kingdom proceeded, so I can be brief. As she explained, the United Kingdom kept the

⁵²*Lac Lanoux Arbitration* (Spain v. France), (1957) XII UNRIIA 281, 315 at para. 22; 24 ILR 101, 139 at para. 22.

1 proposal from Mauritius until the Foreign Secretary had formally decided to pursue the
2 project. It did not consider that Mauritius counted as an ‘interested stakeholder’ deserving of
3 early involvement. It did not mention the issue at the January 2009 talks, although it raised the
4 idea surreptitiously. Professor Boyle advanced the surprising argument that in the *July 2009*
5 talks that those talks were, themselves, sufficient to fulfill any obligation to consult. And
6 following that, the United Kingdom pursued the public consultation, a development which, as
7 you have heard, made it impossible for Mauritius to continue with bilateral dialogue on the
8 subject.

9 23. For the same reasons, the United Kingdom breached its coordination and cooperation
10 obligations under Articles 63 and 64 of UNCLOS and Article 7 of the 1995 Fish Stocks
11 Agreement. The United Kingdom’s principal defense is to contend that they aren’t applicable
12 to Mauritius because of the location of Mauritian fishing activities. This is wrong as a matter
13 of fact, and the Tribunal need only refer to Professor Boyle’s map to see why. Mauritian
14 vessels clearly *do* fish in areas adjacent to the EEZ of the Chagos Archipelago. Professor
15 Boyle made no attempt to explain why the areas fished by Mauritian vessels are too far away to
16 count. Nor did he respond to the point I made in the first round that the relevant species can
17 quickly traverse the distance between the EEZ of the Chagos Archipelago and areas fished by
18 Mauritian vessels. And, in regard to Article 64, the 2013 report relied upon by Professor
19 Boyle notes that 47 percent of the chilled fish landed in Mauritius by its fishing vessels were
20 swordfish, a highly migratory species listed in Annex I.

21 24. The United Kingdom is not saved by citing its participation in the activities of the IOTC. This
22 says nothing about whether it has complied with the obligations set out in 63 and 64 and
23 Article 7 in specific regard to the “MPA”. Those articles do not require general participation
24 in regional organizations. They impose specific coordination and cooperation obligations
25 when a State contemplates measures that may impact the relevant stocks. The “MPA” is

1 clearly such a measure. The UK's notification to the IOTC stated that the "MPA" could
2 impact the Commission's work. So the UK is left with the argument that it discharged this
3 obligation by notifying the IOTC of its planned consultation exercise. I explained in the first
4 round why these are not articles on notification, but rather impose much more demanding
5 obligations. In its oral pleadings, the UK did not explain why mere notification of the IOTC
6 would discharge its obligations, other than to stand these obligations on their head by
7 suggesting that the onus was on the *IOTC* to engage with the UK. The UK's view is plainly
8 inconsistent with the ruling of the WTO Appellate Body that, in cases involving measures
9 undertaken for environmental purposes, but which may impact other States' rights under a
10 treaty regime, there must be "ongoing serious, good faith efforts to reach a multilateral
11 agreement."⁵³

12 25. This brings me to the United Kingdom's breach of the undertaking its Prime Minister gave to
13 the Prime Minister of Mauritius in November 2009. For the reasons I have already explained,
14 this undertaking is applicable to the rights of Mauritius in all areas, both in the territorial sea
15 and the EEZ, rights that are protected by Articles 2(3) and 56(2). The question for the Tribunal
16 is essentially one of fact. Did Prime Minister Brown give a commitment to put the "MPA" on
17 hold? We say the evidence is clear and unchallenged. On the one side, you have an
18 unambiguous statement by the Prime Minister of Mauritius, a signed statement the contents of
19 which are confirmed by a raft of contemporaneous materials. On the other side, you have
20 nothing that can properly be called evidence. The record before you points only in one
21 direction, that Mr. Brown gave the undertaking, and that it was violated. The United Kingdom
22 is responsible for this breach.

23 26. The Tribunal can determine the answer to this dispute of fact by performing its ordinary
24 fact-finding function; that is, by weighing the evidence presented by each side, and

⁵³United States - Import prohibition of certain shrimp and shrimp products (Report of the Appellate Body, 22 October 2001), WT/DS58/AB/RW, paras. 152-3.

1 determining whether Mauritius has sustained its burden of proof. The fact that Heads of
2 Government are involved does not alter the basic task, but as Judge Greenwood noted, the fact
3 that the undertaking was between two Heads of Government makes it all the more significant
4 in its consequence.

5 27. With this in mind, let's review the evidence before the Tribunal. On the one hand, Mauritius
6 has provided clear evidence as to the commitment given by Mr. Brown. The evidence in
7 support has been presented in various forms, all consistent. Prime Minister Ramgoolam has
8 been crystal clear about what Prime Minister Brown promised him during their meeting. He
9 said it before the Mauritian Legislative Assembly. And he said it in the Witness Statement he
10 submitted to this Tribunal for your consideration, made knowing that it would subject him to
11 cross-examination by the United Kingdom. Prime Minister Ramgoolam has been consistent
12 each time: Prime Minister Brown promised the "MPA" would be put on hold.

13 28. In contrast, the United Kingdom has tendered *no* evidence to contradict this declaration. The
14 UK did not provide any written statement in response to when the matter was raised at the
15 Foreign Ministerial level in Mauritius' letter of 30 December 2009. As the Tribunal has
16 noted, there was no British response to the very serious allegation made in that letter that the
17 United Kingdom had breached a commitment given by one Head of Government to another.
18 The draft letter, apparently prepared by Mr. Murton and which was never sent that was
19 attached to one of the emails put in by the UK last weekend makes no mention of the
20 commitment and did not refer to any misunderstanding in relation to it. The United Kingdom
21 elected not to cross examine Prime Minister Ramgoolam, and Mauritius does not understand
22 the statement by the United Kingdom's Agent that it would have been "fanciful" to try to do
23 so.⁵⁴

⁵⁴Whomersley, Day 5, p. 502, line 18.

1 29. The record, we would submit, is clear: Prime Minister Brown gave a commitment to Prime
2 Minister Ramgoolam that the “MPA” would be put on hold. That commitment was not
3 fulfilled. The United Kingdom has tendered no evidence upon which it could be concluded
4 otherwise. It has belatedly supplied some fragmentary emails that we will address on
5 Thursday, which we say do not advance its case on this point, and only throw into sharper
6 relief the absence of any statement from Mr. Brown.

7 30. I turn now to Article 194. First, the UK has breached the obligation under 194(1), which
8 requires it to endeavour to harmonise its policies to prevent, control and reduce pollution of the
9 marine environment with Mauritius and with other States. At a minimum, this requires the UK
10 to make pollution-related policies for the Chagos Archipelago “consistent or compatible” with
11 those of regional States. Of necessity, this requires the UK to consult with Mauritius. There
12 was no such effort. The UK proceeded unilaterally and without proper notice. Professor
13 Boyle’s rhetorical demand for evidence of *Mauritius*’ efforts to cooperate is counter-intuitive.
14 It was not Mauritius that purported to change the legal regime applicable the entirety of the
15 Chagos Archipelago’s EEZ.

16 31. Further, the UK is in breach of Article 194(4), which requires it, in taking measures to prevent,
17 reduce or control pollution, to refrain from unjustifiably interfering with the activities carried
18 out by Mauritius in exercise of its rights. The “MPA”, on its face, is intended to provide
19 comprehensive environmental protection for the waters of the Chagos Archipelago, including
20 its marine environment. This would, by necessity, include marine pollution measures. The
21 United Kingdom does not suggest otherwise. Article 194(4) is therefore applicable. And
22 accordingly, any measures to “prevent, reduce or control” marine pollution must not
23 unjustifiably interfere with Mauritius’ rights in the Chagos Archipelago. Mauritius is entitled,
24 at the least, to declaratory relief that the UK – which keeps insisting new regulations are
25 pending – that it may not use pollution control measures to interfere with those rights. The

1 fact that, as Professor Boyle suggests, pollution has been the subject of prior regulatory
2 measures, is immaterial. Leaving aside the lack of notice to Mauritius about such acts, they
3 say nothing about regulations that are currently being drafted.

4 32. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I turn now to address your jurisdiction over the
5 United Kingdom’s breaches of the articles I just mentioned.

6 33. Both Parties are in agreement about one thing: Part XV is the product of prolonged
7 negotiations, and its final form reflects hard-won compromises. Professor Boyle referred to the
8 “inter-related package deal on which the Convention text rests.” We agree. The question for
9 the Tribunal is: what is the content of the package? Is it, as Mauritius submits, to be found in
10 the text of Part XV, including most relevantly, Article 297, a complicated provision that grants
11 jurisdiction over some issues and, in discrete circumstances, limits them as well. Or is it, as the
12 United Kingdom maintains, a blanket exclusion of any disputes that touch upon fishing in the
13 exclusive economic zone?

14 34. The UK’s approach is encapsulated by Professor Boyle’s telling response to a question from
15 Judge Wolfrum when he said that “297(3) takes EEZ fishery disputes out of compulsory
16 jurisdiction – full stop.”⁵⁵ This perfectly describes both the UK position, and why it is wrong.
17 This is *not* what the text says. The drafters could have written, to use Professor Boyle’s
18 formulation, that there is no jurisdiction over EEZ fisheries disputes, full stop. But this is *not*
19 what they wrote. The Convention says there *is* jurisdiction over claims for alleged
20 contravention of international rules relating to the protection and preservation of the marine
21 environment. It says there *is* jurisdiction over EEZ fisheries disputes, unless the 297(3)
22 exception applies. That exception applies to some disputes, but not all of them. To maintain
23 that *all* disputes touching upon fishing in the EEZ are excluded, full stop, is to denigrate the

⁵⁵ Boyle, Day 7, p. 816, lines 7-8.

1 carefully crafted compromise achieved by the drafters of the Convention and embodied in
2 Article 297.

3 35. It is beyond argument that 297 does not exclude all such disputes. Professor Boyle conceded
4 in his answer to Judge Wolfrum that there are, to use Professor Boyle's word, "*gaps*" in what
5 he thinks should be the total exclusion from jurisdiction of disputes touching upon fisheries in
6 the EEZ. But, inverting the famous London tube announcement, Professor Boyle seemed to
7 say, "*don't mind the gaps.*"

8 36. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I have had the great privilege of working with
9 Professor Boyle on several cases, and the even greater privilege of learning from him while
10 doing so. But I am forced, with the greatest of respect, to disagree. We submit that you *must*
11 mind the gaps. What Professor Boyle calls the gaps are not the product of sloppy drafting, a
12 mismatch between text and intention. They reflect deliberate decisions by the Convention's
13 drafters to bestow upon Part XV courts and tribunals jurisdiction over important matters
14 concerning the interpretation or application of UNCLOS. To disregard these gaps, to close
15 them, to read them out of the Convention, in furtherance of the mistaken view that all disputes
16 touching upon fishing in the EEZ are necessarily excluded from jurisdiction, would be a
17 disservice to the drafting achievement that is Part XV and Article 297 in particular.

18 Mr. President, this might be an opportune time for a break, if that suits you and the
19 Tribunal.

20 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, I think that is very well. We will break for 15
21 minutes at this time.

22 Thank you.

23 (Brief recess.)

24 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Mr. Loewenstein, just before you begin, I want to say
25 something about the arrangements for the photograph. If at the end of this morning's session, if

1 you would all remain in this room in your places, the photographer wants to take some sort of
2 action shots that will be posed or fake, but look as though we are in session.

3 And then after he's done that, we'll move to the lobby of the hotel, and we'll take a
4 group photograph around the steps in the lobby, so, anyway, we will be guided by the
5 photographer. He'll give the signal what he wants us to do and what we do afterwards.

6 Thank you very much, Mr. Loewenstein.

7 37. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I will now turn to Mauritius' primary submission, that
8 the Tribunal has jurisdiction over all of its claims relating to breaches of the Convention
9 because they alleged contraventions of specified international rules or standards for the
10 protection and preservation of the marine environment, and thus fall within the grant of
11 jurisdiction provided in Article 297(1)(c). The United Kingdom has taken a curious approach
12 in responding to this claim. It seems to accept that if 297(1)(c) is applied as drafted, it would
13 give jurisdiction over Mauritius' claims, assuming that Mauritius has alleged contravention of
14 such rules, a matter to which I will return later. So the United Kingdom is forced to look
15 *outside* the text of 297(1)(c) to find a limitation. It finds this alleged limitation in 297(1)(a)
16 and (1)(b), which, as Professor Boyle points out, grant jurisdiction over disputes concerning
17 navigational rights, overflight and the laying of submarine cables and pipelines. This is
18 accurate, as far as it goes, but Professor Boyle fell into error when he said that the references in
19 (1)(a) and (1)(b) to navigational rights, overflight and the laying of submarine cables and
20 pipelines, also limit a court or tribunal's jurisdiction under a different paragraph: 297(1)(c).

21 38. This cannot be right. The limitation appears *only* in (1)(a) and (1)(b). It does *not* appear in
22 (1)(c). What accounts for these different texts? Is it, as Professor Boyle appears to suggest,
23 poor draftsmanship, an unexpressed intention to apply the limitations of (1)(a) and (1)(b) to
24 (1)(c) without actually saying so in the text of (1)(c)? Or is it that (1)(c) means exactly what it
25 says: that a Part XV court or tribunal has jurisdiction over *all* disputes concerning the alleged

1 contravention of specified international rules for the protection and preservation of the marine
2 environment? The answer, we submit, is obvious: there is no implied, extra-textual limitation
3 in (1)(c) restricting its application to disputes over navigational rights, overflight, or the laying
4 of submarine cables and pipelines.

5 39. Professor Boyle attempts to re-write the text of 297(1)(c) in another way as well. He says it is
6 exclusively concerned with rules and standards regulating *marine pollution*. But that is *not*
7 what is said in the text. A broader category is mentioned: the “protection and preservation of
8 the marine environment.” The two are not synonymous. To be sure, marine pollution may
9 fall within the general category of environmental protection and preservation, but there is no
10 textual basis on which to conclude that 297(1)(c) is confined solely and exclusively to marine
11 pollution. The text says otherwise.

12 40. Nor is there any textual basis on which to conclude that 297(1)(c) concerns only MARPOL and
13 SOLAS rules. That is not the view of Judge Mensah, about whom Professor Boyle had little
14 to say. [pp. 797-798] I won’t belabor the point by taking you back to Judge Mensah’s article.
15 Suffice to say he addresses these very issues, including specifically 297(1)(c) and the meaning
16 of specified international rules and standards for that purpose. He does not share the view that
17 only MARPOL and SOLAS rules are covered. And Judge Mensah should know: before his
18 elevation to ITLOS he was the Director of Legal Affairs for the IMO.

19 41. Professor Boyle also misunderstands Mauritius’ position when he attributes to Mauritius the
20 view that the articles the UK are alleged to have breached are specified international rules or
21 standards for purposes of 297(1)(c) “simply because they are part of the Convention.” [p.
22 798]. This is *not* Mauritius’ position. These articles are specified rules within the meaning
23 of 297(1)(c) because they establish binding obligations relating to the protection and
24 preservation of the marine environment. This is the view of Judge Mensah, who specifically
25 includes Article 56 among them.

1 42. The views of Professor Oxman offer the UK no assistance. To begin with, the article cited by
2 Professor Boyle does *not* address how international rules or standards should be understood
3 within the meaning of Article 297(1)(c). The section quoted by Professor Boyle is not
4 concerned with UNCLOS. Nor does Professor Oxman address the definition of a *rule*. He
5 was concerned with “standards.” Professor Boyle quotes Professor Oxman as suggesting that
6 “the duty to respect international standards ... is ‘typically expressed in connection with a duty
7 (or right) to adopt national laws or regulations governing a particular matter.’”⁵⁶ Now, putting
8 to one side the fact that Professor Oxman was addressing standards, not rules, Professor Boyle
9 elides over the qualification in what Professor Oxman wrote. He said “typically.” This
10 means there are *other* circumstances where standards are not connected to the enactment of
11 national laws. The rules set out in the Convention are good examples. They establish
12 binding legal obligations in relation to the protection and preservation of the marine
13 environment that do not concern the adoption of national laws.

14 43. The Tribunal now has had the benefit of the parties’ written and oral pleadings on whether the
15 articles of UNCLOS alleged to have been contravened by the UK are specified rules within the
16 meaning of 297(1)(c). I do not propose to go over this well-worn ground again. I will simply
17 say that each of the articles alleged to have been contravened by the UK – Article 194 stands
18 out in particular – establish a binding obligation and each relates to the protection or
19 preservation of the marine environment. Nothing more is required.

20 44. I turn now to the question of whether, even if the UK were correct that Mauritius’ claims do not
21 fall within the 297(1)(c) grant of jurisdiction, you may still exercise jurisdiction because
22 297(3) also grants jurisdiction over fisheries disputes and the disputes Mauritius has raised do
23 not fall within that paragraph’s exclusion.

⁵⁶ Boyle, Day 7, p. 800, lines 13-15.

1 45. As with 297(1)(c), it is important to pay close attention to the text of 297(3) to determine
2 precisely what is excluded from jurisdiction. It is clearly *not* all disputes touching upon fishing
3 in the EEZ. If that was the intention, the drafters would have said so. There would have been
4 no need to provide for a general grant of jurisdiction and then a narrower exception.

5 46. Professor Boyle objected to the argument that 297(3) excludes only disputes concerning the
6 sovereign rights of coastal States, and does not exclude disputes concerning the rights of *other*
7 States. Let's test this view by reference to the text. We begin with what appears to be
8 common ground: there is a correlation between Articles 56 and 297.⁵⁷ Disputes concerning
9 some aspects of Article 56 are clearly subject to jurisdiction under 297, while others are not.
10 Now let's examine Article 56. There is a distinction between two sets of rights: the rights of
11 coastal States, on the one hand, and the rights of other states, on the other. To be specific:
12 paragraph 1(a) of Article 56 provides that in the EEZ the coastal State has "sovereign rights for
13 the purposes of," among other things, "conserving and managing" living resources. On the
14 other hand, Article 56(2), in language with which the Tribunal is very familiar, addresses the
15 obligations of coastal States in regard to the rights of *other* States.

16 47. With this distinction in mind, we can return to the text of 297(3). It excludes only disputes
17 over the *sovereign rights* of a coastal state. It does *not* exclude disputes concerning the rights
18 of *other* states. The United Kingdom's only response is to argue that "the two go together"
19 and that "any assertion of sovereign rights over living resources in the EEZ will impact on the
20 ability of foreign States to exploit those resources and vice versa."⁵⁸

21 48. This is where the Tribunal's duty to characterize the dispute becomes paramount. Is this, as
22 the United Kingdom suggests, a dispute over its putative sovereign rights as a coastal State, or
23 is it a dispute over the rights of Mauritius under the 1965 undertaking? This is a matter for the
24 Tribunal to decide. As the ICJ held in the *Fisheries Jurisdiction* case (Spain against Canada):

⁵⁷ Boyle, Day 7, p. 814, lines 18-19.

⁵⁸ Boyle, Day 7, p. 804, lines 15-16.

1 “The Court will itself determine the real issue that has been submitted to it.⁵⁹ It will base itself
2 not only on the Application and final submissions, but on diplomatic exchanges, public
3 statements and other pertinent evidence.”⁶⁰

4 49. The Arbitral Tribunal in *Barbados v. Trinidad*, a case Professor Boyle mentioned, performed
5 this characterization exercise. And in doing so, it distinguished between the sovereign rights of
6 coastal states and the rights of other States in the EEZ. In that arbitration, there was no
7 preexisting agreement or undertaking committing the coastal State – Trinidad and Tobago – to
8 respect the fishing rights of Barbados in the Trinidadian EEZ. Rather, Barbados sought a
9 declaration that would have granted it access to fisheries in the Trinidadian EEZ as a *remedy*
10 for the Tribunal’s disadvantageous boundary delimitation. The Tribunal characterized
11 Barbados’ claim this way at paragraph 277 of the Award: “Barbados stated clearly that its
12 submissions in respect of its claim to a right to fish within the EEZ of Trinidad and Tobago
13 were made on the basis that such a right could be awarded by the Tribunal as a *remedy* *infra*
14 *petita* in the dispute concerning the course of the maritime boundary.”⁶¹

15 50. The Tribunal ruled that 297(3) did not allow it to exercise jurisdiction over a claim to *establish*
16 a right of access to the fisheries where none already existed. It held, at paragraph 283, that it
17 “does not have jurisdiction to make an award *establishing* a right of access for Barbadian
18 fishermen to flyingfish within the EEZ of Trinidad and Tobago.” But the Tribunal
19 emphasized that this is *not* the same as a claim to enforce what it called a “pre-existent
20 traditional fishing regime in the region which included a right of access.”⁶² Exercising
21 jurisdiction over *that* type of claim, the Tribunal said, “is very different from saying that a
22 Tribunal has an inherent power to *create* a right of access by way of a remedy in a boundary

⁵⁹ *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1995*, pp. 24-25.

⁶⁰ *Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1974*, pp. 262-263.

⁶¹ *Barbados v. Trinidad and Tobago, Award of 11 April 2006, XXVII RIAA*, p. 147, para. 277.

⁶² *Id.*, para. 277,

1 dispute.”⁶³ To underscore the point, the Tribunal italicized the word “create.” In other
2 words, disputes relating to pre-existing fishing rights are not excluded by 297(3); disputes
3 that seek to create or establish such rights are. And the Tribunal may find of interest the
4 historical footnote that this distinguished Tribunal included Sir Arthur Watts, the author of the
5 UK note which concluded that Mauritius has “fishing rights” in the waters of the Chagos
6 Archipelago.⁶⁴

7 51. Let us now turn to another reason why 297(3), the exclusion found therein, does not cover the
8 claims Mauritius has raised. The drafters were careful to provide that the exclusion applies
9 only to disputes concerning a coastal State’s “sovereign rights” with respect to the living
10 resources in the EEZ or their exercise. As Judge Wolfrum pointed out in his questions to
11 Professor Boyle, this is a reference to specific provisions in Part V. So let us return to the text
12 of Article 56. It establishes in the EEZ the distinction between a coastal State’s sovereign
13 rights, on the one hand, and its jurisdiction, on the other. These are addressed in *different*
14 paragraphs. Subparagraph (1)(a) concerns a coastal State’s “sovereign rights,” including
15 sovereign rights for the purpose of conserving and managing living resources. *Jurisdiction* in
16 the EEZ, on the other hand, is addressed in subparagraph (1)(b), including specifically
17 “jurisdiction” concerning “*the protection and preservation of the marine environment,*” as set
18 out in subparagraph (1)(b)(iii).

19 52. Article 297(3)’s exclusion mentions only sovereign rights. It does not mention *jurisdiction*.
20 This must have been deliberate. When the drafters of 297 intended a jurisdictional clause to
21 cover both “jurisdiction” *and* “sovereign rights,” they did so expressly. This was done in
22 paragraph (1)(a). It makes Part XV procedures available for disputes concerning the
23 interpretation or application of the Convention “with regard to the exercise of a coastal state of

⁶³ *Id.*, para. 277.

⁶⁴ MR Annex 83, Minute dated 13 October 1981 from A.D. Watts to [name redacted], “Extension of the Territorial Sea: BIOT”.

1 its sovereign rights *or jurisdiction.*” We thus see in (1)(a) the choice to include both
2 sovereign rights and jurisdiction. This contrasts with 297(3). There, the drafters referred
3 *only* to “sovereign rights.” “Jurisdiction” is not mentioned. This, we submit, is a clear
4 indication that the drafters intended only disputes over “sovereign rights” under Article
5 56(1)(a) to be covered by the exclusion. Disputes relating to “jurisdiction” under 56(b)(iii)
6 were not. The latter category of disputes thus falls within the general grant of jurisdiction over
7 fisheries disputes, not the exclusion. This is important for the present case because the
8 “MPA” is alleged to be an exercise of the UK’s purported *jurisdiction* in the EEZ in relation to
9 the protection and preservation of the marine environment. As such, even if characterized as
10 a fisheries dispute, it does *not* fall within the 297(3) exception.

11 53. This brings me to why nothing the UK has argued undermines the conclusion that its
12 declaration of the “MPA” was done pursuant to its alleged *jurisdiction* over environmental
13 protection and preservation, not as an alleged exercise of sovereign rights in relation to the
14 conservation or management of living resources. As has been emphasized, the United
15 Kingdom has consistently described the “MPA” as an environmental protection and
16 preservation measure, not as a fisheries conservation or management measure, including most
17 relevantly, in the 2010 proclamation establishing the “MPA”. Professor Sands made this very
18 clear in the first round, and Professor Boyle was not able to rebut the conclusions that flow
19 from what he said. This is reflected as well in a great many documents we have reviewed in
20 these oral proceedings. These documents contrast with other documents that do, in fact,
21 address conservation and management. An example can be seen at Tab 7.1. And you will
22 see at 7.1 the first page of BIOT Ordinance No. 1 of 1991, which extended the fisheries regime
23 to the 200 mile limit of the EEZ. The document describes itself as “An Ordinance to make
24 fresh provision for the *regulation, conservation and management of the fishing waters* of the
25 British Indian Ocean Territory and matters incidental thereto.” This contrasts with the

1 “MPA”’s proclamation, which referred expressly to the protection and preservation of the
2 environment. The contrast could not be plainer.

3 54. Nor, it is clear, did the United Kingdom in adopting the “MPA” undertake the sorts of actions
4 that are required of States exercising sovereign rights in relation to living resources in the EEZ,
5 pursuant to Articles 61 and 62. It did not, for instance, take into account the “best scientific
6 evidence available to it” in determining the “allowable catch.” It did not design measures to
7 achieve the “maximum sustainable yield.” It did not promote the “optimum utilization” of the
8 EEZ’s living resources. And it certainly did not take into account the “need to minimize the
9 economic dislocation in States whose nationals have habitually fished” in the EEZ of the
10 Chagos Archipelago. The reason why the United Kingdom did not do any of these things is
11 plain: it was not acting to conserve or manage living resources. It was, instead, purporting to
12 exercise jurisdiction over the protection and preservation of the marine environment.

13 55. Turning now to Articles 63 and 64 of UNCLOS and Article 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement,
14 the United Kingdom persists in suggesting that Articles 281 and 282 preclude this Tribunal
15 from exercising jurisdiction. The United Kingdom made no effort to engage with the
16 arguments made by Mauritius in the first round, including that the dispute before you is plainly
17 *not* a dispute over the interpretation or application of the IOTC Agreement, and that the dispute
18 resolution provision in that Agreement cannot deprive you of jurisdiction because it does not
19 mandate referral to any other dispute resolution procedure for a binding decision. Professor
20 Boyle mentioned conciliation,⁶⁵ but that could not result in a binding decision.

21 56. The United Kingdom also argues that you should follow the *Southern Bluefin Tuna* case. I
22 will be brief. As the Tribunal is aware, when ITLOS considered the 281 argument in the
23 provisional measures phase of that case, albeit on a *prima facie* basis, it was resoundingly
24 rejected. No court or tribunal has ever followed the later Annex VII award. It has, to put it

⁶⁵ Boyle, Day 7, p. 819, line 9.

1 mildly, been the subject of critique. A good example is UK Authority 54, which is an article
2 by Professor Churchill that the UK submitted with its Counter-Memorial. Professor Churchill
3 writes:

4 57. This is a strained and artificial reading of Article 16(2), and one that appears contrary to Article
5 281. The latter requires States to opt out of the normal rule that disputes relating to the Law of
6 the Sea Convention are to be settled in accordance with the procedures of that Convention: as
7 an exception to a general rule it should be strictly construed, which therefore suggests that an
8 agreement must state clearly and explicitly that the Law of the Sea Convention procedures are
9 excluded.

10 58. Professor Boyle is among those who say that the *Southern Bluefin Tuna* case was wrongly
11 decided, a position he elaborated upon in an article on that case. I will not further detain the
12 Tribunal with this issue, and have placed a copy of Professor Boyle's article into the folder at
13 Tab 7.2, in case the Tribunal wishes to review his views at its leisure.

14 59. I turn now to jurisdiction over the UK's remaining breaches of UNCLOS. I can be even
15 briefer here. The United Kingdom accepts that Article 288 grants a Part XV court or tribunal
16 jurisdiction over all disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention,
17 subject only to the limitations found in section 3. In connection with Article 2(3), the UK
18 accepts that nothing in 297 prevents this Tribunal from exercising jurisdiction over a territorial
19 sea dispute. This has to be the case, because 297 is concerned exclusively with the EEZ. 297
20 says nothing about the territorial sea. So the United Kingdom is forced to invent a new
21 jurisdictional limit that is *not* found in the Convention.

22 60. Where does the UK locate this new limitation? Not in section 3, which is the section that sets
23 out the limitations on jurisdiction, but in Article 288(2). This cannot be right. Article 288(2)
24 is a provision that *extends* a Part XV court or tribunal's jurisdiction beyond the interpretation
25 or application of UNCLOS to *other* agreements when the parties to those agreements so agree.

1 It is difficult to see how this extension of jurisdiction to other agreements limits a Part XV
2 court or tribunal’s jurisdiction to interpret or apply UNCLOS.

3 61. Finally, your jurisdiction over Article 194 is also plainly established. The United Kingdom
4 does not argue it is excluded by 297. Its only argument is that the UK has not yet enacted new
5 laws or regulations on marine pollution. The UK seems to be saying there will be jurisdiction,
6 but *not yet*. I explained in the first round why you need not wait until the UK enacts its
7 long-promised laws before exercising jurisdiction. It is worth making another point as well.
8 Article 194(1) obligates States to “endeavour to harmonize their policies” in connection with
9 marine pollution. This is an obligation that, self-evidently, attaches *prior* to the enactment of
10 such rules since it is concerned with the development of regulatory policies. The UK avers that
11 the “BIOT” administration is drafting these laws, so the dispute is ripe.

12 62. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, this concludes my presentation. I thank you very
13 much for your kind attention, and invite you to call to the podium Professor Crawford, who
14 will address Article 300.

15 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you very much, Mr. Loewenstein, and I give the
16 floor to Professor Crawford.

17 Thank you.

18 **Mauritius v United Kingdom**

19 **Reply of Mauritius**

20 **8. Abuse of Rights**

21 **Professor James Crawford AC SC**

22 **Introduction**

23 Thank you, Mr. President.

24 1. In this presentation I will respond briefly to Professor Boyle’s after-hours presentation on
25 Friday on Article 300. I will only make five points.

- 1 2. First, Professor Boyle says we are in agreement that ‘abuse of rights is not an independent
2 basis of claim’.⁶⁶ That is not our position exactly. Article 300 establishes an independent
3 obligation under the Convention and, to that extent, it is an independent basis of the claim.
4 What the Convention requires, as construed by the tribunal in the *Virginia* case, is that the
5 abuse be linked with the exercise of one of the substantive rights provided in the Convention.
6 The same way that the rule about equality in the European Convention has to be linked to
7 one of those substantive rights, it is still an independent obligation.
- 8 3. Second, Professor Boyle does not dispute our interpretation of Article 300 to the effect that
9 there is abuse when a right is intentionally exercised for a purpose different from the one it
10 was meant to fulfil, or where the measure implementing the right is unreasonable in relation
11 to its stated objectives.⁶⁷ Relying on Alexandre Kiss’ entry in the *Max-Planck*
12 *Encyclopedia*, what he proposes is a third element – ‘clear and convincing proof of injury’ –
13 He criticises me for not mentioning this requirement.⁶⁸ The reason I did not do so is simple.
14 We do not agree with that reading of Professor Kiss’ article, and if it’s right, we don’t agree
15 with Professor Kiss. The point appears to be that abuse of rights depends on actual proven
16 material injury and there is nothing in Professor Kiss’ approach to support that view, nor is
17 there anything in the relevant scholarship or in the text of Article 300 or in the practice. The
18 Appellate Body of the WTO cited the other day does not recognise that proposition.
- 19 4. What we do accept is that abuse of rights presupposes an element of detriment, which may
20 comprise material injury, legal injury or a combination of both. The notion that a State can
21 act in bad faith or abuse its rights just so long as material injury is not proved is an
22 unattractive one. It is reminiscent of the line of French doctrine – rejected by the ILC – to
23 the effect that there is never a delict without material injury, a doctrine that would play havoc

⁶⁶ Transcript, Day 7, p. 900, lines 1-2.

⁶⁷ Transcript, Day 7, p. 901, lines 4-8.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, p. 900, lines 7-14.

1 with environmental claims. The rationale of the prohibition in the 1982 Convention is to
2 ensure that the broad sovereign and jurisdictional rights under the Convention are not
3 exercised in a way that unjustifiably impairs the collective enjoyment of the world's oceans.
4 Professor Boyle's extremely restrictive view of injury has no place in that system.

5 5. Third, Professor Boyle denies the accuracy of the evidence we presented on Mr. Roberts'
6 remarks about the 'No Man Friday policy'. He noted, and I noted in the first round, Mr.
7 Roberts' denial under cross-examination of the use of that phrase.⁶⁹ But even if his
8 American interlocutor used it, it must have come from somewhere. Indeed it did come from
9 somewhere, as I will shortly show you.

10 6. Moreover, Professor Boyle could not rebut the deeper implications of the *Wikileaks*
11 document – the strong suggestion of an ulterior motive. In the cable – this is at Page 149 of
12 the folder, Tab 8.1 – Mr. Roberts is recorded as saying, and I will take the Man Friday
13 reference out: 'according to HMG's current thinking on a reserve, there would be "no human
14 footprints" ... on the BIOT's uninhabited islands'.⁷⁰ 'In effect', he adds, 'establishing a
15 marine park would... put paid to resettlement claims of the former residents'. Even without
16 the Robinson Crusoe touch, that is a remarkable statement to fabricate.

17 There is indeed a regrettable element of continuity in the policy of the Government. A Foreign
18 Office telegraph from 1966 reveals how the United Kingdom then described the inhabitants of
19 the Archipelago.⁷¹ This note is at Tab 8.2 of your Folder. It was quoted in full in the *Bancoult*
20 *Number 2* Case, which is where we got it from. There is a copy of that document online and the

⁶⁹ Transcript, Day 7, p. 901, lines 19-20.

⁷⁰ Cable from US Embassy, London, on UK Government's Proposals for a Marine Reserve Covering the Chagos Archipelago, May 2009: Mauritius Application, 20 December 2010, Annex 2: Annex 146.

⁷¹The note dated 24 August 1966 is quoted in full in *R v. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs ex parte Bancoult* [2006] EWHC 1038 (Admin) para. 27, available

at: <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2006/1038.html>. A scanned copy of the original document is also available

online: http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/6/6d/Diplomatic_Cable_signed_by_D.A._Greenhill%2C_dated_August_24%2C_1966.jpg.

1 link is in a footnote. The Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office is said to have said in
2 relation to the eviction of the Chagossians, and I quote:

3 ‘[w]e must surely be very tough about this. The object of the exercise was to get some rocks
4 which will remain ours; there will be no indigenous population except seagulls who have not got
5 a Committee (the Status of Women Committee does not cover the rights of Birds).’The link
6 between Birds and females is one which my generation was familiar with, but I’m not sure that’s
7 true of everyone.

8 A handwritten annotation adds: “[u]nfortunately along with the Birds go some few Tarzans or
9 Men Fridays.” I interpolate that I didn’t know about the existence of lianas on the Chagos
10 Archipelago. Perhaps Tarzan would have felt out of his league... ‘whose origins are obscure, and
11 who are hopefully wished on to Mauritius...’ Those ‘few Tarzans or Men Fridays’ amounted
12 to more than 1000 souls ‘wished on to Mauritius’.

13 7. Fourth, although Professor Boyle was rhetorically dismissive of the Article 300 claim, he
14 failed to engage with most of our points demonstrating that the design and implementation of
15 the “MPA” is unreasonable in relation to its stated objectives. He ignored our criticism of
16 the lack of legislation, of the completely inadequate enforcement mechanisms, of doubts
17 regarding financing, and the exclusion of Diego Garcia – the combination of fact that has
18 lead me to describe this as a Clayton’s MPA. Instead of engaging with those arguments, he
19 referred us back to Ms. Nevill’s presentation and to the written answers given to Judge
20 Wolfrum.⁷²

21 8. So, let’s take a closer look at those. As to the lack of implementing legislation, the claim is
22 that the no fish zone is being implemented via the no-concession of fishing licenses. In this
23 respect, as in others, the “MPA” compares unfavourably with other similar protection areas.
24 And we haven’t got any explanation of how the “MPA” is to be implemented and its

⁷² Transcript, Day 7, p. 903, lines 15-16.

1 environmental purposes fulfilled, other than by the non-issue of fishing permits. No
2 regulations, no budget or next to no budget, no evidence as to enforcement.

3 9. As to the necessary regulations, Professor Boyle sounds just like the prototypical parade drill
4 sergeant – ‘wait for it, wait for it’. We’ve been waiting quite a while.

5 10. Concerning financing, Ms. Nevill has only told us that the “MPA” will be funded until 2015
6 by a private-public partnership with the Bertarelli Foundation. Professor Greenwood asked
7 a supplementary question, which was answered in part yesterday. But, again, you were
8 largely left waiting. We will reply in full to that answer on Thursday. All I would say is
9 that the Bertarelli contract has not been made available to the Tribunal.

10 11. What Mr. Whomersley provided yesterday was a figure for the “MPA”’s budget for the first
11 time, £1.2 million which ‘includes the funding for the patrol vessel, fuel, and a Fisheries
12 Protection Officer’.⁷³ Again, it’s no wonder that the UK waited so long. The Northwestern
13 Hawaiian Islands Marine National Monument, which covers less than half the area of the
14 “MPA”, has a budget of over \$358 million for the 15 years in question. The US is spending
15 \$66 per square kilometre per year on that MPA, the UK is spending \$2 per square kilometre
16 per year. This is environmental protection on the cheap and in particular when it takes into
17 account that more than half of that funding comes from the Bertarelli Foundation. It is
18 privatized public policy.

19 12. As to the exclusion of Diego Garcia, we have heard hardly a word. We have already
20 commented on that through Mr. Reichler. The UK still fails to explain the inherent
21 contradiction in having a robust no take-zone combined with the exclusion of the only place
22 where there is evidence that pollution is occurring.

23 13. Fifth, a quick word on science, the only point which Professor Boyle touched upon when he
24 replied to our Article 300 claim. I’m not going to repeat what other counsel have said. I

⁷³ Transcript, Day 8, p. 987, line 25, and p. 988, line 1.

1 will simply take the point on precaution. Of course, a precautionary approach is fully
2 consistent with the Convention. But the UK's reliance on precaution to justify its use of
3 science is put into question by the not-so-precautionary approach that has been taken in
4 relation to design and implementation of the "MPA". We cannot infer any commitment to
5 conduct the scientific studies that would be expected to go ahead with a conservation project
6 of this size. Very little concrete evidence has been provided. Mostly the evidence which
7 Professor Boyle snuck in the side door on the last instant is scientific report in disguise.
8 Precaution should not be turned into a cover for abuse.

9 14. For all these reasons, it remains highly doubtful that the design and implementation of the
10 "MPA" are reasonable in regard to its much vaunted purposes. After rushing through to
11 proclaim it just before closing time prior to the General Election, in breach of what we say is
12 a commitment given by one Prime Minister to another, without consulting Mauritius, without
13 even consulting its own Parliament, the UK appears to be in no hurry to implement it (or to
14 provide this Tribunal with much by ways of detail about it). Towards the end of his
15 presentation, Professor Boyle said, to dramatic effect: '[d]estroy this [MPA] and you destroy
16 all of them'.⁷⁴ That is simply not true. This MPA is not comparable to others, which are
17 well regulated, well financed and which meet demonstrable environmental needs. Destroy
18 this MPA, speaking of it as an experiment in isolation, and you will put it out of its misery.
19 That would be a good thing for conservation, quite apart from the claims of Mauritius.

20 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, unless there are any questions, that ends my
21 presentation on Article 300.

22 I now ask you to call upon the Agent.

23 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, indeed. Thank you very much.

24 Mr. Dabee.

⁷⁴ Transcript, Day 7, p. 906, line 2.

1 removed by the United Kingdom from the Chagos Archipelago. The outcome is also being
2 awaited by the international legal community generally, and by many scholars and observers.

3 5. After two rounds of written pleadings and two rounds of Mauritius’ oral pleadings, we
4 are still in the dark as to the United Kingdom’s position on key issues that go to the heart of
5 Mauritius’ case. When counsel was asked by Judge Greenwood on Friday whether it is the
6 United Kingdom’s position that “none of the undertakings given at Lancaster House ... is legally
7 binding upon the United Kingdom today...”,⁷⁵ the response – if one can call it that – was: “we
8 would like to be seeing what Mauritius’ position is in terms of which specific statements
9 [Mauritius] is relying on.”⁷⁶ We were equally surprised that counsel for the UK was unable to
10 confirm that the Chagos Archipelago would not be ceded to a third State.

11 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

12 6. Over the past three and a half years, and in the course of these hearings, you have been
13 provided with very detailed submissions by Mauritius and by the United Kingdom. We are most
14 grateful for the continuous patience, attention and interest that has been shown by the Tribunal.

15 7. Now bringing Mauritius’ submissions to a close, I do so by reflecting on the eight points
16 addressed by Professor Sands exactly two weeks ago in the introductory remarks of Mauritius.

17 8. *First* in defence against Mauritius’ claim, the United Kingdom is inviting the Tribunal to
18 apply the 1982 Convention in a way which would ratify a legacy of British colonialism – and
19 perpetuate it. The United Kingdom was still the colonial master when it excised the Chagos
20 Archipelago from the territory of Mauritius in 1965. Four and a half decades later, the conduct
21 and attitude of the United Kingdom appear, in that regard, to have hardly changed.

22 9. This morning Professor Crawford took you to the infamous note of 1966 in which the
23 United Kingdom Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office described the residents of the
24 Chagos Archipelago as “Tarzans” and “Men Fridays”. Mr. President, it was with a huge sense of

⁷⁵ Transcript, p. 855, line 25 and p. 856, lines 1-2 (Arbitrator Greenwood)

⁷⁶ Transcript, p. 856, lines 7-8 (Mr. Wordsworth).

1 disappointment that we saw this language again, this time in the 2009 US cable, that Professor
2 Crawford also took you to, and in which Colin Roberts, the then Director of Overseas Territories
3 at the FCO, is reported to have said: “there would be ‘no human footprints’ or ‘Man Fridays’ on
4 the BIOT’s uninhabited islands.”⁷⁷

5 10. Against this background, it is a matter of considerable regret that the United Kingdom’s
6 tone in these proceedings has, on occasion, reflected the attitude adopted by its officials in the
7 1960’s and early 1970’s. In his introductory observations last Wednesday, the Agent for the
8 United Kingdom dismissed large swathes of Mauritius’ case as “background noise.”⁷⁸ This is an
9 unfortunate characterisation of our claim.

10 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

11 11. By appearing before you in these proceedings, Mauritius has the opportunity for the first
12 time to assert its legal rights under the Law of the Sea Convention against the United Kingdom,
13 and this before an independent adjudicative body. We say that you have jurisdiction to address
14 all of Mauritius’ claims. Before you, the Parties appear as equal States. We do not, as the
15 United Kingdom has done, tell you what is, and what is not, acceptable to us. We trust that you
16 will interpret the law and apply it to the facts. We can ask no more than that.

17 12. On the *second* point I can be very brief. The Chagos Archipelago has always been an
18 integral part of Mauritius and the United Kingdom’s argument to the contrary reflects the
19 weakness of its position. Professor Crawford dealt with this point yesterday morning and I will
20 not repeat what he said. This argument was first used to circumvent criticism at the United
21 Nations after the excision of the Chagos Archipelago in 1965 and then resuscitated after four
22 decades in hibernation for the purposes of these proceedings. The argument was not accepted by
23 the international community when it was first conjured up, and we do not see how this Tribunal
24 could any more accept it today.

⁷⁷ Mauritius Application, Annex 2 and MM Annex 146.

⁷⁸ Transcript, p. 500, line 1 (Whomersley).

1 13. *Thirdly*, the UK continues to be unwilling to confront the evidence. On the facts of this
2 case, the United Kingdom simply has no answer to the historical record. It cannot deny what
3 happened. In the face of clear evidence, we have been met with silence. Counsel for the United
4 Kingdom went to great lengths to diminish the significance of the documents at Annex 17 of
5 Mauritius' Memorial. You will recall, this is the Note to the Prime Minister Harold Wilson from
6 his Private Secretary, in which he was told that the object of his meeting with Premier
7 Ramgoolam was to "frighten him with hope: hope that he might get independence; Fright lest he
8 might not unless he is sensible about the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago."⁷⁹ We are now
9 told by the United Kingdom that the note is of "strictly limited significance" and that those
10 words were merely "scribbled on top of the considered brief in order to get the attention of the ...
11 Prime Minister."⁸⁰

12 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

13 14. The United Kingdom has provided no answer, or explanation for these words. It cannot
14 be the United Kingdom's position that those words are not true, that they do not mean what they
15 say, and that the threat was invented by the Prime Minister's Private Secretary merely to get his
16 attention. We say that the document makes clear that the United Kingdom obtained the so-called
17 "agreement" of Mauritian Ministers to the detachment of the Chagos Archipelago, in
18 contravention of the right to self-determination, by threatening to withhold independence, and to
19 detach the Archipelago unilaterally in the event if Mauritius did not "consent".

20 15. This is confirmed by another document. It is the record of a meeting of the Defence and
21 Oversea Policy Committee in May 1967, attended by Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and the
22 then Secretary of State for Commonwealth Affairs, the Rt. Hon. Herbert Bowden. You will recall
23 that the Commonwealth Secretary summarised what happened in September 1965 and is

⁷⁹ MM Annex 17.

⁸⁰ Transcript, p. 525, lines 19-23 (Sir Michael Wood).

1 recorded to have said that Mauritian Ministers were told “unless they accepted our proposals we
2 should not proceed with the arrangements for the grant to them of independence.”⁸¹

3 16. This document was annexed to our Reply⁸² and Professor Crawford has taken you to it in
4 our first round, and again yesterday morning. Yet the United Kingdom seems unwilling to
5 address it. Not in the Rejoinder, nor in its presentations last week. If it does, finally, address this
6 document during the second round, Mauritius will not have an opportunity to respond to what
7 they say. The United Kingdom’s approach to the evidence in this case, we say, leaves much to be
8 desired. The United Kingdom’s own internal documentation reveals the true nature of the
9 “MPA” and the unfortunate circumstances in which it was unexpectedly declared by Mr.
10 Miliband on 1 April 2010.

11 17. Last Friday the United Kingdom complained that “the Tribunal has no insight into the
12 internal workings of Mauritius” and the views of Mauritian officials. The United Kingdom told
13 you: be “wary of placing weight on the partial picture it had through sight of just the UK internal
14 documentation”.⁸³

15 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

16 18. Up to 1968, Mauritius was a colony of the United Kingdom and the Council of Ministers
17 was presided over by a British Governor. There can be no doubt that the United Kingdom is in
18 possession of all the relevant records and documents relating to issues concerning the
19 detachment of the Chagos Archipelago, and the activities subsequent. Given the extensive
20 records maintained by the United Kingdom, it should be in possession of internal documentation
21 that we ourselves do not have.

22 19. Mauritius made clear in its letter of 7 April 2014, in reply to the United Kingdom’s letter
23 of 18 March 2014, that it had reviewed to the fullest extent possible its own internal documents
24 for the preparation of its pleadings in this case. Mauritius offered to consider and respond to

⁸¹ MR Annex 59, p. 2.

⁸² MR, Annex 59.

⁸³ Transcript, p. 860, lines 3-7 (Wordsworth).

1 any request for discovery of any internal documentation which the United Kingdom considered
2 supportive of its case. The United Kingdom has made no such request.

3 20. The *fourth* point – that the “MPA” is the product of policy-making “on the hoof” and one
4 that the UK undertook to put on hold – has hardly been refuted by the UK. The evidence of hasty
5 decision-making by the Foreign Secretary, against the advice of so many of his advisers and the
6 British High Commissioner in Mauritius, and in breach of the commitment given by Prime
7 Minister Gordon Brown to the Prime Minister of Mauritius remain compelling.

8 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

9 21. The UK complains that these proceedings were a surprise. The only real surprise in this
10 case came on the 1st of April 2010, with the sudden announcement of the “MPA”. Just 6 days
11 earlier, on the 26th of March 2010, the British High Commission in Port Louis wrote to the
12 Mauritian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, confirming that “the United Kingdom should like to
13 reiterate that no decision on the creation of an MPA has been taken yet.”⁸⁴ On 31 March 2010,
14 the British High Commissioner warned numerous high-ranking officials at the FCO that: “to
15 follow the course of action that you are [...] proposing risks a political reaction that will
16 significantly increase the eventual chance of a legal challenge to the MPA (and sovereignty
17 itself) from the next Government of Mauritius.”⁸⁵ It is hard to see how the UK can now say it
18 was taken by surprise by Mauritius’ Application. Mr. Miliband’s announcement on the 1st of
19 April, which the UK referred to as the “last possible date he could do so before the election”,⁸⁶
20 came despite the warning from the British High Commissioner and despite Prime Minister
21 Gordon Brown’s promise to the Prime Minister of Mauritius on 27 November 2009 that the
22 “MPA” project would be put on hold.

⁸⁴ MM, Annex 164.

⁸⁵ MR, Annex 156.

⁸⁶ Transcript, p. 889, lines 2-3 (Boyle).

1 22. Mauritius is in no doubt about the firm commitment made by Prime Minister Gordon
2 Brown. The United Kingdom tells us it was a “misunderstanding”,⁸⁷ that this was just a
3 “confusion”.⁸⁸ We have looked closely at the emails submitted to the Tribunal over the
4 weekend. This material was tendered 21 months after we filed our Memorial, in which the
5 tête-a-tête between the two Prime Ministers is referred to at Annex 157. Ms. Macdonald will
6 address this new material on Thursday – but in the meantime, I would just note that there is
7 nothing from Mr. Brown to contradict Prime Minister Ramgoolam’s witness statement.

8 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

9 23. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, moving on to the *fifth* point – the stated purpose
10 of the “MPA”. It was disappointing to hear the United Kingdom’s Attorney General say that
11 “Mauritius doesn’t appear to recognise the importance of maintaining the pristine environment of
12 the [Chagos] archipelago and has currently given no commitment to protecting the vulnerable
13 eco-system” around it.⁸⁹ We also heard that by acceding to Mauritius’ claim, this Tribunal
14 would threaten the continued existence of all other Marine Protected Areas. As was said earlier
15 by James Crawford, “[d]estroy this one and you destroy all of them” you were warned.⁹⁰

16 24. That is most unfair. Mauritius is strongly committed to the protection and preservation of
17 the marine environment throughout the territory of Mauritius, including the Chagos Archipelago.
18 It is difficult to see how the Attorney General could have made the comment that he did, given
19 the firm commitment that we made in our Memorial,⁹¹ in the Reply⁹² and in our response to
20 Judge Wolfrum’s questions on Friday the 25th of April.⁹³ Mauritius is deeply committed to the
21 protection and preservation of the marine environment and is conscious of the extraordinary
22 diversity of the waters of the Chagos Archipelago. As we explained in our responses to the

⁸⁷ Transcript, p. 55, line 12 (Grieve); p. 502, line 15 (Whormersley); p. 577, line 1 (Nevill); p. 591, lines 8-9 (Nevill).

⁸⁸ Transcript, p. 577, line 4 (Nevill).

⁸⁹ Transcript, p. 51, lines 18-20 (Grieve).

⁹⁰ Transcript, p. 906, line 2 (Boyle).

⁹¹ MM, para. 1.2.

⁹² MR, para. 3.3.

⁹³ Transcript, p. 421 lines 6-21 (Sands).

1 written questions from Judge Wolfrum, Marine Protected Areas for mainland Mauritius cover a
2 total of 7,190 hectares, encompassing six fishing reserves and two marine parks.⁹⁴ Mauritius is
3 equally proud of its contribution to the Law of the Sea and is mindful of its rights and obligations
4 under the 1982 Convention. It was one of the first two African States to make a submission to
5 the UN Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf on 1 December 2008. That was a
6 joint submission with the Seychelles, relating to the region of the Mascarene Plateau.⁹⁵

7 25. This takes me neatly to the *sixth* point: the “MPA” manifestly violates the requirements
8 of the Convention. The UK was not entitled to declare the “MPA” and, as Messrs Reichler and
9 Loewenstein have explained, it violated the requirements of the Convention. The UK’s
10 characterisation of Mauritius having no relevant rights under the Convention underscores the
11 generally dismissive attitude it has adopted in these proceedings.

12 26. The UK implies that Mauritius is acting in bad faith by asking this Tribunal to construe as
13 binding international obligations the UK’s supposed gratuitous acts towards Mauritius since
14 1965. We are accused of being “allerg[ic]” to the word “understandings” and of, instead,
15 preferring the word “undertakings” to artificially strengthen our case.⁹⁶ This is in stark contrast
16 to the views expressed by Ministers and by senior UK officials, including the British High
17 Commissioner to Mauritius on 19 and 26 March 2010, that “the United Kingdom has undertaken
18 to cede the Territory to Mauritius when it is no longer needed for defence purposes”. We note
19 that while Mr. Wordsworth was unable to answer Judge Greenwood’s question, whether the
20 United Kingdom would be free to cede the Chagos Archipelago to a third State, the Attorney
21 General reiterated the UK’s commitment that – as he carefully put it – the Chagos Archipelago
22 will be “ceded to Mauritius when it’s no longer needed for defence purposes.”⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Transcript, p. 422, lines 12-13 (Sands).

⁹⁵ See: http://www.un.org/Depts/los/clcs_new/commission_submissions.htm.

⁹⁶ Transcript, p. 851, line 17 (Wordsworth).

⁹⁷ Transcript, p. 51, line 21 (Grieve).

1 27. Moving on to point *seven*, the Tribunal’s jurisdiction over the dispute. The UK continues
2 to argue that you have jurisdiction over none of Mauritius’ claims – you cannot interpret the
3 words “coastal State”, and you cannot determine whether the purported creation of an “MPA”
4 over 640,000 square kilometres violates even a single provision of the Convention on the Law of
5 the Sea. Professor Sands demonstrated yesterday why this argument fails.

6 28. When Mauritius filed its Application on 20 December 2010, it did so as a last resort.
7 Despite being an independent State with sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, as defined in
8 its Constitution, and a State which the UK acknowledges has at least a reversionary sovereign
9 interest in the Chagos Archipelago, Mauritius was asked during the public consultation process
10 on the “MPA” to what amounts to being allowed to simply line up alongside a quarter million of
11 consultees and to submit just another view on the “MPA”. And yet, Mauritius is accused of
12 walking away from the consultations and of “putting a gun to the Foreign Secretary’s head”!⁹⁸

13 29. Finally, coming to *eighth* point – the *sui generis* character of this dispute. You will recall,
14 Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, that you were cautioned by the United Kingdom
15 about the floodgates being opened – the heavens falling – if the Tribunal were to hold that it has
16 jurisdiction in this case.

17 30. When Judge Wolfrum asked counsel for the UK about whether the 1965 undertakings or
18 understandings constituted a quid pro quo for Mauritius’ “consent” to the excision of the Chagos
19 Archipelago, and whether it was right to refer to “unilateral” undertakings, Mr. Wordsworth
20 replied “But sir, I absolutely understand the point because this is a slightly unusual situation
21 because what you have is the 1965 record which reflects undoubtedly some form of
22 arrangement”.⁹⁹ Indeed it is, we say. We say that this is a unique case, one that directly engages
23 the right of self-determination and General Assembly resolution 1514. The Article 76(8) issue
24 alone is surely unique, as very precisely explained by Mr. Reichler this morning.

⁹⁸ Transcript, p. 884, line 5 (Boyle).

⁹⁹ Transcript, p. 863, lines 1-3.

1 31. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to express our sincere appreciation, on behalf of
2 Mauritius, to you and the Members of the Tribunal, for according us your patient attention and
3 for your commitment to resolution of this dispute within the framework of Part XV of the 1982
4 Convention. We shall remain available to the Tribunal for any outstanding matters on which
5 assistance from Mauritius would be helpful. We also extend our sincere gratitude to the
6 Permanent Court of Arbitration – to Mr. Brooks Daly, Mr. Garth Schofield, Ms. Fiona Poon –
7 for the exemplary way in which they have ensured the smooth conduct of the hearings and the
8 excellent arrangements put in place here in Istanbul, and for their continued efforts in the Hague,
9 and in Dubai during the hearing on Bifurcation. We are also grateful to Mr. David Kasdan, the
10 Court Reporter, for his excellent work, and the technical staff who have been on hand to assist
11 us. We also wish to thank the UK team for their cooperative attitude on a number of procedural
12 matters that arose during these proceedings.

13 32. Thank you, Mr. President. With your permission, all that remains is for me to read out the
14 final submissions of the Republic of Mauritius.

15 **FINAL SUBMISSIONS OF THE REPUBLIC OF MAURITIUS**

16 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal,

17 On the basis of the facts and the legal arguments presented in its Memorial, Reply, and during
18 these oral hearings, Mauritius respectfully requests the Arbitral Tribunal to adjudge and declare,
19 in accordance with the provisions of the 1982 Convention, in respect of the Chagos Archipelago,
20 that:

- 21 (1) the United Kingdom is not entitled to declare an “MPA” or any other maritime zones
22 because it is not the “coastal State” within the meaning of *inter alia* Articles 2, 55 and 76 of
23 the Convention; and/or
24 (2) having regard to the commitments that it has made to Mauritius in relation to the Chagos
25 Archipelago, the United Kingdom is not entitled unilaterally to declare an “MPA” or other

1 maritime zones because Mauritius has rights as a “coastal State” within the meaning of *inter*
2 *alia* Articles 2, 55 and 76 of the Convention; and/or

3 (3) the United Kingdom shall take no steps that may prevent the Commission on the Limits on
4 the Continental Shelf from making recommendations in respect of any full submission that
5 Mauritius may make to the Commission regarding the Chagos Archipelago under Article 76
6 of the Convention;

7 (4) The United Kingdom’s purported “MPA” is incompatible with the substantive and
8 procedural obligations of the United Kingdom under the Convention, including *inter alia*
9 Articles 2, 55, 56, 63, 64, 194, 300, as well as Article 7 of the 1995 Agreement.

10 Mr. President, in accordance with your request this morning, we will provide a
11 hard copy of Mauritius' submissions to the Tribunal.

12 I thank you, Mr. President.

13 PRESIDENT SHEARER: I thank the Agent for Mauritius for his final
14 submissions, and with that, I think we formally adjourn, but remain behind for the photographs,
15 just in case any of you are unaware, we have no hearing tomorrow, but we will reconvene on
16 Friday at the earlier time of 1330 for half an hour's opportunity for Mauritius to reply to the
17 young on documents. From 1400 onwards, we will hear the second round of argument from the
18 United Kingdom.

19 So, with that, with thanks to everybody, I declare the Hearings adjourned until
20 towards, and I think now the photographer will shortly be with us, and he will tell us what poses
21 to adopt, I imagine.

22 (Whereupon, at 1:00 p.m., the hearing was adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Thursday,
23 May 8, 2014.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, David A. Kasdan, RDR-CRR, Court Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were stenographically recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewritten form by computer-assisted transcription under my direction and supervision; and that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in this proceeding, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this litigation.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David A. Kasdan", is written over a horizontal line.

DAVID A. KASDAN

Index

A

- AB, *1111*
ab, *1089*
ability, *1119*
able, *1122*
abrogating, *1105*
absence, *1113*
absent, *1081*
absolutely, *1077, 1088, 1139*
abundance, *1075*
Abuse, *1125*
abuse, *1126, 1130*
AC, *1092, 1125*
acceding, *1137*
accept, *1104, 1116, 1126, 1133*
acceptable, *1072, 1107, 1133*
acceptance, *1085*
accepted, *1103, 1108, 1133, 1135*
accepts, *1091, 1124*
access, *1088, 1100, 1109, 1120*
accessed, *1095*
Accession, *1095*
accompanied, *1083*
accordance, *1097, 1103, 1124, 1140-1141*
According, *1082, 1107*
according, *1100, 1109, 1127, 1140*
accordingly, *1113*
account, *1104, 1123, 1129*
accounts, *1116*
accuracy, *1127*
accurate, *1116, 1142*
accurately, *1097*
accused, *1138-1139*
achieve, *1123*
achieved, *1115*
achievement, *1109, 1115*
acknowledged, *1077, 1085*
acknowledges, *1139*
acknowledging, *1088*
acquired, *1090, 1100*
across, *1090, 1094, 1098*
act, *1074, 1126*
acted, *1085, 1109*
acting, *1105, 1123, 1138*
action, *1087, 1100, 1116, 1136, 1142*
actions, *1123*
activities, *1110, 1113, 1135*
acts, *1100, 1104, 1114, 1138*
actual, *1092-1094, 1099, 1126*
actually, *1104, 1116*
adapted, *1094*
added, *1086*
addition, *1079*
address, *1081, 1084, 1091, 1102, 1113-1114, 1118, 1122, 1125, 1133, 1135, 1137*
addressed, *1073, 1077, 1081, 1088-1089, 1102, 1109, 1121, 1132*
addresses, *1117, 1119*
addressing, *1089, 1102, 1118*
adds, *1127-1128*
adjacent, *1092, 1110*
adjourn, *1141*
adjourned, *1141*
adjudge, *1140*
adjudicative, *1133*
Admin, *1127*
Administration, *1075, 1078*
administration, *1125*
Admissibility, *1120*
admitted, *1078, 1099*
adopt, *1118, 1141*
adopted, *1081, 1133, 1138*
adopting, *1123*
adoption, *1118*
advance, *1113*
advanced, *1110*
advantage, *1082*
adverse, *1105*
advice, *1136*
advised, *1075, 1086-1087*
advisers, *1136*
Affairs, *1086, 1117, 1127, 1134, 1136*
affect, *1082*
affected, *1108*
affecting, *1100*
affirmation, *1095*
affirmed, *1095*
African, *1138*
afterwards, *1116*
agendas, *1079*
Agent, *1112, 1130-1131, 1133, 1141*

ago, *1132*
 agree, *1086-1087, 1107, 1114, 1124, 1126*
 agreed, *1085, 1093-1095, 1099-1100*
 agreeing, *1084*
 Agreement, *1096, 1102, 1110, 1123, 1141*
 agreement, *1076-1077, 1083, 1090, 1092, 1098, 1111, 1114, 1120, 1124, 1126, 1134*
 agreements, *1096, 1124-1125*
 agrees, *1096*
 ahead, *1130*
 aide, *1085, 1088*
 AJIL, *1097*
 Akrotiri, *1095*
 albeit, *1123*
 Alexandre, *1126*
 alia, *1140-1141*
 allegation, *1112*
 alleged, *1103, 1114, 1116-1118, 1122*
 allerg, *1138*
 allocation, *1097*
 allocations, *1109*
 allow, *1120*
 allowable, *1123*
 allowed, *1094, 1139*
 allowing, *1079*
 allows, *1090, 1105, 1107*
 almost, *1108*
 alone, *1083, 1093, 1107, 1139*
 alongside, *1100, 1139*
 already, *1073, 1076, 1078, 1085, 1087, 1089-1090, 1102-1103, 1108, 1111, 1120, 1129*
 alter, *1112*
 alternative, *1102*
 Although, *1085, 1107*
 although, *1084, 1095-1096, 1110, 1128*
 American, *1078-1079, 1097, 1127*
 Americans, *1079*
 among, *1117, 1119, 1124*
 amongst, *1107*
 amount, *1107*
 amounted, *1128*
 amounts, *1139*
 analysis, *1088*
 Andrew, *1091, 1101*
 ANNEX, *1131*
 Annex, *1075-1079, 1081-1083, 1085-1086, 1088, 1096, 1102, 1110, 1121, 1123, 1127, 1133-1137*
 annexed, *1135*
 annexes, *1095*
 annotation, *1128*
 announcement, *1077, 1083, 1115, 1136*
 announcements, *1072*
 announcing, *1107*
 annual, *1075*
 annuls, *1100*
 another, *1079, 1083, 1085, 1087, 1107-1108, 1112, 1117, 1121, 1125, 1130, 1134, 1139*
 answer, *1073, 1077-1078, 1080, 1093, 1102, 1104, 1111, 1115, 1117, 1129, 1134, 1138*
 answered, *1073, 1129*
 answers, *1080, 1128*
 anyway, *1116*
 apart, *1130*
 apparently, *1096, 1112*
 appear, *1074, 1076, 1080, 1085, 1091, 1100, 1104, 1116, 1131-1133, 1137*
 appearing, *1133*
 appears, *1074, 1089, 1094, 1100, 1105, 1116, 1119, 1124, 1126, 1130*
 Appellate, *1111, 1126*
 appertains, *1073*
 applicability, *1075*
 applicable, *1078, 1099, 1110-1111, 1113*
 Application, *1120, 1127, 1133, 1136, 1139*
 application, *1090, 1094, 1115, 1117, 1121, 1123-1124*
 applications, *1108*
 applied, *1097, 1107-1108, 1116*
 applies, *1104, 1108, 1114, 1121*
 apply, *1077, 1085, 1094, 1097, 1100, 1116, 1125, 1132-1133*
 applying, *1094, 1105*
 appreciation, *1140*
 approach, *1109, 1114, 1116, 1126, 1130, 1135*
 appropriate, *1077*
 approximately, *1101*
 April, *1083, 1095, 1120, 1131, 1135-1137*
 apt, *1084*
 Arab, *1096*
 Arbitral, *1120, 1140*
 arbitrary, *1075*
 ARBITRATION, *1131*
 Arbitration, *1075-1076, 1079, 1081-1083, 1086, 1088, 1109, 1140*
 arbitration, *1120*
 ARBITRATOR, *1074*
 Arbitrator, *1132*
 Arbitrators, *1073*
 Arc, *1079*
 archipelagic, *1073*
 Archipelago, *1073-1075, 1080-1086, 1089-1090, 1092-1093, 1095, 1102, 1104, 1107, 1110, 1113, 1121, 1123, 1127-1128,*

1131-1135,
 1137-1141
 archipelago, 1137
 archives, 1095
 Area, 1076-1079,
 1082-1083, 1095,
 1131
 area, 1077, 1082,
 1097, 1129
 Areas, 1095,
 1137-1138
 areas, 1075, 1096,
 1098-1099,
 1109-1111, 1128
 aren, 1110
 arguably, 1094
 argue, 1074, 1108,
 1119, 1125, 1139
 argued, 1074,
 1080, 1122
 argues, 1123
 Argument, 1072
 argument, 1080,
 1102, 1110-1111,
 1115, 1119,
 1123, 1125,
 1133, 1139, 1141
 arguments, 1082,
 1102-1103, 1123,
 1128, 1140
 arise, 1099
 arises, 1131
 arose, 1140
 around, 1072-1075,
 1084, 1096,
 1101, 1116,
 1131, 1137
 arrangement,
 1093, 1099, 1139
 arrangements,
 1115, 1135, 1140
 art, 1080
 Arthur, 1121
 Article, 1073-1074,
 1080-1081,
 1083-1085,
 1087-1090,
 1095-1096,
 1099-1100,
 1102-1105, 1108,
 1110, 1113-1119,
 1121-1126,
 1128-1130, 1139,
 1141
 article, 1079, 1098,
 1117-1118, 1124,
 1126
 Articles, 1080,
 1090, 1102,
 1108, 1110-1111,
 1119, 1123,
 1140-1141
 articles, 1080,
 1110-1111, 1114,
 1117-1118
 artificial, 1124
 artificially, 1138
 aside, 1114
 aspect, 1074, 1086,
 1088, 1100
 aspects,
 1089-1090, 1119
 Assembly, 1112,
 1139
 assert, 1093, 1131,
 1133
 asserted, 1096
 assertion, 1074,
 1093, 1119
 assertions, 1108
 assessing, 1094
 assist, 1094, 1140
 assistance, 1118,
 1140
 assisted, 1142
 Associated, 1095
 Assume, 1099-1100
 assume, 1075, 1100
 assumes, 1094
 assuming, 1097,
 1116
 assurance, 1081
 assurances, 1081
 assure, 1082
 assured, 1082
 astonishing, 1079
 ated, 1127
 Athens, 1095
 attached, 1112
 attaches, 1125
 attempt,
 1103-1104, 1110,
 1131
 attempted, 1083
 attempts, 1117
 attended, 1134
 attention, 1076,
 1078, 1119,
 1125, 1132,
 1134, 1140
 attitude,
 1132-1133, 1138,
 1140
 Attorney, 1093,
 1107, 1137-1138
 attractiveness,
 1076
 attributable, 1098
 attributes, 1080,
 1083, 1085,
 1089-1090, 1092,
 1094, 1099-1100,
 1117
 August, 1076,
 1088, 1095,
 1098, 1127
 Australia, 1120
 author, 1121
 authoritatively,
 1098
 Authority, 1099,
 1124
 authority, 1093,
 1097, 1099
 automatically,
 1074, 1104
 available, 1095,
 1108, 1121,
 1123, 1127,
 1129, 1140
 avers, 1125
 avoid, 1072
 avoided, 1078
 await, 1083
 awaited, 1131-1132
 Award, 1120
 award, 1120, 1123
 awarded, 1120
 aware, 1077-1080,
 1104, 1123
 awareness, 1105
 away, 1074, 1110,
 1139

B

back, 1082, 1088,
 1117, 1128, 1131
 background, 1133
 bad, 1126, 1138
 Bahrain, 1120
 bailii, 1127
 balance, 1109
 balancing, 1105
 ballad, 1094
 ban, 1075-1076,
 1078-1079
 Bancoult, 1127
 Barbadian, 1120
 Barbados, 1120
 bare, 1094
 Base, 1095
 base, 1073-1074,
 1100, 1120
 based, 1075, 1094
 baseline, 1098

baselines, *1073, 1096*
 basic, *1098, 1112*
 basis, *1081, 1087, 1090, 1098, 1117, 1120, 1123, 1126, 1140*
 batons, *1099*
 bay, *1097*
 Bazaar, *1090*
 bears, *1083, 1086*
 became, *1095*
 becomes, *1119*
 begets, *1079*
 begin, *1102, 1115, 1118-1119*
 beginning, *1076, 1088*
 begins, *1090*
 behalf, *1140*
 behest, *1089*
 behind, *1141*
 belabor, *1117*
 belatedly, *1113*
 believe, *1073, 1102*
 belittle, *1083*
 below, *1075, 1097*
 beneath, *1084*
 beneficiary, *1082*
 benefit, *1078, 1082, 1084, 1086-1087, 1100, 1118*
 benefits, *1082, 1085*
 Bertarelli, *1078-1079, 1129*
 best, *1072, 1086, 1123*
 bestow, *1115*
 better, *1091*
 between, *1072-1073, 1075, 1082, 1088, 1095-1099, 1110, 1112, 1115, 1119-1121, 1128, 1137*
 beyond, *1085, 1093, 1096-1098, 1104-1105, 1115, 1124*
 Bifurcation, *1140*
 bilateral, *1082, 1085, 1087-1088, 1090, 1110*
 BINDING, *1074*
 binding, *1074, 1080, 1083, 1090, 1102, 1104, 1117-1118, 1123, 1132, 1138*
 BIOT, *1073, 1075-1078, 1083-1084, 1086-1089, 1093, 1121-1122, 1125, 1127, 1133*
 Birds, *1128*
 Birnie, *1103*
 bit, *1087*
 black, *1093*
 blanket, *1114*
 Blenheim, *1073-1074*
 Bluefin, *1123-1124*
 boat, *1091*
 Body, *1111, 1126*
 body, *1133*
 book, *1090*
 Both, *1114*
 both, *1072-1074, 1080-1081, 1085-1086, 1088, 1095, 1102, 1104-1105, 1111, 1114, 1121-1122, 1126*
 Boundaries, *1095*
 boundaries, *1073, 1095-1096*
 Boundary, *1095*
 boundary, *1094, 1120*
 Bowden, *1134*
 Boyle, *1079, 1103-1105, 1107-1108, 1110, 1113-1130, 1136-1137, 1139*
 breach, *1094, 1100, 1103, 1108, 1111, 1113, 1130, 1136*
 breached, *1105, 1107, 1110, 1112-1113, 1117*
 Breaches, *1101*
 breaches, *1102, 1114, 1116, 1124*
 breaching, *1090*
 break, *1091, 1100-1101, 1115*
 breaks, *1072*
 Brief, *1095, 1101, 1115*
 brief, *1102-1103, 1105, 1108-1109, 1123, 1133-1134*
 briefer, *1124*
 briefly, *1079, 1094, 1125*
 bringing, *1132*
 brings, *1111, 1122*
 Britain, *1095, 1098*
 British, *1077-1079, 1082-1084, 1086, 1088, 1093, 1095, 1098, 1102, 1112, 1122, 1132, 1135-1136, 1138*
 broad, *1127*
 broader, *1117*
 Brooks, *1140*
 Brown, *1111-1113, 1136-1137*
 budget, *1129*
 burden, *1112*
 business, *1076*
 by, *1127*
 BYIL, *1098*

C

Cable, *1127*
 cable, *1127, 1133*
 cables, *1116-1117*
 Cairo, *1096*
 call, *1076, 1078, 1080, 1091-1093, 1096, 1100, 1125, 1130, 1132*
 called, *1084, 1088, 1095, 1111, 1120, 1134*
 calling, *1084, 1090*
 calls, *1079, 1115*
 came, *1090, 1136*
 Canada, *1119*
 cannot, *1075, 1080-1081, 1085, 1103, 1105, 1109, 1116, 1123-1124, 1130-1131, 1134, 1139*
 capable, *1100*
 capacity, *1096*
 careful, *1121*
 carefully, *1115, 1138*
 carried, *1113*
 carrying, *1099*
 Case, *1097, 1127*
 case, *1074, 1079-1081, 1085, 1089, 1092-1095,*

1097, 1099-1100,
 1102, 1104,
 1107, 1113,
 1119-1120,
 1122-1124, 1126,
 1132-1136,
 1138-1139, 1141
 cases, 1094-1095,
 1099, 1108-1109,
 1111, 1115, 1127
 catch, 1109, 1123
 Catches, 1075
 category, 1117,
 1122
 caught, 1107
 cause, 1091
 cautioned, 1139
 cede, 1079, 1083,
 1093, 1131, 1138
 ceded, 1079, 1082,
 1085, 1087,
 1132, 1138
 ceding, 1095
 Central, 1097
 Centre, 1076
 certain, 1079-1080,
 1094, 1100, 1111
 Certainly, 1101
 certainly, 1107,
 1123
 CERTIFICATE, 1142
 certify, 1142
 Chagos, 1073,
 1075, 1080-1082,
 1084-1086,
 1089-1090, 1092,
 1095, 1102,
 1104, 1107,
 1110, 1113,
 1121, 1123,
 1127-1128,
 1131-1135,
 1137-1141
 Chagossian, 1131
 Chagossians, 1090,
 1128
 challenge, 1136
 challenged, 1100,
 1104
 chamber, 1097
 chance, 1136
 change, 1083, 1113
 changed, 1132
 CHARACTER, 1074
 character, 1097,
 1139
 characterisation,
 1133, 1138
 characterization,
 1120
 characterizations,
 1074
 characterize, 1119
 characterized,
 1120, 1122
 chart, 1107
 Charter, 1109
 cheap, 1129
 Chile, 1094-1095
 chilled, 1110
 choice, 1078, 1122
 choose, 1101
 Churchill, 1124
 circumstances,
 1075, 1084-1085,
 1100, 1109,
 1114, 1118, 1135
 circumvent, 1133
 cite, 1094
 cited, 1094, 1118,
 1126
 citing, 1110
 claim, 1080-1081,
 1089-1090, 1096,
 1099-1100, 1107,
 1116, 1120,
 1126, 1128-1129,
 1131-1133, 1137
 claims, 1080, 1084,
 1090, 1100,
 1102, 1114,
 1116, 1118,
 1121, 1127,
 1130, 1133, 1139
 clarify, 1086, 1088
 classic, 1090, 1098
 clause, 1121
 Clayton, 1128
 CLCS, 1085-1089
 clcs, 1138
 clear, 1087, 1097,
 1103, 1105,
 1109, 1111-1113,
 1122-1123, 1126,
 1134-1135
 clearly, 1087, 1089,
 1103, 1110-1111,
 1119-1120, 1124
 clock, 1086, 1089
 close, 1072, 1096,
 1115, 1119, 1132
 closed, 1075, 1109
 closely, 1137
 closer, 1096, 1099,
 1128
 CLOSING, 1131
 Closing, 1097
 closing, 1090,
 1097-1098, 1101,
 1130
 closure, 1075,
 1078, 1099
 coast, 1092,
 1094-1096, 1098
 COASTAL, 1074
 Coastal, 1092,
 1098-1099
 coastal, 1080-1081,
 1083-1085,
 1087-1090,
 1092-1095,
 1097-1100, 1102,
 1104, 1108,
 1119-1121, 1131,
 1139-1141
 coastline, 1096,
 1098-1099
 codifying, 1103
 coffee, 1091
 Colin, 1077-1078,
 1086, 1090, 1133
 collect, 1087
 collective, 1127
 collectively, 1098
 colonial, 1132
 colonialism, 1132
 colony, 1135
 column, 1076
 combination, 1126,
 1128
 combined, 1129
 come, 1072, 1080,
 1127
 comes, 1105, 1129
 Comic, 1090
 comic, 1090
 coming, 1139
 comment,
 1077-1078, 1087,
 1137
 Commentary,
 1104-1105
 commented, 1129
 Comments, 1075
 comments, 1086
 Commission, 1085,
 1111, 1136,
 1138, 1141
 commission, 1138
 Commissioner,
 1077, 1081-1082,
 1086-1087, 1136,
 1138
 Commissioners,
 1099
 commissioners,
 1098-1099
 commitment,
 1082-1083, 1096,
 1111-1113, 1130,
 1136-1138, 1140

commitments, *1083, 1140*
 committed, *1098, 1137*
 Committee, *1128, 1134*
 committing, *1120*
 common, *1119*
 commons, *1127*
 Commonwealth, *1075, 1077-1078, 1081, 1083, 1086, 1088, 1127, 1134*
 communication, *1077-1078*
 communications, *1109*
 community, *1132-1133*
 comparable, *1130*
 compared, *1107*
 compares, *1128*
 compatible, *1109, 1113*
 compelling, *1136*
 competing, *1108-1109*
 complained, *1135*
 complains, *1136*
 complaints, *1109*
 complete, *1099*
 completely, *1084, 1128*
 compliance, *1103*
 complicated, *1114*
 complied, *1110*
 comply, *1102-1103, 1108*
 comprehensive, *1099, 1113*
 comprise, *1126*
 compromise, *1115*
 compromises, *1114*
 compulsory, *1114*
 computer, *1142*
 concede, *1080, 1105*
 conceded, *1115*
 conceive, *1093*
 concentration, *1075*
 concern, *1086, 1118*
 concerned, *1073, 1092, 1097, 1109, 1117-1118, 1124-1125*
 Concerning, *1095, 1129*
 concerning, *1095, 1100, 1109, 1115-1116, 1119-1121, 1124, 1135*
 concerns, *1095, 1097-1098, 1104, 1117, 1121*
 concession, *1093, 1128*
 conciliation, *1123*
 conclude, *1102, 1117, 1131*
 concluded, *1095-1096, 1113, 1121*
 concludes, *1125*
 concluding, *1076*
 conclusion, *1122, 1140*
 Conclusions, *1099*
 conclusions, *1122*
 concrete, *1130*
 condition, *1078*
 conditional, *1078*
 conditions, *1078, 1094, 1099*
 Condominium, *1098*
 condominium, *1093, 1098*
 conduct, *1080, 1130, 1132, 1140*
 conducted, *1109*
 confine, *1102*
 confined, *1109, 1117*
 confirm, *1132*
 confirmation, *1103*
 confirmed, *1078, 1082, 1097, 1107, 1111, 1134*
 confirming, *1103, 1136*
 confront, *1134*
 confronted, *1103*
 confusion, *1137*
 conjured, *1133*
 conjures, *1099*
 connected, *1118*
 connection, *1090, 1108, 1118, 1124-1125*
 Connell, *1098*
 conscious, *1101, 1137*
 consent, *1081, 1083, 1134, 1139*
 consented, *1092*
 consequence, *1112*
 consequential, *1094*
 Conservation, *1075*
 conservation, *1076, 1122, 1130*
 conserve, *1123*
 conserving, *1119, 1121*
 consider, *1081, 1089-1090, 1092, 1110, 1135*
 considerable, *1133*
 consideration, *1104, 1109, 1112*
 considerations, *1085*
 considered, *1076, 1080, 1123, 1134, 1136*
 considering, *1094*
 consistency, *1085*
 consistent, *1112-1113, 1130*
 consistently, *1087, 1122*
 constant, *1108*
 constituted, *1139*
 constitutes, *1074*
 Constitution, *1139*
 constitutional, *1094*
 constitutions, *1094*
 constructions, *1103*
 construe, *1138*
 construed, *1124, 1126*
 consult, *1108-1110, 1113*
 consultants, *1091*
 Consultation, *1079, 1083*
 consultation, *1079, 1082, 1090, 1105, 1107-1108, 1110-1111, 1139*
 consultations, *1109, 1139*
 consultees, *1079, 1139*
 consulting, *1130*
 contains, *1093*
 contemplate, *1088*
 contemplates, *1110*
 contemporaneous, *1085, 1087-1088, 1111*
 contend, *1110*
 content, *1109, 1114*
 contention, *1092*

- contentions, *1094*
 contents, *1111*
 Context, *1095*
 context, *1087*
 contiguous, *1104*
 Continental, *1085, 1138, 1141*
 continental, *1084-1086, 1089, 1096-1098*
 continue, *1072, 1107, 1110*
 continued, *1137, 1140*
 continues, *1134, 1139*
 continuing, *1094*
 continuity, *1127*
 continuous, *1132*
 continuously, *1083*
 Contract, *1078*
 contract, *1129*
 contradict, *1093, 1112, 1137*
 contradiction, *1129*
 contrary, *1075, 1105, 1124, 1133*
 contrast, *1084, 1096, 1112, 1122-1123, 1138*
 contrasts, *1122*
 contravened, *1118*
 contravention, *1114, 1116-1117, 1134*
 contraventions, *1116*
 contribution, *1138*
 control, *1091-1093, 1100, 1113*
 convened, *1077*
 convenience, *1076*
 convenient, *1091*
 Convention, *1073, 1080-1081, 1090, 1092-1094, 1096-1097, 1100-1104, 1114-1118, 1121, 1124, 1126-1127, 1130-1133, 1138-1141*
 convincing, *1126*
 cooperate, *1113*
 cooperation, *1110*
 cooperative, *1140*
 coordinated, *1088*
 coordination, *1110*
 copies, *1102*
 copy, *1102, 1124, 1127, 1141*
 coral, *1075, 1078*
 correct, *1074, 1101, 1103, 1108, 1118*
 correctly, *1073, 1087*
 correlation, *1119*
 correspondence, *1102*
 Council, *1135*
 Counsel, *1074, 1080, 1134*
 counsel, *1088, 1129, 1132, 1139, 1142*
 count, *1110*
 counted, *1110*
 Counter, *1089, 1124*
 counter, *1113*
 Countries, *1095*
 countries, *1074*
 country, *1090*
 course, *1082, 1086, 1088, 1096, 1098, 1100-1101, 1109, 1120, 1130, 1132, 1136*
 Court, *1097, 1120, 1140, 1142*
 court, *1093, 1097-1099, 1116, 1123-1125*
 courtesy, *1091*
 courts, *1098, 1115*
 cover, *1086, 1094, 1096, 1121, 1128, 1130, 1138*
 covered, *1117, 1122*
 Covering, *1127*
 covers, *1129*
 crafted, *1115*
 CRAWFORD, *1091*
 Crawford, *1080-1081, 1084, 1091-1092, 1100-1102, 1125, 1132-1133, 1135, 1137*
 crayfish, *1108*
 create, *1120-1121*
 creation, *1083, 1136, 1139*
 criticises, *1126*
 criticism, *1128, 1133*
 criticisms, *1076*
 critique, *1124*
 cross, *1112, 1127*
 CRR, *1142*
 crucial, *1108*
 Crusoe, *1092, 1127*
 crystal, *1112*
 curious, *1116*
 current, *1127*
 currently, *1090, 1114, 1137*
 Cyprus, *1095-1097*
- ## D
- Dabee, *1101, 1130-1131*
 Daly, *1140*
 damaged, *1107*
 dangers, *1075*
 dark, *1132*
 darken, *1077*
 data, *1077, 1087*
 date, *1136*
 dated, *1075, 1077-1078, 1081, 1086, 1088, 1121, 1127*
 DAVID, *1142*
 David, *1140, 1142*
 Day, *1074, 1079-1084, 1089, 1092-1093, 1103-1104, 1108, 1112, 1114, 1118-1119, 1123, 1126-1130*
 day, *1077, 1082, 1126*
 days, *1136*
 deadline, *1086*
 deal, *1094-1095, 1100, 1114*
 dealt, *1099, 1133*
 decades, *1107, 1132-1133*
 December, *1096, 1112, 1127, 1138-1139*
 decide, *1080, 1093, 1098, 1102, 1119*
 decided, *1110, 1124*
 decision, *1076, 1082, 1123, 1131, 1136*
 decisions, *1115*

declaration, 1074-1075, 1077-1078, 1082, 1096, 1100, 1112, 1120, 1122
 declaratory, 1113
 declare, 1077, 1089, 1092, 1131, 1138, 1140-1141
 declared, 1075, 1077-1078, 1081, 1083, 1096, 1135
 declaring, 1100
 deep, 1079
 deeper, 1127
 deeply, 1137
 defective, 1100
 Defence, 1134
 defence, 1081, 1083, 1090, 1108, 1131-1132, 1138
 defended, 1082
 defense, 1110
 deference, 1092
 defined, 1097, 1099-1100, 1105, 1139
 definition, 1089, 1099, 1118
 definitions, 1104
 definitively, 1095
 delay, 1091
 delegation, 1082, 1086-1088
 deliberate, 1115, 1121
 delict, 1126
 Delimitation, 1096, 1120
 delimitation, 1096-1098, 1109, 1120
 delineating, 1096
 demand, 1113
 demanded, 1079
 demanding, 1105, 1111
 demands, 1091
 democratic, 1079
 demonstrable, 1130
 demonstrated, 1087, 1139
 demonstrating, 1128
 denial, 1127
 denies, 1100, 1103, 1127
 denigrate, 1114
 deny, 1104, 1134
 depends, 1126
 deprive, 1123
 deprives, 1078
 Depts, 1138
 derive, 1100
 derived, 1109
 derives, 1080
 deriving, 1080, 1086-1087
 describe, 1089, 1128
 described, 1089, 1098, 1122, 1127, 1132
 describes, 1114, 1122
 describing, 1090
 description, 1084
 descriptive, 1103
 deserving, 1110
 design, 1123, 1128, 1130
 designate, 1075
 desired, 1135
 Despite, 1077, 1139
 despite, 1079, 1136
 Destroy, 1130
 destroy, 1130, 1137
 detach, 1134
 detached, 1079
 detachment, 1079, 1083, 1134-1135
 detail, 1095, 1101, 1109, 1130
 detailed, 1095, 1132
 detain, 1103, 1124
 determination, 1092, 1094, 1134, 1139
 determine, 1092-1093, 1097, 1100, 1111, 1119-1120, 1139
 determined, 1095
 determining, 1100, 1112, 1123
 detriment, 1126
 Development, 1075
 development, 1110, 1125
 Dheerendra, 1131
 Dhekelia, 1095
 dialogue, 1110
 dictionaries, 1105
 Diego, 1077, 1107, 1128-1129
 differ, 1074
 difference, 1073-1074, 1088
 differences, 1073
 different, 1076, 1081, 1097, 1116, 1120-1121, 1126
 differs, 1074, 1084
 difficult, 1125, 1137
 diminish, 1134
 Diplomacy, 1095
 Diplomatic, 1127
 diplomatic, 1120
 direction, 1111, 1142
 directly, 1099, 1139
 Director, 1075, 1077-1078, 1087, 1117, 1133
 Directorate, 1077-1078, 1086, 1088
 disadvantageous, 1120
 disagree, 1080, 1086-1087, 1115
 disagreement, 1087, 1099, 1103
 disappeared, 1081
 disappointing, 1137
 disappointment, 1133
 discharge, 1111
 discharged, 1111
 discovered, 1084
 discovery, 1136
 discrepancies, 1085
 discrepancy, 1072
 discrete, 1104, 1114
 discussion, 1076, 1085, 1087-1088, 1102
 disguise, 1130
 dislocation, 1123
 dismissed, 1133
 dismissive, 1128, 1138
 displacement, 1075
 Dispute, 1097
 dispute, 1089, 1103, 1111, 1119-1126, 1139-1140
 Disputes, 1119, 1122
 disputes, 1089, 1097, 1099, 1109, 1114-1119, 1121-1122, 1124

disregard, 1115
disregards, 1100
disservice, 1115
distance, 1110
distinct, 1091
distinction, 1074,
1119, 1121
distinguished,
1120-1121, 1131
distributed, 1099
disturb, 1094
diversity, 1137
divided,
1093-1094, 1099
doctrine, 1126
document, 1076,
1078-1079, 1082,
1086, 1088,
1122, 1127,
1134-1135
documentation,
1135-1136
documents, 1072,
1100, 1102,
1122, 1134-1135,
1141
doing, 1078, 1094,
1097, 1105,
1108, 1115, 1120
donations, 1078
done, 1076, 1081,
1116, 1121-1122,
1133
door, 1089, 1130
dose, 1080
doubt, 1131, 1135,
1137
doubtful, 1096,
1130
doubts, 1128
Doug, 1086
down, 1072, 1076,
1093
downstream, 1109

DP, 1098
draft, 1112
drafted, 1114, 1116
drafters,
1114-1115, 1119,
1121-1122
drafting, 1115, 1125
draftsmanship,
1116
dramatic, 1130
drawing, 1074
drawn, 1073,
1096-1097
drill, 1129
driven, 1079
dry, 1097
DS, 1111
Dubai, 1140
Due, 1104
due, 1104-1105,
1107
during, 1073, 1075,
1100-1101, 1104,
1112, 1135,
1139-1140
duties, 1104
duty, 1109,
1118-1119
dwindling, 1075

E

each, 1074, 1081,
1091, 1097-1099,
1111-1112, 1118
eagerly, 1131
earlier, 1089, 1093,
1100, 1137, 1141
early, 1109-1110,
1133
ears, 1090

Eastern, 1095
eastern, 1095
eco, 1137
Economic, 1096
economic, 1081,
1098, 1114, 1123
ed, 1095
EEZ, 1073,
1083-1084,
1096-1097, 1102,
1104-1105,
1107-1108,
1110-1111,
1113-1115,
1119-1124
effect, 1103,
1126-1127, 1130
effected, 1098
effort, 1084, 1086,
1113, 1123
efforts, 1111, 1113,
1140
Egypt, 1096
eight, 1132
eighth, 1139
Either, 1089
either, 1076, 1085,
1092-1093,
1098-1099
El, 1097
elaborated, 1124
elected, 1112
Election, 1130
election, 1136
elegant, 1086
element, 1103,
1126-1127
elevation, 1117
eleven, 1095
eleventh, 1088
elides, 1118
eliminating, 1090
elocution, 1086
elsewhere, 1075

elucidated, 1105
Email, 1075, 1077
emails, 1112-1113,
1137
embarrassments,
1079
Embassy, 1127
embedded, 1085
embodied, 1115
emphasis, 1083,
1086
emphasise, 1083,
1093
emphasized, 1082,
1120, 1122
employed, 1105,
1142
enacted, 1125
enactment, 1118,
1125
enacts, 1125
encapsulated, 1114
enclave, 1096
encompassing,
1138
encourage, 1087
encouraged, 1086
encouraging, 1082
Encyclopedia, 1126
end, 1072, 1076,
1115, 1130
endangered, 1107
endeavour, 1113,
1125
ended, 1084
endows, 1081
ends, 1130
enforce, 1099, 1120
enforceable, 1102
enforced, 1075
enforcement,
1099, 1128-1129
enforcing, 1078
engage, 1111,

1123, 1128
 engages, 1139
 engaging, 1128
 enjoy, 1085
 enjoyed, 1083
 enjoying, 1084
 enjoyment, 1085, 1127
 enjoys, 1081, 1084
 enlargement, 1083
 ensure, 1127
 ensured, 1140
 entail, 1104
 entire, 1075, 1083, 1086-1087, 1090, 1096
 entirety, 1113
 entitled, 1085, 1089, 1094, 1113, 1138, 1140
 entitlement, 1073-1074, 1085, 1090, 1098, 1105
 entry, 1126
 environment, 1081-1084, 1090, 1113-1114, 1116-1118, 1121-1123, 1137
 Environmental, 1073
 environmental, 1076-1078, 1082, 1091, 1105, 1107, 1111, 1113, 1117, 1122, 1127, 1129-1130
 EPPZ, 1073-1074
 equal, 1133
 equality, 1126
 equally, 1094, 1132, 1138
 equitable, 1108-1109
 equivalent, 1096
 error, 1116
 especially, 1083, 1107
 essence, 1090
 essential, 1095
 essentially, 1074, 1092, 1111
 establish, 1074, 1079, 1082-1083, 1093, 1117-1118, 1120-1121
 established, 1074, 1083, 1104, 1125
 establishes, 1121, 1126
 establishing, 1103, 1120, 1122, 1127
 Establishment, 1095-1096
 establishment, 1082, 1094-1095, 1131
 estroy, 1130, 1137
 EU, 1095
 European, 1093, 1126
 Even, 1083-1084, 1091, 1108, 1127
 even, 1074-1075, 1084-1085, 1093, 1095, 1105, 1107, 1115, 1118, 1122, 1124, 1127, 1130, 1139
 event, 1092, 1102, 1109, 1131, 1134
 events, 1099
 eventual, 1136
 eventually, 1079, 1082
 everybody, 1141
 everyone, 1076, 1128
 Everything, 1090
 everything, 1072
 eviction, 1128
 evidence, 1075, 1079, 1104-1105, 1109, 1111-1113, 1120, 1123, 1127, 1129-1130, 1134-1136
 evidently, 1125
 eviscerate, 1103
 ew, 1127
 EWHC, 1127
 ex, 1081, 1127
 exactly, 1074, 1116, 1126, 1132
 examination, 1112, 1127
 examine, 1112, 1119
 examining, 1102
 example, 1094, 1097-1099, 1103, 1122, 1124
 Examples, 1092
 examples, 1084, 1094, 1118
 excellent, 1140
 Except, 1102
 except, 1128
 exception, 1077, 1089, 1093, 1114, 1119, 1122, 1124
 exceptions, 1093
 Exchange, 1095
 exchange, 1083
 exchanges, 1109, 1120
 excised, 1132
 excision, 1092, 1094, 1131, 1133, 1139
 exclude, 1115, 1119
 excluded, 1077, 1114-1115, 1119, 1121, 1124-1125
 excludes, 1089, 1119
 excluding, 1077
 exclusion, 1077, 1095, 1114-1115, 1118, 1121-1122, 1128-1129
 Exclusive, 1096
 exclusive, 1081, 1084-1085, 1090, 1093, 1098, 1114
 exclusively, 1117, 1124
 executes, 1091
 exemplary, 1140
 exempts, 1107
 exercisable, 1097
 exercise, 1079, 1094, 1100, 1105, 1111, 1113, 1118, 1120-1123, 1126, 1128
 exercised, 1102-1103, 1126-1127
 exercises, 1085
 Exercising, 1120
 exercising, 1090, 1102-1104, 1123-1125
 exist, 1094
 existed, 1075, 1120
 existence, 1090, 1128, 1137
 existent, 1120
 existing, 1121
 expect, 1075, 1090
 expectation, 1086-1087
 expected, 1130
 expense, 1079
 experiment, 1130

expire, *1086*
 expiring, *1089*
 explain,
 1104-1105,
 1110-1111, 1129
 explained, *1073,*
 1075, 1082-1083,
 1088, 1102,
 1104, 1108-1109,
 1111, 1125,
 1137-1139
 explaining, *1082*
 explanation, *1128,*
 1134
 explicitly, *1124*
 exploit, *1108, 1119*
 exploited, *1108*
 exploiting, *1085*
 express, *1140*
 expressed, *1079,*
 1086, 1118, 1138
 expressly, *1093,*
 1099, 1121, 1123
 extend, *1140*
 extended, *1085,*
 1089, 1096,
 1104, 1122
 extends, *1124*
 Extension, *1121*
 extension, *1125*
 extensive, *1088,*
 1135
 extent, *1076, 1085,*
 1126, 1135
 extinguish, *1105*
 extinguished, *1108*
 extra, *1117*
 extracted, *1086*
 extraction, *1084*
 extraordinary, *1137*
 extremely, *1127*

F

fabricate, *1127*
 face, *1113, 1134*
 facie, *1123*
 facilitate, *1078,*
 1088
 facilities, *1081*
 fact, *1085, 1090,*
 1107-1108,
 1110-1112, 1114,
 1118, 1122, 1128
 facts, *1085, 1099,*
 1104, 1107,
 1133-1134, 1140
 failed, *1089, 1109,*
 1128
 fails, *1129, 1139*
 faith, *1090, 1109,*
 1111, 1126, 1138
 fake, *1116*
 fall, *1090, 1098,*
 1116-1118, 1122
 falling, *1139*
 falls, *1109, 1122*
 familiar, *1119, 1128*
 famous, *1115*
 fanciful, *1112*
 far, *1073, 1097,*
 1099, 1104,
 1110, 1116
 fashion, *1088*
 fashioned, *1087*
 fate, *1090*
 favored, *1079*
 FCMZ, *1075*
 FCO, *1076-1077,*
 1079, 1082,
 1087, 1133, 1136
 features, *1074*
 February, *1075,*
 1096

fees, *1078*
 fell, *1116*
 felt, *1128*
 females, *1128*
 few, *1072, 1108,*
 1128
 Fifth, *1129*
 fifth, *1137*
 fifty, *1079*
 Figure, *1073*
 figure, *1129*
 figures, *1079*
 file, *1087, 1089*
 filed, *1086-1087,*
 1137, 1139
 filing, *1086-1087*
 FINAL, *1140*
 final, *1072, 1076,*
 1080, 1085,
 1087, 1101,
 1114, 1120,
 1140-1141
 Finally, *1073, 1125,*
 1139
 finally, *1077, 1104,*
 1135
 financed, *1130*
 financially, *1142*
 financing, *1078,*
 1091, 1128-1129
 find, *1082, 1086,*
 1090, 1092,
 1103, 1116, 1121
 finding, *1111*
 findings, *1075*
 finds, *1116*
 Fiona, *1140*
 firm, *1137*
 First, *1072-1073,*
 1078, 1080,
 1085, 1113,
 1126, 1132
 first, *1076, 1079,*
 1089, 1093-1095,

1103-1104, 1108,
 1110-1111,
 1122-1123, 1125,
 1127, 1129,
 1131, 1133,
 1135, 1138
 Fish, *1075, 1102,*
 1110, 1123
 fish, *1075,*
 1083-1084, 1105,
 1107, 1109-1110,
 1120, 1128
 fished, *1107, 1110,*
 1123
 Fisheries,
 1108-1109, 1119,
 1129
 fisheries, *1076,*
 1098, 1104,
 1114-1115, 1118,
 1120, 1122
 fishermen, *1120*
 Fishery, *1076*
 fishery, *1078, 1114*
 Fishing, *1083*
 fishing, *1074-1080,*
 1083-1084, 1099,
 1102, 1104-1105,
 1107-1108, 1110,
 1114-1115,
 1119-1122,
 1128-1129, 1138
 five, *1125*
 Fixed, *1075*
 fixed, *1099*
 flagged, *1084*
 fleets, *1075*
 floodgates, *1094,*
 1097, 1139
 floor, *1101, 1125*
 flow, *1087, 1122*
 fluent, *1093*
 flyingfish, *1120*
 focus, *1086*
 fold, *1092*
 Folder, *1075-1076,*

- 1079, 1081-1083,
 1086, 1088,
 1107, 1127
 folder, 1124, 1127
 folders, 1076
 follow, 1072, 1075,
 1077, 1123, 1136
 followed, 1086,
 1101, 1123
 following, 1086,
 1088, 1092, 1110
 follows, 1073,
 1076, 1082,
 1095, 1098
 Fonseca, 1097
 footnote, 1082,
 1121, 1128
 footprints, 1127,
 1133
 force, 1096
 forced, 1115-1116,
 1124
 forcibly, 1131
 foregoing, 1142
 Foreign, 1075,
 1077-1078, 1081,
 1083, 1086,
 1088, 1098,
 1110, 1112,
 1127-1128, 1132,
 1136, 1139
 foreign, 1079,
 1091, 1119
 forever, 1089
 form, 1074, 1079,
 1114, 1139, 1142
 formal, 1072, 1109
 formally, 1074,
 1110, 1141
 former, 1127
 forms, 1112, 1131
 formulation, 1105,
 1114
 found, 1091, 1114,
 1121, 1124
 Foundation, 1078,
 1129
 Four, 1132
 four, 1133
 Fourth, 1128
 fourth, 1136
 fragmentary, 1113
 framework, 1140
 France, 1098,
 1109, 1120
 free, 1138
 freeholder, 1084
 French, 1098, 1126
 fresh, 1122
 Friday, 1074, 1093,
 1125, 1127,
 1132, 1135,
 1137, 1141
 Fridays, 1128,
 1132-1133
 friend, 1073,
 1083-1084
 Fright, 1134
 frighten, 1134
 Frontier, 1097
 fuel, 1129
 fulfil, 1126
 fulfill, 1110
 fulfilled, 1113, 1129
 fulfillment, 1080
 Full, 1077
 full, 1077-1079,
 1085, 1088,
 1107, 1114,
 1127, 1129, 1141
 fullest, 1135
 fully, 1097, 1130
 function, 1103,
 1111
 functions, 1098
 funded, 1078, 1129
 funders, 1079
 funding,
 1078-1079, 1088,
 1129
 Further, 1113
 further, 1077,
 1087, 1097,
 1100, 1124, 1142
 furtherance, 1115
 Future, 1095
 future, 1082, 1084,
 1108
 1079-1080, 1084,
 1092, 1094-1095,
 1100, 1102,
 1105, 1112,
 1128, 1130,
 1132, 1136-1137
 gives, 1085
 GMF, 1095
 gmfus, 1095
 Gordon, 1136-1137
 GOSK, 1131
 got, 1127-1128
 governed, 1094,
 1098
 governing, 1118
 Government, 1112,
 1127, 1136
 Governor, 1135
 governs, 1094
 grace, 1079
 Graham, 1090
 grammatical, 1103
 Grand, 1090
 grant, 1094, 1116,
 1118-1119, 1122,
 1135
 granted, 1108, 1120
 granting, 1083
 grants, 1114, 1118,
 1124
 grateful, 1132, 1140
 gratitude, 1140
 gratuitous, 1138
 Great, 1095
 great, 1086, 1115,
 1122, 1134
 greater, 1076,
 1082, 1107, 1115
 greatest, 1115
 Greene, 1090
 Greenhill, 1127
 GREENWOOD,
 1074
 Greenwood,
 1073-1074, 1078,
G
 gamut, 1099
 gaps, 1115
 Garcia, 1077, 1107,
 1128-1129
 Garth, 1140
 gave, 1081, 1104,
 1111, 1113
 General, 1093,
 1107, 1130-1131,
 1137-1139
 general, 1097,
 1099-1100, 1103,
 1108, 1110,
 1117, 1119,
 1122, 1124
 generalis, 1097
 generally, 1132,
 1138
 generate, 1074
 generation, 1128
 generations, 1082
 Generis, 1095
 generis, 1095, 1139
 generous, 1091
 gentlemen, 1072
 genuinely, 1109
 give, 1080, 1104,
 1109, 1111,
 1116, 1125
 Given, 1135
 given, 1077,
 1079-1080, 1084,
 1092, 1094-1095,
 1100, 1102,
 1105, 1112,
 1128, 1130,
 1132, 1136-1137
 gives, 1085
 GMF, 1095
 gmfus, 1095
 Gordon, 1136-1137
 GOSK, 1131
 got, 1127-1128
 governed, 1094,
 1098
 governing, 1118
 Government, 1112,
 1127, 1136
 Governor, 1135
 governs, 1094
 grace, 1079
 Graham, 1090
 grammatical, 1103
 Grand, 1090
 grant, 1094, 1116,
 1118-1119, 1122,
 1135
 granted, 1108, 1120
 granting, 1083
 grants, 1114, 1118,
 1124
 grateful, 1132, 1140
 gratitude, 1140
 gratuitous, 1138
 Great, 1095
 great, 1086, 1115,
 1122, 1134
 greater, 1076,
 1082, 1107, 1115
 greatest, 1115
 Greene, 1090
 Greenhill, 1127
 GREENWOOD,
 1074
 Greenwood,
 1073-1074, 1078,

1102, 1112,
1129, 1132, 1138
Grieve, 1137-1138
ground, 1082,
1118-1119
Group, 1099
group, 1116
guided, 1116
Gulf, 1097-1098
gun, 1139
Gurel, 1095

H

habitually, 1123
Hague, 1080, 1140
half, 1072, 1129,
1132, 1141
hand, 1076, 1112,
1119, 1121, 1140
handwritten, 1128
happened, 1134
happy, 1101
harbours, 1099
hard, 1114, 1136,
1141
hardly, 1129, 1132,
1136
harm, 1108-1109
harmonise, 1113
harmonize, 1125
Harold, 1134
harvest, 1108
harvesting, 1108
hasty, 1136
havoc, 1126
Hawaiian, 1129
he, 1095
Head, 1075,
1077-1078, 1086,
1112

head, 1086-1087,
1111, 1139
Heads, 1112
hear, 1089, 1101,
1137, 1141
heard, 1110, 1129,
1137
Hearing, 1072
hearing, 1140-1141
Hearings, 1141
hearings, 1132,
1140
heart, 1132
heavens, 1139
heavy, 1080
Hebrides,
1098-1099
hectares, 1138
held, 1076, 1083,
1086, 1097-1098,
1109, 1119-1120
helmets, 1099
help, 1088
helpful, 1092, 1140
Herbert, 1134
hereby, 1142
hibernation, 1133
High, 1077,
1081-1082, 1099,
1136, 1138
high, 1098-1099,
1136
highest, 1081, 1093
highly, 1075, 1110,
1130
historic,
1097-1098, 1131
historical, 1079,
1084, 1121, 1134
HM, 1093
HMG, 1127
Hoffman,
1076-1077
hold, 1111-1113,

1136, 1139
holders, 1098
holding, 1100
hole, 1093
holes, 1093
home, 1131
homeland, 1090
Hon, 1134
Honduras, 1097
honour, 1091, 1131
hoof, 1136
hook, 1075
hope, 1079, 1088,
1134
hopefully, 1128
hopes, 1090
hotel, 1116
hour, 1101, 1141
hours, 1125
House, 1132
housekeeping,
1101
However, 1082
however, 1079
htm, 1138
html, 1127
http, 1095, 1127,
1138
huge, 1132
human, 1127, 1133
hundred, 1079
hurry, 1130
Hydrocarbons,
1095

I

Ibid, 1095,
1097-1098, 1126
ic, 1138
ICJ, 1097, 1109,

1119
Id, 1120-1121
idea, 1099, 1101,
1110
ideal, 1090
identified, 1079
identify, 1079, 1084
ignore, 1105
ignored, 1128
II, 1085
iii, 1080-1081,
1083-1085,
1089-1090,
1121-1122
ILC, 1104-1105,
1126
ILR, 1109
imagine, 1141
immaterial, 1114
immediate, 1097
immediately, 1083,
1086
IMO, 1117
impact, 1076,
1083, 1110-1111,
1119
impacted, 1084,
1096
impacts, 1105
impairs, 1127
implement, 1130
implementation,
1128, 1130
implemented,
1108, 1128
implementing,
1126, 1128
implicated, 1107
implications, 1127
implied, 1117
implies, 1138
Import, 1111
importance, 1137
important, 1103,
1105, 1109,

1115, 1119, 1122
 impose, *1081, 1103, 1110-1111*
 imposes, *1105, 1108*
 impossible, *1110*
 impotent, *1100*
 imprecise, *1089*
 inadequate, *1128*
 inapplicable, *1092*
 incidental, *1122*
 include, *1079-1080, 1107, 1113, 1122*
 included, *1076-1077, 1082, 1120-1121*
 includes, *1117, 1129, 1131*
 including, *1076, 1084-1085, 1094, 1097, 1108-1109, 1113-1114, 1117, 1121-1123, 1137-1138, 1141*
 incompatible, *1141*
 inconsistent, *1093, 1100, 1111*
 increase, *1136*
 Indeed, *1081, 1099, 1127, 1139*
 indeed, *1096, 1127, 1130*
 independence, *1095, 1098, 1134-1135*
 independent, *1095, 1126, 1133, 1139*
 Indian, *1075, 1078-1079, 1083, 1086, 1088, 1122*
 indicated, *1107*
 indication, *1105, 1122*
 indigenous, *1128*
 indisputably, *1090*
 individually, *1098*
 inevitably, *1083*
 infamous, *1090, 1132*
 infer, *1130*
 informally, *1074*
 Information, *1088*
 information, *1079, 1085-1089, 1109*
 infra, *1120*
 inhabitants, *1127*
 inherent, *1120, 1129*
 initio, *1089*
 injury, *1126-1127*
 inshore, *1075*
 insight, *1135*
 insisted, *1078*
 insistence, *1078*
 insisting, *1113*
 insofar, *1096*
 instance, *1123*
 instant, *1130*
 Instead, *1075, 1128*
 instead, *1123, 1138*
 Institute, *1095*
 instrument, *1094*
 insufficient, *1089*
 integral, *1131, 1133*
 Integration, *1086*
 intended, *1076, 1088, 1090, 1108, 1113, 1121-1122*
 intention, *1085, 1095, 1115-1116, 1119*
 intentionally, *1126*
 inter, *1114, 1140-1141*
 interest, *1081, 1084-1085, 1093, 1100, 1121, 1132, 1139*
 interested, *1110, 1142*
 interesting, *1074*
 interests, *1084, 1109*
 interfere, *1104-1105, 1113*
 interfering, *1113*
 interim, *1100*
 interlocutor, *1127*
 internal, *1078, 1098, 1102, 1135-1136*
 internally, *1076, 1097*
 International, *1079, 1086, 1094-1095, 1097*
 international, *1076, 1085, 1091-1094, 1097-1098, 1100, 1102-1103, 1108, 1114, 1116-1118, 1132-1133, 1138*
 interpolate, *1128*
 interpret, *1104, 1125, 1133, 1139*
 Interpretation, *1092*
 interpretation, *1090, 1094, 1103-1105, 1115, 1121, 1123-1124, 1126*
 interpreting, *1094, 1103*
 interprets, *1089*
 intervening, *1097*
 intervenor, *1097*
 introduced, *1084*
 Introduction, *1092, 1125*
 introductory, *1132-1133*
 intuitive, *1113*
 invalid, *1081*
 invent, *1124*
 invented, *1134*
 inverting, *1115*
 invested, *1087*
 invite, *1125*
 invited, *1089*
 invites, *1091*
 inviting, *1132*
 invocation, *1078*
 invoked, *1079*
 involve, *1089*
 involved, *1107, 1109, 1112*
 involvement, *1110*
 involves, *1092, 1105*
 involving, *1098, 1111*
 IOTC, *1107, 1110-1111, 1123*
 Ireland, *1095*
 irrefutable, *1082*
 irrelevant, *1092, 1108*
 irrespective, *1100*
 Island, *1097*
 island, *1074*
 Islands, *1129*
 islands, *1073, 1081-1082, 1127, 1133*
 isolation, *1130*
 Israel, *1096*
 Issue, *1095*
 issue, *1076, 1094, 1108-1110, 1124, 1129, 1139*
 issued, *1108*
 issues, *1076, 1099, 1104, 1114, 1117, 1132, 1135*
 Istanbul, *1140*

italicized, *1121*
ITLOS, *1117, 1123*
itself, *1079, 1082,*
1120, 1122, 1136

J

Jacovides, *1095*
James, *1092, 1125,*
1137
January,
1085-1086, 1088,
1110
Joan, *1079*
Joanne, *1075,*
1077-1078
John, *1077*
joint, *1086, 1088,*
1097-1098, 1138
jointly, *1088,*
1098-1099
jpg, *1127*
Judge, *1073-1074,*
1076-1078, 1102,
1112, 1114-1115,
1117, 1121,
1128, 1132,
1137-1139
Judgment, *1120*
July, *1075, 1082,*
1085, 1087-1088,
1110
June, *1095*
Jurisdiction, *1101,*
1108-1109,
1119-1122
jurisdiction,
1080-1081,
1089-1090,
1092-1094,
1097-1100, 1102,

1114-1116,
1118-1125, 1133,
1139
jurisdictional,
1121, 1124, 1127
Justice, *1097*
justiciable,
1099-1100
justification, *1131*
justifications, *1076*
justify, *1079, 1130*

K

KASDAN, *1142*
Kasdan, *1140, 1142*
keeps, *1113*
kept, *1109*
key, *1132*
kilometre, *1129*
kilometres, *1139*
kind, *1084, 1091,*
1125
kindly, *1088*
KINGDOM, *1074*
Kingdom,
1072-1075,
1079-1082, 1086,
1091-1092,
1095-1097, 1102,
1104-1105,
1107-1114, 1116,
1119, 1122-1125,
1127, 1131-1141
kismet, *1090*
Kiss, *1126*
Kluwer, *1095*
knowing, *1112*
Kochenov, *1095*
Kristof, *1079*
Kumar, *1131*

L

Lac, *1108-1109*
lack, *1114, 1128*
lacks, *1089*
ladies, *1072*
lagoon, *1078*
laid, *1072*
Lancaster, *1132*
Land, *1097-1098*
land, *1074, 1078,*
1080, 1084,
1089, 1092,
1094, 1098, 1100
landed, *1110*
landing, *1107*
landward, *1098*
language, *1086,*
1096, 1104,
1119, 1133
Lanoux, *1108-1109*
large, *1076, 1094,*
1133
largely, *1129*
Last, *1076, 1135*
last, *1073,*
1078-1079, 1082,
1086-1088,
1092-1093, 1112,
1130, 1133,
1135-1136, 1139
later, *1095, 1104,*
1116, 1123, 1132
lateral, *1096*
latter, *1122, 1124*
Law, *1095-1096,*
1099, 1124,
1131, 1133,
1138-1139
law, *1085, 1092,*
1094, 1097-1098,
1100, 1102-1103,
1108, 1133
lawful, *1074, 1080*
laws, *1078, 1118,*
1125
lay, *1084, 1093*
laying, *1116-1117*
lead, *1128*
leads, *1079, 1087*
leafed, *1090*
league, *1097, 1128*
learned, *1079*
learning, *1115*
least, *1080-1081,*
1087, 1100,
1105, 1107,
1113, 1139
leaves, *1135*
Leaving, *1114*
leaving, *1108*
left, *1104, 1111,*
1129
legacy, *1132*
Legal, *1117*
legal, *1074, 1081,*
1088, 1090,
1098, 1103-1104,
1113, 1118,
1126, 1131-1133,
1136, 1140
legality, *1094, 1100*
LEGALLY, *1074*
legally, *1080-1081,*
1100, 1132
legislation, *1096,*
1128
Legislative, *1112*
leisure, *1103, 1124*
lengths, *1134*
lengthy, *1076*
less, *1080, 1129*
lest, *1134*
Letter, *1081*
letter, *1112, 1135*
level, *1075, 1081,*
1112

- 1134-1139
 lex, 1097
 lianas, 1128
 licences,
 1083-1084, 1108
 license, 1078
 licensed, 1107
 licenses, 1128
 licensing, 1075
 lies, 1097
 life, 1083
 light, 1090, 1102
 likely, 1075
 limb, 1102
 limit, 1073-1074,
 1083, 1096,
 1104, 1116,
 1122, 1124
 limitation,
 1116-1117, 1124
 limitations, 1109,
 1116, 1124
 limited, 1075,
 1093, 1097,
 1105, 1108-1109,
 1134
 Limits, 1085, 1095,
 1138, 1141
 limits, 1074, 1085,
 1096-1097, 1114,
 1125
 Line, 1097
 line, 1073,
 1088-1089,
 1097-1098,
 1103-1104, 1112,
 1123, 1126,
 1129-1130,
 1132-1133,
 1137-1139
 lines, 1074,
 1079-1084,
 1092-1093, 1096,
 1104, 1108,
 1114, 1118-1119,
 1126-1128, 1132,
 1134-1139
 link, 1128
 linked, 1094, 1126
 list, 1086
 listed, 1076, 1110
 literature, 1095
 litigation, 1097,
 1142
 little, 1078, 1117,
 1130
 littoral, 1097
 living, 1084, 1090,
 1119, 1121-1123
 ll, 1091, 1101, 1116
 lobby, 1116
 locally, 1077
 locate, 1124
 location, 1110
 LOEWENSTEIN,
 1101
 Loewenstein,
 1073, 1091,
 1100-1101,
 1115-1116, 1125,
 1138
 London, 1081,
 1086, 1115, 1127
 long, 1072,
 1082-1084, 1091,
 1099, 1103,
 1125-1126, 1129
 longer, 1081, 1083,
 1088, 1090,
 1097, 1131, 1138
 longstanding, 1090
 look, 1116, 1128
 looked, 1137
 looking, 1090, 1093
 los, 1138
 lose, 1078
 lost, 1086
 lot, 1093
 Louis, 1077, 1088,
 1136
 Lyrical, 1090
 lyrical, 1090
M
 Macdonald, 1109,
 1137
 made, 1074-1075,
 1077-1078, 1080,
 1086-1088, 1096,
 1100, 1104,
 1109-1110, 1112,
 1120, 1122-1123,
 1129, 1135-1137,
 1140
 main, 1099
 mainland, 1138
 maintain, 1114
 maintained, 1082,
 1135
 maintaining, 1137
 maintains, 1114
 major, 1084-1085
 majority, 1079
 Maldives, 1073
 Man, 1127, 1133
 manage, 1123
 managed, 1075
 Management, 1075
 management, 1122
 managing, 1119,
 1121
 mandate, 1123
 manifestly, 1138
 manner, 1085, 1109
 many, 1077,
 1079-1082, 1103,
 1122, 1132, 1136
 map, 1073, 1110
 March, 1077-1078,
 1081, 1135-1136,
 1138
 Marine, 1076-1079,
 1082-1083, 1127,
 1129, 1131,
 1137-1138
 marine, 1075,
 1081-1084, 1090,
 1097, 1100,
 1113-1114,
 1116-1118,
 1121-1123, 1125,
 1127, 1137-1138
 Maritime, 1095,
 1097, 1120
 maritime,
 1073-1075, 1081,
 1083-1084,
 1092-1095,
 1097-1100, 1104,
 1120, 1131,
 1140-1141
 MARPOL, 1117
 Martinus, 1095
 Mascarene, 1138
 master, 1132
 material, 1126,
 1137
 materially, 1084
 materials, 1111
 matter, 1080,
 1092, 1094,
 1098-1100, 1110,
 1112, 1116,
 1118-1119, 1133
 matters, 1090,
 1098-1099, 1109,
 1115, 1122, 1140
 Mauritian,
 1076-1077,
 1082-1083, 1086,
 1102, 1104-1105,
 1107, 1110,
 1112, 1134-1136
 Mauritians, 1082,
 1131
 MAURITIUS, 1074,

1140
 Mauritius, 1072-1073, 1075, 1077-1094, 1102-1105, 1107-1114, 1116-1119, 1121, 1123, 1125, 1127-1128, 1130-1141
 Max, 1126
 maximum, 1123
 maybe, 1097
 mean, 1087-1089, 1104-1105, 1134
 meaning, 1090, 1103, 1105, 1107, 1117-1118, 1140-1141
 meaningful, 1105
 means, 1078, 1086-1087, 1089, 1092, 1103-1104, 1116, 1118
 meant, 1126
 meantime, 1137
 measure, 1111, 1122, 1126
 Measures, 1083
 measures, 1081-1082, 1084, 1110-1111, 1113-1114, 1123
 mechanisms, 1128
 median, 1073
 Mediterranean, 1095
 mediterranean, 1095
 meet, 1130
 Meeting, 1086
 meeting, 1082, 1086, 1088, 1112, 1134
 Members, 1072, 1091-1092, 1094, 1101, 1114-1116, 1125, 1130-1137, 1139-1140
 memoire, 1088
 memoires, 1085
 Memorial, 1073, 1089, 1102, 1124, 1134, 1137, 1140
 Men, 1128, 1132
 men, 1099
 Mensah, 1117
 mention, 1088, 1110, 1112, 1121
 mentioned, 1114, 1117, 1120, 1122-1123
 mentioning, 1126
 mentions, 1121
 mere, 1083, 1105, 1111
 merely, 1103, 1134
 Merits, 1101-1102
 merits, 1080, 1102
 Messrs, 1138
 met, 1131, 1134
 Michael, 1073-1074, 1083-1089, 1134
 Might, 1076
 might, 1076-1077, 1101, 1115, 1134
 migration, 1075
 migratory, 1075, 1110
 mildly, 1124
 mile, 1097, 1104, 1122
 miles, 1084, 1097-1098
 Miliband, 1135-1136
 military, 1078, 1095-1096, 1100
 million, 1129, 1139
 Mills, 1108
 mind, 1079, 1112, 1115, 1119
 mindful, 1138
 mine, 1073, 1076
 mineral, 1085
 minerals, 1084
 minimal, 1095
 minimize, 1109, 1123
 minimum, 1113
 Minister, 1082, 1088, 1102, 1111-1113, 1130, 1134, 1136-1137
 Ministerial, 1112
 Ministers, 1134-1135, 1137-1138
 Ministry, 1086, 1136
 Minster, 1113
 Minute, 1078, 1121
 minute, 1072, 1101
 minutes, 1091, 1101, 1115
 misery, 1130
 mismatch, 1115
 misread, 1076
 misstate, 1076
 mistaken, 1115
 misunderstanding, 1112, 1137
 misunderstands, 1117
 MM, 1081, 1083, 1133-1134, 1136-1137
 mollusks, 1108
 moment, 1077, 1091, 1101
 money, 1079
 months, 1137
 Monument, 1129
 Moreover, 1085, 1127
 morning, 1072-1073, 1076, 1081, 1102, 1109, 1115, 1132-1133, 1135, 1139, 1141
 most, 1114, 1122, 1128, 1132, 1137
 Mostly, 1130
 motivated, 1079
 motive, 1127
 move, 1116
 Moving, 1139
 moving, 1137
 MPA, 1074-1079, 1081-1083, 1089-1092, 1094, 1100, 1107, 1110-1113, 1122-1123, 1128-1131, 1135-1141
 MRAG, 1075-1076
 Ms, 1076, 1078-1079, 1082, 1109, 1128-1129, 1137, 1140
 much, 1086, 1091, 1095, 1097, 1100, 1107, 1111, 1116, 1125, 1130, 1135
 Mullen, 1095
 multilateral, 1095, 1111
 multitude, 1094
 multitudes, 1079, 1090
 Murton, 1077, 1112
 museum, 1080
 music, 1090
 must, 1093-1094, 1096, 1098, 1100, 1103-1104, 1111, 1113,

1115, 1121,
1124, 1127-1128
mutually, 1083
myself, 1102

N

name, 1121
names, 1076-1077
narrow, 1108
narrower, 1119
National, 1076,
1129
national, 1118
nationals, 1123
Nations, 1133
nature, 1090, 1108,
1135
navigational,
1116-1117
neatly, 1138
necessarily, 1089,
1115
necessary, 1088,
1129
necessity, 1113
need, 1075, 1077,
1081, 1101,
1103, 1109-1110,
1119, 1123, 1125
needed, 1076,
1081-1083, 1090,
1131, 1138
needs, 1130
negotiated, 1078
negotiation,
1076-1077, 1090
negotiations, 1114
Neither, 1100
neither, 1102,
1108, 1142
Never, 1084

never, 1089, 1096,
1112, 1126
Nevill, 1076, 1079,
1082, 1128-1129,
1137
New, 1079, 1083,
1098-1099
new, 1113,
1124-1125,
1137-1138
Next, 1078
next, 1072, 1078,
1087, 1129, 1136
nfortunately, 1128
Nicaragua, 1097
Nicholas, 1079
Nicosia, 1095-1096
night, 1090
Nijhoff, 1095
Noah, 1079
noble, 1079, 1090
noise, 1133
non, 1075, 1080,
1084, 1096,
1107, 1129
none, 1074-1075,
1088, 1099-1100,
1120, 1132, 1139
nonliving, 1090
Nor, 1096, 1103,
1105, 1107,
1110, 1117-1118,
1123
nor, 1102, 1126,
1135, 1142
normal, 1094, 1124
Normally, 1084
northeastern, 1073
Northern, 1095
Northwestern, 1129
Note, 1134
note, 1088, 1105,
1109, 1121,
1127, 1132,

1134, 1137-1138
noted, 1112, 1127
Notes, 1095
notes, 1110
Nothing, 1118
nothing, 1083,
1088, 1093,
1099, 1104,
1108, 1110-1111,
1114, 1122,
1124, 1126, 1137
notice, 1113-1114
noticed, 1104
notification, 1109,
1111
notifying, 1111
notion, 1126
November, 1075,
1079, 1102,
1111, 1136
NR, 1107
Nuclear, 1120
nullity, 1089
Number, 1127
number, 1086,
1094, 1140
numerous, 1077,
1136

O

object, 1128, 1134
objected, 1096,
1119
objection, 1087
objections, 1076
objective, 1090
objectives, 1107,
1126, 1128
obligates, 1125
obligation, 1074,
1090, 1097,

1103-1105,
1107-1111, 1113,
1118, 1125-1126
obligations, 1081,
1090-1091, 1103,
1110-1111,
1117-1119, 1138,
1141
obscure, 1128
observations, 1133
observed, 1085
observers, 1132
obtain, 1085, 1091
obtained, 1078,
1083, 1134
obvious, 1117
occasion, 1133
occupation, 1093
occupier, 1093
occur, 1109
occurred, 1085,
1087
occurring, 1129
Ocean, 1075,
1078-1079, 1083,
1086, 1088, 1122
ocean, 1075-1076
Oceanography,
1076
oceans, 1127
October, 1082,
1111, 1121
of, 1079
offer, 1118
offered, 1135
Office, 1075,
1077-1078, 1081,
1083, 1086,
1088, 1127-1128,
1132
Officer, 1129
officers, 1076
official, 1074
Officials, 1086
officials, 1077,

1133, 1135-1136,
 1138
 often, 1103
 oil, 1084-1085
 old, 1087
 One, 1075, 1088,
 1093
 one, 1072-1073,
 1076, 1080,
 1083-1089,
 1091-1094,
 1098-1101,
 1111-1112, 1114,
 1118-1119, 1121,
 1124, 1126,
 1128, 1130,
 1132, 1136-1139
 ongoing, 1111
 online, 1127
 Only, 1084
 only, 1076-1077,
 1079-1081,
 1083-1084,
 1086-1087,
 1091-1092,
 1094-1096, 1100,
 1103, 1108-1111,
 1113, 1116-1117,
 1119-1122,
 1124-1125, 1129,
 1136
 onus, 1111
 onwards, 1095,
 1141
 open, 1076
 opened, 1139
 opening, 1093
 openly, 1093, 1099
 operation, 1093,
 1102
 operative, 1086,
 1103
 opinion, 1079, 1109
 opportune, 1115
 opportunities, 1076
 opportunity, 1133,
 1135, 1141
 opt, 1124
 optimum, 1123
 option, 1079
 options, 1076
 oral, 1111, 1118,
 1122, 1131-1132,
 1140
 order, 1134
 Ordinance, 1122
 ordinary, 1105,
 1107, 1111
 org, 1095, 1127,
 1138
 organizations, 1110
 origin, 1131
 original, 1127
 origins, 1128
 Oslo, 1095
 other, 1073, 1075,
 1077-1078, 1081,
 1083-1084,
 1088-1089, 1094,
 1096-1099,
 1102-1105, 1109,
 1111, 1113,
 1118-1126,
 1128-1129, 1131,
 1137, 1140
 others, 1119, 1128,
 1130
 otherwise, 1103,
 1113, 1117, 1142
 ourselves, 1135
 out, 1073, 1080,
 1082, 1089,
 1092, 1094,
 1103-1104, 1107,
 1110, 1113-1116,
 1118, 1121,
 1124, 1127-1128,
 1130-1131, 1140
 outcome,
 1131-1132, 1142
 outer, 1073-1074,
 1085-1086, 1096
 Outermost, 1095
 outermost, 1073
 outline, 1086
 outlined, 1109
 outside, 1098, 1116
 outstanding, 1140
 Over, 1132
 over, 1073,
 1079-1082,
 1084-1085, 1087,
 1089-1090,
 1093-1095,
 1097-1100,
 1102-1103, 1109,
 1114-1120,
 1122-1125, 1129,
 1131, 1135,
 1137, 1139
 overfishing, 1075
 overflight,
 1116-1117
 overriding, 1105,
 1107
 Oversea, 1134
 Overseas,
 1077-1078, 1086,
 1088, 1095, 1133
 own, 1079, 1082,
 1085-1086, 1088,
 1091, 1098,
 1104, 1107,
 1109, 1130, 1135
 Oxman, 1118
 1088-1089, 1122
 paid, 1090-1091,
 1127
 pains, 1083
 Paper, 1088
 Papers, 1098
 para, 1078, 1109,
 1120-1121, 1127,
 1137
 parade, 1129
 paragraph,
 1077-1078, 1082,
 1088, 1103,
 1116, 1118-1121
 paragraphs, 1076,
 1121
 paramount, 1119
 paras, 1111
 park, 1127
 parks, 1138
 Parliament, 1130
 Parliamentary,
 1081, 1102
 Part, 1089,
 1093-1094, 1097,
 1100, 1103,
 1114-1116, 1121,
 1124-1125, 1140
 part, 1074, 1080,
 1083, 1094,
 1100, 1117,
 1129, 1131, 1133
 parte, 1127
 partial, 1135
 participants, 1086
 participation, 1110
 particular, 1078,
 1115, 1118, 1129
 Parties, 1072-1074,
 1085-1087, 1107,
 1114, 1133
 parties, 1091,
 1097, 1109,
 1118, 1124, 1142
 partnership, 1129
 parts, 1092

P

package, 1083,
 1114
 Page, 1086, 1127
 page, 1074, 1076,
 1078-1084, 1086,

passage, 1093
 past, 1072, 1080, 1132
 patches, 1094
 patience, 1091, 1132
 patient, 1140
 patrol, 1129
 PAUL, 1074
 Pause, 1072
 pause, 1091
 pay, 1119
 Peace, 1095
 peaceful, 1103, 1109
 Pellet, 1095
 pen, 1093
 pending, 1113
 people, 1079
 per, 1129
 percent, 1110
 percentage, 1079
 perfectly, 1072, 1114
 performed, 1120
 performing, 1111
 Perhaps, 1089, 1101, 1128
 perhaps, 1091-1092
 period, 1075, 1086, 1099-1100
 Permanent, 1128, 1132, 1140
 permanent, 1084
 permanently, 1086
 permission, 1101, 1140
 permits, 1129
 permitted, 1085, 1107
 perpetual, 1084
 perpetuate, 1132
 persists, 1123
 person, 1084
 personal, 1099
 personally, 1099
 personnel, 1078
 pertain, 1104
 pertinent, 1120
 Peru, 1094
 petita, 1120
 phase, 1123
 photograph, 1115-1116
 photographer, 1116, 1141
 photographic, 1072
 photographs, 1141
 phrase, 1090, 1094, 1127
 picture, 1135
 pipelines, 1116-1117
 Pitcairn, 1075, 1077-1078
 pith, 1099
 place, 1075, 1127, 1129, 1140
 placed, 1124
 places, 1116
 placing, 1135
 plain, 1103, 1123
 plainer, 1123
 plainly, 1089-1090, 1105, 1107, 1109, 1111, 1123, 1125
 Planck, 1126
 planned, 1111
 plans, 1095
 Plateau, 1138
 plausible, 1107
 play, 1126
 pleadings, 1104, 1111, 1118, 1132, 1135
 pleasant, 1090
 Please, 1078
 please, 1077
 pledged, 1085
 pockets, 1079
 podium, 1091, 1125
 point, 1073-1074, 1078, 1085, 1095, 1101, 1103, 1107, 1110, 1113, 1117, 1121, 1125-1126, 1129-1130, 1133, 1136-1139
 pointed, 1086, 1121
 pointing, 1080
 points, 1073-1074, 1097, 1103, 1111, 1116, 1125, 1128, 1132
 policies, 1113, 1125
 Policy, 1095, 1134
 policy, 1079, 1091, 1127, 1129, 1136
 political, 1076, 1079, 1087, 1136
 poll, 1079
 pollution, 1078, 1091, 1113-1114, 1117, 1125, 1129
 Poon, 1140
 poor, 1116
 population, 1128
 Port, 1077, 1088, 1136
 portions, 1086
 ports, 1099
 posed, 1116
 poses, 1141
 posited, 1105, 1107
 position, 1074, 1080, 1088-1089, 1094-1095, 1114, 1117, 1124, 1126, 1132-1134
 Positions, 1095
 positive, 1103
 possession, 1135
 possibility, 1108
 possible, 1072, 1135-1136
 possibly, 1107
 postdates, 1078
 potential, 1076
 power, 1120
 powerful, 1082
 pp, 1098, 1117, 1120
 practice, 1097, 1126
 practices, 1108
 pre, 1100, 1120-1121
 Precaution, 1130
 precaution, 1130
 precautionary, 1130
 precedents, 1108
 precisely, 1105, 1119, 1139
 preclude, 1089, 1123
 preexisting, 1120
 preferably, 1090
 preferring, 1138
 prefers, 1090
 preliminary, 1086-1089
 Premier, 1134
 preparation, 1135
 prepared, 1085, 1112
 prerogatives, 1079
 prescribe, 1099
 present, 1072, 1085, 1122
 presentation, 1073, 1076, 1080, 1082, 1125, 1128,

1130-1131
 presentational, *1076, 1079*
 presentations, *1135*
 presented, *1084, 1086, 1111-1112, 1127, 1140*
 Preservation, *1073*
 preservation, *1081, 1090, 1114, 1116-1118, 1121-1123, 1137*
 preserve, *1082-1084*
 presided, *1135*
 PRESIDENT, *1072, 1091, 1100-1101, 1115, 1125, 1130, 1141*
 President, *1072, 1091-1092, 1094, 1100-1101, 1114-1116, 1125, 1130-1137, 1139-1141*
 Press, *1083*
 press, *1107*
 pressed, *1078*
 presumably, *1087*
 presupposes, *1126*
 pretty, *1084*
 prevail, *1097*
 prevent, *1075, 1085, 1113, 1141*
 preventing, *1084*
 prevents, *1091, 1124*
 previously, *1086, 1108*
 price, *1100*
 prima, *1123*
 primary, *1116*
 Prime, *1082, 1088, 1102, 1111-1113, 1130, 1134, 1136-1137*
 principal, *1081, 1110*
 principle, *1092, 1095, 1098, 1100, 1108*
 principles, *1109*
 prior, *1109, 1114, 1125, 1130*
 pristine, *1137*
 Private, *1078, 1134*
 private, *1078-1079, 1091, 1129*
 privatized, *1129*
 privilege, *1115, 1131*
 pro, *1075, 1095, 1139*
 problem, *1078, 1097*
 procedural, *1140-1141*
 procedure, *1123*
 procedures, *1103, 1121, 1124*
 proceed, *1086, 1135*
 proceeded, *1109, 1113*
 proceeding, *1090, 1101-1102, 1142*
 proceedings, *1091, 1122, 1131, 1133, 1136, 1138, 1140, 1142*
 process, *1088, 1139*
 proclaim, *1130*
 proclamation, *1122-1123*
 produced, *1077, 1102*
 product, *1076, 1114-1115, 1136*
 products, *1111*
 PROFESSOR, *1091*
 Professor, *1079-1081, 1084, 1089, 1091-1092, 1100-1105, 1107-1108, 1110, 1113-1130, 1132-1133, 1135, 1139*
 progressive, *1083*
 prohibition, *1108, 1111, 1127*
 project, *1110, 1130, 1136*
 prolonged, *1114*
 promise, *1136*
 promised, *1112, 1125*
 promote, *1123*
 proof, *1112, 1126*
 proper, *1107, 1113*
 properly, *1111*
 proposal, *1075, 1110*
 Proposals, *1127*
 proposals, *1072, 1135*
 propose, *1076, 1101, 1118*
 proposed, *1072, 1079, 1082, 1086, 1088*
 proposes, *1126*
 proposing, *1088, 1136*
 proposition, *1126*
 propositions, *1095*
 protect, *1082-1084*
 Protected, *1076-1079, 1082-1083, 1131, 1137-1138*
 protected, *1075, 1082, 1111*
 protecting, *1137*
 Protection, *1073, 1083, 1129*
 protection, *1075-1077, 1081, 1113-1114, 1116-1118, 1121-1123, 1128-1129, 1137*
 protections, *1077*
 protest, *1081*
 protests, *1109*
 Protocol, *1095, 1098-1099*
 protocol, *1099*
 prototypical, *1129*
 proud, *1138*
 proudly, *1079*
 proved, *1126*
 proven, *1126*
 provide, *1073, 1087, 1104, 1109, 1112-1113, 1119, 1121, 1130-1131, 1141*
 provided, *1099, 1112, 1116, 1126, 1129-1130, 1132, 1134*
 provides, *1085, 1102, 1119*
 providing, *1073, 1075*
 provision, *1092, 1099, 1114, 1122-1124, 1139*
 provisional, *1123*
 provisions, *1080-1081, 1090, 1100, 1102-1103, 1121, 1140*
 public, *1079, 1082, 1090, 1107, 1110, 1120, 1129, 1139*
 published, *1079*
 Pulp, *1108*
 purely, *1109*

purported, *1084, 1105, 1113, 1122, 1131, 1139, 1141*
purporting, *1123*
purports, *1085*
purpose,
1074-1075, 1092, 1117, 1121, 1126, 1137
purposes,
1080-1081, 1083, 1085-1090, 1092, 1094-1098, 1111, 1117, 1119, 1129-1131, 1133, 1138
pursuant, *1098, 1122-1123*
pursue, *1079, 1110*
pursued, *1110*
pursuit, *1109*
push, *1101*
put, *1073, 1079, 1086, 1091-1092, 1111-1113, 1123, 1127, 1130, 1136, 1138, 1140*
putative, *1119*
putting, *1090, 1118, 1139*

Q

Qatar, *1120*
quaintly, *1099*
qualification, *1093, 1118*
qualified, *1093, 1097*
qualify, *1099*

quarter, *1075, 1139*
Question, *1102*
question, *1073, 1077, 1079, 1081, 1089, 1092-1093, 1102, 1104, 1111, 1114, 1118, 1129-1130, 1138*
Questions, *1120*
questions, *1073, 1082, 1089, 1092, 1100, 1121, 1130, 1137-1138*
quick, *1129*
quickly, *1110*
quid, *1075, 1139*
quite, *1093, 1097, 1129-1130*
quo, *1075, 1139*
quod, *1075, 1080*
quote, *1076, 1082, 1090, 1092-1093, 1098-1099, 1128*
quoted, *1118, 1127*
quotes, *1118*
quoting, *1073*

R

raft, *1111*
raised, *1082, 1110, 1112, 1118, 1121*
raising, *1104*
Ramgoolam, *1082, 1102, 1112-1113, 1134, 1137*
ranking, *1136*
Rather, *1120*
rather, *1075-1076,*

1082, 1095, 1099, 1107, 1111
ratify, *1132*
rationale, *1127*
RDR, *1142*
re, *1076, 1096, 1098, 1117*
reach, *1111*
reaction, *1136*
read, *1076, 1079, 1086, 1115, 1140*
reading, *1087, 1090, 1103, 1124, 1126*
reaffirmed, *1081*
real, *1074, 1120, 1136*
really, *1074*
reason, *1079, 1121, 1123, 1126*
reasonable, *1130*
reasons, *1073, 1079, 1087, 1091, 1105, 1107-1108, 1110-1111, 1130*
rebut, *1122, 1127*
recall, *1090, 1104, 1134, 1139*
recently, *1075, 1096*
recess, *1101, 1115*
recognise, *1126, 1137*
recognition,
1083-1084, 1087
recognize, *1087*
recognized,
1083-1084, 1087
recognizes, *1084, 1089*
recognizing, *1087*
recommendation,
1077

recommendations,
1141
recommended,
1075
reconcile, *1109*
reconvene, *1141*
Record, *1082*
record, *1082, 1086, 1088, 1111, 1113, 1134, 1139, 1142*
recorded, *1085, 1127, 1135, 1142*
records, *1085, 1087, 1135*
recreational, *1077, 1107*
redacted, *1077, 1121*
Redgwell, *1103*
reduce, *1113*
reduced, *1142*
redundant, *1103*
Reef, *1073-1074*
reefs, *1075, 1078*
refer, *1077, 1087-1088, 1103, 1110, 1112, 1139*
reference, *1093, 1096, 1099, 1103, 1105, 1107, 1119, 1121, 1127*
references, *1095, 1116*
referral, *1123*
referred, *1086, 1095, 1099, 1102, 1107, 1114, 1122-1123, 1128, 1136-1137*
referring, *1103*
refers, *1087, 1092, 1102*
reflect, *1107, 1115*

reflected, 1122, 1133
 reflecting, 1132
 reflects, 1085, 1114, 1133, 1139
 refrain, 1104-1105, 1113
 refuted, 1136
 regard, 1073-1075, 1080-1081, 1084-1085, 1089-1090, 1097, 1099, 1104-1105, 1107-1110, 1119, 1121, 1130, 1132, 1140
 regarded, 1081, 1083, 1090
 regarding, 1073, 1085, 1102, 1128, 1141
 Regardless, 1105, 1109
 regardless, 1105
 regime, 1111, 1113, 1120, 1122
 region, 1120, 1138
 Regional, 1086
 regional, 1110, 1113
 Regions, 1095
 regret, 1133
 regrettable, 1127
 regulated, 1130
 regulating, 1099, 1117
 regulation, 1122
 regulations, 1113-1114, 1118, 1125, 1129
 regulatory, 1114, 1125
 REICHLER, 1072, 1074
 Reichler, 1072, 1074, 1081, 1091-1092, 1102, 1108, 1129, 1138-1139
 reinforced, 1083
 reiterate, 1136
 reiterated, 1138
 rejected, 1123, 1126
 rejects, 1105
 Rejoinder, 1078, 1088-1089, 1102, 1135
 related, 1089, 1113-1114, 1142
 relates, 1118
 relating, 1094, 1109, 1114, 1116-1117, 1121-1122, 1124, 1135, 1138
 relation, 1094-1095, 1100, 1102, 1109, 1112, 1118, 1122-1123, 1126, 1128, 1130, 1140
 relatively, 1107
 Release, 1083
 release, 1107
 relevant, 1086, 1094, 1097, 1102, 1108-1110, 1126, 1135, 1138
 relevantly, 1114, 1122
 reliance, 1130
 relied, 1073-1074, 1110
 relief, 1113
 rely, 1074
 Relying, 1126
 relying, 1132
 remain, 1095, 1098, 1116, 1128, 1136, 1140-1141
 remaining, 1124
 remains, 1130, 1140
 remarkable, 1085, 1127
 REMARKS, 1131
 remarks, 1086, 1101, 1127, 1132
 remedy, 1094, 1120
 remind, 1072
 reminiscent, 1126
 removed, 1132
 renvoi, 1103
 Rep, 1097
 repeat, 1102, 1129, 1133
 repeated, 1081, 1095
 repeatedly, 1082, 1084
 replied, 1129, 1139
 Reply, 1091, 1103, 1125, 1135, 1137, 1140
 reply, 1072, 1129, 1135, 1141
 Report, 1111
 report, 1076, 1110, 1130
 reported, 1082, 1107, 1133
 REPORTER, 1142
 Reporter, 1140, 1142
 Reports, 1120
 reports, 1107
 representations, 1109
 REPUBLIC, 1140
 Republic, 1095-1096, 1131, 1140
 request, 1136, 1141
 requests, 1140
 require, 1081, 1090, 1105, 1110
 required, 1086, 1108-1109, 1118, 1123
 requirement, 1103, 1108, 1126
 requirements, 1109, 1138
 requires, 1102, 1104, 1109, 1113, 1124, 1126
 requisite, 1086
 Research, 1095
 Reserve, 1127
 reserve, 1075, 1127
 reserved, 1096
 reserves, 1138
 resettle, 1090
 resettlement, 1127
 reside, 1084
 Resident, 1099
 residents, 1127, 1132
 resolution, 1123, 1139-1140
 resolved, 1076, 1103
 resort, 1139
 resoundingly, 1123
 resource, 1082
 resources, 1084-1085, 1087, 1090, 1100, 1119, 1121-1123
 respect, 1080-1081, 1083, 1087-1089, 1092-1094, 1096, 1098-1099, 1102, 1104, 1107, 1115, 1118, 1120-1121, 1128, 1140-1141
 respected, 1083

respectfully, *1082, 1087, 1140*
 respecting, *1098, 1104*
 respective, *1074, 1085, 1109*
 respects, *1084*
 respond, *1102, 1104, 1110, 1125, 1135*
 responded, *1102*
 respondents, *1079*
 responding, *1116*
 response, *1072, 1086, 1092, 1103, 1112, 1114, 1119, 1132, 1137*
 responses, *1131, 1137*
 responsible, *1111*
 rest, *1096*
 restricting, *1117*
 restrictions, *1109*
 restrictive, *1127*
 rests, *1114*
 result, *1075, 1090, 1105, 1123, 1131*
 resume, *1072-1073*
 resuscitated, *1133*
 retain, *1098*
 retained, *1095, 1100*
 retains, *1095*
 return, *1079, 1082, 1101, 1116, 1119, 1121, 1131*
 returned, *1081, 1090*
 reveals, *1127, 1135*
 Reversion, *1099*
 reversion, *1083, 1093-1095, 1099-1100*

reversionary, *1081-1082, 1085, 1093, 1100, 1139*
 revert, *1079*
 review, *1112, 1124*
 reviewed, *1122, 1135*
 revocation, *1074-1075*
 revoking, *1074*
 rhetorical, *1113*
 rhetorically, *1128*
 RIAA, *1120*
 Rights, *1099, 1125*
 rights, *1074, 1076-1077, 1079-1081, 1083-1084, 1086, 1090, 1093-1094, 1096, 1100, 1102-1105, 1107-1109, 1111, 1113, 1116-1117, 1119-1123, 1126-1128, 1131, 1133, 1138, 1141*
 riparian, *1109*
 riparians, *1108*
 ripe, *1125*
 risk, *1076, 1107, 1109*
 risks, *1136*
 Roberts, *1077-1078, 1086-1087, 1090, 1127, 1133*
 Robinson, *1092, 1127*
 robust, *1129*
 rock, *1074*
 rocks, *1128*
 room, *1116*
 roughly, *1073*
 Round, *1072, 1075, 1081, 1086, 1088*

round, *1088, 1104, 1108, 1110-1111, 1122-1123, 1125, 1127, 1135, 1141*
 rounds, *1085, 1132*
 Rt, *1134*
 rule, *1108, 1118, 1124, 1126*
 ruled, *1109, 1120*
 rules, *1099, 1102-1103, 1108-1109, 1114, 1116-1118, 1125*
 ruling, *1111*
 rulings, *1094*
 run, *1089, 1101*
 runs, *1108*
 rushing, *1130*
 RW, *1111*

S

safeguarded, *1108*
 Salvador, *1097*
 same, *1073-1074, 1081, 1084-1086, 1095, 1099-1100, 1110, 1120, 1126*
 Sands, *1080, 1089, 1092, 1103, 1122, 1132, 1137-1139*
 Santayana, *1090*
 sarcasm, *1080*
 satisfaction, *1109*
 save, *1086*
 saved, *1110*
 saving, *1079*
 saw, *1089, 1093, 1133*
 saying, *1116, 1120,*

1125, 1127
 says, *1087, 1110, 1114, 1116-1117, 1124, 1126, 1131*
 SBA, *1095-1097*
 SBAs, *1095-1097*
 SC, *1092, 1107, 1125, 1131*
 scale, *1107*
 scaled, *1076*
 scanned, *1127*
 Scenarios, *1095*
 schedule, *1072*
 schedules, *1095*
 scheduling, *1072*
 Schofield, *1140*
 scholars, *1132*
 scholarship, *1126*
 science, *1076, 1129-1130*
 scientific, *1075-1076, 1079, 1123, 1130*
 scientists, *1076-1077*
 scope, *1103, 1105, 1108*
 Scovazzi, *1095*
 scribbled, *1134*
 scrutiny, *1084*
 Sea, *1095, 1099, 1121, 1124, 1131, 1133, 1138-1139*
 sea, *1078, 1083, 1094-1098, 1102-1104, 1107-1108, 1111, 1124*
 seabed, *1082, 1084*
 seagulls, *1128*
 Seas, *1095*
 seas, *1096-1097*
 Second, *1085, 1126*
 second, *1072,*

1077, 1080,
 1088, 1092-1093,
 1097, 1103,
 1133, 1135, 1141
 Secondly, 1073
 seconds,
 1092-1093, 1097
 Secretary,
 1077-1078, 1081,
 1083, 1110,
 1127-1128, 1132,
 1134, 1136, 1139
 Section, 1075,
 1077-1078, 1096
 section, 1076,
 1103, 1118, 1124
 sector, 1073, 1078
 secured, 1078
 sedentary, 1108
 See, 1081, 1095,
 1097, 1138
 see, 1072,
 1076-1077, 1079,
 1088, 1101,
 1104, 1110,
 1122, 1125,
 1133, 1136-1137
 seeing, 1132
 seek, 1094, 1109,
 1121
 seem, 1073
 seemed, 1115
 seems, 1097, 1116,
 1125, 1135
 seen, 1073, 1077,
 1087, 1122
 Seewoosagur, 1102
 Selected, 1095
 self, 1092, 1125,
 1134, 1139
 senior, 1076, 1138
 sense, 1090, 1104,
 1132
 sensible, 1134
 sent, 1112
 sentence, 1087
 separate, 1098
 September, 1134
 sergeant, 1129
 serious, 1079,
 1090, 1111-1112
 seriously, 1074
 serve, 1103
 session, 1072,
 1115-1116
 set, 1085, 1087,
 1103, 1107,
 1110, 1118, 1121
 sets, 1119, 1124
 settled, 1093,
 1103, 1124
 settlement, 1103,
 1109
 seven, 1139
 several, 1099, 1115
 Seychelles, 1081,
 1138
 Shaelou, 1095
 shall, 1080, 1085,
 1099, 1102,
 1140-1141
 share, 1109, 1117
 shared, 1093, 1108
 sharing, 1093, 1099
 sharper, 1113
 SHEARER, 1072,
 1091, 1100-1101,
 1115, 1125,
 1130, 1141
 Shelf, 1085, 1138,
 1141
 shelf, 1084-1086,
 1089, 1096-1098
 short, 1082, 1095,
 1101, 1109
 shortly, 1127, 1141
 shots, 1116
 show, 1075, 1084,
 1094-1095, 1099,
 1102, 1109, 1127
 showed, 1103,
 1107-1108
 showing, 1102,
 1104
 shown, 1084, 1092,
 1108, 1132
 shows, 1105, 1109
 shreds, 1094
 shrimp, 1111
 shutting, 1089
 side, 1098, 1111,
 1118, 1130
 sight, 1135
 signal, 1116
 signed, 1111, 1127
 significance, 1134
 significant, 1073,
 1095, 1112
 Significantly, 1105
 significantly, 1136
 silence, 1134
 similar, 1084,
 1103-1104, 1128
 simmering, 1099
 simple, 1086,
 1092-1093, 1126
 simplicity, 1076
 simply, 1074, 1086,
 1103, 1117-1118,
 1130, 1134, 1139
 simultaneously,
 1098
 Since, 1098
 since, 1081, 1083,
 1085, 1125, 1138
 sincere, 1140
 sincerely, 1091
 single, 1084, 1091,
 1094, 1139
 Sir, 1073-1074,
 1083-1089, 1102,
 1121, 1134
 sir, 1139
 sitting, 1097
 situation,
 1083-1084,
 1093-1095,
 1097-1098, 1139
 situations, 1084,
 1094-1095
 six, 1138
 sixth, 1138
 size, 1130
 slightly, 1139
 sloppy, 1115
 small, 1101, 1107
 smooth, 1140
 snatches, 1094
 snuck, 1130
 so, 1112
 sojourn, 1090
 SOLAS, 1117
 solely, 1086, 1091,
 1117
 Solicitor, 1131
 solitary,
 1092-1095,
 1098-1099
 solve, 1078
 somehow, 1093
 somewhere, 1127
 songs, 1094
 sorry, 1076, 1091
 sort, 1116
 sorts, 1123
 sought, 1108-1109,
 1120
 souls, 1128
 sounds, 1129
 sources, 1088, 1097
 Southern,
 1123-1124
 Sovereign, 1095
 sovereign,
 1079-1081,
 1084-1085,
 1119-1123, 1127,
 1139

sovereigns, *1098*
 sovereignty, *1079, 1082-1085, 1088-1090, 1092, 1094-1095, 1097-1098, 1102, 1131, 1136, 1139*
 Spain, *1109, 1119*
 speaking, *1130*
 special, *1093-1095*
 specialis, *1097*
 species, *1075, 1107-1108, 1110*
 specific, *1080, 1103, 1108, 1110, 1119, 1121, 1132*
 specifically, *1082, 1086, 1108, 1117, 1121*
 specified, *1116-1118*
 SPEECH, *1131*
 speech, *1101*
 spending, *1129*
 spent, *1090*
 square, *1129, 1139*
 st, *1136*
 stable, *1107*
 staff, *1140*
 stage, *1092, 1109*
 stakeholder, *1110*
 stalls, *1090*
 Stamboul, *1090*
 stand, *1083-1084, 1111*
 standard, *1105, 1107, 1109*
 standards, *1116-1118*
 standing, *1083, 1088-1089, 1103*
 stands, *1118*
 stark, *1138*
 start, *1072*
 started, *1096*
 STATE, *1074*
 State, *1079-1081, 1083-1085, 1087-1090, 1092-1095, 1097-1100, 1102, 1104, 1107-1110, 1119-1121, 1126-1127, 1131-1132, 1134, 1138-1141*
 state, *1119, 1121, 1124*
 stated, *1111, 1120, 1126, 1128, 1137*
 Statement, *1078, 1112*
 statement, *1072, 1078, 1088-1089, 1102, 1111-1113, 1127, 1137*
 statements, *1120, 1132*
 States, *1081, 1086, 1088, 1093, 1095, 1097-1099, 1102-1105, 1108, 1111, 1113, 1119-1120, 1123-1125, 1133, 1138*
 states, *1082, 1102, 1104-1105, 1119-1120*
 stating, *1080*
 statistics, *1107*
 STATUS, *1074*
 Status, *1128*
 status, *1080-1081, 1084-1085, 1087, 1089, 1100, 1103*
 stcase, *1136*
 stenographically, *1142*
 step, *1075*
 Steps, *1078*
 steps, *1116, 1141*
 still, *1082, 1118, 1126, 1129, 1132*
 stock, *1131*
 Stocks, *1102, 1110, 1123*
 stocks, *1075, 1107, 1109-1110*
 stop, *1079, 1086, 1089, 1114*
 straight, *1091, 1096*
 strained, *1124*
 strength, *1105*
 strengthen, *1138*
 stress, *1078*
 stretch, *1095*
 strictly, *1124, 1134*
 strong, *1127*
 strongly, *1075, 1137*
 structure, *1087*
 studies, *1077, 1130*
 subject, *1076, 1097, 1102, 1110, 1112, 1114, 1119, 1124*
 subjects, *1098, 1103*
 submarine, *1100, 1116-1117*
 submission, *1085-1086, 1088-1089, 1116, 1138, 1141*
 SUBMISSIONS, *1131, 1140*
 submissions, *1072, 1089, 1103, 1120, 1132, 1138, 1140-1141*
 submit, *1085, 1087, 1107, 1113, 1115, 1117, 1122, 1139*
 submits, *1114*
 submitted, *1085, 1112, 1120, 1124, 1137*
 Subparagraph, *1121*
 subparagraph, *1121*
 subsequent, *1135*
 subsoil, *1084*
 substantially, *1073*
 substantive, *1105, 1126, 1141*
 subtle, *1076*
 sudden, *1136*
 suddenly, *1077*
 sue, *1120*
 Suffice, *1117*
 sufficient, *1110*
 suggest, *1093, 1099, 1103, 1113, 1116*
 suggesting, *1103, 1108-1109, 1111, 1118, 1123*
 suggestion, *1127*
 suggests, *1103, 1105, 1114, 1119, 1124*
 Sui, *1095*
 sui, *1095, 1139*
 suits, *1115*
 summarised, *1134*
 superimposed, *1073*
 supervision, *1142*
 supplementary, *1129*
 supplied, *1078, 1113*

- support, *1087-1088, 1094, 1105, 1108, 1112, 1126*
- supported, *1073*
- supporting, *1077*
- supportive, *1136*
- supposed, *1138*
- surely, *1078, 1080, 1104, 1128, 1139*
- surprise, *1136*
- surprised, *1132*
- surprising, *1110*
- surreptitiously, *1110*
- surround, *1077*
- surrounding, *1082, 1084*
- surveys, *1088*
- sustainable, *1123*
- sustained, *1075, 1112*
- swathes, *1133*
- swordfish, *1110*
- synch, *1087*
- synonymous, *1117*
- system, *1075, 1096, 1127, 1137*
- T**
- Tab, *1075-1079, 1081-1083, 1086, 1088, 1107, 1122, 1124, 1127*
- tab, *1082*
- tabs, *1086*
- Talks, *1088*
- talks, *1082, 1085-1088, 1110*
- tanto, *1095*
- Tarzan, *1128*
- Tarzans, *1128, 1132*
- task, *1102, 1112*
- team, *1140*
- technical, *1088, 1140*
- telegraph, *1127*
- tells, *1087, 1137*
- temporary, *1084*
- ten, *1092-1093, 1097*
- tendered, *1112-1113, 1137*
- term, *1082, 1084, 1092*
- termination, *1105*
- terms, *1072, 1074, 1092-1093, 1132*
- terribly, *1076*
- Territorial, *1095-1096, 1120-1121*
- territorial, *1078, 1083, 1095-1098, 1102-1104, 1107-1108, 1111, 1124*
- Territories, *1077-1078, 1086, 1088, 1095, 1133*
- territories, *1095*
- Territory, *1078-1079, 1082-1083, 1086, 1088, 1122, 1131, 1138*
- territory, *1078, 1080, 1083-1084, 1087, 1099-1100, 1131-1132, 1137*
- test, *1105, 1119*
- Tests, *1120*
- tête, *1137*
- text, *1103, 1114-1117, 1119, 1121, 1126*
- textbook, *1089*
- texts, *1116*
- textual, *1117*
- th, *1137*
- thanks, *1141*
- that, *1095*
- the, *1095, 1127, 1137*
- thearlier, *1136*
- themselves, *1110*
- thereafter, *1142*
- Therefore, *1085*
- therefore, *1082, 1085, 1113, 1124*
- therein, *1121*
- thereto, *1122*
- thesis, *1092-1095, 1098-1099*
- they, *1081*
- thinking, *1127*
- thinks, *1104, 1115*
- Third, *1127*
- third, *1079, 1093, 1095, 1098, 1102, 1126, 1132, 1138*
- Thirdly, *1134*
- this, *1082*
- though, *1116*
- thousand, *1079*
- threat, *1134*
- threaten, *1107, 1137*
- threatened, *1094*
- threatening, *1134*
- three, *1081, 1092, 1094-1095, 1097-1099, 1132*
- threply, *1102*
- throughout, *1083-1084, 1104, 1107, 1137*
- throw, *1113*
- Thursday, *1072-1073, 1113, 1129, 1137, 1141*
- ties, *1072*
- timely, *1109*
- timing, *1077*
- Tobago, *1120*
- today, *1072, 1077, 1132-1133*
- together, *1088, 1094-1095, 1119*
- tomorrow, *1141*
- tone, *1133*
- tonnage, *1107*
- tonnes, *1107*
- took, *1076, 1083, 1086, 1108, 1132-1133*
- top, *1073, 1076, 1134*
- total, *1079, 1115, 1138*
- touch, *1114, 1127*
- touched, *1129*
- touching, *1114-1115, 1119*
- tough, *1128*
- toward, *1076*
- Towards, *1130*
- towards, *1138, 1141*
- Trade, *1086*
- traditional, *1120*
- Tragic, *1090*
- tragic, *1090*
- Train, *1090*
- tranquillity, *1094*
- transboundary, *1108-1109*
- Transcript, *1072, 1092-1093, 1101, 1126-1130, 1132-1139*
- transcript, *1142*

transcription, *1142*
transfer, *1095*
traverse, *1110*
treated, *1094, 1104*
Treaties, *1097*
Treaty, *1095-1096*
treaty, *1095, 1111*
Tribunal, *1072, 1076, 1080, 1091-1092, 1094, 1100-1104, 1109-1112, 1114-1116, 1118-1121, 1123-1125, 1129-1141*
tribunal, *1093, 1097, 1099, 1116, 1123-1126*
tribunals, *1094, 1115*
Trinidad, *1120*
Trinidadian, *1120*
trouble, *1089*
True, *1094*
true, *1084, 1094, 1108, 1128, 1130, 1134-1135, 1142*
truly, *1090*
trust, *1133*
try, *1112*
tube, *1115*
Tuesday, *1131*
Tuna, *1123-1124*
tuna, *1075, 1107*
tunas, *1075*
Turkey, *1090*
turn, *1078, 1080, 1082, 1085-1086, 1088, 1104, 1108, 1113-1114, 1116, 1118, 1121, 1124*

turned, *1130*
Turning, *1123*
two, *1072-1074, 1076, 1079-1081, 1083, 1090, 1093-1095, 1098-1099, 1103, 1112, 1117, 1119, 1132, 1137-1138*
type, *1120*
typewritten, *1142*
typically, *1118*
Tzimitras, *1095*

U

UK, *1072-1091, 1093, 1095-1098, 1100, 1103-1105, 1107, 1109, 1111-1114, 1117-1118, 1121-1122, 1124-1125, 1127, 1129-1130, 1132, 1134-1136, 1138-1140*
UKCM, *1076, 1079, 1083, 1088*
UKR, *1082*
ulterior, *1127*
ultimate, *1082*
Ultimately, *1076*
ultimately, *1084*
umbrella, *1088*
UN, *1109, 1138*
un, *1138*
unable, *1093, 1095, 1132, 1138*
unambiguous, *1111*

unattractive, *1126*
unaware, *1141*
uncertainty, *1074*
unchallenged, *1111*
uncharacteristically, *1089*
UNCLOS, *1089, 1092, 1110, 1115, 1118, 1123-1125, 1131*
UNDER, *1131*
Under, *1081, 1104, 1128, 1132*
under, *1074, 1080, 1083-1085, 1088-1090, 1097, 1099-1100, 1103, 1105, 1109-1111, 1113, 1116, 1119, 1122, 1126-1127, 1131, 1133, 1138, 1141-1142*
underlying, *1087*
undermines, *1122*
underscore, *1121*
underscores, *1138*
understand, *1104, 1112, 1139*
understandings, *1100, 1138-1139*
understood, *1087, 1118*
undertake, *1123*
undertaken, *1111, 1131, 1138*
undertaking, *1074, 1080-1081, 1083, 1085, 1096-1097, 1102, 1104, 1107-1108, 1111-1112, 1119-1120*

UNDERTAKINGS, *1074*
undertakings, *1075, 1080, 1083, 1090, 1100, 1132, 1138-1139*
undertook, *1136*
undisputed, *1084, 1086, 1094*
undisputedly, *1081*
undivided, *1094*
undoubted, *1076*
undoubtedly, *1139*
unexpectedly, *1135*
unexpressed, *1116*
unfair, *1137*
unfavourably, *1128*
unfortunate, *1133, 1135*
unfortunately, *1095*
unilateral, *1075, 1077, 1109, 1139*
unilaterally, *1081, 1113, 1131, 1134, 1140*
uninformed, *1090*
uninhabited, *1127, 1133*
Union, *1093*
unique, *1082, 1084-1085, 1139*
UNITED, *1074*
United, *1072-1075, 1079-1082, 1086, 1091-1092, 1095-1097, 1102, 1104-1105, 1107-1114, 1116, 1119, 1122-1125, 1127, 1131-1141*
univocal, *1092*
unjustifiably, *1113, 1127*
unknown, *1090*

unlawful, *1094, 1100, 1131*
Unless, *1100*
unless, *1114, 1130, 1134-1135*
unlike, *1073, 1105*
unlikely, *1102*
unofficial, *1074*
unreasonable, *1126, 1128*
UNRIAA, *1109*
until, *1098, 1110, 1125, 1129, 1141*
UNTS, *1095-1096*
unusual, *1083, 1139*
unwilling, *1134-1135*
unwind, *1090*
Up, *1135*
up, *1084-1086, 1094, 1099, 1133, 1139*
upload, *1127*
upstream, *1109*
using, *1096*
usual, *1076*
utilization, *1123*

V

valid, *1092, 1099*
validity, *1094*
value, *1082, 1100*
Vanuatu, *1098*
variety, *1074*
various, *1100, 1109, 1112*
vaunted, *1130*
ve, *1095, 1129*
versa, *1119*

version, *1076*
vessel, *1129*
vessels, *1078, 1084, 1099, 1107, 1110*
vested, *1080, 1085, 1090*
vests, *1083*
via, *1128*
vice, *1119*
vicinity, *1094*
view, *1073, 1083, 1089, 1096, 1111, 1115, 1117, 1119, 1126-1127, 1139*
views, *1079, 1118, 1124, 1135, 1138*
VII, *1123, 1131*
violate, *1091*
violated, *1111, 1138*
violates, *1138-1139*
violating, *1090*
violation, *1074, 1077, 1079*
Virginia, *1104-1105, 1126*
virtue, *1095, 1108*
visiting, *1077*
void, *1089*
Volume, *1073*
vulnerable, *1137*
vying, *1093*

W

wait, *1125, 1129*
waited, *1129*
waiting, *1094, 1129*
walking, *1139*

wanted, *1074*
wants, *1116*
warned, *1136-1137*
warning, *1136*
warranted, *1105*
wary, *1135*
water, *1077*
watercourse, *1108*
Waters, *1096*
waters, *1078, 1082, 1084, 1097, 1102, 1104, 1107, 1113, 1121-1122, 1131, 1137*
Watts, *1121*
way, *1081-1082, 1099-1100, 1108, 1117, 1120, 1126-1127, 1132, 1140*
ways, *1105, 1130*
weakness, *1133*
Wednesday, *1073, 1086, 1133*
week, *1072-1073, 1076, 1078-1079, 1082, 1086, 1088, 1092, 1135*
weekend, *1112, 1137*
weeks, *1132*
weighed, *1105*
weighing, *1111*
weight, *1135*
whatever, *1093, 1095*
whatsoever, *1088*
whenever, *1104*
whereas, *1075, 1092, 1097*
Whereupon, *1141*
Whether, *1098*
whether, *1073, 1077, 1079-1081, 1083, 1086, 1089, 1093-1094, 1096, 1099, 1104, 1110, 1112, 1118, 1132, 1138-1139*
whole, *1094, 1099-1100*
whom, *1117*
Whomersley, *1078, 1112, 1129, 1133*
Whormersley, *1137*
wide, *1094*
wider, *1103*
wife, *1079*
Wikileaks, *1127*
wikimedia, *1127*
wikipedia, *1127*
will, *1072-1073, 1076-1079, 1081-1088, 1090-1093, 1095-1096, 1098, 1101-1105, 1108, 1113, 1115-1116, 1118-1120, 1122-1125, 1127-1130, 1133-1139, 1141*
Wilson, *1086, 1134*
wish, *1073, 1087, 1140*
wished, *1108, 1128*
wishes, *1101, 1124*
withhold, *1134*
within, *1075-1076, 1083-1084, 1086, 1090, 1116-1118, 1120, 1122, 1140-1141*
without, *1081, 1086, 1088, 1092, 1096, 1101, 1105, 1113, 1116,*

1126-1127, 1130
Witness, *1078, 1112*
witness, *1137*
Wolfrum,
1114-1115, 1121,
1128, 1137-1139
Women, *1128*
won, *1091, 1114,*
1117
wonder, *1129*
wonders, *1072*
Wood, *1073-1074,*
1083-1084, 1089,
1134
word, *1093-1095,*
1115, 1121,
1129, 1138
words, *1077,*
1080-1081, 1086,
1090, 1096,
1098, 1103,
1105, 1107-1108,
1121, 1134, 1139
Wordsworth, *1074,*
1080, 1092-1093,
1095, 1099,
1102-1104, 1132,
1135, 1138-1139
work, *1088,*
1098-1099, 1103,
1111, 1140
worked, *1082*
working, *1115*
workings, *1135*
workshop,
1076-1077
world, *1084, 1094,*
1107, 1127
worn, *1118*
worse, *1077*
worth, *1125*
write, *1089, 1117*
writer, *1101*
writes, *1078, 1124*
writing, *1072*
Writings, *1095*

written, *1072,*
1087, 1104,
1112, 1114,
1118, 1128,
1132, 1138
wrongly, *1124*
wrote, *1114, 1118,*
1136
WT, *1111*
WTO, *1111, 1126*
www, *1095, 1127,*
1138

X

XII, *1109*
XV, *1089,*
1093-1094, 1097,
1100, 1103,
1114-1116, 1121,
1124-1125, 1140
XXVII, *1120*
XXX, *1099*

Y

yachtsmen, *1077*
YBIL, *1095*
Yeadon, *1075,*
1077-1078
year, *1086, 1089,*
1129
years, *1075, 1080,*
1083, 1099,
1129, 1131-1132
yesterday,
1076-1078, 1083,

1109, 1129,
1133, 1135, 1139
yield, *1123*
York, *1079*
young, *1141*

Z

Zone, *1073, 1075,*
1096
zone, *1076, 1081,*
1083-1084,
1092-1093,
1097-1098, 1104,
1114, 1128-1129
zoned, *1076*
zones, *1081, 1083,*
1098, 1104,
1131, 1140-1141