

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 7

HEARING ON JURISDICTION AND THE MERITS

Friday, May 2, 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

UNITED KINGDOM ARGUMENT ROUND 1 (Continued):

By Mr. Wordsworth.....771

By Professor Boyle.....789

By Mr. Wordsworth.....827

By Professor Boyle.....874

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Well, good morning, everyone. I think we are ready to
3 start the day's proceedings, and Mr. Wordsworth will begin.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. WORDSWORTH: Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, thank you.

6 **Article 283: application in this case**

7 **Sam Wordsworth QC**

8 **Non-sovereignty claims**

9 You will recall that I was taking you through the question of the application of Article
10 283, and I've already taken you taken you to documents which Mauritius is relying on to say
11 there was an UNCLOS dispute with respect to the existence of its "we are the coastal State" or
12 "we are a coastal State" argument. And I was taking you through the documents that Mauritius
13 relied on last Friday, which you will recall are all at Tab 56 of our Judges' Folder, and I will be
14 taking you to some of these documents again, but obviously not in relation to the case that there
15 has been a presentation of an UNCLOS coastal State claim, but in relation to the second and
16 third strands of Mauritius' claims. And strand 2, you will recall, is Mauritius' claim that the
17 MPA is incompatible with a multitude of different rights and obligations under UNCLOS¹,
18 including, we note, in relation to sedentary species under article 78, which was notably raised for
19 the first time in its Mauritius' Reply².

20 33. And the simple point here is that there is nowhere any Statement from Mauritius that
21 challenges the legality of MPA on the basis of UNCLOS provisions x, y, and z, and then
22 concludes with an invitation to discuss some form of exchange of views. And there is
23 nothing in this record that could be treated as somehow of equivalent effect.

24 **Pre MPA**

¹ UKCM para 5.16.

² Rejoinder paras. 6.4 and 7.78.

1 34. So, again, Ms. Macdonald divided the communications into two categories, those dated
2 before the MPA proposal and those dated after the MPA proposal “emerged”³. That was
3 her word: "emerged". That is a rather more easy division to follow than the new division
4 between strands 2 and 3. You will recall, that is strand 2, alleged breaches of UNCLOS,
5 and strand 3, alleged breaches of legally binding undertakings. Indeed, so far as I can see,
6 all the documents that Mauritius relies on to establish the existence of a dispute and an
7 exchange of views for the purposes of its breach of UNCLOS strand concern fishing rights,
8 which is also the principal element in the new strand 3 to the claim. That is on breach of
9 undertakings.

10 35. And you already have the point that we do not understand how a dispute regarding breach
11 of UNCLOS can have been raised, and views exchanged, prior to that MPA even being
12 proposed, and Ms. Macdonald did characterize the ‘pre MPA’ exchanges here as forming
13 “part of the background”⁴.

14 36. Ms. Macdonald’s submissions on these pre-MPA exchanges are heavily reliant on references
15 to Mauritius’s historic fishing rights⁵. Ms. Sander has addressed the Tribunal on this matter,
16 and has explained to the Tribunal that when Mauritius responded to the various restrictions
17 on its ability to fish over the years, it did not object on the grounds that the UK was acting in
18 breach of UNCLOS but cast its case in terms of its sovereignty claim, which, as already
19 discussed, was not with reference to UNCLOS. Now, you were taken to a letter between
20 Prime Ministers dated 1st December 2005, and that's the first document that I would like to
21 take you to this morning, at Page 6 of Tab 56. You will see the pagination is in manuscript,
22 in the bottom right-hand corner. This is Mauritius' Annex 132. It's a letter from the Prime
23 Minister of Mauritius to Prime Minister Blair of 1st December 2005; and as you cast your
24 eyes down this text, you will see it's all about sugar, and first page all about sugar, second

³ Day 4, Macdonald 406: 5 and 13.

⁴ Day 4, Macdonald, 406:7

⁵ Day 4, Macdonald, 405: line 20 and following.

1 page all about sugar, its sugar quotas within the context of the European Union. And then
2 you come to Page 3 of the letter, which is Page 8 of this bundle, and you will see there that
3 there is the sole reference to fishing rights that is being relied on, which is in the last
4 substantive paragraph:

5 "As you would recall at our meeting we also discussed the issue of the Chagos
6 Archipelago. While there is no need for us both to pursue the discussion further, I am
7 glad that you consented to our proposal for an official of the Government of Mauritius to
8 be on board the vessel that will take the Chagossians on a visit to Diego Garcia. I look
9 forward to discussing with you in the near future the important issue of fishing rights of
10 Mauritius in the Chagos waters. This has become particularly important in view of the
11 plans of my Government to turn Mauritius into a seafood hub."

12 And one turns over the page to page 9 of this bundle to Mr. Blair's letter of 4th January 2006 in
13 response, and he says, "Thank you for your letter of 1st December regarding the reform
14 of the EU sugar regime, and the potential impact of that reform on Mauritius".

15 So clearly Prime Minister Blair has understood this to be all about sugar.

16 And then you will see on page 2, which is tab 56, page 10, again he's understanding it to be all
17 about the ACP sugar protocol. But in the last paragraph you will see:

18 "The question of fishing rights in the Archipelago and its implications need to be talked
19 through. I'm pleased that good progress is being made in arranging the planned
20 humanitarian visit by the Chagossians to the islands."

21 So, there is absolutely no hint there of any dispute, any dispute in relation to fishing rights, any
22 dispute in relation to UNCLOS, still less what would be required for the purposes of 283.

23 The next document relied on is overleaf at page 11 of this bundle, and you will see this is extract
24 from an information paper. This is one of the five Mauritius-U.K. internal documents that's

1 being disclosed: Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting of 29th November 2007.

2 And you will see the relevant passage is at paragraph 18.

3 "I also brought up the question of the exercise of our fishing rights over the Chagos
4 waters, i.e., the Chagos Archipelago, excluding Diego Garcia, where there is an
5 American presence. This will enable Mauritius to contribute meaningfully in the
6 conservation of fish stocks and the exchange of commercial fisheries data."

7 So, again, exactly the same point. Not a hint of any reliance on binding undertakings on
8 fishing. Not a hint of how this somehow might be squeezed into a breach of UNCLOS.

9 You see overleaf page 12 of the bundle, there is then a letter from Dr. Ramgoolam, 13th
10 December 2007, to Prime Minister Gordon Brown, saying it was a pleasure to meet him in
11 Kampala. And then you will see at the bottom:

12 "During our meeting, I also raised with you the question of our fishing rights in the
13 waters of Chagos Archipelago excluding, of course, the immediate vicinity of Diego
14 Garcia for obvious security reasons. Mauritius has historically exercised such rights
15 over the waters of the Chagos Archipelago."

16 And so, I'm not going to reiterate the same point every time.

17 And you can see how that letter was then understood, at page 14, which gives you the response
18 from Prime Minister Brown. That's at 7th February 2008, and you will see there he refers back
19 to the letter of 13th December 2007, says:

20 "It was a pleasure to have the opportunity to talk with you in the margins of the
21 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Kampala. While the United
22 Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty of the BIOT, as I said during our
23 conversation in Kampala, I'm happy to establish a dialogue between the Mauritian High
24 Commission in London and officials at the FCO. During the talks we will need to bear

1 in mind the UK's treaty obligations and our ongoing need of the BIOT for defense
2 purposes."

3 And then one comes to the bit about fishing, which is what is being emphasised by Mauritius in
4 context of Article 283: "There are certainly many other issues relating to the British
5 Indian Ocean Territory that we can discuss, such as fishing. My officials will be in
6 touch soon to arrange a first meeting."

7 So again, where, we say, where is the suggestion that there is in fact a breach – an allegation, I
8 should say – a breach of UNCLOS, and where is the shared understanding of the
9 existence of a dispute in relation to UNCLOS? And we say it's nowhere to be found.

10 Now, the next step in the documentation, as we understood it, was the January 2009 talks.

11 37. And Ms. Macdonald said that the United Kingdom officials involved were “well aware that
12 Mauritius had raised these specific rights”. That is a reference to fishing rights in the
13 Archipelago⁶. Well, as to the United Kingdom officials' understanding at that time, you have
14 got the Statements of Ms. Yeadon⁷ and Mr. Roberts⁸, and you have seen the
15 contemporaneous records of those meetings⁹ and we've included them in the tab. I
16 obviously don't ask you to go through them now because they actually comprise most of the
17 tab. That's why this tab is, let's say, 2 centimeters thick instead of 1 centimeter thick, but
18 they're there at pages 17 and 52.

19 38. It is common ground that “fishing rights” were referred to, but the United Kingdom’s
20 understanding was that those references were in the context of Mauritius’s sovereignty claim,
21 and related to joint issuing of licences and sharing of licence fees. In any event, you'll
22 recall, there was again no suggestion of any breach of UNCLOS.

23 **Post MPA proposal**

⁶ Day 4, Macdonald, 408, lines 1-2.

⁷ Rejoinder, Annex 73, para. 9.

⁸ Rejoinder, Annex 74..

⁹UKCM, Annex 94; MR, Annexes 128 and 129. See also MR, Annex 144 at p. 4.

1 39. So I turn to the documents that are relied on at the time the MPA was under consideration
2 from May 2009, and you already have the point that there is no suggestion of a claim to
3 breach of UNCLOS at the July 2009 meeting. There was a reference to “access to natural
4 resources of the maritime zone / fishing” on the agenda, and your attention was drawn to
5 this¹⁰. But you have seen the record of the discussions¹¹, and there is nothing there to
6 suggest the existence of the UNCLOS dispute that is now alleged. In fact, Mauritius is
7 slightly defensive about that.

8 40. I move then to the documents that you were taken to in the period after the July 2009 talks.

9 41. Ms. Macdonald stated that Mauritius continued to “make clear its opposition to the MPA and
10 to the UK's unilateral approach” at a meeting between the Prime Minister Ramgoolam and
11 the British High Commissioner on 22 October 2009¹². Now, the document in relation to 22
12 October 2009 is the document that you were taken to on Wednesday by Ms. Nevill, and that's
13 at tab 14 of our Judges' Folder, but we've also obviously included it in this clip at page 64
14 because it's one of the documents of one of the meetings that's being relied on by Mauritius
15 to establish Article 283 compliance. So, if I can ask you to turn to that. And, as I
16 understand this record of what is said at the meeting in the e-mail, the meeting was just
17 between the Mauritian Prime Minister and the British High Commissioner. And you'll see
18 there, in the first substantive paragraph there is a reference to what the High Commissioner
19 has been saying, and then it gets into what we, as it were, were agreeing. That's he and the
20 Mauritian Prime Minister.

21 42. And it is plain from the email recording the meeting, which was written by the British High
22 Commissioner, immediately afterwards, that neither UNCLOS nor any claim was
23 discussed. Indeed, there was no suggestion of any claim at all.

¹⁰ Day 4, Macdonald, 408: 20.

¹¹ MR. Annex 143 and UKCM Annex 100.

¹² Day 4, Macdonald: 410: 13-15; see UKR, Annex 60.

1 43. Notably, it is recorded that: “We agreed that it was for the best if GoM could find its way
2 to being positive about the consultation, were it to be signed off by SoS”.

3 44. We observed that any consultation would be genuine and would not reflect a pre-existing
4 decision on a course of action.

5 Consultation in Mauritius would be constructive and reflective of Mauritius' unique
6 position vis-à-vis BIOT and so on. I ask you at a quiet moment to work through these bullet
7 points.

8 And you will see at the end:

9 “In short the PM could see the advantages in coming out in support of the consultation.

10 This would, however, require some political footwork locally.”

11 And then also you will see at end there, there is a reference:

12 “I reassured Ramgoolam that if SoS approved the draft consultation, it would not be
13 made public until my return to Mauritius, thereby giving us another chance to discuss
14 face to face before any consultation hit the streets, assuming SoS agrees to the drafts.

15 I'm likely to meet the PM's Chief of Staff, former Mauritian ambassador in Washington,
16 in Washington tomorrow to discuss further.”

17 45. And you will see that in fact that meeting did take place from the next page of this bundle.

18 And you may recall the discussions at this meeting, and particularly in the third paragraph,
19 you can see, Kailesh took this ‘in his stride’. He personally was ‘1000% committed to the
20 idea’. He understood and agree with the science. It made sense for Mauritius. He would
21 seek to persuade the Prime Minister of the merits of embracing the idea on environmental
22 grounds alone. So, again, where is the hint of the dispute in any of this? How does this
23 show Mauritius "continuing to make clear its opposition to the MPA and to the UK's
24 unilateral approach"?

1 46. And if I can take you then to the next document that I understand is being relied on, you will
2 see this is at page 66 of the bundle. It's a record of a telephone conversation between the
3 British Foreign Secretary and the Mauritian Prime Minister, Tuesday 10th November 2009.
4 And you will see there the Foreign Secretary said that he understood that the UK and
5 Mauritian officials had been talking very productively about a marine protected area being
6 created during the bilateral discussions on areas of mutual cooperation on BIOT. He
7 wanted to reassure PM Ramgoolam that "the public consultation being launched was on the
8 *idea* of an MPA and it was only an *idea* at this point".¹³

9 And you will see the important point for present purposes is really how and what Prime Minister
10 Ramgoolam is saying. And you will see there in the two central paragraphs that what he is
11 saying is not, of course, oh, this is going to be a breach of UNCLOS, but rather he's talking about
12 the consultation document. He says environmental protection was an important subject for him.
13 He had a few problems with the consultation document, which he had only just seen and would
14 be sending a Note Verbale on this.

15 His first problem was on page 12:

16 "We, Mauritius, have agreed in principle to the establishment of an MPA. This was not
17 the case. Could we amend the consultation document?"

18 In addition, Mr. Ramgoolam said that the consultation document completely overlooked the
19 issue of resettlement, a total ban on fishing would not be conducive to resettlement. Neither
20 was there any mention of the sovereignty issue. PM Ramgoolam did not want the MPA
21 consultation to take place outside of the bilateral talks between the UK and Mauritius on Chagos.
22 So, it's a complaint about the consultation document. And insofar as it's raising anything else,
23 it's resettlement and sovereignty. It's not about an UNCLOS dispute.

¹³ Emphasis in the original.

1 And precisely the same thing comes out of the Note Verbale that is then sent on the same day.
2 That's at page 68 of this tab. And unsurprisingly you get that from the second, third, and fourth
3 paragraphs, complaint in relation to the consultation document, it's Page 12, which is really at
4 issue. And you will see: "The Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and
5 International Trade, therefore, requests that the FCO accordingly amend its consultation
6 document to accurately reflect the position of the Government of the Republic of Mauritius."

7 And then overleaf there is the letter of 23rd November 2009, page 69 of this tab, from the
8 Mauritian MFA, and we were criticized last Friday for the lack of comment on this. But we are
9 perplexed by that, because again one sees in the second paragraph that there is a reference there
10 to the consultation document and how the complaint is about the consultation document.

11 And then you will see towards the end of the next paragraph, it's being said that:

12 "The Government of the Republic of Mauritius believes it is inappropriate for the
13 consultation on the proposed MPA as far as Mauritius is concerned to take place outside this
14 bilateral framework."

15 And then:

16 "The Government of Mauritius considers that an MPA project in the Chagos Archipelago
17 should not be incompatible with the sovereignty of the Republic of Mauritius over the
18 Chagos Archipelago and should address the issues of resettlement, access to the fisheries
19 resources and the economic development of the islands in a matter which would not
20 prejudice an eventual enjoyment of sovereignty. A total ban on fisheries exploitation and
21 omission of those issues from any MPA project, would not be compatible with the
22 long-term resolution of our progress in the talks on the sovereignty issue."

23 So, again, you see it's all coming down to the sovereignty issue, and you will see there the
24 reference to the long-term resolution of the sovereignty issue which absolutely ties in with what I
25 was saying to you yesterday morning on jurisdiction. This is all about trying to fit within

1 UNCLOS a reference to the long-term sovereignty dispute between the Parties. And it can't be
2 done either by saying that this is somehow there is an UNCLOS dispute with relation to who is
3 the coastal State or by saying in relation to strand 2, this is somehow articulating an UNCLOS
4 dispute.

5 And precisely the same thing comes overleaf; you'll see the letter continues overleaf. If you
6 read that, the first two paragraphs, you will see there is a reference to "the existing framework
7 for talks should not be overtaken or bypassed by the consultation." And there you see
8 Mauritius wishes to reiterate the sovereignty of Mauritius over the Chagos Archipelago,
9 including Diego Garcia, and its non-recognition of the so-called BIOT.

10 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, I'm sorry to interrupt you.
11 Help me with this, please: This is a reference back to the existing framework of talks by which
12 I presume is meant the January 2009 and July 2009 talks. But both of those discussed fishing
13 rights under a sovereignty umbrella.

14 So, is the context here that their fishing rights are being raised separately from
15 sovereignty?

16 MR. WORDSWORTH: I don't see that, no. Because what is being said here is
17 that the total ban on fisheries exploitation and omission of those issues from any MPA project
18 would not be compatible with the long-term resolution of or progress in the talks on the
19 sovereignty issue. So, it appears very much to be saying access to fisheries is part of the
20 sovereignty issue. It doesn't appear to be saying independent of the sovereignty issue there is
21 an issue in relation to binding undertakings that you gave us back in 1965 in relation to fishing
22 rights and those separately give rise to potential breaches of UNCLOS. There isn't a first limb
23 reference to the allegedly binding undertakings. There isn't the second limb anywhere, the
24 reference to UNCLOS.

1 47. The final document relied on here, at 72, is 19 February 2010, and from there Mauritius
2 moves on to documents that are subsequent to the declaration of the MPA, and you already
3 have the point from what I was saying yesterday, that there is no whisper of any alleged
4 breach of UNCLOS there. The basis for the protest is the sovereignty issue. And you'll recall
5 that Ms. Macdonald sought to glean something from the complaint on the absence of
6 consultation that one sees in the Mauritian note verbale of 2 April 2010¹⁴, and she also took
7 you to a reference to unhappiness with “unilateral FCO consultation” in a Joanne Yeadon
8 memorandum of a few days earlier¹⁵.

9 48. The final document relied on here, at 72, is 19 February 2010, and from there Mauritius
10 moves on to documents that are subsequent to the declaration of the MPA, and you already
11 have the point from what I was saying yesterday, that there is no whisper of any alleged
12 breach of UNCLOS there. The basis for the protest is the sovereignty issue. And you'll recall
13 that Ms. Macdonald sought to glean something from the complaint on the absence of
14 consultation that one sees in the Mauritian note verbale of 2 April 2010¹⁶, and she also took
15 you to a reference to unhappiness with “unilateral FCO consultation” in a Joanne Yeadon
16 memorandum of a few days earlier¹⁷.

17 49. But these references cannot somehow be characterized as an allegation of failures to
18 consult on, for examples, straddling stocks or highly migratory species in breach of the
19 1982 Convention. There is no hint of any UNCLOS claim. The complaint, as formulated
20 on 2nd April, in terms of consultation, is an entirely general complaint, pinned back to the
21 sovereignty issue, and it's not an issue of a failure to consult under provisions of UNCLOS.
22 And one sees from these documents that Mauritius' position going forward continues to be
23 grounded in the sovereignty claim, and that appears from the meeting of 9th June 2010, which is

¹⁴ MM, Annex 167.

¹⁵ MR, Annex 152.

¹⁶ MM, Annex 167.

¹⁷ MR, Annex 152.

1 at page 91 of this tab, and actually it's worth taking you to this really for two reasons because
2 you will see that it is an extract of an information paper: Official mission to France and the
3 United Kingdom of 9th June 2010. And you will see it's about a meeting with the new British
4 Foreign Secretary Mr. Hague, and there are two points that flow from it: First, the position of
5 Mauritius is grounded in the sovereignty claim, not in breaches of UNCLOS; but, second, when
6 you look at this document and you read it, you think, well, how on earth can it be being said that
7 it was futile for Mauritius to engage in an exchange of views? It makes absolutely no sense at
8 all because what you see as actually happening is the MPA being declared on the 1st of April
9 2010 and you will see that the parties are then – or Mauritius is then precisely raising it with the
10 British Foreign Minister at the date of this meeting 9th of June 2010. Of course, it didn't think
11 it was futile to raise these matters. It raised the MPA. It simply did not engage in any
12 exchange of views under Article 283, as Sir Michael has demonstrated it was required to do so.
13 Now, you will see 37 there: "Mr. Hague gave me an insight into the functioning of the new
14 coalition Government and expressed his delight to work together with Mauritius on several
15 issues." So, he's hardly putting up the barriers.
16 Then you will see at 39: "I expressed concern over the decision of the former United Kingdom
17 Government to proceed with the establishment of a Marine Protected Area around the Chagos
18 Archipelago. Despite the undertaking given by the then Prime Minister and the project – that
19 the project would be put on hold and brought up for consideration under the bilateral talks
20 between UK and Mauritius on the Chagos issue. I pointed out that, according to legal advice
21 obtained, the decision of the UK Government to proceed with the creation of the MPA could be
22 tinted with illegality."
23 Now just pausing there for a moment, of course, that's a reference to the Gordon Brown – what
24 Mauritius says, is an undertaking, and now what we see is the use of that undertaking, or alleged
25 undertaking, by Mauritius to make a particularly serious allegation of breach of UNCLOS. It is

1 said the failure to comply with that alleged undertaking means that there is a breach of Article
2 300, so clearly as serious as it gets in terms of the 1982 Convention.

3 And yet where is the hint of anything there? Where is the opportunity for the United Kingdom
4 to understand that there was a dispute by reference to what Gordon Brown is alleged to have said
5 so that it could respond? So, at least once the dispute crystallized, there could be the exchange
6 of views. Clearly nothing of that.

7 And then you see from Paragraph 40, again the whole thing is ultimately grounded in the
8 sovereignty issue. On the sovereignty issue:

9 "I stated that on several occasions Mauritius has indicated that it is fully conscious of the
10 importance of Diego Garcia as a strategic military installation for the U.S. and that it does
11 not propose any change with regard to the continued use of the island as such. We need
12 to settle the sovereignty issue and the Chagossians be allowed to resettle on the other
13 islands. I also made it clear that the Chagossians are Mauritian citizens, and they should
14 not be dealt with separately."

15 Mr. Hague conceded he was not fully conversant with all the issues concerning the Chagos
16 Archipelago. He stated that he would revert to me on this matter in due course. So, it all
17 comes down to sovereignty, and not a hint of anything there that could support Mauritius' case
18 on futility.

19 And one sees precisely the same points that come out of the next document that was relied on,
20 which is at page 93 of this tab, and, of course, this is an extract from parliamentary debates in
21 Mauritius, so it wouldn't meet the first hurdle of announcing the existence of an UNCLOS
22 breach to the United Kingdom. But, in any way, when you look at the passage relied on, which
23 is page 96 of this bundle, it's precisely the same two issues that have been raised on the 9th of
24 June. You will see at the top there, there is a passage on sovereignty, and then you will see, in
25 the third paragraph on this page, there is a reference to: "The honorable Prime Minister

1 expressed concern over a decision of the former UK Government to establish an MPA around
2 the Chagos Archipelago, despite the undertaking given by the former Prime Minister that the
3 project would be put on hold." And so on. I think it's more or less the same wording.

4 Now, it was not for the United Kingdom to stitch together miscellaneous references to access to
5 fisheries resources or broad assertions of sovereignty, or reference to the alleged Gordon Brown
6 Statement, and then to understand that Mauritius was asserting, for example, that there had been
7 abuse of rights under the Convention or that the UK had failed to cooperate to agree on measure
8 necessary for the conservation of straddling stocks or there had been a breach of 65 undertaking
9 which fed into Article 2(3) and Article 56(2) of the Convention.

10 And, of course, and any event, even if it had been possible to discern the existence of an
11 UNCLOS dispute, and it was not, Mauritius is unable to point to any exchange of views in
12 relation to a claim of alleged breaches of UNCLOS.

13 50. Mauritius has highlighted some references (i) by Mauritius to possible legal challenge (ii)
14 by the United Kingdom to the "threat of legal action"¹⁸. But we simply do not see what that
15 adds. There is no suggestion UK representatives somehow understood that Mauritius had
16 an UNCLOS claim in mind. To similar effect, as I noted earlier yesterday, when at various
17 junctures Mauritius has threatened legal proceedings, it has generally been in the broadest
18 of terms¹⁹, and certainly not with reference to UNCLOS.

19 51. Indeed, the references made by the United Kingdom to a possible legal challenge are
20 instructive; it shows an understanding that any reference to legal action related to
21 Mauritius's sovereignty claim, which it was anticipated might be brought before the ICJ
22 for an advisory opinion²⁰, and with no understanding that UNCLOS might be invoked. And
23 you may recall how one member of the Mauritian delegation at the meeting of 24 July
24 2009 made the 'usual sovereignty/ICJ mutterings', although that was apparently ignored by

¹⁸ Day 4, Macdonald, 399: 1, citing Ms. Yeadon on 31 March 2010 (Reply, Annex 156).

¹⁹ E.g. UK Rejoinder, Annex 54.

²⁰ See MR, Annexes 133, 164; also UKCM Annex 119.

1 the rest of the Mauritian delegation, and that's at tab 12 of our Judges' Folder, at paragraph
2 14 of the particular note. And that of course is not as polite as one might wish, and that is
3 why this record was initially redacted. And the point is that UK representatives did not
4 understand that a claim was being made, let alone an UNCLOS claim.

5 52. Now, so far as concerns strand 3 – stand 3 is, as we understand it, allegations of breach of
6 allegedly binding undertakings which would somehow feed into an UNCLOS claim.
7 There is actually very little to add. Professor Sands referred you to tabs 8.4, 8.6, 8.10 and
8 8.11 of its Judges' Folder, but that is the records of the January and July 2009 meetings,
9 and also the July 2009 joint communiqué. I have already touched on these. They do not
10 establish the existence as to a claim of breach of the alleged undertakings, still less that this
11 amounted to a breach of articles 2(3) and 56 of the 1982 Convention, or that such
12 undertakings accorded to Mauritius the attributes of a coastal State such that any
13 declaration of the MPA would be impermissible.

14 53. And, again, as follows inevitably, the documents relied on do not establish the existence of
15 an exchange of views.

16 54. And, for good measure, I should add that the alleged 1965 undertakings do not even
17 receive a mention in Mauritius' carefully formulated Notification of Claim initiating these
18 proceedings. The case that they were raised as a dispute sometime in 2009, and that there
19 was the required exchange of views, reflects a post-claim attempt to make the facts fit what
20 was not then perceived as a claim at all, let alone a claim under UNCLOS.

21 **Alleged futility**

22 55. I move on to Mauritius' case that a "further" exchange of views was futile by December
23 2010, and that case is, at best, misconceived. Ms. Macdonald's submissions actually
24 seemed to tail off at this point, but it appears that the case on futility is made on the basis

1 that the United Kingdom allegedly proceeded with the MPA contrary to Prime Minister
2 Brown's alleged commitment to put it on hold²¹.

3 56. Well, the Tribunal already has our case on what was actually said, but I leave that to one
4 side, and make three short points on the argument of futility.

5 57. First, there is nothing in the background to the exchange, and likewise the record and
6 witness Statement that Mauritius has tendered, to show that the Mauritian Prime Minister
7 was seeking to raise with Gordon Brown any UNCLOS dispute, still less to discuss means
8 of settlement of that dispute.

9 58. Secondly, and following on from the above, there was no basis of any kind on which
10 Mauritius could consider that an actual exchange of views on an actual UNCLOS dispute
11 would be futile once the MPA was in fact declared. I note that this is all the more so in
12 circumstances where a new Government came into power in the United Kingdom in May
13 2010, i.e., shortly after the MPA had been declared.

14 59. And, thirdly, the contention is plain wrong on the facts in light of the fact that
15 governmental contacts did not somehow cease after the MPA was declared, and one can
16 see how, at the meeting of 9 June 2010 with the new British Foreign Secretary, Mauritius
17 did consider it worthwhile to raise and discuss the issue of the MPA.

18 And, in fact, you can see – again, if I could just ask you to turn to one last document in this tab –
19 you will see that there was then a later meeting where, far from considering it futile to discuss
20 the MPA, Mauritius again raised it.

21 If I could ask you to turn to page 97 of this tab, and you will see there is again a reference
22 to the debate or it is in Hansard of 9th November 2010 this time in Mauritius – and again I'm
23 only taking you to documents that Mauritius was relying on last Friday – and you will see from
24 this at page 100, there is a description being given of a further meeting, this time on 22nd July,

²¹ Reply, para. 4.79; See also Day 4, 411:1 to 7. Reliance was also placed on UKCM, Annex 87.

1 and it says: "The Honorable Minister of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International
2 Trade had a meeting with the Honorable Bellingham on 22nd July 2010 in Kampala." And you
3 will see from the preceding paragraph that there is a reference to the Honorable Henry
4 Bellingham, Minister for Africa and Overseas Territory at the UK FCO:

5 "Had this meeting in the margins of the AU Executive Council meeting. During the
6 meeting, Minister Boolell reiterated the sovereignty of Mauritius over the Chagos
7 Archipelago as well as our objections to the unilateral establishment by the UK of a
8 Marine Protected Area around the Chagos Archipelago."

9 In response, Minister Bellingham indicated that the new British Government would have handled
10 the issue of the Marine Protected Area differently.

11 And you will see time passes, that was 22nd July 2010, and speaking as of 9th November 2010,
12 it's being said:

13 "It is now clear that the new British Government does not hold a different view from the
14 previous Government on the issue of the MPA or on the sovereignty of Chagos
15 Archipelago."

16 60. But, clearly, there was a time when Mauritius did not consider that was the view when
17 Mauritius did consider it worth raising with the United Kingdom's representatives, and yet
18 Mauritius did not seek to engage in any change of views for the purposes of Article 283.

19 61. So, in short, there was never any basis for regarding anything Gordon Brown said as
20 rendering futile a true Article 283 exchange, and the current contention on futility is plainly
21 inconsistent with the facts.

22 **Conclusion**

23 62. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I have sought to take you to all the documents that
24 Mauritius relied on last week. We say that the real and important requirements of Article
25 283 have not been met. The United Kingdom was indeed taken by surprise by the

1 institution of UNCLOS proceedings against it on 20 December 2010. And, certainly, one
2 of the purposes of Article 283 is precisely to avoid such a situation.

3 63. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, that concludes what we have to say on Article
4 283. So if I could now ask you to hand the floor to Professor Boyle, who will be setting out
5 our case on Article 297 of the Convention, the jurisdictional objection there.

6 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Just before you leave the podium, Judge Greenwood
7 has a question.

8 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Could we go back to the letter of the 30th of
9 December 2009 that I asked when about when Ms. Nevill was speaking about the other day. I'll
10 move the microphone and hope that I can be heard. That's Mauritius Memorial Annex 157, and
11 that was the letter that finished from Dr. Boolell to Mr. Miliband:

12 "You will no doubt be aware that in the margins of the last Commonwealth Heads of
13 Government Meeting our prospective Prime Ministers agreed that the Marine Protected
14 Area project be put on hold and that this issue address the during the next round of
15 Mauritius-United Kingdom bilateral talks."

16 Now, obviously that next round of Mauritius-United Kingdom bilateral talks
17 never took place; I understand that, and I also understand the other points you have made about
18 the alleged Gordon Brown undertaking.

19 But was there ever a reply? Because it strikes me as odd from this record that
20 here you have the Foreign Minister of Mauritius writing to the Foreign Minister of the United
21 Kingdom saying that there was an agreement at Prime Ministerial level – it's even higher than a
22 unilateral undertaking – that the MPA project be put on hold, and there doesn't appear to be a
23 reaction.

24 MR. WORDSWORTH: It has just been whispered to me, helpfully by Professor
25 Boyle, that he is going to be dealing with that point shortly. When I say "shortly", I think it

1 may be this afternoon, because he is first going to be addressing you on jurisdictional issues but
2 then he will be taking you to merits issues on consultation in the context of which he will be
3 addressing – making some submissions on that particular point.

4 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: That's absolutely fine. I'm sorry. I thought
5 it was something that came within your remit, Mr. Wordsworth.

6 MR. WORDSWORTH: I don't think it's a jurisdictional issue. Insofar as it is,
7 then I will certainly revisit it over lunch and feed a line or two to Professor Boyle.

8 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: No, it was the fact that you had gone through
9 the train of correspondence that made that I should ask the question again.

10 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you very much, Mr. Wordsworth.

11 MR. WORDSWORTH: Thank you.

12 PRESIDENT SHEARER: And I call on Professor Boyle.

13 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Thank you, Mr. President. And I can assure Judge
14 Greenwood we have followed up the correspondence and I will be dealing with it this afternoon.

15 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, it's a pleasure to appear before you again
16 and do so on behalf of the United Kingdom.

17 **Mauritius v United Kingdom**

18 **The absence of jurisdiction over Mauritius' claims with respect to the MPA**

19 **Professor Alan Boyle**

20 **A. Mauritius' case on the MPA and the United Kingdom's response**

21 1. Mr. President, members of the tribunal. In its Reply and in its submissions last week Mauritius
22 invited you to hold that the United Kingdom's declaration of a marine protected area around
23 the BIOT is incompatible with various obligations under the Convention, including Articles 2,
24 55, 56, 63, 64, 194, and 300, as well as article 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement.

- 1 2. Mauritius argued that even if the United Kingdom is the coastal State it has acted unlawfully
2 by proclaiming the Marine Protected Area and by banning commercial fishing in that area.
3 Mauritius says that the Marine Protected Area and the fishing ban are inconsistent not only
4 with the 1982 Convention but also with the rights which Mauritius claims to possess in the
5 waters now covered by the Marine Protected Area.
- 6 3. In this speech I will respond to the arguments Mauritius uses to justify its assertion that you
7 have jurisdiction over these claims. I will make four points.
- 8 4. First, Mauritius' challenge to the legality of the ban on commercial fishing – the only new
9 element that was introduced by the MPA declaration – is necessarily, we would say, a
10 challenge to the legality of a measure whose purpose and effect is to conserve and manage the
11 marine living resources of the Marine Protected Area – or more specifically the fish stocks, the
12 sharks, the coral reefs, the biodiversity in which that marine protected area is richly abundant.
13 To claim, as Mauritius does, that the ban on commercial fishing has an environmental purpose
14 does not alter or undermine that conclusion in any way.
- 15 5. Second, I will argue that Article 297(1)(c) provides no basis for jurisdiction over the
16 declaration of an MPA or the ban on commercial fishing. Mauritius says that because the
17 purpose of the MPA is environmental the dispute therefore falls within Article 297(1)(c). But
18 on its own terms that article is inapplicable to this dispute, which does not concern, we would
19 say, the breach of any “specified international rules and standards for protection and
20 preservation of the marine environment” as provided in that article. Characterising the Marine
21 Protected Area or the ban on fishing as environmental is for that reason irrelevant: there are no
22 specified international rules and standards applicable to the declaration of an MPA or a ban on
23 commercial fishing within the limits of national jurisdiction.
- 24 6. Third, I will argue that Mauritius' case is inevitably excluded from compulsory jurisdiction
25 over fisheries disputes by the second limb of Article 297(3)(a). Because the declaration of an

1 MPA and the ban on commercial fishing relate to conservation and management of living
2 resources, and within the Exclusive Economic Zone, the dispute, we would say, falls fairly and
3 squarely within this exclusion. Mauritius says that Article 297(3)(a) does not apply to
4 environmental disputes within Article 297(1)(c). But this is unsustainable. Even if the MPA or
5 the ban on commercial fishing have environmental purposes, that simply does not alter the
6 plain fact that the dispute relates to, and I quote, “sovereign rights with respect to living
7 resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone, or their exercise...” On that basis, it clearly falls
8 outside your jurisdiction by virtue of Article 297(3)(a).

9 7. Finally, I will deal briefly with jurisdiction over other claims made by Mauritius, including
10 fishing in the territorial sea, the harvesting of sedentary species on the continental shelf, fishing
11 for straddling and highly migratory fish stocks, marine pollution, and abuse of rights.

12 Let me then turn to the characterisation of the MPA dispute.

13 **B. Characterisation of the MPA dispute**

14 8. Throughout its pleadings and in the arguments you heard last week Mauritius has sought to
15 persuade you that this is an environmental case and to invest that characterisation with
16 jurisdictional significance. Its reasons for doing so are obvious: were it to accept that the
17 dispute is about the sovereign right to conserve and manage living resources in the EEZ it
18 would also have to accept that the dispute is excluded from your jurisdiction by Article
19 297(3)(a). Yet it is of course precisely the termination of its alleged fishing rights that most
20 obviously affects Mauritius and about which it has expressed most concern. Almost everything
21 else is hypothetical apart from sovereignty.

22 9. The United Kingdom's White Paper on Overseas Territories published in 2009 sets out British
23 policy on BIOT and other UK overseas territories. It identifies the following aims and
24 objectives, and I would highlight two, in particular:

- 1 a. First, “To promote sustainable use and management of the Overseas Territories' natural and
2 physical environment, for the benefit of the local people”;
- 3 b. Second, “to protect fragile ecosystems such as coral reefs from further degradation and to
4 conserve biodiversity in the Overseas Territories.”²²

5 And the 2012 White Paper on the Overseas Territories confirms that policy with respect to BIOT
6 and other uninhabited territories.²³

7 10. The United Kingdom does not dispute that the purpose of the MPA is “environmental” if that
8 term is understood to include conservation and management of living resources, biodiversity,
9 ecosystems of coral reefs and their surrounding seas. The MPA brings under one umbrella and
10 strengthens both the environmental and resource conservation objectives previously addressed
11 by the two overlapping maritime zones, the Environmental Protection and Preservation Zone
12 and the Fisheries Conservation and Management Zone.

13 11. The Attorney General and Ms. Nevill have explained the science supporting the establishment
14 of the MPA and the ban on commercial fishing. The scientific literature shows that the BIOT
15 MPA is of exceptional importance for its unpolluted ecosystem, the extensive coral reefs, and
16 the abundant biodiversity which it supports.²⁴ The Chagos reef system has the highest biomass
17 of coral reef fishes anywhere in the Indian Ocean. And a no-take marine protected area is
18 beneficial firstly for the protection and preservation of the reef system. After the Great Barrier
19 Reef, the Chagos Banks are the second largest reef system in the world, and they are the least
20 polluted.

21 12. But, secondly the MPA is important for the recovery of commercially exploited pelagic fish
22 stocks which are under heavy pressure from poorly regulated fishing elsewhere in the Indian

²² Command paper Cm 4246, UKCM, Annex 71, para. 8.5.

²³ White Paper, “Overseas Territories: Security, Success and Sustainability”, Command Paper CM 8374 (June 2012), UKCM, Annex 127, p. 46.

²⁴ National Oceanography Centre final report of workshop held on 5-6 August 2009, UKCM, Annex 102.

1 Ocean. A ban on commercial fishing eliminates the elasmobranch by-catches, which exercised
2 Judge Greenwood's curiosity on Wednesday. These, of course, are the valuable but endangered
3 species such as sharks, rays and skates. The impact of commercial fishing on these species is
4 particularly severe in the Indian Ocean and this is one of the key reasons for the no-take MPA.
5 And it might be worth noticing at this point that, according to the IOTC, 2318 tonnes of shark
6 were landed at Port Louis in Mauritius in 2012.²⁵ All of this is unlicensed by-catch from tuna
7 fishing in Mauritius' Exclusive Economic Zone and surrounding waters. That figure takes no
8 account of un-landed or unreported by-catch.

9 13. Taking into account the potential impact on fish stocks of the MPA, the Chagos Conservation
10 Trust summarises the economic benefits as follows. It says: "In the long-term, the Chagos
11 Marine Reserve will contribute to a richer ocean and should benefit people living in and around
12 that ocean, such as the coastal countries of East Africa and elsewhere."²⁶

13 14. So is a dispute about the creation of a no-take MPA an environmental matter as Mauritius
14 alleges? And if so, does it matter? Mauritius points to similar language in the proclamations
15 establishing the EPPZ and the Marine Protected Area, and it claims that neither of them refers
16 to the conservation or management of living resources. But this is to ignore entirely the
17 science, the negotiations between the parties, the public consultation, the implementing
18 measures, all of which presuppose and make explicit the close relationship between
19 conservation of biodiversity, coral reefs, endangered species, and the biomass of depleted fish
20 stocks. The first question asked in the public consultation document was whether commercial
21 fishing within the MPA should be banned.²⁷ Is this a question about environmental protection?
22 Or about unsustainable exploitation of living resources?

²⁵ IOTC, *Report of the Sixteenth Session of the Scientific Committee*, IOTC-2013-SC16-R[E], p. 64 UKAF, Folder 2, Tab 59, full report at

<http://www.iotc.org/sites/default/files/documents/2014/01/IOTC-2013-SC16-RE.pdf>.

²⁶ <http://chagos-trust.org/about/chagos-marine-reserve>.

²⁷ Consultation on whether to establish a Marine Protected Area in the British Indian Ocean Territory, UKCM, Annex 111, question 1(i).

1 15. Mauritius can have been in no doubt that the MPA was intended to conserve fish stocks and
2 living resources. A press release about the MPA public consultation issued by the British
3 High Commission in Port Louis explained the point very clearly. And you will find this press
4 release at tab 57 in your folder. It says: “The idea is that creating a marine park where fishing
5 is tightly controlled or prohibited enables the ocean environment and fish stocks to recover.”

6 It goes on: “Recovering fish-stocks then help replenish fisheries even in areas outside the
7 protected zone — to the benefit of the wider economy and environment.”²⁸

8 16. Mr. President, members of the tribunal. It seems to me that if a ban on fishing is not a measure
9 relating to conservation and management of living resources, then I must be Humpty Dumpty.
10 The point seems elementary. But even if there were no ban on fishing, an MPA whose aims
11 include conservation of coral reefs, and sharks and other endangered species, and biodiversity,
12 must still be a measure intended to address the management and conservation of marine living
13 resources. And the National Oceanographic Centre Report to which you've been referred and
14 which was annexed to the public consultation document makes that abundantly clear.²⁹ That
15 Report can be found, to remind you, at Tab 17 in your folder.

16 17. So the issue here is not whether the measures taken by the UK in creating the MPA - or the
17 measures that will be taken in future - are in some general sense “environmental”. There is a
18 chapter on fisheries conservation in a well-known textbook on international environmental
19 law. But the important question is in this context whether this dispute is environmental for the
20 purposes of jurisdiction under Part XV of the Law of the Sea Convention. And that is not a
21 question that can be answered by reference to the MPA Proclamation or its wording. To
22 answer it, we have to look carefully at the wording and the totality and the context of Article

²⁸ UKCM, Annex 109.

²⁹ National Oceanography Centre final report of workshop held on 5-6 August 2009, UKCM, Annex 102,
UKAF Folder 1, Tab 17.

1 297 in order to understand how that article deals with disputes relating to the environment, and
2 to fisheries and other living resources.

3 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I am going to take you to Article 297 and spend a little
4 time looking carefully at its wording.

5 PRESIDENT SHEARER: May I just interrupt, Professor Boyle. We normally
6 take a break at about this time. Would this be a convenient point?

7 PROFESSOR BOYLE: That would be a perfect moment at which to take a break,
8 Mr. President.

9 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Very good. Thank you.

10 (Brief recess.)

11 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, Mr. Boyle.

12 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Mr. President, I was threatening to take you to the text of
13 Article 297, which I think you will now see before you.

14 18. Although the heading is “Limitations on the applicability of section 2” – that is, limitations
15 on compulsory jurisdiction - in reality this article also confers jurisdiction over certain
16 categories of dispute as provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

17 19. Paragraph (1) goes on to list three categories of dispute all concerning the exercise by the
18 coastal State of its sovereign rights or jurisdiction that are, pursuant to that article, subject to
19 the procedures in section 2 of part XV. The wording of each of these merits careful reading,
20 and I'm hoping you're going to see 297(1)(a). Let me begin with that one:

21 a. The point of sub-paragraph (a) is to protect the rights of *other* States within the Exclusive
22 Economic Zone from interference by the coastal State. You will note that the rights to which it
23 refers are limited to navigation, to overflight, to laying of cables and pipelines, and other
24 lawful uses of the sea related to those freedoms as set out in article 58. You will also notice that
25 Article 297(1)(a) says nothing about any right of other States to fish in the Exclusive Economic

1 Zone, or to exploit other living resources. And had there been any intention to extend the
2 protection of Part XV to foreign fishing or the harvesting of other species in the Exclusive
3 Economic Zone, you might have expected Article 297(1)(a) to say something about that, and it
4 does not.

5 b. If we move then to 297(1)(b): the point of sub-paragraph (b) is to allow *the coastal State* to sue
6 other States which have exercised the rights of navigation, of overflight, and the laying of
7 cables and pipelines – referred to as “the aforementioned freedoms, rights or uses” - in
8 contravention of the Convention or of coastal State laws. Again, there is nothing here about
9 fishing or the exploitation of other living resources in that article.

10 c. Finally, we move to sub-paragraph (c), which obviously is the crucial one for Mauritius.
11 Mauritius says this provision gives you jurisdiction over environmental disputes, including
12 this dispute. But you will notice that sub-paragraph (c) refers only to disputes where the coastal
13 State has acted in contravention of “specified international rules and standards for the
14 protection of the marine environment”. We say that the purpose of this provision, like
15 paragraph (1) as a whole, is to protect freedom of navigation, or the other freedoms referred to
16 in Article 58, against misuse by the coastal States of their power to regulate marine pollution. It
17 does not cover environmental disputes in general, and specifically it does not cover this
18 dispute. It does not do what Professor Sands says it does.

19 20. So, how we interpret the phraseology used in Article 297(1)(c) is plainly crucial for Mauritius’
20 case. Unless a dispute relating to the creation of an marine protected area or a ban on
21 commercial fishing within that MPA involves the contravention of specified international rules
22 and standards it will not fall within 297(1)(c), and there will then be no basis for the
23 jurisdiction which Mauritius claims that you possess. My simple point is that Mauritius’
24 interpretation of Article 297(1)(c) is novel, and reflects neither the ordinary meaning of the
25 words used, nor the context in which the article as a whole applies.

1 21. I would invite the Tribunal to start by looking briefly at that context, including the other
2 provisions of Article 297(1). As you will recall, Articles 297(1)(a) and (b) are about
3 navigation, overflight, cables, and pipelines. They would, for example, cover a claim by
4 Mauritius that the MPA interfered with freedom of navigation by imposing a requirement,
5 shall we say, of compulsory pilotage, or by banning navigation entirely within the MPA. That
6 we would accept. They would also cover a claim by the United Kingdom that, for example, a
7 pipeline had been laid across the MPA by Mauritius without first conducting an environmental
8 impact assessment.

9 22. But that is the context in which we have to interpret Article 297(1)(c). And if we take that
10 context seriously we would expect Article 297(1)(c) also to be relevant to disputes about
11 navigation, pipelines and so on. But we would think it perhaps surprising if a dispute about
12 fishing or the conservation and management of living resources were within 297(1). Such a
13 dispute has nothing to do with navigation or overflight or cables or pipelines, and so on. It
14 obviously falls outside the context of Article 297(1) read as a whole. If there is jurisdiction
15 over a dispute of that kind, we would expect to find it not in 297(1)(c) as Mauritius argues but
16 in some other part of Article 297 – and we would suggest Article 297(3) is the obvious place
17 to locate it.

18 23. And that brings me to my second and equally obvious point, which will take a little longer to
19 develop: that when we consider the ordinary meaning of the terms used in Article 297(1)(c), in
20 context, it is abundantly clear that they cannot confer jurisdiction over the creation of the BIOT
21 MPA or the ban on fishing in the BIOT MPA. So, even if we do characterise the MPA and the
22 ban on commercial fishing as having an environmental purpose, this will not be sufficient to
23 bring the present case within Article 297(1)(c). Last Friday, reference was made to a Chapter
24 by Judge Mensah in support of the opposite view, but having re-read that chapter, it's obvious
25 that there is nothing in his text that supports the very broad reading that was given to Article

1 297(1)(c) by Mauritius. The learned judge does not address the issues we are debating here
2 today, or he does so at best only in the broadest of terms.

3 **C. Absence of jurisdiction under Article 297(1)(c)**

4 24. So, the heart of the issue is that the text of Article 297(1)(c) refers only to disputes concerning
5 “specified international rules and standards for the protection and preservation of the marine
6 environment which are applicable to the coastal State”. Now, Mauritius argues at this point
7 that the other articles of the 1982 Convention on which it relies constitute “specified
8 international rules and standards” for this purpose. We say that argument is untenable, for two
9 reasons.

10 25. First, it does not fit the wording used in Article 297(1)(c) or the context in which the phrase is
11 employed. Mauritius claims that articles 55, 56, 63, 64 and 194 are “specified international
12 rules and standards” “established by the Convention” simply because they are part of the
13 Convention. But if that is what 297(1)(c) means, why would any half-decent negotiator or
14 draftsman use the phrase “specified international rules and standards” to achieve this result?
15 He or she would surely have referred instead to “contravention of other provisions of the
16 Convention for the protection and preservation of the marine environment”. That would
17 make far more sense.

18 26. The phrase "international rules and standards" is employed throughout Part XII, notably in
19 articles 211, 213, 214, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 222, 226, 228, and 230. These articles
20 collectively empower or require coastal States, flag States, or port States to regulate and
21 enforce regulations for the prevention of marine pollution from ships, aircraft, and seabed
22 activities. In in that context, international rules and standards provide a common standard for
23 national regulations to follow. Obviously without that common standard, freedom of
24 navigation would be impaired: ships, like aircraft, have to operate internationally, and there is
25 no use having different national standards in different countries. But none of these articles

1 covers anything resembling a marine protected area whose purpose is to manage and conserve
2 living resources in the EEZ, nor is there any comparable policy reason for doing so.

3 27. Moreover, it is well understood that the relevant international rules and standards for
4 preventing marine pollution from ships are those negotiated at the International Maritime
5 Organization and laid down in very considerable detail in the annexes of the 1973/78
6 MARPOL Convention, and of the annexes of Safety of Life at Sea Convention, the SOLAS
7 Convention. So, if you want to build or operate an oil tanker the applicable international rules
8 and standards on safety and prevention of pollution are in those annexes. The 1996 London
9 Dumping Convention does the same for the dumping of waste at sea. But none of these
10 annexes, or the London Dumping Convention, deals with the conservation of living resources.

11 28. The same phraseology, the use of the term "international rules and standards", or variants of it,
12 occurs elsewhere in the Convention, including Article 21 on the regulation of ships in innocent
13 passage, article 39 on the duties of ships in transit passage through straits, article 41 on
14 sealanes and traffic separation schemes, article 53 on archipelagic sealanes, article 60 on
15 artificial islands, in the EEZ, article 94 on the duty of States to regulate ships flying their flag,
16 and Article 271 on marine technology. Now, with the exception of articles 60 and 271, all of
17 these articles are also concerned with the regulation of ships. None of them covers anything
18 resembling a marine protected area whose purpose is to manage and conserve living resources.

19 29. Fishing and the conservation and management of living resources in the Exclusive Economic
20 Zone are dealt with in Part V of the Convention. But apart from article 60, the phrase
21 "international rules and standards" is not found anywhere else in Part V. It is not used in
22 articles 55 or 56. Indeed, far from endorsing any commitment to international regulation, in
23 Part V it is the laws of the coastal State that prevail. Take, for example, Article 62(4), which
24 requires nationals of other States fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zone, and I quote, to
25 “comply with the conservation measures and with the other terms and conditions established in

1 the laws and regulations of the coastal State.” And no attempt is made in article 62(4) to
2 harmonise these laws with other States or specify their content with any provision.

3 30. Let me emphasise that word “comply” with coastal State laws in article 62(4). That wording
4 contrasts starkly with article 56(2) on which Mauritius has relied and which merely requires
5 the coastal State to have due regard for the rights of other States in the Exclusive Economic
6 Zone. None of this supports the proposition that any of the articles on which Mauritius relies
7 constitute “specified international rules and standards” for the purposes of Article 297(1)(c).

8 31. Now, there is a second objection to Mauritius’ argument and it's that the very general wording
9 of articles 55, 56, 63, 64, and 194 also contradicts any suggestion that they could constitute
10 “specified international rules and standards.” Professor Oxman has written most helpfully
11 about this subject on the meaning of international rules and standards, and you will find the
12 most relevant page of his article – at Tab 58 in your folder - and his analysis entirely
13 contradicts the argument made by Mauritius. He points out that the duty to respect
14 international standards, he says, “is typically expressed in connection with a duty (or right) to
15 adopt national laws and regulations governing a particular matter.”³⁰

16 32. And he carries on. I think there are three points which follow from his analysis of this
17 relationship and I'll quote the relevant sections. On that page of his article - you will find them
18 towards the bottom, the bottom half - first, he says that while a ‘standard’ need not be
19 fundamentally normative in character, “it should inform the precise content of ...national laws
20 and regulations.” Second, he says that clauses requiring States to cooperate, or to take into
21 account, or endeavour to do something “normally do not introduce precise rules of conduct to
22 be observed uniformly.” And, thirdly, he concludes that, for these reasons, “many provisions

³⁰ B. Oxman, The Duty to Respect Generally Accepted International Standards, 24 NYUJ Int Law & Pol (1991-2), p. 109, UKCM, authority 87, p. 5252 “(MS. page numbering), UKAF, Folder 2, Tab 58.

1 of international instruments adopted by international organizations or diplomatic conferences
2 would not be relevant ...even if the instruments were very widely accepted.”³¹

3 33. Now, we say that the articles of the Convention on which Mauritius relies for this purpose do
4 not conform to the definition of international rules and standards identified by Professor
5 Oxman. None of them – none of those articles – is capable of informing “the precise content of
6 ...national laws and regulations”. Several of them are scarcely even relevant to a dispute about
7 “protection and preservation of the marine environment”, as Mauritius would allege. And we
8 can turn briefly to look at the text of the articles themselves.

9 34. Article 55, well, it simply defines the Exclusive Economic Zone and indicates that: “the rights
10 and jurisdiction of the coastal State and the rights and freedoms of other States are governed by
11 the relevant provisions of this Convention.” This is not an international rule or standard in the
12 same way that the annexes of the MARPOL Convention or the London Dumping Convention
13 are international rules and standards, nor is it even primarily directed at protection and
14 preservation of the marine environment.

15 35. And if we turn to article 56, in the language of the Virginia Commentary, “The purpose of
16 article 56 is to indicate the general nature of the rights, jurisdiction and duties of the coastal
17 State in the [exclusive economic] zone.”³² It confers sovereign rights with respect to
18 exploration, exploitation, conservation and management of natural resources. And it provides
19 the legal basis for the United Kingdom’s right as a coastal State to regulate the Exclusive
20 Economic Zone of BIOT and, in particular to regulate conservation and management of living
21 resources, but it specifies no particular international rules and standards for doing so.

22 36. Article 56 also confers jurisdiction with regard to protection and preservation of the marine
23 environment, but it says only “as provided for in the relevant provisions of this Convention”.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *UNCLOS 1982 Commentary*, vol. II, p. 525.

1 The relevant provisions are those set out in detail in Part XII. And as we have seen, they do not
2 cover conservation and management of fish stocks or living resources.

3 37. Article 63 requires States “to agree upon the measures necessary to coordinate and ensure
4 conservation and development” of straddling fish stocks. Article 64 requires them to cooperate
5 directly or through appropriate international organizations, and we'll come back to these
6 articles this afternoon. But neither article identifies specific international rules and standards:
7 at best they encourage States to negotiate such rules and standards, and Professor Oxman
8 would, I think, say these are not international rules and standards by his criteria.

9 38. Finally, Article 194 sets out the obligation of States parties to take measures necessary to
10 prevent, reduce and control pollution. In effect this article articulates the general obligation of
11 due diligence with respect to the environment, or the marine environment, but its precise
12 content is specified in more detail by the provisions articles 207 – 222 of the Convention. So,
13 while it may provide a basis for international regulation of marine pollution, article 194 does
14 not itself constitute or incorporate specified international rules and standards; indeed it makes
15 no reference to them.

16 39. So, what does this survey of the Convention tell us about the phrase “international rules and
17 standards for the protection and preservation of the marine environment,” when used in Article
18 297(1)(c)? It tells us, we would submit, that this phrase refers to rules and standards for the
19 prevention, reduction and control of marine pollution, as specified in the various articles of
20 Part XII. It is not a reference to the other articles of the Convention on which Mauritius relies.

21 40. Thus, to reiterate my opening explanation, the point of Article 297(1)(c) – and this is entirely
22 consistent with articles 297(1)(a) and (b) – is to protect freedom of navigation, or the other
23 freedoms referred to in Article 58, against misuse by coastal States of their power to regulate
24 marine pollution. And that interpretation is consistent with the two previous sub-paragraphs
25 and it reflects their focus on navigation and pipelines and it reflects the wording of the article

1 itself. But bringing articles 55, 56, 63, 64 and 194 into the ambit of Article 297(1)(c) achieves
2 neither coherence nor contextual consistency with the rest of Article 297(1).

3 41. I think, Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, the conclusion inevitably follows that Article
4 297(1)(c) does not exist in order to confer compulsory jurisdiction over a dispute about
5 conservation and management of fish stocks or marine living resources. There are no
6 internationally agreed rules and standards on those subjects, none on the conservation and
7 management of marine living resources which could fit within the terminology used in Article
8 297(1)(c) and the other articles of the Convention to which Mauritius refers do not do so. There
9 is no fisheries equivalent of MARPOL or SOLAS or the London Dumping Convention.

10 42. Mauritius has also tried to portray its case, in part, as a pollution dispute under article 194, and
11 it is true that the United Kingdom does regulate pollution within the waters of the MPA. But,
12 again, for you to have jurisdiction over that aspect of the dispute, Mauritius must still point to
13 some violation of “specified international rules and standards. It has signally failed to do so.
14 Does it plead a violation of the MARPOL, Convention or the SOLAS Convention or the
15 London Dumping Convention? No. These international rules and standards are mentioned
16 nowhere in Mauritius' arguments on article 194.

17 43. Mr. President, members of the tribunal. I have taken you through Article 297(1) in some detail,
18 and if you may feel that I have been stating the obvious on a Friday morning at some length, I
19 apologise. But Mauritius has insisted that this article provides you with jurisdiction over the
20 MPA dispute, and that argument merited a serious and detailed response. The conclusion, I
21 would suggest, seems overwhelmingly clear. Article 297(1)(c) is concerned with international
22 rules and standards which regulate marine pollution.

23 44. Simply put, it's irrelevant to this case. If you have any jurisdiction over a dispute about fish
24 stocks or conservation of marine living resources, it can come only via Article 297(3), to which
25 I will now turn.

1 **D. Mauritius' MPA case is excluded from compulsory jurisdiction by Article 297(3)**

2 45. My third point, therefore, is that a dispute relating to conservation and management of fish
3 stocks and other living resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone is excluded from
4 compulsory jurisdiction by Article 297(3)(a) unless the coastal State agrees. This provision,
5 we would say, is fatal for Mauritius' challenge to the ban on commercial fishing within the
6 BIOT MPA. And it is fatal even if the MPA's purpose is characterised as environmental, since
7 the wording of Article 297(3)(a) takes no account of the purpose for which the discretionary
8 powers of the coastal State have been exercised. That a ban on commercial fishing within the
9 MPA should fall within the exclusion carved out by Article 297(3)(a) seems straightforward
10 and obvious. It is unambiguously within the ordinary meaning of that provision.

11 46. Last Friday, my good friend Mr. Loewenstein made one argument that can be disposed of
12 immediately. He claimed that Article 297(3)(a) only excludes jurisdiction over the exercise of
13 sovereign rights by the coastal State within its EEZ, and he said that it does not exclude
14 jurisdiction over fishing within the EEZ by other States. But that is an absurdity. The two go
15 together: any assertion of sovereign rights over living resources in the EEZ will impact on the
16 ability of foreign States to exploit those resources and vice versa. The whole point of the
17 exclusion from jurisdiction in Article 297(3)(a) is to prevent other States from challenging that
18 exercise of sovereign rights in respect of their activities in the Exclusive Economic Zone. So
19 let me explain.

20 47. Article 297(3)(a) also does two things. First it confers compulsory jurisdiction over, and I'll
21 quote, "Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention with regard to
22 fisheries..." But second, it exempts coastal States from any obligation to accept compulsory
23 jurisdiction over "any dispute relating to its sovereign rights with respect to the living
24 resources in the Exclusive Economic Zone or their exercise..." Put simply, high seas fisheries
25 disputes are within compulsory jurisdiction, EEZ living resources, quite deliberately, are not.

1 48. The article then goes on to specify that the exclusion of jurisdiction covers, among other
2 things:

- 3 • the coastal State's discretionary powers for determining the allowable catch in the EEZ
- 4 • its harvesting capacity in the EEZ
- 5 • the allocation of surplus EEZ stocks to other States
- 6 • and the terms and conditions for conservation and management of living resources in the EEZ

7 Those are all excluded from compulsory jurisdiction.

8 49. In limited circumstances an EEZ living resources dispute may be submitted to compulsory
9 conciliation under Article 297(3)(b), and I will come back to that a later on, but that merely
10 emphasises that Article 297(3)(a) provides and was intended to provide almost complete
11 exclusion from the jurisdiction of an UNCLOS court or tribunal. But I will return to that, as I
12 indicated.

13 50. But you will notice firstly that the exclusion from jurisdiction is broader than the inclusion.
14 Fish are living resources, but not all living resources are fish. So it follows that while in
15 principle there is jurisdiction over a fisheries dispute, this does not extend to a dispute that
16 relates to other types of marine living resource. Thus, even if it were right about jurisdiction
17 over access to EEZ fish stocks, Mauritius cannot use Part XV proceedings to challenge an
18 MPA insofar as it relates to conservation and management of living resources other than fish.
19 Mauritius has not argued that coral reefs or endangered species are not living resources for the
20 purpose of Article 297(3)(a) – and indeed it would be impossible to do so. So, for that reason
21 its claim against the declaration of the Marine Protected Area, we would say, must be
22 dismissed..

23 51. But, secondly, you will also notice that the coastal State's powers to conserve and manage fish
24 stocks and other living resources within the EEZ are effectively put beyond the jurisdiction of
25 an UNCLOS tribunal by the very broad terms of Article 297(3)(a). The detailed terms of that

1 article in effect leave coastal States free to set the allowable catch at zero, to refuse other States
2 access to any surplus stocks, and to set their own terms and conditions for conservation and
3 management of fish stocks and other living resources in the EEZ. And those are exactly the
4 powers used by the United Kingdom when it banned commercial fishing in the MPA. It was
5 thereby exercising its sovereign rights in the EEZ. If there is any remedy, it lies in compulsory
6 conciliation under Article 297(3)(b). Again, I'll come back to that.

7 52. So, if you are satisfied that a ban on commercial fishing in the MPA falls within the second
8 limb of Article 297(3)(a) [i.e. the jurisdictional exclusion] that should be sufficient to dispose
9 of Mauritius' claim that you have jurisdiction over that part of the dispute.

10 53. Mauritius has two responses to this seemingly decisive obstacle. First, it argues that many
11 negotiating States at the UNCLOS III conference did not want to exclude fisheries disputes
12 from compulsory jurisdiction and that they therefore favoured a narrow reading of Article
13 297(3)(a). Second, Mauritius also says that the environmental purpose of the MPA precludes it
14 from being a dispute relating to living resources for the purposes of that article.

15 54. Neither argument is persuasive. Article 297(3)(a) is unambiguous and there is no basis for
16 looking beyond its clear terms. But in any case the negotiating record simply does not support
17 Mauritius. As we all know the 1982 Convention was negotiated by consensus as a package
18 deal. Many States put forward different positions on various issues, including EEZ fisheries
19 disputes, and Mauritius cites some States that wanted those disputes to be included within
20 compulsory jurisdiction. And we have cited other States who advocated the opposite
21 position.³³

22 55. At UNCLOS III, Mauritius strongly favoured excluding fisheries disputes – Exclusive
23 Economic Zone fisheries disputes – from compulsory jurisdiction. Here is what the Mauritian
24 delegate, Mr. Gayan, said during the 62nd session: “the reasons for not having a compulsory

³³ UKR, para 7.8.

1 procedure for dispute settlement in areas of national jurisdiction were overwhelming”. “Were
2 that to happen, needless tension and bad feeling would be created among neighbouring States.”
3 He was very prescient, Mr. Gayan. Coastal States, he said, “should be the only competent
4 forums for the settlement of [EEZ disputes]”: and “the principle was intrinsic to the basic
5 notion of State sovereignty”.³⁴

6 56. Many other States were also of the view that disputes relating to the exercise of sovereign
7 rights in the EEZ should not be subject to compulsory judicial settlement or arbitration. Again,
8 I can quote the delegate from Madagascar – these are all set out in the Rejoinder. That
9 delegate was a certain Dr. Raymond Ranjeva, who I'm sure many people in this room will
10 know, and he made the same argument as the Mauritian delegate. He said, “the only matters
11 not amenable to dispute settlement procedures were those falling within the exclusive
12 competence of the State in question.” Well, I might note in passing that the powers exercised
13 by the United Kingdom with regard to the BIOT MPA are powers which fall within its
14 exclusive competence. Such disputes, Dr. Ranjeva said, “would fall within the jurisdiction of
15 the coastal State, and not that of the machinery for the settlement of disputes”.³⁵

16 57. Until the final vote on adoption of the text, the UNCLOS III negotiations had proceeded on a
17 consensus basis. So the text thus represents a compromise which no negotiating State,
18 including Mauritius, opposed during its elaboration. It is this text of the Convention which has
19 to be interpreted, in accordance with its ordinary meaning and taking into account the context
20 in which it was negotiated. To start reinterpreting UNCLOS by reference to the views of some
21 States rather than by reference to the ordinary meaning of the text would quickly unravel the

³⁴ UNCLOS III, Summary Records of the 57th-65th Plenary Sessions, Official Records Vol. V, UN Docs. A/Conf.62/SR.57-65, 62nd Meeting, pp. 36-37, para. 10.

³⁵ UNCLOS III, Summary Records of the 57th-65th Plenary Sessions, Official Records Vol. V, UN Docs. A/Conf.62/SR.57-65, 61st Meeting, pp. 33-4, para. 43.

1 whole Convention. It is fundamentally misguided. But in any event, reference to *travaux*
2 *préparatoires* of this kind simply cannot help Mauritius, for two obvious reasons.

3 58. First, *travaux préparatoires* are only relevant when the ordinary meaning is “ambiguous or
4 obscure”, or when it would produce a result which is “manifestly absurd or unreasonable”³⁶.

5 Well, there is nothing ambiguous or obscure about the ordinary meaning of Article 297(3)(a),
6 nor is the exclusion from jurisdiction of disputes relating to living resources manifestly absurd
7 or unreasonable. The reasons for that exclusion were well known in the 1970s, are set out in the
8 records and they remain as valid and powerful today as they were in 1980 or 1982. They were
9 in fact reiterated in 1995 when the UN Fish Stocks Agreement was adopted and it incorporates
10 exactly the same provisions on dispute settlement as UNCLOS.

11 59. Second, the views of States arguing for or against any particular position cannot be decisive
12 when interpreting an agreed text. Such material is only useful if it provides clear confirmation
13 of the meaning of that text³⁷. The contradictory material which both parties have cited in their
14 written pleadings does not confirm any particular reading of Article 297(3)(a). On the contrary,
15 it confirms that the text finally adopted represents a compromise between several competing
16 visions, and it is that compromise which must be interpreted and applied here.

17 60. Mauritius’ other response to the logic of Article 297(3)(a) is to argue that the dispute is an
18 environmental one within Article 297(1)(c) and that so long as you have jurisdiction under that
19 article, you can ignore Article 297(3). I have already explained why Article 297(1)(c) cannot
20 give you jurisdiction over this dispute.

³⁶ 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Article 32.

³⁷ See *Maritime Dispute (Peru/Chile)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2014, paras. 65-66 (UKR Authority 18); *Sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan (Indonesia/Malaysia)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2002, p. 625 (UKR Authority 11), para. 53; *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain (Qatar v. Bahrain)*, Jurisdiction and Admissibility, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1995, p. 6 (UKR Authority 5), para. 40; *Territorial Dispute (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya/Chad)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1994, p. 6, para. 55, (UKCM Authority 12).

1 61. But let's assume momentarily, and merely for the sake of argument, the implausible hypothesis
2 that Mauritius persuades you that Article 297(1)(c) might possibly give you a more extensive
3 jurisdiction over environmental disputes than the wording allows. The question then is whether
4 a dispute which indisputably involves conservation and management of fish and other living
5 resources can be extracted from Article 297(3)(a) and relocated to this more environmentally
6 friendly version of Article 297(1)(c), the one imagined by Mauritius and relocated merely
7 because the MPA has a broadly defined environmental purpose.

8 62. The answer in our view is still no, the dispute cannot be extracted from Article 297(3)(a). And
9 the environmental purpose of the MPA and the ban on fishing are irrelevant to the
10 unambiguous wording and scope of that article. Why would the purpose of the fishing ban
11 remove the dispute from the exclusion provided by Article 297(3)(a), even if that purpose is
12 one of protecting and preserving the marine environment? We can characterise the ban on
13 fishing in the MPA as “environmental,” but it does not follow that it therefore ceases to be
14 about conservation and management of living resources, or that the environmental purpose
15 prevails over the conservation and management purpose for jurisdictional purposes, or that it
16 falls outside the very broad terms of Article 297(3)(a) as I've already explained.

17 63. On the contrary, almost any modern fisheries conservation and management measure will
18 serve the multiple objectives described above. In our Rejoinder we explain at some length that
19 the UN Fish Stocks Agreement of 1995 has environmental objectives. Indeed it has even
20 been described as the first “environmental” agreement relating to fisheries conservation and
21 management in the literature.³⁸ But does that mean that EEZ fisheries disputes are now outside
22 the Article 297(3)(a) and inside compulsory jurisdiction under Article 297(1)(c)? Even on
23 Mauritius’ reading of Article 297(1)(c) we would say no. The parties to the Fish Stocks
24 Agreement would be very surprised if the answer was yes.

³⁸ UKR, fn. 609 (para. 7.51)..

1 64. Mauritius' argument ignores the obvious point that jurisdiction over disputes relating to
2 fisheries is established, expressly, by the opening line of Article 297(3)(a), not by Article
3 297(1)(c), which makes no reference to fisheries. Even if Article 297(1)(c) somehow
4 represents the general principle on jurisdiction over all environmentally-related disputes,
5 which we say it does not, Article 297(3)(a) obviously represents the exception to that principle
6 with respect to disputes about conservation and management of living resources in the EEZ.
7 And if disputes concerning conservation and management of living resources in the Exclusive
8 Economic Zone are within the exception provided by Article 297(3)(a), then Mauritius'
9 argument gets it nowhere, however broadly we construe Article 297(1)(c). So, even if you
10 want to be progressive, even if you want to be evolutionary, we would still say that fisheries
11 disputes, that disputes concerning the conservation management of marine living resources,
12 are extracted from or fall outside your jurisdiction by virtue of Article 297(3)(a).

13 65. The exclusion from compulsory jurisdiction under that article is very broad. It applies to
14 "any" disputes with respect to "living resources" and we would say that includes conservation
15 and management of biodiversity, with coral reefs, endangered by-catch species, as well as
16 commercial fish stocks. All of these are "living resources" in the terms of that article³⁹, whose
17 "conservation and management" fall within the "sovereign rights" and "discretionary powers"
18 of the "coastal State", i.e. the United Kingdom. In our submission a ban on fishing aimed in
19 part at conservation of fish stocks and in part at protecting other living resources falls squarely
20 and unambiguously within the exclusion provided by Article 297(3)(a) and the fact that it may
21 have "environmental" purposes is irrelevant.

22 66. Moreover the conclusion that you have no jurisdiction over conservation and management of
23 the EEZ living resources or fish stocks is entirely consistent with the UNCLOS negotiating

³⁹ See *United States – Import Prohibition of Certain Shrimp and Shrimp Products*, WTO WT/DS58/AB/R (1998), paras. 130-131, where turtles and biological resources are treated as "living resources" (**UKR Authority 8**)

1 record. The Virginia Commentary sets out clearly the reasoning which led to the exclusion of
2 EEZ fisheries and living resources disputes from compulsory jurisdiction. Let me refer you to
3 the Commentary for Article 297. The relevant pages are Authority 85 in the
4 Counter-Memorial, but I will read the very brief key passages.

5 67. The very first paragraph notes: “The acceptance by many participants in the Third UNCLOS of
6 the provisions for the settlement of disputes was, from the very beginning, conditioned on the
7 exclusion of certain issues from the obligation to submit them to a procedure entailing a
8 binding decision.” And the Commentary goes on then to show how successive drafts of the
9 Convention all excluded in some form or another disputes arising out of the exercise of
10 discretionary powers and sovereign rights in the EEZ.

11 68. The final draft convention contained what is now Article 297(3). The Commentary notes in
12 this respect that it says: “Disputes relating to marine scientific research and fisheries were
13 divided into three categories: those that would remain subject to adjudication, those that would
14 be completely excluded from adjudication.... and those that would be subject to compulsory
15 conciliation.”⁴⁰ It then says: “to the second group” – that’s those excluded from adjudication –
16 “belong primarily disputes relating to the exercise by a coastal State of those powers with
17 respect to which the substantive provisions of the Convention granted such State complete
18 discretion.”⁴¹

19 69. And it is to that second group that the powers exercised by the United Kingdom in relation to
20 the BIOT MPA belong. And what this shows is that the argument made by Mauritius with
21 respect to Article 297(3)(a), like its argument under Article 297(1)(c), wholly lacks support in
22 the Commentary, in the *travaux*, in the wording of the Convention, or, indeed, in the
23 jurisprudence.

⁴⁰ At para. 297.19, UKCM Authority 85, p. 5230 (MS page numbering).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

1 70. Mr. President, members of the tribunal. In advocating an evolutionary and environmental
2 interpretation of Article 297 Mauritius invites you to overturn a clear policy preference of the
3 negotiating States at UNCLOS III, a preference reiterated and endorsed in 1995 when the UN
4 Fish Stocks Agreement adopted and incorporated exactly the same dispute settlement
5 provisions, mutatis mutandis. As such Mauritius is challenging both the consensus of States
6 parties and the inter-related package deal on which the Convention text rests. And this is
7 exactly, we would say, the kind of unilateral challenge to the Convention that the dispute
8 settlement machinery was designed to prevent, not to promote.

9 71. Counsel opposite have drawn attention to some of my writings on this subject. I would
10 normally not do so myself, and I have made no mention of theirs. But in the circumstances it
11 may be appropriate merely to point out that my 1997 ICLQ article takes exactly the same view
12 of fisheries disputes and Article 297(3)(a) as I have articulated before you this morning, and
13 Mauritius has not identified a single writer who takes a different view.

14 Mr. President, I could offer you a break at this point or I could carry on until about
15 12 o'clock. I'm in your hands.

16 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, do you have questions?

17 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Yes. Professor Boyle. May I ask you a general
18 question on the interpretation of Article 297, and I raise that question to really full understand your
19 reasoning. The question I'm raising is on Article 297 in connection with Article 56 of the
20 Convention, which is not too astonishing.

21 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

22 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: May I draw your attention, Professor Boyle, to
23 Article 56(1)(b)(iii).

24 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

1 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: There is a reference to the jurisdiction, I take it
2 from the first line, of the coastal State concerning the Protection and Preservation of the marine
3 environment.

4 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

5 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Let us now turn to Article 297(1)(c).

6 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

7 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: In your interpretation, if I followed you correctly –
8 and please correct me – this is providing jurisdiction only for disputes when it is alleged that the
9 coastal States has violated international rules or standards in connection or concerning the
10 Protection of the Marine Environment.

11 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

12 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: What do we do with disputes which don't allege the
13 violation of international rules and standards but of the Law of the Sea Convention? Is that not
14 covered by (1)(c)? Is that, so to speak, an area where the coastal State may take whatever measure
15 without or perhaps being challenged by dispute-settlement procedure? That's the first question.
16 In my view, I always thought that 297 has to reflect 56, but if you give (1)(c) a very narrow
17 reading, then there may be gaps at the end of the day.

18 I have a second question.

19 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Well, could I perhaps answer the first question –

20 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: No, no – let me – and take your time.

21 I would rather also bring up a second question at that moment. It's much easier to answer
22 probably. Let us now turn to 297(3)(a). Perhaps I have not followed you with sufficient
23 attention, but, in my view, 3(a) consists of two different parts, the first ending roughly at the third
24 line or something, with Section 2, and then it continues, "except that." Therefore, we have a
25 general indication there is jurisdiction in cases of dispute, but this is not so for the second part of

1 that particular sentence, which is referring to – (unclear) is not going to accept submission to such
2 resources, Exclusive Economic Zone, then there comes a couple of example, allowable catch,
3 harvesting capacity, et cetera, and then establishment in its conservation and management, laws
4 and regulations. I assume that was your main point, the last part.

5 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes.

6 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: For we have no dealing with surplus, trade
7 (unclear) .

8 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes, but I'll do my best.

9 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Now, may I ask you whether this latter part of
10 297(3)(a) refers to everything done in the – concerning the conservation and management of living
11 resources or does it only refer to activities of the coastal State under Article 61 and 62? Here
12 again my question is: The correlation between 297(3)(a) and the competences of the coastal
13 State, as outlined in Part V.

14 PROFESSOR BOYLE: I understand your point.

15 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Thank you.

16 PROFESSOR BOYLE: And it's a good one. And, if I may, I'll simply treat those
17 as one question because I think the two go together.

18 My understanding of this has always been that there is a correlation between
19 56(1)(a) and 297(3), and there is a correlation between 56(1)(b)(3) and 297(1)(c). And if we take
20 protection and preservation of the marine environment, I would interpret that as, in substance, a
21 reference part XII of the Convention, which is headed: Protection, Preservation, of the Marine – so
22 it's, in substance, about rules on pollution. You could broaden that a little bit, but I would suggest
23 that however broadly you want to read it, it simply doesn't include conservation and sustainable
24 use of living resources, which seem to me to fall within 56(1)(a) and, therefore, in jurisdictional
25 terms, in 297(3).

1 Now, there is obviously a deliberate distinction here. It is going to be much easier to challenge
2 coastal State laws that regulate pollution or that interfere with navigation. In substance, if you
3 want to ban, shall we say, single hull oil tankers from navigation in your EEZ, then you need to be
4 able to demonstrate that that's consistent with international rules and standards. You just can't do
5 it unilaterally. So you've got to be able to show the IMO has banned single hull oil tankers, or if
6 you want to ban any discharge of pollution in your EEZ, you're again going to have to show that
7 that's allowed for by the MARPOL Convention, which in some situations it might be.

8 So, what the articles are trying to do is to ensure that if the coastal State regulates
9 pollution excessively, that it can be taken to court, and that will be subject to compulsory
10 jurisdiction in order to protect freedom of navigation, which is one of the key issues that the
11 dispute settlement section was designed to protect.

12 Now, I would say, and I think this is entirely consistent with the negotiating record,
13 that there was a great deal of concern that having created the Exclusive Economic Zone, having
14 given extensive powers to manage and conserve and exploit fish stocks and living resources in the
15 Exclusive Economic Zone to coastal States, taking those away from distant water fishing nations,
16 who were not happy with this outcome, as we all know. This was a major battle in the Law of the
17 Sea in the 1970s, and the outcome was very much beneficial to coastal States, many of them
18 Developing States without fisheries of their own, and many of them were deeply concerned with
19 the possibility that if they were then subjected to compulsory jurisdiction over fisheries disputes,
20 they would effectively be bullied by the same distant water fishing States that had been bullying
21 them previously.

22 And the object of this whole provision, particularly 297(3), is to keep coastal State
23 fisheries disputes out of court as far as possible. That's what coastal States wanted, particularly
24 Developing States, when they asked for creation of the Exclusive Economic Zone.

1 I hope that's an answer to your question. It might be that you could probably parse
2 very minute gaps between this and that, and clearly the negotiation of a convention of this
3 complexity over such a long time, the wording doesn't always quite match up, like the maritime
4 boundary between England and Scotland which doesn't quite match up either, but don't tell any
5 fishermen. It may not match up, but I think the differences you're going to find are extremely
6 small, and the message which I've always taken from 297(3), indeed, this is what I was taught by
7 those who taught me Law of the Sea, is that 297(3) takes EEZ fishery disputes out of compulsory
8 jurisdiction – full stop.

9 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Thank you.

10 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Professor Boyle, I think this might now be a
11 convenient point at which to take the short break, and we will be back at 12 noon.

12 Thank you.

13 (Brief recess.)

14 **E. Jurisdiction over Mauritius' claims with respect to straddling and highly migratory fish**
15 **stocks**

16 72. Mr. President, I can now deal much more briefly with the remaining aspects of Mauritius's
17 claims, and I'll begin with articles 63 and 64 of UNCLOS and article 7 of the Fish Stocks
18 Agreement. Here essentially Mauritius claims that when adopting the MPA the United
19 Kingdom failed in its duty to cooperate with or to consult Mauritius and the Indian Ocean Tuna
20 Commission⁴². For all the reasons that I've already addressed, we would say that these
21 articles on cooperation are not “specified international rules and standards for the protection
22 and preservation of the marine environment.” So Article 297(1)(c), we would say, cannot
23 provide a jurisdictional foundation for them.

⁴² MM, paras. 7.63-4.

1 73. Nor, I would suggest, can Article 297(3)(a) provide you with jurisdiction. The most obvious
2 reason is that Mauritius is again challenging the discretionary exercise by the coastal State of
3 its sovereign rights over living resources, “the allocation of surpluses” and “the terms and
4 conditions established in its conservation and management laws and regulations”. So, as such
5 that dispute is excluded by Article 297(3)(a) from compulsory jurisdiction.

6 74. To argue as Mauritius does that the fish stocks occur in the fisheries zones of both States would
7 not change that conclusion, even if it were true. As we pointed out in the Rejoinder, on four
8 separate occasions in their judgment the *Barbados/Trinidad*, the arbitral tribunal found that
9 disputes about straddling fish stocks in adjacent EEZs were outside their jurisdiction.⁴³

10 75. Quoting from the judgment, the Tribunal said “Disputes over such rights and duties fall outside
11 the jurisdiction of this Tribunal because Article 297(3)(a) stipulates that a coastal State is not
12 obliged to submit to the jurisdiction of an Annex VII Tribunal ‘any dispute relating to [the
13 coastal State’s] sovereign rights with respect to the living resources in the Exclusive Economic
14 Zone’.

15 76. But, unlike Trinidad and Tobago and Barbados, BIOT and the Mauritius fisheries zones are, at
16 their closest point, over 500 miles apart, so article 63 would be applicable only if Mauritian
17 vessels fished for straddling stocks in waters adjacent to the BIOT MPA, and article 64 would
18 be applicable only if it fished for highly migratory species in the same region.

19 77. As we also pointed out in the Counter-Memorial and the Rejoinder, there is no evidence that
20 Mauritius does. Mauritius’ own national report to the Tuna Commission in 2011 indicated that
21 there were four Mauritian fishing vessels targeting swordfish and tuna between 12⁰ and 23⁰
22 south latitudes and longitudes 52⁰ and 63⁰ east⁴⁴. And hopefully there is a map coming on the
23 screen right now. The report notes that Mauritius concentrates on fish processing and issues

⁴³ UKR, paras 7.15-17.

⁴⁴ IOTC, *Mauritius National Report to the Scientific Committee of the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission*, 2012, IOTC–2012–SC15–NR18 Rev 1, Executive Summary, p. 2. (UKCM, Annex 130)

1 licences for foreign boats to fish in its Exclusive Economic Zone, and you will find that report
2 at Annex 130 of the Counter-Memorial. The coordinates referred to in that report are shown on
3 screen now – they are the larger of the two red boxes, which you see down in the left-hand – I
4 should say the southwest corner of the map. It's obvious they are far to the southwest of the
5 BIOT MPA.

6 78. The most recent IOTC Scientific Committee report, the one for 2013, is available online.⁴⁵

7 You will find the entry for Mauritius – that's page 64 – at Tab 59 in your folders. It sets out in
8 summary the totality of Mauritian fishing for that year. The fishing areas were between
9 latitudes 9°S and 26°S and longitudes 56°E and 62°E. That is the small red box on the screen,
10 and, again, it's nowhere near BIOT. There is also reference in the report to Mauritian coastal
11 fishing around fish aggregation devices. Anticipating a possible question, these devices are
12 stationary. They facilitate the catching of tuna, but they also facilitate catching juvenile fish,
13 and they are particularly harmful to sharks, turtles and other large non-target species.⁴⁶

14 79. But we would say that what Mauritius has the burden of proving if it's to bring a claim under
15 these articles is that Mauritian vessels fish in high seas areas adjacent to the BIOT MPA or in
16 the same region. And unless it can do so it has no standing to invoke a dispute under either of
17 those articles. And the evidence of fish catches which it offers in the Reply⁴⁷ relates only to
18 fishing within waters of BIOT and is irrelevant to the application of article 63 or 64.

19 80. Second, if there is a dispute about cooperation with the IOTC under either of those articles or
20 under the Fish Stocks Agreement article 7, that dispute is one which bears directly on the
21 participation and the conduct of both States in the IOTC. In accordance with articles 2(3) and
22 56(2) Mauritius itself argues that UNCLOS parties are required to exercise their respective

⁴⁵ IOTC, *Report of the Sixteenth Session of the Scientific Committee*, IOTC–2013–SC16–R[E], p. 64 UKAF, Folder 2, Tab 59.

⁴⁶ Bureau of Rural Sciences, *A Review of the impact of fish aggregating devices (FADs) on tuna fisheries* (Canberra, <http://data.daff.gov.au/brs/brsShop/data/PC12777.pdf>), see esp. p. 3 and section 6.4.”

⁴⁷ MR, p. 61.

1 rights and responsibilities in the territorial sea and in the EEZ “subject to” or “with due regard
2 to” the rights of other States. We would say that must include the rights of all parties to the
3 IOTC Agreement. Following the logic of Mauritius’ own argument, the IOTC Agreement is
4 applicable law in these proceedings in accordance with Article 293.

5 81. So I would draw your attention therefore to Article XXIII of the IOTC Agreement. You will
6 note that article says that any dispute regarding interpretation or application of the agreement
7 “shall be referred for settlement to a conciliation commission procedure.” And we would
8 suggest that if Mauritius wishes to complain about a lack of cooperation by the United
9 Kingdom with the IOTC, it must first use the conciliation procedure envisaged by article XXIII
10 of the IOTC Agreement, failing which the parties may then resort to the ICJ or any other
11 agreed procedure, including the procedures agreed under Part XV of UNCLOS. Mauritius has
12 made no attempt to invoke the article XXIII conciliation procedure.

13 82. UNCLOS dispute settlement is of course residual in character; that is it defers to any other
14 method of dispute settlement chosen by the parties. And in accordance with articles 281 and
15 282 an Annex VII tribunal will have no jurisdiction if the terms of those articles are satisfied.

16 83. Article 282 excludes resort to dispute settlement where there is an alternative procedure
17 involving a binding decision.

18 84. Alternatively, if article XXIII of the IOTC agreement does not satisfy the requirements of
19 Article 282, we would suggest that it will satisfy the requirements of Article 281 as interpreted
20 and applied in the *Bluefin Tuna Case*. That decision, you will recall, concludes that “the intent
21 of the dispute settlement provision of the Bluefin Tuna Convention is to remove proceedings
22 under that Article from the reach of the compulsory procedures of section 2 Part XV of
23 UNCLOS, that is, to exclude the application to a specific dispute of any procedure of dispute
24 resolution not accepted by the parties to the dispute.”

1 85. But we would say that if Article XXIII of the Tuna Commission Agreement falls within the
2 terms of Article 282, then *a fortiori* the Tribunal has no jurisdiction, but with respect to Article
3 281 the reasoning of *Bluefin Tuna* is equally applicable. Either way, it follows that Mauritius
4 must proceed to conciliation under the terms of the IOTC agreement and not to arbitration
5 under UNCLOS Part XV.

6 That brings me, and again, very briefly, to jurisdiction over fisheries access disputes under articles
7 2(3) and 56(2).

8 **F. Jurisdiction over fisheries access under articles 2(3) and 56(2)**

9 86. Mauritius' argument for jurisdiction over its claim to fish in the territorial sea amounts to no
10 more than saying that nothing in Article 297 excludes it. With respect it is not quite so simple.

11 87. Mauritius' claim to fish both in the territorial sea and elsewhere in the MPA rests on the
12 agreement which it claims the parties reached in 1965. That alleged agreement makes no
13 provision for dispute settlement. And our straightforward response is that a dispute concerning
14 the status and interpretation of a fisheries access agreement is not a dispute concerning
15 interpretation and application of UNCLOS unless there is a provision for dispute settlement
16 meeting the terms of Article 288(2) of UNCLOS.

17 88. And both parties agree that there is no such provision in the alleged agreement reached in 1965.
18 And we would say that is decisive of the point; it deprives you of jurisdiction both with respect
19 to fishing in the territorial sea, and fishing elsewhere in the Marine Protected Area. Mauritius
20 says the point is irrelevant because the alleged access agreement is incorporated into the
21 Convention via articles 2(3) and 56(2). For that reason they say it is within your jurisdiction
22 to interpret and apply those articles thus reinterpreted.

23 89. But with respect to EEZ fish stocks, the logic of article 62, which is the article on access to fish
24 stocks in the EEZ, combined with Article 297(3) on fisheries disputes, is that an agreement on

1 access to EEZ stocks is, we would say, subject to compulsory jurisdiction only if it so provides
2 in accordance with Article 288(2).

3 90. Mauritius' contrary view based on article 56(2) would surprise the many developing countries
4 in Africa and the Pacific that have opened their EEZs to foreign fishing pursuant to article 62.
5 It would leave them vulnerable to compulsory dispute settlement even if their access
6 agreements make no provision to that effect. And we would say therefore that Mauritius'
7 interpretation of article 56(2) is incompatible with the Convention and with the State practice
8 under fisheries access agreements.

9 91. As regards the territorial sea, not surprisingly, there is no provision of UNCLOS which
10 expressly regulates foreign fishing in the territorial sea and there is no provision which
11 expressly provides for, or excludes, jurisdiction over disputes relating to fish stocks in the
12 territorial sea. On the face of it, why would you make such provision? The coastal State has
13 sovereignty in the territorial sea, subject only to a right of innocent passage. Foreign fishing
14 vessels have no right of access to the territorial sea save by agreement of the coastal State and
15 that has always been true. Why would the drafters of UNCLOS say anything about territorial
16 sea fisheries disputes?

17 92. Article 2(3) provides only that sovereignty in the territorial sea is exercised "subject to the
18 Convention." We say that also means subject to the Convention's provisions on fisheries
19 access disputes, including Article 288(2). The obvious inference is that any agreement on
20 access to territorial sea fisheries must likewise provide for dispute settlement if it is to fall
21 within UNCLOS compulsory jurisdiction. And a fortiori there must be an agreement. Well, of
22 course we say there is no agreement, but both Parties do agree that if there is, it doesn't provide
23 for dispute settlement. But either way, we would suggest there is no jurisdiction under Article
24 288(2) over fishing in the territorial sea.

1 93. Mauritius attempts to evade these points by again incorporating its alleged access agreement
2 within Article 2(3) and then relying on Article 288(1) for jurisdiction, but this is as flawed in
3 this context as it was under article 56. We say that whether the alleged agreement is viewed
4 separately from Article 2(3) or as part of Article 2(3), there must still be provision for dispute
5 settlement in accordance with Article 288(2) in order for that dispute about a fisheries access
6 agreement to fall within Part XV jurisdiction. And we would say that accordingly there is
7 therefore no jurisdiction under Article 288 (1).

8 94. Of course, we would also observe, and I will come back to this this afternoon - we're not going
9 to get away from article 56 - but we would observe that article 56(2) is of course different from
10 Article 2(3). It merely talks about having "due regard" for the rights of other States and acting
11 "in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention". Now, in our view, having
12 "due regard" means what it says: It means take account of, give consideration to, do not
13 ignore. The Virginia Commentary notes that: "The significance of this provision [art 56(2)] is
14 that it balances the rights, jurisdiction and duties of the coastal State with the rights and duties
15 of other States in the Exclusive Economic Zone."⁴⁸

16 95. And the key word here is "balances". Article 56(2) is concerned in particular with balancing
17 the sovereign rights of the coastal State with the freedoms of navigation and other article 58
18 freedoms exercisable by other States in the Exclusive Economic Zone. If there are good
19 reasons for overriding the rights of other States in the EEZ, then article 56(2) allows that, and
20 indeed that is expressly confirmed by article 58(3). And for that reason it cannot be read in
21 clinical isolation from its context.

22 96. Now, in the present context articles 61 and 62 are the most relevant provisions, and Mauritius
23 has said almost nothing about those two articles. Well, we would say that article 62 gives the
24 coastal State ample power to regulate and terminate foreign fishing rights in the Exclusive

⁴⁸ *UNCLOS Commentary 1982*, vol. II, p. 543.

1 Economic Zone on conservation grounds. And we would say that Article 297(3)(a) leaves that
2 judgment exclusively to the coastal State, subject only to conciliation in cases of arbitrariness
3 or abuse. What is missing from Mauritius' reading of article 56(2) is any sense of a coherent
4 relationship between that article and articles 58(3), 61, 62, and 297(3).

5 97. And that leads me to the obvious conclusion on jurisdiction over this element of the dispute.

6 Mauritius and the United Kingdom never agreed any mechanism to settle disputes with respect
7 to Mauritian fishing in the territorial sea or in the waters out to 200 nm, and UNCLOS Part XV
8 cannot now be invoked to solve that omission or the legal consequences that flow from it. That
9 conclusion is consistent with the terms of section 2 of part XV, and it ensures, as Mauritius'
10 does not, coherence and consistency between the treatment of the territorial sea and the EEZ
11 fisheries access disputes. In both cases, we would argue, a Part XV court or tribunal will only
12 have jurisdiction over that access dispute only insofar as the parties to the access agreement
13 have provided accordingly.

14 98. And this not an absurd or unreasonable conclusion. On the contrary, there would have been
15 little point in negotiating a complex and balanced fisheries regime for the EEZ, with specific
16 rules on jurisdiction designed to protect the coastal State's sovereign rights from litigation by
17 distant-water fishing States, if that regime could then be undermined via claims to fish in the
18 territorial sea. And to hold that you have jurisdiction over territorial sea fishing while you have
19 none over EEZ fishing truly would be an absurd and unreasonable conclusion.

20 That brings me to jurisdiction over claims with regard to the continental shelf.

21 **G. Jurisdiction over continental shelf claims**

22 99. Mauritius claims the Marine Protected Area contravenes its alleged right to seabed minerals
23 and sedentary species. It invokes article 78 of the Convention. The United Kingdom of
24 course does not accept that Mauritius has any right – any current right – to exploit continental
25 shelf resources within the MPA, nor does it accept that such a claim involves interpretation or

1 application of the Convention. At best this claim, it seems to us, requires interpretation of the
2 understanding reached in 1965, an issue that falls outside the scope of your jurisdiction under
3 Article 288 of the Convention for reasons already explained.

4 100. In any case, as pointed out in the Counter-Memorial, the MPA has no bearing on the
5 exploitation and exploitation of seabed minerals. It has not altered the longstanding policy of
6 not granting any licences for exploration or exploitation of the seabed. Mauritius has not
7 explained how the creation of an MPA or the ban on commercial fishing can have interfered
8 with the oil and mineral rights which it claims to have.

9 101. Mauritius offers no evidence that its nationals have ever harvested sedentary species in the
10 MPA. Even if it could be said that there is a dispute about those species, which we rather doubt,
11 it would not be a dispute about fisheries, as Mauritius contends⁴⁹, but a dispute about BIOT's
12 continental shelf resources. And it would not be about interpretation or application of
13 UNCLOS but about interpretation and application of the 1965 understanding. That too falls
14 outside your jurisdiction under Article 288.

15 I'm almost at the end. That brings me to article 194.

16 **H. Jurisdiction over Mauritius' article 194 claims**

17 102. I suppose for the sake of completeness, I should say something about this. The conclusion
18 is obvious. It too is outside your jurisdiction.

19 103. Mauritius relies on article 194 to advance a claim that essentially, if I understand it
20 correctly, future regulation of marine pollution in the Marine Protected Area may unjustifiably
21 interfere with its right to fish. It also argues that the United Kingdom must consult Mauritius in
22 order to harmonize its policies on marine pollution with those of Mauritius.

23 104. At present the MPA involves no new laws or policies on marine pollution. The laws
24 already in force when the MPA was created remain in force. Mauritius has never challenged

⁴⁹ MR, para 7.74.

1 the compatibility of those laws with UNCLOS, nor has it previously asserted that they violate
2 its claimed rights. Its case as outlined last week seemed to focus on the possibility that future
3 legislation on marine pollution might interfere with fishing.

4 105. It's a little difficult to identify a dispute here over which the tribunal could have
5 jurisdiction. And moreover, although article 194 is undoubtedly concerned with protection and
6 preservation of the marine environment, it does not constitute the "specified international rules
7 and standards" whose contravention comes within your jurisdiction under Article 297(1)(c),
8 for all the reasons I set out earlier, and it seems unnecessary, I think, to pursue this point any
9 further. There is manifestly no basis for jurisdiction.

10 That brings me to the last claim: Abuse of Rights.

11 **I. Abuse of Rights**

12 106. Mauritius accepted last week that this Tribunal would have jurisdiction over its abuse of
13 rights claim only to the extent that it already has jurisdiction over a dispute concerning other
14 provisions of the Convention. So, if Article 297(1)(c) does not give you jurisdiction over the
15 MPA declaration or the fishing ban, or if Article 297(3)(a) excludes jurisdiction, then there is
16 likewise no jurisdiction over the related article 300 claim.

17 107. But the relationship between jurisdiction over the merits of its case, and jurisdiction over
18 an article 300 claim, does not quite end there. It's a little more complicated than Mauritius may
19 have suggested. The core of Mauritius' case on abuse of rights is the denial of fishing rights,
20 and the Convention has its own special regime for abuse of rights claims in that context – that's
21 Article 297(3)(b). I said earlier this morning I would come back to that and now I am. Article
22 297(3)(b) mandates compulsory conciliation as the remedy for abuse of coastal State rights
23 over fishing.

24 108. Mauritius has said nothing about Article 297(3)(b). Compulsory conciliation was included
25 precisely in order to deal with abuse of rights by coastal States with respect to EEZ fisheries

1 access. So Article 297(3)(a) is not a complete withdrawal of any remedy because Article
2 297(3)(b) does make compulsory conciliation available, and it applies – as you will see now on
3 the screen - where the coastal State has, among other things, “arbitrarily refused” the request of
4 another State either to determine the total allowable catch or to allocate part of any surplus to
5 that State. Now, if, as Mauritius claims, the MPA has indeed been adopted for ulterior political
6 reasons – as it argued last week – if it is not justified on fisheries conservation grounds, then it
7 might well be that there is a case here for characterising the withdrawal of fishing licences and
8 the ban on commercial fishing as arbitrary. It's not for me to explore the parameters of that
9 case.

10 109. But Mauritius has not requested the determination of allowable catch for the BIOT Marine
11 Protected Area. It has not requested the allocation of any surplus. Presumably it is not
12 interested in conciliation for that purpose, or perhaps it is not interested in fishing. Either way,
13 it cannot then turn round and use article 300 to make what is essentially the same claim
14 concerning denial of fishing rights.

15 110. So, even if it had a good case on the merits of this claim, Mauritius cannot evade Article
16 297(3)(b) simply by repackaging that claim as one based on article 300. In our view, insofar as
17 its claims with regard to fishing rights have any substance – we don't think they do – the article
18 300 claim made by Mauritius falls within the confines of Article 297(3)(b) and is subject to
19 compulsory conciliation. It is therefore not within the jurisdiction of this tribunal.

20 111. Mr. President, members of the tribunal. Even by the standards of international litigation
21 Mauritius has presented a remarkably fragmented, disjointed and selective account of the
22 UNCLOS dispute settlement regime and its relationship to the substantive provisions of the
23 Convention. But the Law of the Sea Convention is not an à la carte meal. It is a package deal.
24 It has to be taken whole.

- 1 a. That concludes my arguments for this morning – no, it is the afternoon. I beg your pardon.
2 And that concludes my arguments for this part of the afternoon, and I therefore invite you to
3 hold first that: Mauritius’ claims with respect to articles 55, 56, 63, 64, 78, and 194 of
4 UNCLOS, and article 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement, are not within your jurisdiction under
5 Article 297(1)(c), and
6 b. that insofar as these claims relate to conservation and management of living resources of the
7 Exclusive Economic Zone they are removed from your jurisdiction over fisheries and living
8 resources by articles 297(3)(a) and (b), and
9 c. that Mauritius’ claims with respect to articles 2(3), 56(2) and 78 of UNCLOS are not within
10 your jurisdiction pursuant to Article 288(1), 288(2), or otherwise, and
11 d. that Mauritius’ claim under article 300 is not within your jurisdiction by virtue of Article
12 297(3)(b).

13 Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, thank you for listening. And I would ask you to call Mr.
14 Wordsworth to the podium.

15 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you very much, Professor Boyle.

16 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Unless I can assist any Member of the Tribunal.

17 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Are there any questions?

18 No.

19 Thank you very much.

20 **The 1965 understandings; alleged breach**
21 **of articles 2(3) and 56(2) UNCLOS with respect to the alleged fishing rights**

22 **Sam Wordsworth QC**

23 **A. Introduction**

24 63. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, we shift to the merits. I’m going to be
25 looking at some detail at Mauritius’ case that a series of binding undertakings were given by

1 the British Government in 1965, with a particular focus on the alleged undertaking with respect
2 to fishing rights, as that has come to occupy very considerable space in Mauritius' claims in
3 these proceedings.

4 64. The claim on fishing rights has, of course, to be made out by Mauritius at two levels: first, by
5 Mauritius establishing the existence of rights under international law arising pursuant to a
6 binding undertaking contained or reflected in the minutes of the meeting of 23 September
7 1965, or pursuant to alleged traditional fishing rights; and secondly, by establishing that the
8 declaration of the MPA cuts across the asserted fishing rights in such a way as to lead to
9 breach of Articles 2(3) and/or 56(2) of UNCLOS. And I'm going to be looking at the two
10 stages to the claim in that order, and Professor Boyle will then be coming back later this
11 afternoon to deal with the alleged breaches of UNCLOS on consultation, although, in fact, as
12 you may have picked up already, he is making some of the, or he is taking the running, the
13 principal running on the legal submissions on Article 56(2).

14 65. But, I should say at the outset that, as follows from a close look at the key documents, you
15 never get to the provisions of UNCLOS that are relied on, because there never was any
16 intention on the part of the United Kingdom to be bound by reference to what was and
17 always has been a non-binding understanding on fishing rights.

18 **B. The 1965 record**

19 66. I wish to start with the precise wording of the record of the meeting of 23 September 1965, as
20 that, as is agreed between the parties, reflects what was subsequently accepted by the
21 Mauritian Council of Ministers. We say of course that this record contains a series of
22 understandings, not legally binding obligations, while Mauritius argues the contrary. But,
23 and Mr. Reichler appeared to approve of this last week to some extent⁵⁰, we think that what
24 matters is not so much what labels are used, but what the wording in the record of 1965

⁵⁰ Transcript, Day 3, 256 to 257.

1 establishes, with a particular emphasis on the question of whether there was an intention to
2 be bound.

3 67. To that extent, we note that there was something faintly quixotic about Mauritius' arguments
4 last week, with Ms. Macdonald saying repeatedly on day 2 that what matters is not what
5 label has been used in the past by UK officials, but rather the reality⁵¹, and then Mr. Reichler
6 taking you by contrast to every internal document he could find to highlight where UK
7 officials had used the term 'undertaking' not 'understanding,' and, of course, he was asking
8 you to draw firm conclusions from the use of the former term.

9 68. Now, before I ask you to take up the 23rd September 1965 record with a particular eye to the
10 alleged undertaking on fishing rights, I wish first to recall the background to the meeting of
11 23 September, and this was as follows:

12 a. The fishing as of 1965 was limited to fishing for the domestic needs of the then inhabitants of
13 the islands. In that light, it is unsurprising that the issue of fishing rights appears to have
14 received only very limited attention in the exchanges between the British Government and the
15 Mauritian Council of Ministers.

16 Secondly – and Ms. Sander has taken you to the relevant facts and the relevant documents on all
17 these background points, so at this stage I'm not going to ask you to turn to any particular
18 documents, but I will give you the references in the Judges' Folder.

19 Secondly, the reference to fishing rights was a late addition to the text appearing only on 1st
20 October 1965. That's Tab 29 of our Judges' Folder. It was not a matter discussed on 23rd
21 September 1965, and you can see the original record at Tab 61 of our Judges' Folder. Rather, as
22 we saw, it was subsequently added into the record in light of the handwritten letter from Sir
23 Seewoosagur Ramgoolam on 1st October 1965.

⁵¹ Transcript day 2, page 82 lines 22-24, page 83 lines 3-4, and page 92 lines 20-22.

1 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, can we just be clear about
2 that. I was going to ask both Parties about this. I realize it may be impossible to answer this
3 question, but is your case that this was an amendment to what had been agreed put forward by Sir
4 Seewoosagur Ramgoolam at a later stage, or is it rather that he was seeking to correct the draft
5 minutes on the basis that he thought they didn't properly reflect what had been said at the meeting?
6 Since I presume everybody who attended the meeting is now dead and has been dead for some
7 time, I doubt we can answer this question, but I'd like to know how each Party puts that point.

8 MR. WORDSWORTH: I think to the extent that one can answer it, it's going to
9 have to be by reference to that manuscript note because we have virtually—well, as far as I'm
10 aware, we have nothing else that tells us what happened subsequent to the 23rd of September, so
11 far as concerns this point on fishing rights. That manuscript letter, I should say, rather than note,
12 it's at Tab 29 of your Judges' Folder, and I think in light of Judge Greenwood's question, I will have
13 to ask you to turn to that.

14 Sorry, I should have made clear. You've now got two volumes in our Judges'
15 Folder. I do apologize. This is Volume 1. I'm very sorry.

16 So, you see there at the top from Sir S. Ramgoolam, you will see underneath that,
17 underneath the address of the Strand Palace Hotel, I presume it's acknowledged in manuscript, it
18 looks to be on the same date. Dear Mr. Trafford Smith: "I and Mr. Mohamed have gone through
19 the enclosed papers on the question of Diego Garcia and another near island, i.e., two altogether,
20 and we wish to point out the amendment that should be effected to Page 4 of this document. The
21 matters to be added formed part of the original requirements submitted to H.M.G. We think that
22 these can be incorporated in any final agreement."

23 So, I think it's fair to characterize that what is happening here is that the original
24 record of 23rd September has been received by the Mauritian delegation. They've gone through
25 that record, and they've said no, we want to add something, and what they wanted to add – and they

1 are effectively, they say, to point out the amendment that should be effected, "the matters to be
2 added formed part of the original requirements submitted to H.M.G. These can be incorporated in
3 any final agreement." Well, of course, that makes sense because at this stage you're still, I think,
4 six, five weeks ahead of the acceptance of what is recorded in this document, the Agreement – in
5 fact, said in a very loose term – by the Mauritian Council of Ministers on 5th of November.

6 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Mr. Wordsworth, that's an important element.
7 Here there is a reference in this letter, this handwritten letter, to the original requirements. To
8 what does it refer to?

9 MR. WORDSWORTH: Judge, that refers back to the requirements as stated by
10 Mauritius on 30th of July 1965, and with your leave, perhaps I will take you to that, and that is Tab
11 30. So, in fact, it's the next tab.

12 Now, you can follow through, I think I can take you to a document which takes you
13 through the chronology of what is happening, and that establishes that the requirements that are
14 being referred to in the 1st of October can only be as stated here as 30th of October, and what you
15 will see there in Paragraph 2, the references to Ministers objecting to detachment which would be
16 unacceptable to public opinion in Mauritius, they therefore asked that you consider with sympathy
17 and understanding how UK, U.S. requirements might be reconciled with the long-term lease; e.g.,
18 for 99 years. That's not relevant for present purposes. They wished also the provision should be
19 made for safeguarding mineral rights to Mauritius and ensuring preference for Mauritius if fishing
20 or agricultural rights were ever granted. So, that is what the Mauritian delegation is seeking on
21 the 1st of October.

22 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, you said the 30th of October.
23 I think you meant the 30th of July. On the 1st of October they are referring back to the 30th of July.

24 MR. WORDSWORTH: Yes. That's exactly right.

1 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, this is again one of the points
2 I wanted to – to go back to the first question I asked, what you're saying is that, although we can't
3 be sure, Sir Seewoosagur was seeking to introduce on the 1st of October something that had not
4 been agreed on the 23rd of September. He wasn't simply trying to correct the minutes better to
5 reflect that discussion.

6 MR. WORDSWORTH: Well, no, I would actually put it slightly higher than that
7 because we can be sure that was not agreed on the 23rd of September.

8 So, if I can take you to a different annex – and I apologize for doing this, because
9 this is in Volume 2 – I will just double-check before I ask you to pick it up – yes. It's Volume 2 of
10 the Judges' Folder, Tab 61. Now, this is Annex 8 to the United Kingdom Rejoinder, and this is the
11 original minute, as we understand it, of the meeting on the afternoon of the 23rd of September, and
12 what you will see there is largely it's the same wording, so you'll recognize the wording in the
13 second paragraph; for example, Mr. Reichler very much focused on the sentence at the end of this
14 paragraph. "He had throughout done his best to ensure that whatever arrangements were agreed
15 should secure the maximum benefit for Mauritius." And my friend Mr. Reichler kept coming
16 back to that.

17 But you'll see that what follows is four paragraphs which doesn't include the
18 supposed binding undertaking on fishing rights, and then you'll see that this is set out in record
19 form, and if I can ask you to turn to the third page of this, you will see towards the bottom,
20 summing up the discussion, the Secretary of State asked whether he could inform his colleagues
21 that Dr. Ramgoolam, et cetera, were prepared to agree to the detachment of the Chagos
22 Archipelago on the understanding that he would recommend to his colleagues the following, and
23 there you see the original two, three, four, five and six, and then there is a seven which somebody
24 has added in manuscript, "amendments enclosed."

1 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: That could just be that Sir Seewoosagur
2 thought the draft minutes he had been sent didn't properly reflect what they had agreed on the 23rd
3 of September. What I'm trying to get at is this: Was the manuscript letter from the Strand Palace
4 Hotel an attempt to correct an otherwise deficient minute or an attempt to renegotiate the package,
5 albeit in a relatively restricted compass?

6 MR. WORDSWORTH: I think it's an extremely difficult question to answer from
7 the documents, as I understand them, because it's difficult to pick up pointers in the 1st of October
8 manuscript letter, so what I'd like to do is a little bit of homework over the lunch adjournment and
9 see if I can come back to help you on that.

10 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Thank you.

11 And while you're doing that, there is another question, which I was going to ask
12 anyway, and that is that the Tab 30, the letter you had just taken us to from the Governor, dated the
13 30th of July, which I think you entirely understand to be tied in to Sir Seewoosagur's letter of the
14 1st of October, this refers to ensuring preference for Mauritius if fishing rights were ever granted.
15 In other words, it seems to me to be looking to something that wasn't happening in 1965. Its
16 preference in relation to something that might be granted in the future, whereas other documents
17 talk about perpetuating a practice that already existed, and I must say it seems to me the
18 inconsistency between the two runs through the documentation for the whole of that period of the
19 mid-sixties, and it characterizes the documents put forward by both Parties in this case, but I, for
20 one, would find it helpful to hear both Parties' submissions on whether what was meant by fishing
21 rights was a perpetuation of what was already in existence, or protection for Mauritius to get
22 something that had not yet been granted.

23 MR. WORDSWORTH: Now, I think – I mean, our submission would be that,
24 yes, it's difficult to pin down with absolutely clarity on that question because one can say

1 preference in relation to rights were ever granted could be looking forward to the future, whatever
2 rights were granted in the future.

3 But what one does not see is any evidence here – and absolutely I accept that the
4 evidence we're looking at is fairly reduced. One sees no evidence here that they are looking
5 forward to prospectively to whatever fishing rights were ever going to be granted. And one can
6 say also that there is a tension, if the interpretation is correct, that this is for preferential rights if
7 ever granted whatever those rights are going to be in the future, there is a tension there between
8 what one sees in Paragraph 22(6) of the September record, which I will come back to a little later,
9 you will recall that says – it refers to facilities that would remain available, and the use of the term
10 "would remain available" suggests they're simply referring to what limited fishing there happened
11 to be at the time, and that's consistent also with the fact that fishing wasn't such a big issue. It's a
12 huge issue in this case, but it was not a big issue back in September 1965.

13 But I would also make the point that ultimately what the case on fishing rights
14 comes down to is Mauritius making out a case under *Nuclear Tests*, and the tests under *Nuclear*
15 *Tests* is not just about, or as part of requiring that there be an intention to be bound, it has to show
16 clarity as to what the undertaking, the alleged undertaking, actually provides for. So, although we
17 will come back to you this afternoon, perhaps, maybe a little more in relation to your question, the
18 running is on Mauritius to show that there is a binding undertaking here that sets out its case in
19 clear terms.

20 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Yes, I understand that. Leave aside the
21 question of whether whatever was said has a legally binding quality for a moment, and just look at
22 the question of what the content of any agreement or any undertaking might have been. On the
23 one hand, you have the view put by, I think it's Monsieur Forget, speaking on behalf of the Prime
24 Minister in the Mauritius Legislative Assembly a few weeks after the November Council of
25 Ministers decision, where, if I remember rightly, he essentially says, as far as I'm aware, the only

1 fishing is domestic fishing by the people who are resident in the Archipelago, and as they're all
2 going to be removed, that's coming to an end.

3 Now, if that is all that's meant by fishing rights, then presumably it comes to an end
4 with the departure of the last Chagossian from the islands, but neither Party seems to have treated
5 it as such because they go on corresponding about fishing rights long after the last Chagossian
6 leaves – it's in 1973, isn't it? I really would –

7 MR. WORDSWORTH: Yes.

8 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: I would really welcome some help. I put the
9 point to you because I think the United Kingdom needs to make its position clear, but I would also
10 like to hear from Mauritius on this in the second round, and obviously you will have the
11 opportunity to respond to them.

12 MR. WORDSWORTH: Yes. My point on *Nuclear Tests* was simply to
13 emphasize that it's for Mauritius to establish in the requisite clear and precise terms that one sees as
14 required by *Nuclear Tests*, its meaning, so it's perhaps a slightly separate point to a general, is there
15 an intention to be bound issue. It is about content and not just about the general status of
16 understandings.

17 But I'll come back to Forget perhaps a little later, but I think again one has to be
18 looking at the position that is being put forward by Mauritius, which is there is an undertaking
19 here.

20 Now, the subsequent practice doesn't provide quite such a clue in quite such sharp
21 terms as might be supposed from the fact that, yes, of course, then the UK authorities or BIOT did
22 issue licenses for increasingly large zones, because that subsequent practice could just as easily
23 have been done by reference to a non-binding political commitment as it could have been done by
24 reference to a binding legal obligation. We know that Mauritius at every step wants to portray the
25 United Kingdom as an ex-colonialist which is not acting in good faith, but actually that doesn't

1 reflect the reality of what was happening here, and the fact that the United Kingdom then goes on
2 in good faith to offer more to Mauritius than is placed here within the confines of this 1965
3 understanding does not, we say, establish its case. It's not subsequent practice in the usual sense
4 that one might be looking at it in the confines of 31(3)(b).

5 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Mr. Wordsworth, I'm sorry to add to the burden of
6 questions, but something struck me again when reading at Tab 61 the record of discussion of the
7 23rd of September, and we go to those, the summary, the Secretary of State summary, one, two,
8 three, four, five, little six Roman, and then we have handwritten, seven to ten amendments
9 enclosed. So, I just want to get a full picture of what was discussed or agreed or put forward. Do
10 we have those amendments anywhere, seven to ten? The fact that there were some is indicated by
11 the Colonial Office dispatch to the Governor of Mauritius in the next Tab, 63, which refers in
12 Paragraph 6 to H.M.G. of taking careful note of Point 7 and 8; nothing is said about nine and ten.
13 So, I just wonder whether we should have those or whether they are relevant to our understanding.

14 MR. WORDSWORTH: You do have those. They are at the back of the
15 manuscript letter, so there in Tab 29 on the third page of Tab 29, and you will see that what is being
16 referred there, can you see –

17 PRESIDENT SHEARER: It's in there, okay.

18 MR. WORDSWORTH: It's before it at seven, eight, nine and ten. Of course,
19 that's not how it appears in the agreed record.

20 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes. Well, thank you very much for that clarification.

21 I see now that we're getting close to lunch. What will be a convenient point for
22 you to break, Mr. Wordsworth?

23 MR. WORDSWORTH: Well, if the Tribunal would be willing to sit a little bit
24 early, it may make sense to break now before I continue.

1 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes. Well, I ask because I've just got a couple of
2 matters to raise with the Parties before the luncheon break, so just in a few minutes we will do that.
3 They're not directed specifically to you, but generally to the agents.

4 First of all, on the question of the publication of annexes, which we decided we
5 recommended the Parties try to agree on which annexes to the pleadings could be made available
6 for publication, and I'm just wondering whether any progress had been made on that and perhaps
7 something could be said or a report could be given when we return from lunch. If the Parties have
8 been unable to agree, well, then I think the Tribunal may have its own observations to make on that
9 matter.

10 The second thing relates to the Transcripts, and the Tribunal would be greatly
11 assisted if a corrigendum list could be made, not of the whole transcript, but to especially the
12 references, the footnotes. It said that the Tribunal can work on those or have those references
13 before we get the final version of the Transcript, if that would be possible before too long.

14 And the other thing is I'm not sure whether both Judges Greenwood and Wolfrum
15 asked some questions yesterday. I'm not sure whether they have all been answered. If there are
16 any unanswered questions from the UK side, we'd be grateful if they could be dealt with before the
17 end of today. Yes. Thank you very much.

18 Well, with that, I think we should take the – yes, Mr. Whomersley.

19 MR. WHOMERSLEY: I just was going to say on the first point, there have been
20 consultations between the agents, and obviously we are very busy, as you appreciate, but I hope
21 that we'll be able to report back hopefully quite soon to you and Members of the Tribunal. I think
22 that's agreed between the two of us.

23 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, Professor Sands.

24 PROFESSOR SANDS: I think just to assist the Tribunal a bit further so that you
25 know that we – and I ask Mr. Whomersley's position to just let you know roughly where we are, I

1 think it will provide reassurance, and I stand to be corrected if I have in any way got this wrong, but
2 as we understand it, the position of the Parties is that everything can be made public with
3 immediate effect, subject, during the course of today, subject to two caveats: Firstly, in relation to
4 Annex 185, we are working through the various documents. We have reached agreement on what
5 to do in relation to almost all of them, but not all of them, and we're trying to do that. So, our
6 understanding is that the sensible way to proceed is to make everything public without 185 at all,
7 so that we don't hold everything up as we try to work out 185.

8 And the only other caveat, but I think it may now have passed because it's Friday, as
9 I recall, there were five documents that as a courtesy Her Majesty's Government wished to make
10 available to sitting Ministers today to alert them that they were going to be made public at some
11 point today or thereafter, and I don't know whether that position has now been resolved, but we
12 made a lot of cooperative progress.

13 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you, Mr. Sands.

14 Yes, Mr. Whomersley.

15 MR. WHOMERSLEY: I'm grateful to Professor Sands. I mean, that is accurate.
16 I just wanted to add one thing, which is that some of the documents in Annex 185 are also annexed
17 elsewhere in the Mauritius documentation, so obviously what's said about Annex 185 applies to
18 those, if there are annexed elsewhere.

19 I could also say that on the second point, for which we are grateful for
20 understanding on, we understand that all of the relevant persons have now been informed that
21 these documents are likely to be made public. So, that issue has now fallen away and been
22 resolved. Thank you.

23 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Very good, then.

24 Well, that takes us to exactly 1:00, so we'll break for lunch and return at 2:30.

25 Thank you.

1

2

3

day.)

(Whereupon, at 12:59 p.m., the hearing was adjourned until 2:30 p.m., the same

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, Mr. Wordsworth. Thank you.

3 MR. WORDSWORTH: Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, if I can first just
4 address Judge Greenwood's two questions, first, what is the status of the 1st October letter? Is it
5 a correction of a deficient minute or renegotiation of the package, and we say it must be the latter,
6 and this is because, one, there's no mention in the original Record of the Meeting of 23rd
7 September 1965 to fishing at all; i.e., if you look at Tab 61 – I don't ask you to do that now but just
8 for your record – you will see that nowhere in the body of the minute is there any reference to
9 fishing rights.

10 Second, the letter of 1st October 1965 itself does not say or in any way suggest
11 there was an omission in the record that had then been received, but instead it refers to amendment
12 and that the matters to be added formed part of the original requirements submitted to HMG. If
13 the matter of fishing rights had been negotiated on 23rd September 1965, Sir Seewoosagur would
14 presumably have referred to that, and he would have said, we think that these must be incorporated
15 in our agreement. He did not say that. He said, we think that these can be incorporated in any
16 final agreement.

17 And another third point for your record is also a reference to these matters being
18 added on 1st October 1965, and that's at Tab 60 of your Judges' Folders at Page 6.

19 I move to answer Judge Greenwood's second question with respect to the UK's case
20 on what the intention was with respect to future fishing rights, and we consider that the 1965
21 understanding reflected what Sir Seewoosagur had been seeking, preference for Mauritius if
22 fishing rights were ever granted. Now, I've already taken you to the 30th of July document and
23 the 1st of October document, so I just want for you to recall that there was also a meeting of 13th
24 September where the Mauritian delegation led by Sir Seewoosagur stated that, "They would like
25 preferences in any fishing rights in Diego Garcia waters." And that's also at Tab 60 of this Judges'

1 Folder. Now, we consider that the underlying intention and what the 1965 understanding covers
2 is preference for Mauritius if fishing rights were ever granted, to include future fishing rights if
3 such were granted by the United Kingdom.

4 So, if I can ask you then to move on to the actual document at issue, which is the
5 text of the Record of the Meeting of 23rd September 1965, as amended, and that's in Volume 1 of
6 your Judges' Folder at Tab 8. And if I can ask you to turn on in that tab to Paragraph 22, which is
7 really the issue of concern for us and, of course, it's Paragraph 22(6) that we are focused on. And
8 you'll see when one looks at that, the British Government would use their good offices with the
9 U.S. Government to ensure that the following facilities in the Chagos Archipelago would remain
10 available to the Mauritius Government as far as practicable.

11 69. The first and foremost obvious point is that the commitment, such as it is, is to use 'good
12 offices.' Now, according to Mr. Reichler on day 3, it would make absolutely no sense to
13 interpret this provision so as to obligate the US to endeavour to obtain US consent to
14 Mauritian fishing rights, but then, after this consent was obtained, to allow the UK
15 unilaterally to choose not to give effect to those rights, or to do so briefly, and then abolish
16 them. And that, he said, would have been bad faith⁵².

17 70. Now, that is to address what is an interpretative difficulty for Mauritius by positing an
18 extreme case on the facts that never happened. Mauritius contends for the existence in these
19 words of the grant of an absolute and perpetual right to fish. But such words are absent.
20 They are not suggested by a commitment to use 'good offices,' and the actual words cannot
21 be read out of existence by saying that good faith performance could only be achieved by
22 construing the words as if it read, and it does not read this, but this is Mauritius' case, "the
23 British Government would ensure that the following facilities in the Chagos Archipelago

⁵² Mr. Reichler, day 3, p. 268, line 23 – p. 269, line 4.

1 would remain available to the Mauritius Government, subject always to consent from the US
2 Government.” But that’s not an exercise in construction, that is an exercise in re-drafting.

3 71. The difficulty for Mauritius is that there is nothing to suggest in the actual wording that the
4 United Kingdom was handing away its own discretion in terms of granting fishing rights,
5 and it would not have been bad faith for it to desist in making any grant of fishing rights as of
6 November 1965, just as it was not a breach of anything to cease issuing fishing licences to
7 Mauritian vessels from April 2010.

8 72. The object of the ‘good offices’ is ‘to ensure that the following facilities ... would remain
9 available’; and the Tribunal will have noted that it may appear odd to refer to ‘fishing rights’
10 as a form of facility, and one sees that the reference to ‘fishing rights’ has been slotted in
11 with what are more obviously facilities, i.e. navigational and meteorological facilities, and
12 use of an airstrip. You can obviously see that at the top of the following page.

13 73. But, on closer inspection, this is nonetheless a good fit for the reference to ‘fishing rights.’
14 What was being sought by the Mauritian delegation was in no sense absolute or sovereign
15 rights, but a permission to use or have access to certain aspects of what was to remain UK
16 territory and under UK sovereignty.

17 74. And this is one oddity of the Mauritian interpretation. It assumes that the term ‘fishing
18 rights’ in the 1965 record was intended to be given the broadest conceivable meaning as a
19 matter of international law; that is, as if it were intended to mean ‘absolute and indeed
20 sovereign rights over fishing, and harvesting sedentary species and the like.’⁵³ But there is
21 no basis for that assumption. There is no hint of this in the wording. And the assumption is
22 radically at odds with what the Mauritian delegation had been seeking. They sought
23 preference with respect to fishing rights to the extent such were granted, and that grant would
24 be pursuant to domestic, not international, law. In effect, they were seeking preference with

⁵³ As would follow from e.g. Mr. Reichler, day 3, p. 274, lines 17-22.

1 respect to fishing licences if and when granted, and that is how the use of the term ‘fishing
2 rights’ should be understood, not as rights to fish under international law.

3 75. I move on to the qualifier ‘as far as practicable.’

4 76. On any case, there was no absolute obligation, and this is entirely consistent with what the
5 Mauritian delegation had been seeking; that is, if, within the realms of what was practicable,
6 fishing rights were to be granted by the United Kingdom, Mauritius was entitled to benefit
7 from these.

8 77. Now, as I understood Mr. Reichler’s submissions, Mauritius is saying that this phrase
9 reflects no more than the fact that the UK was not in a position to grant an absolute right, in
10 that this was subject to what the US would permit by reference to its defence interests in
11 respect of Diego Garcia⁵⁴. The obvious difficulty with that analysis is that this is not what
12 paragraph (vi) says. The wording could very easily have been, but is not, ‘subject always to
13 consent,’ or ‘so far as is acceptable to the US.’ What was to be considered practicable was
14 evidently not a matter left to the USA, and that again is entirely consistent with what
15 Mauritius was in fact seeking – preference if fishing rights were ever granted.

16 78. Finally, one comes to the reference to ‘fishing rights,’ a term which Mauritius seeks to
17 portray as unqualified and unambiguous⁵⁵. But the term cannot be construed in isolation,
18 divorced from the qualifier ‘as far as practicable,’ and the natural meaning in this domestic
19 law document is in any event rights to fish as permitted as a matter of domestic law; that is,
20 licences.

21 79. And, when one comes to the practice of the United Kingdom and Mauritius, it is evident that
22 Mauritius did not consider that it had absolute or sovereign rights to fish. It accepted that
23 such rights as it had were domestic law rights, as permitted by BIOT, in other words, as
24 designated or licensed. As follows from Ms. Sander’s presentation, Mauritius did not stop its

⁵⁴ E.g. Reichler, day 2, pp. 149-150.

⁵⁵ E.g. MR, para. 6.47.

1 fishermen applying for licences issued by BIOT as any State with absolute or sovereign
2 rights would have done. It did not voice its opposition when the domestic rights that it was
3 accorded were restricted by the BIOT, for example by reduction of the number of available
4 licences or by exclusion from closed areas (even where such closed areas were not related to
5 US defence needs).

6 80. In short, much as Mauritius now wishes the contrary, sub-paragraph (vi) does not say:
7 “fishing rights within the area within which Mauritius would be able to derive benefit, but
8 for change in sovereignty should remain with the Mauritius Government, subject always to
9 what is acceptable with respect to the defence interests of the US Government.” It’s not
10 what it says, and it is beyond us to see how it is clear that this is what was intended, which is
11 what Mauritius needs to establish for its *Nuclear Tests* argument.

12 81. Now, before coming to the question as to the nature of the agreed record at paragraph 2 as a
13 matter of international law, one first needs to follow through the course of events up to 5
14 November 1965.

15 82. The record of 23 September 1965, as amended pursuant to the manuscript letter of 1
16 October, was despatched by letter of 6 October. And you can see that at Tab 62 of the
17 second volume of your Judges’ Folder.

18 83. Now, Mr. Reichler took you to this, and he focused in particular on Paragraph 2, the
19 reference there towards the end on Britain should now take the necessary steps to detach the
20 Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius on the conditions enumerate in 1 to 8 in Paragraph 22 of
21 the enclosed records. But to draw your attention at Point 5, Paragraph 5, it says, as regards
22 points four, five, and six, the “British Government will make appropriate representations to
23 the American Government as soon as possible. You will be kept fully informed of the
24 progress of these representations.” And that, of course, is entirely consistent with the
25 commitment being to use good offices.

1 84. And then you see at Paragraph 6 is the rather elliptical reference to H.M.G. “having taken
2 careful note of Points 7 and 8”, and 7 and 8 are the understandings in relation to session and
3 oil and minerals.

4 85. And then there is the response from the Mauritian Council of Ministers, and if I can ask you
5 to turn to Tab 64, you’ll see the telegram that was coming back, I think from the Mauritius
6 Governor, and this is a document you now know well, the telegram of 5th November 1965:

7 a. Under paragraph 1, you see that agreement is confirmed ‘on the conditions enumerated,’ but
8 one has to note the clarifications that are sought. You’ll see there is a clarification sought in
9 relation to paragraph 6 that I’ve just taken you to. So, the Council of Ministers is confirming
10 agreement on the understanding that (1) “the statement in paragraph 6 of your despatch, HMG
11 have taken carefully note of points 7 and 8 means HMG have, in fact, already agreed to them”.
12 The point here is that there is nothing equivalent regarding paragraph 5 of that 6 October
13 despatch. There is no statement that all fishing rights are to be taken as having been accorded to
14 Mauritius because they had not been.

15 b. And you already have the point under paragraph 3 of this document, the dissatisfaction being
16 reflected there with ‘mere assurances’ about 5 and 6, so a dissatisfaction with mere assurances.
17 And a note for your record, you’ll see from page 8 of Tab 31 of your Judges’ Folder, that,
18 ‘categorical’ assurances were then contemplated, but so far as we can see they were not
19 pressed for, and just a point of clarification here, please note that the word “mere” appear in the
20 telegram, but not the record of meeting which is at Tab 63 of the Judges’ Folder, so this
21 particular telegram as might be said is reflecting how the Governor understood matters. The
22 basic point is that the Council of Ministers was dissatisfied.

23 c. And I’ll come back to Judge Wolfrum’s question on assurances in a moment.

1 86. So, pausing there, there is, as it were, offer and acceptance, subject to certain unilaterally
2 formulated understandings by the Council of Ministers, and one comes to the question of the
3 status of the documentation as a matter of international law.

4 87. Is there an international agreement, a treaty? No. I think there is largely agreement on that,
5 although Mr. Reichler might have been suggesting the contrary on day 3⁵⁶, in answer to the
6 question posed by Judge Hoffmann.

7 88. Is there nonetheless what my good friend Professor Crawford called a ‘binding
8 commitment’? His argument was that international law required free consent to any
9 dismemberment of a Chapter IX territory, such that, as I understood it, conditions attached to
10 such consent would be subject to international law⁵⁷.

11 89. But, as to this submission, Professor Crawford elected not to deploy his customary eye for
12 teasing apart matters governed by different systems of law. At a general level, certain
13 international law rules might, of course, have been binding on the United Kingdom in
14 respect of its relations with its then colony. But that has no bearing on the separate question
15 of whether the arrangement or agreement that was reached was subject to international law,
16 or whether elements thereof have an existence as a matter of international law. And the
17 answer to that question is as stated in Hendry and Dickson, an extract of which we’ve put at
18 Tab 65 of Volume 2, your Judges’ Folder. And you’ll see there Hendry and Dickson,
19 British Overseas Law, 2011, and there’s a passage that deals with agreements between
20 territories or between a territory and the United Kingdom. “It is not possible for overseas
21 territories to conclude an agreement binding under international law with another overseas
22 territory or for one or more overseas territories to conclude such an agreement with the
23 United Kingdom. This is because internationally the Territories are not legal entities
24 separate from each other or from the United Kingdom.” And if I can ask you to look through

⁵⁶ Mr. Reichler, day 3, p. 287 line 10 - 288 line 2.

⁵⁷ Transcript, day 3, p. 253, line 7 et seq.

1 the rest of that in your own time, but to come back to the last two sentences. ”To draft an
2 instrument between the United Kingdom and an overseas territory in the form of an
3 international agreement is very unusual and not desirable as it leads to confusion and
4 uncertainty, not just between the participants, but for others, too. But regardless of the form
5 they take, probably the most that these instruments could be is a contract binding upon the
6 Parties under domestic law.”

7 90. Now, it follows that, in assessing the status of the 1965 understandings, one needs to look
8 not to international law, but British law, including British constitutional law. And it’s clear
9 that under British law the understandings were not legally binding or otherwise intended to
10 have legal effect. Those involved in the understandings were, on the one side, the British
11 Ministers in London, and, on the other, Mauritian Ministers (the Council of Ministers of
12 the Colony of Mauritius). Under British constitutional law, arrangements of this sort
13 between, to put it at its most formal, the Crown in right of the United Kingdom and the
14 Crown in right of the Colony of Mauritius, could not be legally binding. They were at most
15 political understandings, not enforceable in the courts.

16 91. So, yes, of course one could in principle look to international law to see whether consent to
17 detachment was needed, and if so whether consent was validly given; but that does not
18 somehow elevate all aspects of a document containing to given consent to matters of
19 international law. Of course not.

20 92. And the same underlying reasoning in *Hendry and Dickson* would also deal with respect to
21 any suggestion that, as of 1965, any *Nuclear Tests* type analysis can be applied. Statements
22 made by the British Government to a part of the United Kingdom are not governed by
23 international law, and the *Nuclear Tests* line of jurisprudence has nothing to bite on. That
24 jurisprudence is predicated on a statement being made by State A to State B or States B and

1 C, as one can see for example from paragraphs 46 and 51 of *Nuclear Tests (Australia and*
2 *France)*⁵⁸.

3 93. And so, in terms of how one would qualify legally the reference to assurances in the two
4 documents of 5th November 1965, there are two points: First, there's a preliminary
5 question as to the applicable system of law, which is domestic, not international law, and
6 there is no binding effect. Secondly, in any event, one has to look at the record as a whole
7 and not to the word "assurance" out of context. And from that record, we say it is clear that
8 no legally binding commitment was given and none was understood to be given.

9 94. So what of the position post-independence?

10 95. You'll recall that the Mauritian Prime Minister's Office of 19 November 1969 wrote to the
11 United Kingdom on 19 November 1969, and there's an affirmation there of what is referred
12 to as an agreement on excision, and if I could ask you to turn to that, that's at Tab 66 of your
13 Judges' Folder, the next tab. Sorry, it's from the Prime Minister's office to the British High
14 Commission. And you see there the Prime Minister's office External Affairs decision
15 presents its compliments to the British High Commission and "has the honour to refer to the
16 agreement between the Government of Mauritius and the British Government whereby the
17 Chagos Archipelago was excised from the territory of Mauritius to form the British Indian
18 Ocean Territory. This excision, it will be recalled, was made on the understanding, inter
19 alia, that the benefit of any minerals or oils discovered on or near the Chagos Archipelago
20 would revert to the Government of Mauritius." Mr. Reichler took you to this document,
21 you will recall, because of what then follows, the fact that Mauritius was saying that it
22 intended to introduce in the near future legislation vesting in its ownership the seabed and the
23 subsoil of the territorial sea and the continental shelf of all the islands under its territorial
24 jurisdiction. "The Government of Mauritius wishes to inform the British Government that

⁵⁸ UKCM, Authority 8.

1 it will at the same time vest in its ownership any minerals or oil that may be discovered in the
2 offshore areas of the Chagos Archipelago.” Now, what you weren't taken to was the next
3 document, at Tab 67, which is the response to this from the British Government of 18th
4 December 69 through the British High Commission. You will see from the top the “British
5 High Commission presents their compliments to the Prime Minister's Office and have the
6 honour to refer to their Note of the 19th of November 1969 regarding one of the
7 understandings reached between the British Government and the Government of Mauritius
8 in 1965, when the Chagos Archipelago ceased to be a part of Mauritius.” The
9 understanding in question was that the benefit of any minerals or oil discovered in or near the
10 Chagos Archipelago should revert to the Government of Mauritius, and the British
11 Government then goes on to note what Mauritius is planning to do. And you will see
12 overleaf the response of the British Government: The sovereignty of the United Kingdom
13 over the Chagos Archipelago extends to the territorial waters of the Archipelago, including
14 the seabed and subsoil under those waters. The United Kingdom is also entitled to exercise
15 in accordance with Article 2 of the Convention on the continental shelf exclusive sovereign
16 rights over the continental shelf of the Archipelago for the purpose of exploring it and
17 exploiting its natural resources. In the absence of any agreement to the contrary, the
18 enactment of legislation or issue of a license by another State which purports to relate to the
19 ownership, exploration or exploitation of minerals and oil in those areas would be an
20 infringement of the sovereignty or sovereign rights of the United Kingdom. The British
21 Government feels bound to state that they consider the Government of Mauritius have
22 misconstrued the understanding set out in the second paragraph of this note, which was only
23 to the effect that the Government of Mauritius should receive the benefit of any minerals or
24 oil discovered in or near the Chagos Archipelago. It is not considered that the wording of

1 the understanding can be construed as indicating any intention that ownership of minerals or
2 oils in the area in question should be vested in the Government of Mauritius," and so on.

3 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Mr. Wordsworth, thank you for that explanation
4 very much, but you were at the point of explaining that before independence, the arrangements, as
5 you put it, between Mauritius and the United Kingdom Government could not be qualified as
6 international agreements or agreements or arrangements covered or governed by international law.
7 We are now in the period after independence. My question is: Is this reference here what you're
8 quoted or well-understood, does that mean that this commitment, which was still in the air, so to
9 speak, after the islands are not any use anymore, that this is binding? It's a different question you
10 are dealing with in the moment.

11 MR. WORDSWORTH: What I would like to, with your leave, Judge, is just to
12 move forward a little bit in the record because what I wanted to do was to precisely address that
13 question, but to address it by reference to the document that my learned friend Mr. Crawford
14 focused on, and that, in fact, is a document of 1976, which refers to certain assurances. With your
15 leave, what I'd like to do is just to show you two or three more documents and then to –

16 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: I want to you come back to that question, yes.

17 Thank you.

18 96. MR. WORDSWORTH: So, just moving forward a little bit, what one sees is that
19 there then appears to be a period of calm, before the Mauritian Prime Minister's letter of 4
20 September 1972 saying that Mauritius has all sovereign rights relating to minerals, fishing,
21 prospecting and other arrangements, and that's a document that Mr. Reichler took you to at
22 Annex 67 of the Memorial. And there was also the Mauritian Prime Minister's letter of 24
23 March 1973. You may recall this as Ms. Sander took you to it, which was re-formulating the
24 terms of the understanding in relation to fishing rights. That is Memorial Annex 69, at Tab
25 34 of our first volume. And of course, that attempted reformulation – you will recall there is

1 a reference to fishing rights being reserved to Mauritius – was not acceptable to the United
2 Kingdom, and you've seen the UK internal document on that, Counter-Memorial at Annex
3 23, which Ms. Sander took you to. That's at Tab 34 of our Volume 1. And the letter of 3rd
4 May 1973 that was then sent to the United Kingdom, you've seen in which it gave, "an
5 assurance that there is no change in the undertakings given on behalf of the British
6 Government and set out in the record as then agreed of the meeting at Lancaster House on
7 23rd September 1965". Tab 68 of our Judges' Folder.

8 97. And I'll come back to that in a moment. As I just said, Professor Crawford built his
9 argument on Mr. Rowland's letter of 23 March 1976, which is Tab 69 of our folder. That's
10 Memorial Annex 78, and you'll see there the critical paragraph is the third paragraph, and
11 it's roughly halfway down. "I also take this opportunity to repeat my assurances that Her
12 Majesty's Government will stand by the understandings reached with the Mauritian
13 Government concerning the former Mauritian Islands now forming part of the British Indian
14 Ocean Territory. And in particular that they will be returned to Mauritius when they are no
15 longer needed for defence purposes in the same way as the three ex-Seychelles Islands are
16 now being returned to Seychelles." And I have to say I'm quoting it again as the Mauritian
17 allergy to the word 'understandings' is so strong that in actual fact the word 'undertakings'
18 appeared instead of 'understandings' when this document was read out at day 3, p. 256, line
19 10, of the transcript.

20 98. Now, there are two points to make on these two UK letters – of 3 May 1973 and 23 March
21 1976.

22 99. First, they were not met by any complaint from Mauritius to the United Kingdom. Mauritius
23 did not in subsequent correspondence persist in the attempt to re-formulate paragraphs (vi)
24 and (viii) of the September 1965 record, as it had by the letter of 24 March 1973. And I
25 should clarify that Mauritius does not now contend that the letter of 24 March 1973 provides

1 an accurate rendition of what had been agreed in 1975, and yet, curiously, its contentions on
2 interpretation of the 1965 record come down to repeating the same inaccuracies.

3 100. Secondly, the statements contained in the two UK letters of 1973 and 1976 were evidently
4 made to another State, and so Mauritius' *Nuclear Tests* case can in principle be applied to
5 these. So, the question is, where does this get Mauritius so far as it concerns its case on a
6 binding commitment, in particular in respect of fishing rights?

7 101. Now, Professor Crawford referred only to the second of these two letters, and that no doubt
8 reflects the fact that the 3 March 1973 letter is concerned with correcting and establishing in
9 accurate terms, and as a matter of fact, the contents of the record of the Lancaster House
10 meeting. Yes, the word assurance was given. Do we accept that this is a factor to be taken
11 into account in applying the *Nuclear Tests* criteria? But the question remains as to why the
12 term was used and in what context. We say it was used in the context of correcting, and the
13 purpose was to correct an incorrect rendition of the 1965 record.

14 102. By contrast, the March 1976 letter contains express assurances "that the British Government
15 would stand by the understandings that had been reached." So, Mauritius has focused on this
16 later letter in its legal submissions which, although it makes sense from the perspective of
17 *Nuclear Tests*, makes its fondness for the use of the term 'undertaking' all the more puzzling.
18 For the document on which it has elected to focus so far as concerns the matter of
19 confirmation of the 1965 record post-independence refers to the "understandings reached,"
20 not the "undertakings made." And as to this, one thing is for sure – on Mauritius' case,
21 reference to an understanding does not suggest the existence of a legally binding
22 commitment.

23 103. And, in any event, any renewal of the 1965 statements post-independence would bring one
24 back to the agreed record, as to which the criteria established in the ICJ jurisprudence and
25 reflected in the 2006 ILC Guiding Principles would not be met, not least because there was

1 never any intention to be bound. As to this, you already have my points on the wording of
2 paragraph 22, in particular, of course, subparagraph (vi), and I don't repeat them.

3 104. The next hurdle for Mauritius would be to show that the commitment on fishing in the 1965
4 record was clear and specific in nature⁵⁹, which is another of the criteria established in the
5 ICJ jurisprudence, although Mauritius elected in its first round to pass over this, and to
6 pretend that all were agreed that all that had to be shown was an intention to be bound and
7 nothing more.

8 105. Our case is that the 1965 statement on fishing rights is hedged about with soft language and
9 qualifications, with fishing rights being described as a form of 'facility.' And, of course, our
10 case is that it reflected what Mauritius had been seeking, preference for Mauritius if fishing
11 rights were ever granted. Now, the requisite clarity is absent, at least so far as concerns any
12 commitment on the lines of what Mauritius now contends for, that is a perpetual and absolute
13 right to all such fishing rights as could be granted as a matter of international law as it
14 developed, even going so far as to qualify those rights as sovereign rights.

15 106. By contrast, what is clear is that what the Mauritian Ministers had been seeking was
16 preference if and when fishing rights were granted, and that is only consistent with the UK's
17 interpretation of this language.

18 107. As to the circumstances in which the statement was made, another of the established
19 criteria in the ICJ jurisprudence⁶⁰, we say that the key factors are: (i) what the Council of
20 Ministers was in fact seeking, and (ii) that there was only limited and "casual" fishing as of

⁵⁹ *Nuclear Tests Case (Australia v. France)* at paras. 43, 51, and *Nuclear Tests Case (New Zealand v. France)* at paras. 46, 53. See also *Case concerning Armed Activities (Congo v. Rwanda)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2006, paras. 50 and 52; and Principle 7 of the 2006 ILC Guiding Principles.

⁶⁰ *Nuclear Tests (Australia v. France)*, para. 51; *Nuclear Tests (New Zealand v. France)*, para. 53.

1 1965⁶¹ such that (iii), as appears from the negotiations, fishing rights were a far less
2 important matter to Mauritius than, say, sugar quotas⁶².

3 108. Now, Mauritius says we're missing the point, and that the truly important factor was that
4 this was all part of a deal in which the Council of Ministers was agreeing to the detachment
5 of the Chagos Islands. Well, yes, that is important, but, unlike the language actually used
6 and the factors that I have pointed to, this is not a factor that tells one much, if anything,
7 about the substance of the conditions or whether there was any intention to be bound with
8 respect to fishing rights. Just because detachment was an important matter, it does not
9 follow that there was any request for, and still less any agreement to, an absolute and
10 perpetual legal right to fish within territorial or other waters, subject only to the consent of
11 the USA.

12 109. Finally, it is well-established that a restrictive approach must be applied where interpreting
13 unilateral undertakings. One gets that from the *Nuclear Tests* cases: "When States make
14 statements by which their freedom of action is to be limited, a restrictive interpretation is
15 called for."⁶³ That's paragraph 44 of *Nuclear Tests*, Australia and France. And the same
16 rule is reflected at Principle 7 of the ILC Guiding Principles.

17 110. And that doubt is apposite here in circumstances where the text on fishing rights was a late
18 addition, where there is no evidence of the content of any negotiation on this, and I should
19 say that the absence of any negotiation is consistent with the absence of any intent to be
20 bound and also the fact that the Council of Ministers was relatively moderate in its demands:
21 it sought only preference as and when fishing rights were granted.

⁶¹ See e.g. Mr. Forget's reply before the Mauritius Legislative Assembly dated 21 December 1965, and the letter of the Governor of Mauritius dated 25 April 1966. UKCM, Annexes 15 and 17.

⁶² See e.g. Annexes MM, annexes 16 and 18 and UKR. Annex 6.

⁶³ *Nuclear Tests Case (Australia v. France)* para. 44, and *New Zealand v. France* para. 47.

1 111. And one final word on Mauritius' case on *Nuclear Tests*, which arises in light of Mauritius'
2 response to the question put by Judge Hoffmann. On Mauritius' case, it has to show that, in
3 writing the 23 March 1976 letter or such other communication that Mauritius now relies on,
4 the United Kingdom evinced an intention to be bound by the 1965 understandings regardless
5 of whether Mauritius itself stuck by the agreement to detachment which led to the existence
6 of paragraph 22 in the first place. And we say that the existence of any such intention is
7 implausible, and we leave it to Mauritius to identify the documents that it relies on in this
8 respect in its second round.

9 112. Now, I have been focussing in the above on the understanding on fishing rights. But
10 Mauritius also has a case on the understandings in respect of cession and oil and minerals.
11 But for our part, we don't see how any of this assists Mauritius.

12 113. Whether or not the understandings on cession and oil and minerals are binding, what they do
13 is emphasise that the UK is and Mauritius is not sovereign – and Sir Michael has set out our
14 case on that.

15 114. Your attention has also been drawn to supposedly significant changes in the language in
16 what the UK has said over time, and it is not clear to us even in what form Mauritius
17 contends there is a legally binding undertaking. So, as this is becoming a big part of
18 Mauritius' claim, we will wait to hear precisely what case is being made by reference to the
19 *Nuclear Tests* jurisprudence.

20 **(iii) Subsequent practice**

21 115. I move on to the subsequent practice on fishing rights, and I just want to highlight three
22 themes coming out of Ms. Sander's consideration of the facts.

23 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, before you go to that, could I
24 just ask you a question about what you just said. Am I to understand, therefore, that the United
25 Kingdom's position is that none of the undertakings given at Lancaster House – I use the word

1 undertakings without wishing to pre-judge their legal status – that none of those undertakings is
2 legally binding upon the United Kingdom today, so, for example, the United Kingdom would be
3 free to cede the Chagos Archipelago to a third State. It's not legally as opposed to politically
4 obliged not to do that. You might want to take instructions, and I'm quite happy for you to do so.

5 MR. WORDSWORTH: Thank you.

6 But the way I put it is, in order for us to be in a fair position in responding to that
7 question, we would like to be seeing what Mauritius' position in terms of which specific statements
8 it is relying on. It's put forward the case that there has been a significant change in those
9 statements. It's highlighted to you. It changed from return to cede. I think it's highlighted to
10 you inclusion of language in relation to in accordance with international law. Now, the
11 understandings or undertakings in relation to cession and oil and minerals were not a big part of
12 Mauritius' case before this hearing. The focus on the pleadings in the pleadings has been on the
13 understanding on fishing rights or the alleged undertaking. Now, we wait for Mauritius to put its
14 case in relation to these other alleged undertakings, and then I'll be in a position to respond.

15 116. I move on to the subsequent practice on fishing rights, and I just want to highlight the two
16 themes coming out of Ms. Sander's consideration of the facts. First, the practice shows that
17 there have been multiple proclamations of a regime pursuant to which licences have been
18 issued for Mauritians to fish off the Chagos Islands, yet those changes have met with no
19 objection on the part of Mauritius due to the alleged existence of fishing rights pursuant to
20 the 1965 understanding. This is even the case where Mauritian fishermen have been
21 excluded from certain areas for environmental reasons⁶⁴, or when the number of available
22 licences has been reduced⁶⁵.

23 117. Secondly, and following on from the above, Mauritius has not exploited fishing rights as if
24 it had sought, and now has the benefit of, the absolute and perpetual entitlement that it is

⁶⁴ 8 July 2003, MM, Annex 119.

⁶⁵ UKR, para. A.83; MM, Annex 107.

1 contending for. For example, on its current analysis, Mauritius would have been expected
2 to insist that it had all rights to fish, and that it should be entitled to sub-licence its rights to
3 the nationals of third States, thus securing a source of revenue. Yet it did not claim to do
4 so.

5 118. It is not correct that Mauritius has consistently reminded the UK of the binding nature of
6 the 1965 understanding on fishing rights, as Mr. Reichler aimed to show. It is correct that
7 in the early 1970s Mauritius was saying that it was entitled to “all sovereign rights relating
8 to fishing,” which is pretty much the claim that is now being made. But that claim was not
9 accepted by the United Kingdom⁶⁶, as we have shown, and Mauritius did not persist with
10 this claim in its communications with the United Kingdom.

11 119. And this leads in turn to two important legal points on subsequent practice.

12 120. First, subsequent practice is a tool used in the interpretation of treaties⁶⁷. It is of a quite
13 different and reduced utility where it comes to the question of whether a given document
14 establishes political commitments or binding legal obligations. The fact of subsequent
15 performance in line with that document is consistent both with the existence of a political
16 commitment, which one assumes will be taken seriously, and with the existence of a legal
17 obligation.

18 121. Secondly, where relevant to an issue of interpretation, subsequent practice must of course be
19 comprised of overt acts – how else could it otherwise establish the existence of an agreement
20 on interpretation. One can see that, for example, from paragraph 74 of the *Kasikili/Sedudu*
21 case⁶⁸ where the International Court noted that, for there to be relevant subsequent
22 practice, the Bechuanaland authorities would have had to be “fully aware” of how the

⁶⁶ MM, annex 67.

⁶⁷ VCLT, Art. 31(3)(b).

⁶⁸ *Kasikili/Sedudu Island (Botswana/Namibia), Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1999(II)*, p. 1087, para. 74.

1 Caprivi authorities had been acting, and have also accepted this as a confirmation of the
2 disputed treaty boundary.

3 **(iv) Mauritius' reliance on UK internal documentation**

4 122. As to the legal significance of the UK internal documentation other than as subsequent
5 practice, you have our position that the documentation on which Mauritius has placed so
6 much weight is not material. And that is not a defensive position. We might be feeling
7 defensive if we could see Mauritius' internal documentation, and if we could see that this
8 was consistent with what Mauritius is now saying. But we do not have that luxury, and the
9 Tribunal will recall how Mauritius chose to make its case in its Memorial without submitting
10 one single Mauritian internal document.

11 123. The point is that it is for an international tribunal to determine definitively the meaning of a
12 given international instrument. The internal processes of a State prior to its coming to a
13 concluded view which it then defends in legal proceedings merely represent steps along the
14 way to that concluded view.

15 124. The concluded view of the United Kingdom, as of 2009-2010, was that there was no binding
16 obligation on it with respect to Mauritian fishing rights⁶⁹. That is either right or wrong, and
17 the internal views of Tony Aust of 40+ years ago could carry no weight before a court or
18 tribunal that then has to interpret all the relevant documentation and to come to its own views
19 on the existence of a binding legal obligation and its content.

20 125. And suppose Tony Aust had said – 'no binding obligation' 40+ years ago – would Mauritius
21 be saying that was a material factor for the Tribunal to weigh against its current case? One
22 very much suspects not. So why would it be different because Mauritius considers that
23 something was said that was helpful to its current legal position?

⁶⁹ Ms. Yeadon's statement at UKR Annex 73; Mr. Roberts statement at UKR Annex 74.

1 126. Evidently, internally expressed views do not qualify as statements against interest, and Mr.
2 Reichler's reference on day 3 to the *Argentina-Chile Frontier case* was quite inapposite⁷⁰.
3 Doctrines of estoppel or preclusion cannot conceivably be brought into play where there has
4 been no communication of an alleged legal position, let alone any form of reliance thereon.
5 And you already have our point, as explained by Ms. Sander, that on a closer read, the UK
6 internal documentation is much more of a mixed bag of imprecise views than Mauritius
7 contends for.

8 127. And so we are left puzzled as to why Mauritius considers the UK internal documentation to
9 be of such interest. I should say that it's not supported by such jurisprudence as there is on
10 the point. We referred in our Rejoinder to the *Pedra Branca/Pulau Batu Beteh case*⁷¹, and
11 also to the First State Award in *Eritrea/Yemen*. There a tribunal chaired by Sir Robert
12 Jennings and comprising Judges Schwebel and Higgins, and also Dr El-Kosheri and Keith
13 Highett said as to internal documentation of the UK Foreign Office and the Italian Foreign
14 Office that:

15 "internal memoranda do not necessarily represent the view or policy of any government,
16 and may be no more than the personal view that one civil servant felt moved to express to
17 another particular civil servant at that moment: it is not always easy to disentangle the
18 personality elements from what were, after all, internal, private and confidential memoranda at
19 the time they were made".⁷² And we note that the reticence that's expressed there was in the
20 rather different context of seeking to establish what the British and Italian governments were doing
21 or saying in terms of claims to or possession or use of the islands at issue, not to establish
22 agreement as to meaning of a particular instrument as a matter of international or domestic law.

⁷⁰ Mr. Reichler, day 3, p. 262, lines 12-18.

⁷¹ *Sovereignty over Pedra Branca/Pulau Batu Puteh, Middle Rocks and South Ledge (Malaysia/Singapore)*, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 2008, at para. 197, and at para. 224. UKRej, Auth. 14.

⁷² UKR, Authority 7, para. 94.

1 And one might wonder, and in fact, one does wonder, what has happened to the Mauritian internal
2 documentation, and I should say that no explanation has been given, and perhaps that will come in
3 the second round. But the key point for now is that whatever reason, the Tribunal has no insight
4 into the internal workings of Mauritius. It has no inkling of what Mauritian officials have said
5 over time on the existence of fishing rights or on the validity of its claim to sovereignty, and in
6 light of these one-sided circumstances, the Tribunal should be very wary of placing weight on the
7 partial picture it had through sight of just the UK internal documentation.

8 **(v) Miscellaneous points**

9 128. I wish to pick up on three separate matters before turning to the provisions of UNCLOS on
10 which Mauritius relies when it comes to alleged fishing rights.

11 129. First, suppose a binding unilateral undertaking on fishing rights had been made by the
12 United Kingdom in or subsequent to 1965. The UK would still have been entitled to revoke
13 this. This entitlement is reflected in Principle 10 of the ILC Guiding Principles, which says
14 that, “A unilateral declaration that has created legal obligations for the State making the
15 declaration cannot be revoked arbitrarily.”

16 130. In the present case there would have been no arbitrary revocation. Following a consultation
17 exercise, and bilateral consultations that Mauritius elected to bring to a halt, the United
18 Kingdom declared the MPA, banning commercial fishing and thereby – on this alternative
19 argument – revoking a binding undertaking. There had been no reliance by Mauritius in the
20 bilateral consultations on the existence of a legally binding undertaking, and the reality was
21 that fishing in BIOT waters was of minimal importance to it. The introduction of the MPA,
22 by contrast, provided an entirely rational basis for revocation, and it’s recalled that the MPA
23 is ultimately to the benefit of Mauritius and the region as a whole. And Professor Boyle will
24 be returning to the issues on consultation and the science shortly.

1 131. Secondly, Mauritius has a separate contention that it has the benefit of traditional fishing
2 rights, although there was notably no discussion of the necessary factual underpinnings for
3 such rights in Mauritius' presentations on the facts.

4 132. That is not surprising. The simple point is that there was no fishing at all as of 1965, save for
5 the very limited fishing for the domestic purposes of the Chagossians, and subsequently
6 fishing was as permitted by BIOT Ordinance. There has never been a tradition of Mauritian
7 vessels fishing in Chagos waters, let alone any form of historic dependence as the cases
8 suggest might be protected in certain circumstances.

9 133. Finally, there is the alleged undertaking made by Gordon Brown. And you already have our
10 case that Gordon Brown did not say the words "relied on," and Professor Boyle will be
11 coming back to this in the context of what happened next following the letter of 30
12 December 2009.

13 134. As to the relevant legal principles, the record comes nowhere near to establishing a binding
14 unilateral undertaking that satisfies the requirements of the *Nuclear Tests* line of authority.
15 Despite the huge emphasis, Mauritius did not even seek to show how such requirements
16 were met, including as to demonstrating the required clarity as to what was meant by 'put it
17 on hold' – put what on hold, and for how long? If and when Mauritius does develop its legal
18 case on this, we will return to this issue in our second round.

19 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Mr. Wordsworth, before you proceed to this point,
20 may I come back to a point you just made a minute ago. If I didn't misunderstand you, you
21 referred to the undertaking – I'm still using that word, but you can also understand it as
22 understanding – as unilateral Declaration. That comes up a little bit out of a sudden, so to
23 speak, for don't you take into consideration that this understanding or undertaking together with
24 the others on mineral resources and the return of islands after they are not anymore needed were
25 given in the context of this Lancaster House Conference and through this one receives the

1 consent of the Mauritian Ministers. Therefore, to speak of unilateral Declaration is striking me
2 as needing further explanation, let's put it this way.

3 MR. WORDSWORTH: Well, I was referring to the binding undertaking in the
4 context of *Nuclear Tests* and Gordon Brown.

5 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: You did it on fishing.

6 MR. WORDSWORTH: I did it on fishing.

7 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: The same applies to the others.

8 MR. WORDSWORTH: But it's the same point in relation to the other
9 commitments. Now, you see our case that there was no binding international agreement as of
10 1965. And so what Mauritius has to do is to tie the allegedly binding undertakings that it relies
11 on back to some further statement from the United Kingdom. It has to say, on such-and-such a
12 date, such-and-such a statement was made, and that meets the test as a *Nuclear Tests*. And
13 that's the way it's put its claim in its Memorial and Reply. It hasn't put its claim by reference to
14 the existence of a Treaty. So we are dependent on Mauritius identifying the particular
15 documents it's relying on, and then we think, by reference to those documents one has to apply
16 the *Nuclear Tests* criteria, but until we actually see what Mauritius is saying, it's very difficult,
17 indeed, to apply the criteria, and this is the case that Mauritius has to make out. It's the
18 Claimant, it's the one relying on these binding undertakings. It's not the United Kingdom.

19 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: I understand your point quite well, but I want to
20 understand the construction. Isn't there the possibility to look upon that differently; namely, to
21 take into account after independence of Mauritius and these undertakings, understandings were
22 repeated, that they still come within the context of the Lancaster House meeting, let's put it this
23 way, therefore, it was a quid pro quo? The notion what is bothering me at the moment is the
24 word "unilateral."

1 MR. WORDSWORTH: But, sir, I absolutely understand the point because this
2 is a slightly unusual situation because what you have is the 1965 record which reflects
3 undoubtedly some form of arrangement. There are two Parties, one can call it commitments,
4 agreements, whatever it is. And that's the package, a very important part of the package, that
5 you are going to be looking at. But it's not the only part of the package because the when it
6 comes to applying the ICJ jurisprudence and meeting the case that I understand is being put by
7 Mauritius, one has to see how that package is then put forward on the international plane, and
8 that actual process of putting forward, as I understand it, as it's argued, is by reference to a
9 binding unilateral undertaking. A unilateral undertaking. When Mr. Crawford is referring to
10 the letter of 23rd March 1976, I understand him as saying you, United Kingdom, are saying I
11 assure that I will stand by those commitments, and that has two levels to it. There is the
12 unilateral binding, unilateral binding element of it, I assure, and then there is the other part of it,
13 which I absolutely see you're focusing on, which is the what was actually agreed in 1965.

14 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: I don't think we speak about the same point. Let
15 me try it the other way around. You said that you had a package and you described the package
16 under British national law in the Lancaster House arrangement. I believe on that respect we are
17 on firm grounds.

18 Aren't these statements made later, so to speak, transfer this national law-oriented
19 package on to the international law level?

20 MR. WORDSWORTH: That's an argument or that's a position that I hope I was
21 understood as saying one looks at the document relied on by Mauritius and does that transfer this
22 on to a State-to-State level. We look at the 23rd March 1976 letter, it refers to understandings,
23 and we say, well, it may well make the fishing understandings or the other understandings go on to
24 the international level, yes, we accept that *Nuclear Tests* applies, but we don't accept then that
25 suddenly shows the requisite intention to be bound.

1 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Wordsworth, I can't resist the temptation to
2 come back to this point. What Judge Wolfrum has just said is what's troubling me as well. The
3 agreement that was reached at Lancaster House and as described in the minutes as an agreement
4 could not at that time have been a treaty under international law. I understand your case on that
5 point, I'm not saying whether I agree with it – I understand it – but it produced effects on the plane
6 of international law because it has the vital effect that according to your Government's case, the
7 detachment of the Chagos Islands from Mauritius was with the consent of the representatives of
8 the people of Mauritius, and, therefore, and I grant you there are several contingencies here. If
9 there was a right of self-determination, binding in the terms of Resolution 1514(VI) upon the
10 United Kingdom at the time, then this is the answer to that point. You have the Agreement of the
11 representatives of the people of Mauritius, so at the international level, the United Kingdom gets
12 the benefit of what was Mauritius' side of the bargain, as it were, but the consideration for that
13 bargain was a series of undertakings given by the United Kingdom. This is what I'm grappling
14 with. Is it really right to analyse it in terms that what Mauritius gave was in the past, and what the
15 United Kingdom continues to give after 1968 has to be seen entirely in isolation from that?

16 MR. WORDSWORTH: Well, I will wait to see how Mauritius puts its case, but
17 yes, I think the answer has to be yes, because you're looking at the question of whether that
18 consent, which is consent in a domestic law context, is sufficient for the purposes of international
19 law to establish consent, let's say consent is required as a matter of international law. That doesn't
20 somehow elevate everything within what was agreed to the level of international law.

21 ARBITRATOR KATEKA: Mr. Wordsworth, since you have described the 1965
22 understanding or undertaking, at one stage there is a contract, I wish to get some more clarification
23 on the status of this understanding when related to the detachment agreement. In the written
24 pleadings, the United Kingdom repeats several times that the understanding was reached with the
25 then colonial Mauritius, and then earlier you referred in your Statement to something could be said

1 about the validity of the detachment, agreement and so on. I wonder if you have some comments
2 to make on the fact that these two agreements or understandings were made with the then Colony
3 of Mauritius, and they were approved by the Council of Ministers, in one case said the
4 representatives of the directed people, that is where strictly speaking a colonial regime, they were
5 not free. If you look at the pleadings, you find that the Governor could appoint members of the
6 legislative council, he could preside over the Council of Ministers.

7 So, I wonder if you have any comment to make on the two agreements to make further comments
8 on this.

9 MR. WORDSWORTH: I will respond to that, but I would, by saying that that's
10 certainly not a question I could answer on the hoof because that seems to be also to be going into
11 the constitutional background, and that's Sir Michael Wood's special subject area.

12 Mr. President.

13 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Mr. Wordsworth, I see your point in referring it to
14 Sir Michael is okay, but still I don't believe that the questions raised by Sir Christopher Greenwood
15 and by Judge Kateka and myself have been properly addressed. Our argument, practically at the
16 moment of Sir Christopher Greenwood and mine is, you have had a package as the Lancaster
17 House contract as Judge Kateka put it, let's call it an agreement, and I have the feeling – let me be
18 very open – that now, after independence of Mauritius you unravelled the package and do not
19 consider what was given by Mauritius in the Lancaster House arrangement or agreement, but only
20 look into fishing as commitments of the United Kingdom on fishing, mineral resources and return
21 of the islands. I believe still after the independence of Mauritius has remained the package,
22 which, due to the various interventions from both sides, has been lifted or transferred to the
23 international level as a package; therefore, you can't dissect them. That is the problem.

24 Therefore, it's not so much a constitutional law problem, it's an international law
25 problem. Although I'm awaiting the constitutional law explanations by Sir Michael Wood.

1 MR. WORDSWORTH: Thank you, judge, for clarifying that. I did understand
2 that a separate point was being raised by Judge Kateka in relation to the constitutional issue.

3 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Okay.

4 MR. WORDSWORTH: But what I do take from that is that this is a question that
5 it would be useful for me to pause on and to take instructions and come back with later.

6 PRESIDENT SHEARER: I think it might be time for the break anyway, Mr.
7 Wordsworth, if you would like to consult with your colleagues on some of those questions.

8 I didn't want to come in on my colleagues on this, but another thing that I don't
9 really require an answer to, but might be considered, especially in relation to Judge Kateka's
10 question. As I understand it for the period of one, two or three years before independence, there
11 was always a sort of a semi-autonomous phase that colonies went through. For example, they
12 were always consulted as to whether treaties should be applied to them, things like that, and I don't
13 know whether that's a factor that you would want to meld into your answers.

14 But anyway, I think that's a good point to take our break.

15 MR. WORDSWORTH: Mr. President, with your leave, I think Sir Michael just
16 wanted to raise a point very briefly, if that's okay.

17 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Yes, of course. Please.

18 SIR MICHAEL WOOD: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

19 I won't try to respond immediately to Judge Kateka, I will have another look at
20 Hendry and Dickson and come back with answers, but what I did want to do with your leave was to
21 reply very briefly to a question from Judge Greenwood yesterday.

22 Judge Greenwood referred to the official report to the Parliament on the
23 Constitutional Conference, and to the statement there that the Secretary of State accordingly
24 announced at the plenary meeting at the difference on Friday, the 24th of September, his view that
25 it was right that Mauritius should be independent and take her place among the sovereign nations

1 of the world. Judge Greenwood asked if he would be right in assuming that there must have been
2 a Cabinet decision to that effect the previous evening.

3 And he pointed out that at 4:00 p.m. on the 23rd of September the Colonial
4 Secretary left his meeting with the Premier and his colleagues saying he had to go back and report
5 to his colleagues, the Colonial Secretary's colleagues. And Judge Greenwood asked whether the
6 reporting back was part and parcel of a Cabinet meeting, at which there was a decision by Her
7 Majesty's Government to accord independence subject obviously to the final word resting with
8 Parliament at a later stage, and I would add also subject to the final word resting with the people of
9 Mauritius and elected Legislative Assembly, et cetera.

10 We checked with London. There was not a meeting of the Cabinet itself, but there
11 was a meeting of the Defence and Oversea Policy Committee, which a Cabinet Committee,
12 chaired by the Prime Minister, at 4:00 p.m. on the 23rd. At the meeting, the Colonial Secretary
13 reported to his colleagues on progress of the conference and explained what he proposed to do the
14 next day.

15 We have received from London, from the Public Record Office, the official record, the minutes of
16 this meeting. We have already given copies to our friends opposite, and we understand from them
17 that they see no difficulty with the production of this document. We have copies available for the
18 Tribunal which I could hand in during the break.

19 We have received from London, from the Public Record Office, the official record,
20 the minutes of this meeting. We have already given copies to our friends opposite, and we
21 understand from them that they see no difficulty with the production of this document. We have
22 copies available for the Tribunal which I could hand in during the break.

23 I do not propose to address the document at this stage since we've really passed this
24 stage, as it were. The relevant passages are on pages 5 and 6, and quite short, and in my view
25 self-explanatory. Thank you.

1 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you very much.

2 Thank you, Sir Michael. Well, we might then take our 20-minute break, and we
3 will return.

4 Thank you very much.

5 (Brief recess.)

6 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Mr. Wordsworth, we threw a lot of things at you at
7 before the break, and we owe the UK some minutes from yesterday as I recall, so if your side needs
8 to go a bit beyond 5:30, the Tribunal would be quite content with that.

9 MR. WORDSWORTH: We are very grateful indeed for that. I will try to
10 crack on as fast as I can with my submissions on Article 2(3), a few words at the end on Article
11 56(2).

12 **C. Article 2(3)**

13 135. Mauritius' case on Article 2(3) is, of course, that this establishes, so far as concerns the
14 exercise of sovereignty over the territorial sea, a general and justiciable obligation of
15 compliance with the Convention and, in a 'broad and open-ended' sense⁷³, and that was my
16 friend Professor Sands, day 3, page 299, line 3, as well as other rules of international law.

17 136. If I can ask you to turn to Article 2 in your copies of the Convention, there are a few
18 introductory points to make as to how we see what Article 2 is intended to do.

19 137. Now, as you'll see from your copies of the Convention, Article 2 is, in fact, the only
20 provision in section 1, "General provisions," and Article 2 is then headed, "Legal status of
21 the territorial sea, of the airspace over the territorial sea and of its bed and subsoil." And we
22 would say there's no suggestion there of general obligations of compliance and, we would
23 say that is consistent with our case that Article 2(3) is merely descriptive of an element of

⁷³ Prof Sands, day 3, p. 299, line 3 and 296, lines 5-6.

1 legal status. And, as a third point on immediate context, Articles 2(1) and 2(2) do no more
2 than establish or codify the extent of sovereignty over the territorial sea.

3 138. One then comes to Article 2(3), and there are two points of disagreement – over the meaning
4 of ‘is exercised’ and, then, over the intended scope of ‘other rules of international law.’
5 You see there the sovereignty over the territorial sea is exercised subject to this convention
6 and to other rules of international law.

7 139. And, as to this first issue, the question is whether the UK is right to draw conclusions from
8 the fact that this is the formulation used, instead of “shall be exercised,” as would be in line
9 with the use of “shall take place in conformity with this Convention and with other rules of
10 international law” as in Article 19(1). There is then a debate over ordinary meaning – we
11 say that “it exercised” is descriptive rather than executory, and that if a State, say, breaches
12 Article 24 by hampering the right of innocent passage, it does not separately breach Article
13 2(3).

14 140. Now, pausing there, so far as concerns the reference in Article 2(3) to exercise being subject
15 to the Convention, Mauritius’ argument involves introducing into Article 2(3) an obligation
16 of compliance that is redundant. If a State is already breaching Article 24 or whatever, there
17 is no need and no purpose for the additional level of obligation that Mauritius contends for.
18 And so, it would follow, that if an additional level of obligation was intended to be present, it
19 would most obviously have been introduced with a view to giving effect to the ‘other rules of
20 international law.’

21 141. And if I can ask you to turn to the ILC Commentary behind Article 1(2) of the 1958
22 Convention that Professor Sands took you to, it is important to read that with an eye to
23 looking for some such intent. And that’s behind Tab 70 of your Judges’ Folder.

24 142. And you’ll see the relevant passage starts at paragraph (3) – and Professor Sands emphasised
25 the use of ‘cannot’ in paragraph 3. Clearly sovereignty over the territorial sea cannot be

1 exercised otherwise than in conformity with the provisions of international law. But we
2 can't see what the use of "cannot" there adds. The drafters of the Commentary saw Article
3 1(2) as something of a statement of the obvious. That is more suggestive of the wording
4 being descriptive as opposed to establishing any obligation of compliance.

5 143. Moving to paragraph 4, and Professor Sands skipped over this, saying that it just "provides
6 more descriptive material by way of background in relation to the non-exhaustiveness of the
7 limits." Well, maybe, but we think this merits a close read. Some of the limitations imposed
8 by international law on the exercise of sovereignty in the territorial sea are set forth in the
9 present articles which cannot, however, be regarded as exhaustive. Incidents in the
10 territorial sea raising legal questions are also governed by the general rules of international
11 law, and these cannot be specially codified in the present draft for the purposes of their
12 Application to the territorial sea. That is why other rules of international law are mentioned
13 in addition to the provisions contained in the present articles.

14 And so, that's where our focus comes from on general rules of international law, and that's the
15 second element for our case, you will recall

16 144. And then one sees that paragraph 5 deals with specific bilateral rules of international law
17 which, if Mauritius is right on its undertakings case, is where those undertakings would fit.
18 It may happen that by reason of some special relationship, geographical or other between
19 two States, rights in the territorial sea of one of them are granted to the other in excess of the
20 rights recognized in the present draft. It is not the Commission's intention to limit in any
21 way any more extensive Right of Passage or other right enjoyed by States by custom or
22 Treaty.

23 145. And the key words there are – 'It is not the Commission's intention to limit ...'. The
24 suggestion is not of any intention to give effect to such rights, but merely of there being no

1 intention to limit them. In other words, Article 1(2) was intended to be neutral as to such
2 bilateral rights.

3 146. And the point that, I hope, comes out from the Commentary to Article 1(2) is that, in
4 interpreting the ordinary words of Article 2(3), there has to be a balance, and that Mauritius
5 is contending for two extremes of interpretation that do not fit together.

6 147. If the intention were to establish an obligation of compliance with ‘other rules of
7 international law,’ that would make sense only to the extent that these are interpreted as
8 general rules that cover incidents in the territorial sea, and that are only not to be found
9 within the Convention because the Convention is not exhaustive. Any other interpretation
10 would be to create an entirely open-ended obligation of compliance with the entirety of
11 international law in the territorial sea, as to which there is nothing to suggest that this was the
12 intention of the drafters. And in this respect, I recall how Professor Sands repeatedly
13 emphasised how the words ‘other rules of international law’ were ‘broad and open-ended’
14 and ‘very open-ended.’⁷⁴

15 148. If the intention is not to establish an obligation of compliance, but merely to be descriptive,
16 then according Mauritius the ‘broad and open-ended’ meaning to ‘other rules of
17 international law’ would not be so unworkable.

18 149. But Mauritius seeks to have it both ways, and we say that is supported neither by the
19 commentary nor by the language used.

20 150. Now, Mauritius cannot avoid that by saying it is not seeking the implementation of specific
21 bilateral undertakings, but is just seeking application of general international law rules, like
22 the obligation to comply with undertakings as founded in the general duty of good faith⁷⁵.
23 But such formulations simply bring in the whole of international law through the back door.
24 Most obviously, on Mauritius’ logic, you can say that the obligation to comply with any

⁷⁴ Prof Sands, day 3, p. 299, lines 3-12.

⁷⁵ Prof Sands, day 3, p. 300, from line 9-11.

1 given treaty is a general rule of international law as that is founded on the general
2 international law rule of *pacta sunt servanda*.

3 151. In sum, the attempt to cast bilateral undertakings as general rules of international law goes
4 against the 1956 commentary, just as against the specific words used in Article 2(3).

5 152. There are three more specific points on interpretation.

6 153. First, Mauritius points to a string of other provisions said to be comparable, and suggests that
7 it is absurd to be making so much of the use of ‘is’ or ‘shall’ or ‘must.’ But of course, with
8 each individual provision one must be looking at that provision with respect to its specific
9 wording, and in its context.

10 154. Of the provisions that Mauritius referred to last week, only Article 34(2), which forms part
11 of the general provision describing the legal status of straits, is truly analogous. Article 38(3)
12 on transit passage and Article 49(3) on archipelagic waters are not analogous because they
13 refer only to non-transit activity, or to sovereignty, being subject to the Convention. There is
14 precisely no reference to ‘other rules of international law.’ Articles 78(2) and 87(2) use
15 clearly mandatory terms in relation to a defined object within the Convention: – ‘must not
16 infringe ... navigation and other rights and freedoms of other States as provided for this
17 Convention’; ‘shall be exercised by all States with due regard for the interests of other States
18 in their exercise of the freedom of the high seas.’ So we just don’t see where the reference
19 to this string of particular provisions takes Mauritius.

20 155. Secondly, Mauritius has sought to meet our arguments by reference to the other language
21 texts of the Convention, although oddly it appeared to be suggested that this was a point that
22 we had introduced⁷⁶.

23 156. As we understand it, the argument is that the French text to Article 2(3) uses the present
24 tense “*s’exercent*”, as does the Russian text, and hence there is an obligation of compliance.

⁷⁶ Prof Sands, day 3, p. 296, from line 4.

1 And, in response to Mauritius' reliance on the French language text, we pointed out how the
2 use of the mandatory 'shall take place in conformity with' in Article 19(1) does not appear in
3 the French text through use of the present tense, but rather as '*doit s'effectuer en conformité*
4 *avec*', again, we say, clearly mandatory language.

5 157. We were taken to task for this last week, and told that this was hardly a persuasive argument,
6 hardly a persuasive argument as a linguistic matter because: "The verb 'devoir' is not the one
7 that is usually employed in the French language to convey legal obligation in international
8 agreements" and likewise it was said by Professor Sands, "If anything, that word usually
9 connotes a weaker commitment than the use of the present tense in French."⁷⁷ Well, that is a
10 point that someone should have made to the drafters of the French text of the Vienna
11 Convention on the Law of Treaties, as to which Article 26 provides: "*Tout traité en vigueur*
12 *lie les parties et doit être exécuté par elles de bonne foi.*" One sees the same use of *devoir*
13 in Article 31 of the Vienna Convention, and indeed the verb is used multiple times in both
14 the Vienna Convention and UNCLOS, generally as the French version of the English 'shall'
15 or 'must.'

16 158. Thirdly, Professor Sands relied on the 2011 Advisory Opinion of the ITLOS Seabed
17 Disputes Chamber to support the case that the reference to other rules of international law
18 in Article 2(3) has a broad and open-ended meaning. But all the Chamber was doing was to
19 interpret Article 293(1), coming to the conclusion that this encompassed customary and
20 conventional rules of treaty interpretation⁷⁸. We would very much agree, but we do not see
21 how that assists Mauritius in its interpretation of Article 2(3).

22 159. Finally, on Article 2(3), Mauritius says that its asserted traditional fishing rights fall within
23 the scope of the provision. I will deal with this briefly, as Mauritius has no traditional fishing

⁷⁷ Prof Sands, day 3, p. 297, lines 15-16.

⁷⁸ *Responsibilities and Obligations of States Sponsoring Persons and Entities with Respect to Activities in the Area*, Advisory Opinion, 1 February 2011, para. 57.

1 rights, and it is anyway unable to show any intention to protect such rights within the scheme
2 of the 1982 Convention. The fact that such rights are expressly covered so far as concerns
3 archipelagic States, in Article 51(1), serves to highlight the absence of any intention to bring
4 them indirectly within the ambit of Article 2(3) so far as concerns the territorial sea. And in
5 this respect we refer you to paragraph 8.33(a) of our Counter-Memorial.

6 **D. Article 56(2)**

7 160. I move very briefly indeed to Article 56(2), but simply to say that Professor Boyle is now
8 going to pick up again on the issues of interpretation here. Our basic point is that the
9 formulation ‘shall have due regard to’ does not somehow mean ‘shall give effect to,’ and we
10 see that as a rather straightforward point on interpretation.

11 We do not see Mauritius’ case on Article 56(2) as raising any discrete issues on facts so far
12 as concerns fishing rights.

13 161. Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, I thank you for your kind attention, and ask you to
14 call Professor Boyle to the podium.

15 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you, Mr. Wordsworth.

16 And I call Mr. Boyle.

17 **Mauritius v United Kingdom**

18 **Alleged breaches of UNCLOS, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement and Abuse of Rights**

19 **Professor Alan Boyle**

20 **A. Mauritius’ case on the merits**

21 1. In this speech, I want to respond to the main thrust of Mauritius’ arguments on the remaining
22 allegation of violations of the Convention. If I do so selectively in some places it should not be
23 assumed that the United Kingdom thereby accepts any of the claims advanced by Mauritius in
24 its written pleadings or in the oral argument: it does not.

- 1 2. Last week Mauritius repeated the claims that it made in the written pleadings. And broadly
2 these fall into five groups: first, non-consultation with respect to the declaration on the Marine
3 Protected Area; secondly, non-cooperation with respect to fisheries; third, non-coordination of
4 policy on marine pollution; fourth, violation of alleged continental shelf rights; and then
5 finally, abuse of rights.
- 6 3. I will make seven points in response. Firstly, I will argue that the creation of an MPA, within
7 what is in UNCLOS terms the exclusive economic zone, is not a matter that would normally
8 fall within any of the situations where coastal states would have an obligation in international
9 law to consult other states before acting. My point is that there is no general obligation to
10 consult when exercising sovereign rights under the Convention and if there were the
11 Convention would say so, and in a number of places for particular rights, it does.
- 12 4. My second point will be that even if you reject the first argument, the most that can be said is
13 that international law requires timely consultation at an early stage. Consultation is not an
14 endless process, nor does it entail seeking the consent of the State consulted. These points, I
15 will argue, are accepted customary international law.
- 16 5. My third point, leading on from that, is that if we do judge the United Kingdom's relations with
17 Mauritius in 2009 and 2010 by that standard, then there has been no breach of any obligation to
18 consult, whatever its basis. In our view, any tribunal reading the documents disclosed by both
19 parties in this case can come to no other conclusion.
- 20 6. Turning then to the specific articles of UNCLOS relied on by Mauritius for consultation, my
21 fourth point will be that in the circumstances of the present dispute there was no legal
22 obligation under Articles 2(3) or 56(2) to consult with regard to the MPA, but that, if there was,
23 that obligation, for the reasons already set out, has been satisfied.

1 7. My fifth point is the United Kingdom has complied fully with articles 63 and 64 of the
2 Convention and article 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement. I may reduce that a little bit as we go
3 through since I've already dealt with some of those points this morning.

4 8. My sixth point, will be that I will address very briefly the argument made by Mauritius that it
5 currently has rights over the continental shelf – which, of course, we deny.

6 Seventh, I will deal even more briefly with the arguments on article 194 concerning marine
7 pollution. These are exceptionally weak.

8 9. And then finally, I will explain why the abuse of rights claim made by Mauritius is without any
9 foundation in fact or law. Given the terms of article 297(3)(b) of the Convention we say that
10 this part of Mauritius' case is misconceived. And I think that adds up to eight points, I
11 promised seven to begin with.

12 **B. Consultation regarding the MPA**

13 **(a) No applicable rule on consultation in customary international law**

14 10. So, let me begin with consultation and the general rule. The essential point of Mauritius' case
15 on consultation, at its broadest, is that by virtue of a binding undertaking, it shares the rights of
16 a coastal State over the natural resources of the MPA, and that it must be consulted before any
17 decision is taken which interferes with those shared rights. As, authority for its argument it
18 relies on the *Lac Lanoux Arbitration*⁷⁹ and on the *Icelandic Fisheries Cases*.⁸⁰

19 11. There are two responses to that argument. First, if you decide that Mauritius has none of the
20 rights it claims, then its case on consultation disappears.

21 12. The second response is to ask whether the precedents on which Mauritius relies have any
22 relevance to the present case. Even Mauritius says that this case is unique. Certainly, it is not a
23 case about shared natural resources or common property resources as those concepts are
24 normally understood.

⁷⁹ *Lac Lanoux Arbitration*, 24 ILR (1957) 101.

⁸⁰ *Fisheries Jurisdiction Cases (UK and Germany v. Iceland)* ICJ Reports 1974, p. 3 and p. 175.

1 13. *Lac Lanoux* concerns international watercourses in which all riparians share the right to make
2 equitable use. The *Pulp Mills Case*⁸¹ to which some reference was made also falls into that
3 category. The *Icelandic Fisheries cases* are about the equitable allocation of common property
4 in high seas fish stocks. And in that case, and I think it applies to all of these cases, the ICJ said,
5 “It is implicit that negotiations are required in order to define or delimit the extent of those
6 rights.....” (para 74).

7 14. The *Lac Lanoux case* has been applied to activities which pose a risk of transboundary harm. In
8 that context the law was codified by Principle 19 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and
9 Development. I won’t bother reading that one out but the I will come back to this, so the text
10 will stay there for the moment.

11 But again, this precedent does not apply to the facts of the present case, which obviously do not
12 involve transboundary harm.

13 15. So, Mauritius is unable to cite any precedent requiring states to consult about the conservation
14 and management of natural resources which fall within the exclusive sovereignty or sovereign
15 rights of the coastal state, in other words, in this case, the United Kingdom. The most that
16 Mauritius can say is that exceptionally it benefits from an undertaking or perhaps an agreement
17 to allow access in limited circumstances to those otherwise exclusive resources, either now or
18 at some time in the future. At best its claim exemplifies the limited possibility – I won’t call it
19 a right since it is not – of access to surplus EEZ fish stocks as set out in article 62 of the
20 Convention. Mauritius has been remarkably coy about article 62. But the essential point that I
21 am making is that the precedents on which it relies do not support the existence of a general
22 rule of consultation before sovereign rights are exercised in the EEZ.

23 **(b) Consultations regarding the MPA**

⁸¹ *Case Concerning Pulp Mills on the River Uruguay*, ICJ Reports 2010, p. 14, Judgment.

1 16. That brings me to my second point. Let us suppose for the sake of argument that I am wrong
2 and that there is some obligation to consult in these circumstances. What would the parameters
3 of that obligation be? Even though it is otherwise inapplicable, the nearest analogy, and
4 probably the most useful for this purpose, is the rule on consultation in cases of transboundary
5 harm codified by Principle 19 of the rule that you see in front of you on the screen. You will
6 note what it requires: “provide prior and timely notification and relevant information”;
7 “consult with those states at an early stage and in good faith.”

8 17. If consultations were required before establishing the MPA, we would say that no more can be
9 expected of any coastal state than the criteria set out here. The key points are surely that
10 consultation must be at an early stage and it must be informed. So, with that in mind, we can
11 now return briefly to Ms. Nevill’s account of relations between the parties in the crucial period
12 beginning with the January 2009 bilateral talks and ending with the declaration of the MPA in
13 April 2010.

14 18. I propose only to summarise the key points in order to show that the United Kingdom did in
15 fact consult Mauritius fully, at an early stage, with adequate information, and well before
16 declaring the MPA. So we would say that if there is any legal obligation to consult before
17 exercising sovereign rights, which obviously we do not accept, then there has been no breach.

18 19. The salient facts, I would suggest, are these. First: the Marine Protected Area proposal was
19 initially drawn up by the Chagos Environmental Network and other NGOs, and their public
20 campaign was launched on 9 March 2009. Second: the Secretary of State for Foreign and
21 Commonwealth Affairs decided on 6 May 2009 that consideration should be given to that
22 proposal for a large-scale marine reserve. Third: the MPA proposal was then discussed during
23 the second round of bilateral talks with Mauritius in July 2009, and in meetings between the
24 British High Commissioner in Port Louis in October 2009, with the Foreign Minister on 12
25 October, with the Mauritian High Commissioner in London on 13 October, the Prime Minister

1 on 22 October and with the Prime Minister's Chief of Staff on 23 October, and at that meeting
2 the draft of the public consultation document, which contained 3 options for a large scale
3 MPA, was outlined. Fourth: information about the MPA had also been given to Mauritius in
4 the July talks, and it was supplemented as requested by Mauritius in the October meetings.
5 Fifth: the Marine Protected Area was formally established on 1 April 2010, that is a full eleven
6 months following the Foreign Secretary's May 2009 decision and nine months after the second
7 round of bilateral talks. And indeed six months after the meetings in October, at which all of
8 the final information was conveyed to Mauritius.

9 20. Against this timetable, Ms. MacDonald's idea that the United Kingdom should have consulted
10 Mauritius about the MPA during the first round of bilateral talks in January 2009 is surely
11 fantasy: the government was at that point still considering its policy options and talking to the
12 NGOs. Mauritius complains that it learned of the MPA proposal from a leak to the newspapers
13 in February 2009, but that was the NGO campaign launched a few weeks later, it's not the
14 United Kingdom's proposal. So January 2009 is really too early for consultation to start. And
15 the cases, including *Lac Lanoux* and *Pulp Mills*, show there has to be a plan, a proposal, a
16 policy or a decision to consult about. In January there was none.

17 21. But once the Foreign Secretary had taken his decision in May 2009, there was a plan – or at
18 least a proposal. And we would say this is the right moment to seek consultations. And indeed
19 that is what happened. The Foreign Office arranged for the MPA proposal to be explained and
20 discussed during the second round of bilateral talks in Port Louis on 21 July 2009. Ms. Nevill
21 has given you a full account of that meeting, which also considered joint management of fish
22 stocks and the possibility of a joint submission to the CLCS. On the same day the Mauritian
23 Foreign Minister was given a briefing on the proposed MPA, as was the Cabinet Secretary, Mr.
24 Seeballuck.⁸²

⁸² UKCM, paras 3.42-52.

1 22. Mauritius was told that the proposal under consideration was a large-scale Marine Protected
2 Area that would cover all of BIOT's waters. As regards fishing, Mauritian officials were also
3 told that there were three options, one of which was a ban on fishing throughout the MPA. And
4 you will find that document – I think I've got the wrong tab number here but that document is
5 at a tab in your folder. And I apologize for that.

6 23. In our view, the July meeting was timely, it ensured that –I think that is actually probably
7 Mauritius' Tab 3.12 that I'm referring to at Paragraph 8, and I'm sorry I can't be more definite
8 on that. In our view, the July meeting was timely. It ensured that Mauritius was fully
9 informed about the MPA proposal, including the proposed ban on commercial fishing, and it
10 was at an early enough stage to allow Mauritius to ask for further information – as it did – and
11 to make meaningful representations. And what was the outcome of that July bilateral meeting?
12 It was a joint communiqué in which the Government of Mauritius welcomed in principle the
13 MPA proposal. And you will find the communiqué in your folder at Tab 56.⁸³ If you read that,
14 you will see there were no complaints about inadequate consultation. There were no
15 complaints that Mauritius could not get its views across or had been ignored. We would say
16 that tested by the standard of consultation expected in *Lac Lanoux* or *Pulp Mills* it is quite clear
17 that the United Kingdom would easily pass the test on these facts.

18 24. So, given that conclusion, if I'm right, it follows that as a matter of law the subsequent contacts
19 between the two governments are not relevant to the question whether there was consultation.
20 Now, they might be relevant if Mauritius alleged some later agreement, or they might even
21 help us explain why relations between the two governments broke down in the end. But that
22 was also true in *Lac Lanoux* and the *Pulp Mills* case.

23 25. The purpose of consultation is simply to convey the necessary information and to allow for a
24 response and a reasoned exchange of views. But it does not have to continue indefinitely, it

⁸³ MM, Annex 148; UKAF, Tab 56, p. 69; UKCM, para 5.29 a.

1 does not have to continue until the other party is happy, any more than consultations under
2 article 283 have to carry on indefinitely. But there does come a point when, after listening to
3 and trying to accommodate the other side, it is entirely legitimate for a government to proceed
4 and to make a decision. The *Lac Lanoux* case makes that point in a variety of ways in slightly
5 quaint language. But perhaps the key passage here is where the arbitrators say: ‘the risk of an
6 evil use has so far not led to subjecting the possession of these means of action to the authorisation
7 of states which may possibly be threatened’.⁸⁴ Put simply, there is no need for agreement. And
8 it’s therefore not necessary to carry on consultations when everything has been done.

9 26. So, what was done? Well, following the July meeting, there were follow-up meetings in
10 September, in October and November as detailed by Ms. Nevill. I have referred to some of
11 them. Additional information explaining the MPA options was provided to Mauritius, and I
12 will take you back to some of that correspondence in a moment. It shows repeated attempts to
13 get Mauritius to agree a date for a further round of bilateral talks about the MPA, until
14 Mauritius finally made it clear that it would not agree to any further consultations. But in our
15 view the necessary consultations took place in July, and what occurred after that is not material
16 to Mauritius’ case.

17 27. Perhaps this is the point at which I could respond to Judge Greenwood’s question about the
18 relationship between the Public Consultation conducted by the Foreign Office between
19 November 2009 and March 2010, and the consultations with Mauritius. Let me explain first,
20 that the Public Consultation was a process whose sole purpose was to allow the public to
21 express a view on the proposed MPA. And that’s not necessarily the British public, it was also
22 the Chagossians, indeed it was an international Consultation. In certain instances, of which this
23 is one, British Government policy is to allow for public comment before proceeding with
24 significant legislative or regulatory changes. The BIOT MPA consultation was a very large

⁸⁴ 24 *ILR* (1957) 101, at 126.

1 one, and it was over an unusually long period of six months, but a Consultation of this kind in
2 principle is by no means unusual. In answer to Judge Wolfrum’s question about how many
3 Mauritians responded to the consultation, you can pursue this up to a point in the Facilitator’s
4 Report, which is at Annex 121 of the Counter-memorial, we have been through that. It is not
5 particularly helpful, but it does reveal that 450 individuals responded, of whom we can identify
6 only one who quite clearly has an address in Mauritius. You can draw your own conclusions
7 from that. But I can also say that several Chagossian groups responded as well.

8 28. Second, coming back to Judge Greenwood’s question, I should make clear that the Public
9 Consultation was in no sense a substitute for bilateral consultations with Mauritius, and in our
10 view it is not relevant to the argument made by Mauritius, nor does Mauritius say that it is.
11 Mauritius was invited by Mr. Roberts to join with the United Kingdom in the public
12 consultation, not as a consultee, but as a joint promoter of the MPA. And you can see that in
13 paragraphs 20 and 21 of his witness statement which is at Annex 74 of the Rejoinder.

14 29. If I could take you to Tab 15 in your first folder. You will see there a document about a meeting
15 on the 22 October 2009 between the British High Commissioner who met Mr. Ramgoolam to
16 discuss Mauritius’ attitude to the public consultation.⁸⁵ And I simply note the fact that that’s
17 what he was meeting Mr. Ramgoolam to discuss. The following day he had a follow-up
18 meeting with the Chief of Staff of the Prime Minister to discuss “the likely shape of the
19 anticipated consultation.” He also pointed out that the consultation “couldn’t now be
20 delayed.”⁸⁶ And you will find that document at Tab 15 in the folder. These are all documents
21 that Ms. Nevill referred you to on Wednesday.

22 30. Now, if I could ask you to refer to the second volume, to Tab 71. This is a *note verbale* of 11
23 November 2009, in which the United Kingdom indicated again that the purpose of the public
24 consultation was to gain views on the proposal, that no policy decision had yet been taken, and

⁸⁵ UKR Annex 60.

⁸⁶ UKCM Annex 104.

1 that it envisaged further bilateral talks with Mauritius on the issue.⁸⁷ The note also shows that
2 the public consultation document was given to the Mauritian Cabinet Secretary, and changes
3 were made as a result of representations by the Mauritian Prime Minister.⁸⁸

4 Now if you can turn to Tab 42 in your folder, you will see there a *note verbale* from Mauritius
5 dated 23 November 2009⁸⁹. In that, Mauritius made clear that it really could not proceed with any
6 further Consultations. If I may read out the key passage, it says: “... an MPA project in the Chagos
7 Archipelago should not be incompatible with the sovereignty of the Republic of Mauritius over the
8 Chagos Archipelago and should address the issues of resettlement, access to the fisheries
9 resources, and the economic development of the islands in a manner which would not prejudice an
10 eventual enjoyment of sovereignty. [And it concludes,] A total ban on fisheries exploitation and
11 omission of those issues from any MPA project would not be compatible with the long-term
12 resolution of, or progress in, the talks on, the sovereignty issue”.

13 31. And then finally, if I could take you to Tab 72 of your folder, you will see that’s the letter from
14 the Mauritian Foreign Minister, Mr. Boolell, dated 30th December 2009, and you have already
15 been taken to that several times.⁹⁰ The key thing there is his conclusion, “it was inappropriate
16 for the British authorities to embark on consultations on the [MPA] outside the bilateral
17 Mauritius-UK mechanism for talks on issues relating to the Chagos Archipelago.” So, in other
18 words, what he is saying is that by virtue of proceeding with the Public Consultation, Mauritius
19 felt obliged to withdraw from any further bilateral consultations with the United Kingdom.
20 There is also a Note Verbale of the same date making the same point. I won’t read that one out,
21 it’s at Annex 158 of the Memorial.

22 32. What we suggest, is that these documents provide, we hope, the answer to Judge Greenwood’s
23 questions: the two processes, the Public Consultation and bilateral consultation with Mauritius,

⁸⁷ MM, Annex 154; UKCM, para 8.52(f).

⁸⁸ UKCM, paras 3.62-63.

⁸⁹ MM, Annex 155; UKCM, para 5.29(c).

⁹⁰ MM, Annex 157; UKCM, para 8.52.

1 proceeded in parallel but independently of each other. Plainly, Mauritius ultimately decided it
2 was not in its interest to endorse the Public Consultation. It was prepared to engage, it would
3 appear, in bilateral consultations, but it did not want the Public Consultation to proceed at the
4 same time in disregard of its sovereignty claim. So, in effect, you might say that Mauritius was
5 putting a gun to the Foreign Secretary's head. He could have one or the other consultation but
6 he could not have both.

7 33. I will also now try to answer the ongoing question from Judge Greenwood about the follow-up
8 to Mr. Boolell's letter of 30 December. You will recall that the British Foreign Secretary wrote
9 to Mr. Boolell on 15 December to allay any misunderstanding about the Ramgoolam-Brown
10 meeting. I would ask you to look again at Mr. Boolell's reply at Tab 72. You will see that right
11 at the end he says: "our respective Prime Ministers agreed that the MPA project be put on hold
12 and that this issue be addressed during the next round of Mauritius-United Kingdom bilateral
13 talks." So the response from Mr. Boolell on 30 December very clearly envisaged that the
14 matter would be discussed at the next round of bilateral talks.

15 34. Now, if I could ask you to turn to Tab 73. The UK then wrote to Mauritius on three occasions
16 seeking a date for those further talks. There is first a note verbale of 15 February seeking an
17 indication of dates, secondly, there is a letter of 19 March from the High commissioner to Mr.
18 Seeballuck, and thirdly, there is a further note verbale of 26 March. And in all of these the UK
19 emphasises, as it had before, that the public consultation should not be regarded as an obstacle
20 to further consultations with Mauritius. The United Kingdom's Note Verbale of 15 February
21 responds to the Mauritian Note Verbale of 30 December, which was sent the same day as Mr.
22 Boolell's letter, but it does not refer to any commitment by Gordon Brown or to the CHOGM
23 meeting. You will find that at Annex 158 of the Memorial. Now, there is, so far as we can tell,
24 only one reply from Mauritius, and you will find it at Tab 56, only one reply to these three
25 communications from the United Kingdom. At Tab 56, what you have is a letter from Mr.

1 Seeballuck, Secretary of the Cabinet, on 19 February, responding to the Note Verbale, in
2 which he indicates that Mauritius could not discuss the MPA unless the public consultation
3 was terminated⁹¹. The High Commissioner responded in his letter of 19 March, with his
4 assurances that the public consultation did not preclude, bypass or overtake the bilateral talks.
5 And the United Kingdom tried again on the 26 of March in a further Note Verbale. But at no
6 point was Mauritius willing to agree further bilateral consultation. And there the matter of Dr.
7 Boolell's letter, I think, peters out.

8 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Mr. Boyle, it doesn't quite peter out as far as I'm
9 concerned, I'm afraid. If I could just come back to it for a moment. I remain rather surprised
10 about this correspondence, I must say. The letter from the Foreign Secretary to Mr. Boolell dated
11 15 December has been described both by you and by Ms. Nevill as an attempt to clear up the
12 misunderstanding at CHOGM. But it doesn't refer to a misunderstanding at CHOGM. It doesn't
13 refer to anything allegedly said by one Prime Minister to another at all. It says, at our meeting you
14 mentioned your concerns that the UK should have consulted Mauritius further before launching
15 the consultation exercise. I regret any difficulty this has caused you or your Prime Minister, and
16 there is a reference later to misunderstandings. But it's not directly dealing with this question of
17 whether there was an undertaking to put the MPA on hold. But Dr. Boolell's reply is dealing with
18 that quite expressly. I have now managed, because I had so many tabs open, I've closed the one
19 that has Dr. Boolell's reply. But he does say in terms in the final paragraph of that letter of the 30
20 December, you will recall that your Prime Minister undertook to put the MPA on hold.

21 Now, that's quite a serious suggestion, there was an agreement, it says, between the
22 two Prime Ministers, but there doesn't appear to have been a reply to that.

23 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Well, it depends on how you understand the letter of 15
24 December, with all due respect.

⁹¹ MM, Annex 162, UKAF, Tab 56, p. 72.

1 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Explain it to me.

2 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Well, it might be the kind of letter that any of us would
3 write in the circumstances. It seems to me that you could read that letter as a very diplomatic and
4 rather understated attempt to respond to the point. There is no doubt that Mr. Boolell – I agree
5 entirely that Mr. Boolell does undoubtedly make reference to it but there is no doubt that he also
6 envisages the matter being dealt with in a further meeting. And it's not unreasonable therefore for
7 the recipient in the Foreign Office to say that someone should go and meet Mr. Boolell. That
8 would be the obvious way to deal with a problem of this kind, I would suggest, respectfully.

9 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Well, I can understand that, but I'm also a little
10 bit surprised, given the very, very clear difference of views put by the two delegations here about
11 what transpired at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, that the response to this
12 paragraph in Dr. Boolell's letter wasn't a letter saying we do not accept that anything of the kind
13 was agreed at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting.

14 PROFESSOR BOYLE: I understand your concern, and clearly we would prefer if
15 we could produce correspondence which answered your point directly, but we have looked
16 through everything in our files, and we've scoured all we can. So far that's all we have been able
17 to come up, but it does seem to me that there is a perfectly convincing story there. Maybe there
18 was a misjudgement, but that depends how you understand the Foreign Secretary's letter of the
19 15th. And it doesn't seem to be unreasonable to deal with it that way. It does attempt to address
20 the question, and indeed Dr. Boolell's letter was an attempt to deal with the problem. What's
21 interesting is the Note Verbale from the Government of Mauritius at exactly the same date makes
22 no reference to the CHOGM meeting at all.

23 I've got further instructions.

24 (Pause.)

1 PROFESSOR BOYLE: I think that's actually the point I already made, but Dr.
2 Boolell's letter was quite clearly referring to the possibility of the meeting where the
3 misunderstanding could be resolved, and it's very clear there were repeated attempts following that
4 to deal with the problem. Unfortunately, that meeting never took place, but that was clearly not the
5 United Kingdom's fault. Strenuous efforts were made to attempt to resolve that matter at a
6 meeting once it was grasped and there obviously was a problem. But Dr. Boolell clearly
7 envisaged a meeting being the right response, and as I say, the Note Verbale of the same date didn't
8 make any reference to the issues. So, it may be that this has been somewhat overplayed. But,
9 unfortunately, I can't help you at the moment to any greater extent than that.

10 ARBITRATOR GREENWOOD: Well, thank you for the help that you have
11 given.

12 ARBITRATOR WOLFRUM: Professor Boyle, looking upon this exchange of
13 letters from the receiver's side, I have once upon a time, it's long, long years ago, learned that one
14 should look into this exchange of letters from the receiving side. How was the letter to be
15 understood which you qualify as very diplomatic and understated? Certainly not there is a
16 reference to a misunderstanding and not clarifying a misunderstanding.

17 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Well, I regard it as a very diplomatic letter, but then I'm
18 not here to give evidence. I have just read the letter. That's all I could essentially say on that
19 point. It doesn't seem to me to be an unreasonable response, but I don't know what the facts were,
20 indeed, that was part of the problem, we are in some doubt as to what are the facts, since no one
21 else had any record of this meeting, and we obviously have a difference of view between two
22 Prime Ministers about what occurred. That's unfortunate, but it is where we are.

23 Different governments do write to each other in rather different terms. Had this
24 been an exchange in correspondence between the King of Saudi Arabia and the King of Kuwait,
25 I've forgotten his precise title, but it would be on very different terms, and again, it would be

1 inexplicable to ask why two governments would write to each other in those terms, but it reflects
2 the particular national characteristics of the governments concerned.

3 All I can say is that brings me to the obvious conclusion that, as regards
4 consultation, the United Kingdom clearly did all it could to try to bring these consultations to an
5 amicable and reasonable conclusion, but at the end of the day, it was Mauritius which
6 unquestionably pulled out of the consultations as it said because it did not wish to see the public
7 consultation proceed and that's why it terminated the bilateral consultations with the United
8 Kingdom.

9 35. That brings us to Judge Greenwood's other question, I hope I can answer this one. It was the
10 question about the Foreign Secretary and the decision he took on 1 April. You asked why did
11 he take it quite so quickly. Two points. The Public Consultation was overwhelmingly
12 positive, the scientists were in favour, so were the other UK stakeholders and the NGOs, and
13 the United States was willing for the proposal to go ahead. So, there was no reason to delay a
14 decision. Secondly, the deadline for submissions to the Public Consultation was extended from
15 12 February to 5 March, solely so that the facilitator could hold a video-conference with the
16 Chagossian community in Mauritius on 4 March. She had been unable to travel to Mauritius as
17 planned⁹² to hold that Consultation because there had been difficulties with Mauritius over the
18 public consultation⁹³. Mauritius was advised of the extension of the deadline by a Note
19 Verbale of 15 February⁹⁴. So, it was a decision which could have been taken then. I don't
20 think you would be making your point if the Public Consultation had ended on 15 February.
21 But the only missing piece was that Consultation with the Chagossians in Mauritius. And the
22 third point on this is clearly relevant, there was an election due at the beginning of May, which
23 was a little over four weeks later. In the British system of government, when an election is

⁹² UKCM, Annex 105, Facilitators Terms of Reference, para. 2.

⁹³ UKCM, para. 3.60.

⁹⁴ MM, Annex 161.

1 called, essentially government stops. No new policies can be introduced. So, either Mr.
2 Miliband took his decision on 1 April – which is the last possible date he could do so before the
3 election - or he could leave the decision for the incoming government four weeks later. He took
4 the decision, he did lose office, a new government came in, and they confirmed his decision. It
5 is not only Mauritian politicians who find themselves constrained by election timetables.

6 36. So, in summary, we would suggest that the evidence referred to by Ms. Nevill shows the
7 following:

- 8 • That there were meaningful and initially constructive consultations between the parties with
9 regard to the declaration of the MPA.
- 10 • Secondly, that those consultations were undertaken well before the MPA declaration was
11 adopted and in circumstances designed to give Mauritius every opportunity to influence the
12 design and implementation of the project.
- 13 • The consultations ensured that the Mauritian government at all levels was fully informed of
14 what was proposed and given the opportunity to respond.
- 15 • Mauritius' response was focused largely on joint management of resources and activities
16 which could advance its sovereignty claim.
- 17 • After October 2009 Mauritius chose not to engage in the public consultation or in further
18 bilateral talks on the MPA proposal.
- 19 • It was only once that was clear and the Public Consultation was complete, did the United
20 Kingdom proceed with the declaration of the MPA on 1 April 2010.

21 37. We would say that the evidence shows that the United Kingdom acted in good faith throughout
22 these consultations in an attempt to engage Mauritius on the substance of the proposal, and that
23 it did so before taking any decision to implement the MPA. It sought and it wished to continue
24 discussions with Mauritius. The decision to end those consultations was taken not by the
25 United Kingdom but by Mauritius.

1 **(c) No requirement of consultation pursuant to Arts 2(3) & 56(2)**

2 38. I can now turn very briefly to the specific articles of the Convention on which Mauritius relies
3 for its alleged obligation to consult in advance of the MPA declaration.

4 39. We would say for reasons that are already explained, there is no customary obligation to be
5 incorporated into article 2(3).⁹⁵ There is no customary obligation. And for reasons explained
6 earlier this afternoon by Mr. Wordsworth, we would say that even if there is, it cannot be
7 shoehorned into article 2(3) for the reasons he has already advanced.

8 40. Mauritius also relies on article 56(2). It rightly notes that this article requires the coastal state to
9 have “due regard” to the rights and duties of other states in the exclusive economic zone. But, if
10 having “due regard” for the rights of other states means consulting them, we would suggest the
11 text would have said so. Other articles of the Convention do expressly require consultation
12 when the rights of other states may be affected. They include articles 41 (on traffic separation
13 schemes), 66 (on anadromous species); and Article 142 (on activities in the seabed area). And
14 it is quite possible to have regard for the rights of other states without consulting them: states
15 do so on a daily basis. So the omission of the appropriate language in this particular context, is
16 not likely to be accidental.

17 41. As I said this morning, having due regard means what it says: take account of, give
18 consideration to, do not ignore. We would suggest that both the internal United Kingdom
19 documentary record on which Mauritius relies, and the bilateral negotiations to which the
20 United Kingdom has referred, amply demonstrate that due regard has indeed been paid to the
21 claimed rights of Mauritius. And that there is no breach of article 56(2) on this evidence.

22 42. An express obligation to consult and to cooperate with respect to straddling and highly
23 migratory fish stocks is included in articles 63 and 64, and I will deal very briefly with these
24 because I think I’ve actually dealt with most of the points earlier today.

⁹⁵ MR, paras. 6.68-6.72.

1 **C. Consultation and cooperation with respect to fishing**

2 **(a) The facts establish consultation and cooperation**

3 43. But once again, the United Kingdom's response is that the evidence simply doesn't show the
4 lack of consultation alleged by Mauritius, either in regard to Article 63 or 64 or indeed Article
5 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement. What we would say, is that as a full member of the Indian
6 Ocean Tuna Commission, the United Kingdom has participated in and cooperated with that
7 body in the conservation and management of fish stocks in the Indian Ocean. And in doing so,
8 it has more than satisfied the requirements of Article 64 of UNCLOS and of Article 7 of the
9 Fish Stocks Agreement. I would also point out that as regards bilateral cooperation, there is,
10 once again, the British-Mauritian Fisheries Commission, Ms. Sander drew your attention to
11 that on Wednesday. She explained how it was established in 1994 as a forum for cooperation
12 on fisheries matters between the two countries, that it was Mauritius which brought that
13 Commission to an end for sovereignty reasons in 1999. And it was Mauritius that declined in
14 2009 to resume cooperation on fisheries through that body.

15 44. Ms. Sander has also taken you through the discussions, the bilateral talks, in January and July
16 2009. You will recall that they covered fisheries issues, although the fisheries issues raised by
17 Mauritius were essentially joint licensing of foreign exploitation of the fish stocks.⁹⁶

18 45. So, it seems to us that the evidence really contradicts any argument about a failure of bilateral
19 cooperation between the two parties with regard to fish stocks.

20 46. The same is true of Mauritius' participation in the IOTC. The Commission's published
21 records show that at meetings of the Commission, Mauritius never raised the question of
22 cooperation with the United Kingdom over fisheries, nor has it ever sought to have the MPA
23 discussed. Its only relevant intervention in IOTC meetings has been to press its sovereignty
24 claim over BIOT or to object to proposals made by the United Kingdom with respect to

⁹⁶ UKCM, Annexes 93 and 101; Day 5, Sander, pp. 610-613.

1 BIOT⁹⁷. Mauritius has also objected to the United Kingdom's participation in meetings of
2 like-minded coastal states⁹⁸. Mauritius cannot really complain on the one hand about a failure
3 by the United Kingdom to cooperate with the IOTC while at the same time obstructing the
4 United Kingdom's participation in the work of the Commission.

5 47. Nor has the IOTC itself ever expressed any concern about the declaration of the MPA or the
6 attitude of the UK. There are no resolutions of the IOTC on these subjects. You will search its
7 annual reports in vain for any criticism of the UK or the MPA by any member state – and
8 Mauritius has not drawn your attention to any. Given that one of Mauritius' claims is that the
9 United Kingdom has not consulted or cooperated with the IOTC, this silence is beyond
10 remarkable: it is of evidential significance. It would be extraordinary for this tribunal to find in
11 favour of Mauritius on cooperation with the IOTC when that issue has never been raised in or
12 by the IOTC.

13 48. And that contrasts, I would suggest, very strongly with the recent decision of the ICJ in the
14 *Whaling Case*.⁹⁹ Japanese scientific whaling had been the subject of many critical resolutions
15 in the IWC, it had been discussed on numerous occasions by the Scientific Committee,
16 sometimes in very sceptical terms. No-one who reads IWC reports could be in any doubt that
17 Japanese scientific whaling was controversial and that many member states were unhappy with
18 it. Nothing remotely comparable can be said about the United Kingdom's exemplary record of
19 participation in the IOTC.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ IOTC 14th Report of the Scientific Committee 2011, IOTC-2011-SC14-R[E],
<http://www.iotc.org/sites/default/files/documents/proceedings/2011/sc/IOTC-2011-SC14-R%5BE%5D.pdf>
f, pp. 14-15, p. 14; IOTC 15th Report of the Scientific Committee 2012, IOTC-2012-SC15-R[E],
<http://www.iotc.org/sites/default/files/documents/proceedings/2012/sc/IOTC-2012-SC15-R%5BE%5D.pdf>
f, p. 18, p. 18.

⁹⁸ IOTC Technical Committee on Allocation Criteria Meeting, Muscat, Oman 18-20 February 2013, day 2,
UKCM, Annex 133.

⁹⁹ *Case Concerning Japanese Whaling in the Antarctic (Australia v Japan)*, Judgment, ICJ reports 2014.

¹⁰⁰ UKCM, para 9.24.

1 49. Mauritius claims “the UK’s engagement with the IOTC was simply to inform it that the
2 “MPA” was contemplated and that it “could have implications” for the organisation.”¹⁰¹

3 50. But consultation is a two-way process. Having notified the IOTC it was open to the
4 Commission or its members to come back with a request for more information or to seek
5 further dialogue had they wanted to do so. And they did not do so, nor did Mauritius.

6 **(b) Articles 63 and 64 are inapplicable**

7 51. It follows, we would suggest, from all of this evidence that the United Kingdom has complied
8 with whatever obligations of consultation and cooperation it may have had under articles 63
9 and 64 of UNCLOS, and article 7 of the Fish Stocks Agreement. But you will recall what I said
10 this morning, that in any event these articles are entirely irrelevant to this case because they are
11 inapplicable to Mauritius. Mauritius is not a state which fishes in waters adjacent to the BIOT
12 MPA and it is not a state which fishes in the same region. It certainly hasn’t provided any
13 evidence to that effect. And the evidence which it has provided to the IOTC, and I showed
14 you the map this morning, flatly contradicts the point.

15 52. So, regardless of whether there was consultation and cooperation here, we would say that these
16 articles are entirely irrelevant. And I should also add that in regard to Article 64 and Article 7,
17 Churchill and Lowe described the IOTC as “an organization of the kind envisaged by article
18 64.”¹⁰² Under article IV of the IOTC Agreement, membership is open to “coastal states
19situated wholly or partly within the [IOTC Area].” And the United Kingdom and Mauritius
20 are both members and we would suggest that is the correct forum in which cooperation should
21 occur.

22 **(c) Article 7 UNFSA is inapplicable**

23 53. That brings me very briefly to the Fish Stocks Agreement to which some reference has been
24 made.

¹⁰¹ MR, para. 6.106.

¹⁰² Churchill and Lowe, *The Law of the Sea*, 3rd edn, p. 313.

1 54. It's not necessary to say very much. I think the point which needs emphasis is to explain
2 Mauritius' references to Article 7(2) and 7(3), an argument that the United Kingdom has an
3 obligation to agree conservation measures with Mauritius or with other member states of the
4 IOTC. That argument misunderstands these articles. The key point here is that articles 7(2)
5 and 7(3) require States whose nationals fish on the high seas "to ensure that measures
6 established in respect of such stocks for the high seas do not undermine the effectiveness" of
7 conservation and management measures adopted by "coastal States within areas under national
8 jurisdiction". There is a much weaker obligation for coastal states to take account of the
9 conservation measures applied to the adjacent high seas areas. That might be relevant if there
10 were any, but Mauritius certainly has not drawn our attention to any.

11 55. So, we would suggest the only significance of these two articles is that if Mauritius does fish on
12 the high seas in adjacent waters – and there is no evidence that it does – but if it did, it would
13 have an obligation not to undermine the effectiveness of the conservation measures taken by
14 the United Kingdom in the BIOT MPA. In other words, not to undermine the effectiveness of
15 the no-take fisheries zone. But as I say, there doesn't seem to be any evidence that this article
16 would in fact be applicable on the circumstances of this case.

17 56. Article 7 does involve, however, a complex attempt to balance the rights of coastal states and
18 the legitimate interests of high seas fishing states in conservation and management of shared
19 fish stocks. But again, the obvious forum for negotiating such measures is the IOTC. And here,
20 bilateral negotiations with Mauritius would be of relatively limited value, because if the article
21 were applicable, clearly one would want a much broader forum for cooperation. But as I
22 explained yesterday Mauritian vessels do not on the evidence fish in these waters.

23 57. So, Mr. President, members of the tribunal, if we stand back and look at the totality of the
24 evidence on fisheries cooperation between the parties, two things are fairly clear. First, there
25 were ample opportunities for Mauritius to enter into a dialogue with the United Kingdom about

1 MPA fisheries and straddling or highly migratory fish stocks, either multilaterally through the
2 IOTC, or bilaterally through the Joint Fisheries Commission, or directly. The onus is on
3 Mauritius to show why it could not have availed itself of any of those opportunities, and why
4 the discussions which took place in 2009, and which it brought to an end, do not constitute the
5 ‘consultation’ it now demands. Let me point out that Mauritius too, has an obligation to
6 cooperate.

7 58. Secondly, the IOTC is the appropriate body for discussions and cooperation between coastal
8 states and distant water fishing states with regard to depleted tuna stocks and other highly
9 migratory stocks in the Indian Ocean.

10 59. Here too, the onus is on Mauritius to show why the existing participation of both states in the
11 IOTC does not constitute the cooperation required by article 64 of UNCLOS and article 7 of
12 the Fish Stocks Agreement.

13 60. Finally, we do have to wonder what point Mauritius is trying to make when it alleges
14 non-consultation and non-cooperation on fish stocks. Fairly obviously, it is not trying to save
15 the tuna and it’s not trying to prevent unsustainable fishing in the Indian Ocean. It has not
16 suggested that the MPA fishing ban undermines the effectiveness of the IOTC or of the
17 conservation measures adopted by the IOTC. Indeed, it could not do so.

18 61. Nor is Mauritius saying that the ban on commercial fishing in the MPA has harmed its own
19 non-existent fishing in adjacent waters. In reality, Mauritius is not a distant water fishing state,
20 it’s not dependent on the BIOT fishery; its fishing is confined mainly to its own coastal waters,
21 so nothing that happens between 500 and 900 miles away has any bearing on its fishing
22 industry or economy.

23 62. And what Mauritius does seem to want is some measure of control over how the United
24 Kingdom as a coastal state manages the conservation of fish stocks and other living resources

1 within the BIOT MPA. But as we pointed out in the Counter-Memorial, that makes Mauritius
2 sound like an old-fashioned distant water fishing state from the 1960s.

3 63. The arguments that it now makes for greater access to coastal state fish stocks are the same
4 arguments that brought about the failure of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fisheries. They
5 are fundamentally incompatible with the extension of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction that has
6 occurred since the *Icelandic Fisheries Cases* were decided, and most obviously they contradict
7 the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, of which both States are parties. Nostalgia for the 1960s might
8 be understandable – up to a point – but reinventing preferential fishing rights is surely beyond
9 the pale.

10 **D. Continental shelf rights**

11 64. That leads me very briefly to the continental shelf. Sir Michael Wood has dealt with this issue
12 at some length and I need only recall that the understanding reached in 1965 as part the
13 Lancaster House talks included a paragraph which stated that “the benefit of any minerals or
14 oil discovered in or near the Chagos Archipelago should revert to the Mauritius
15 Government.”¹⁰³ Later the same year the Secretary of State for the Colonies indicated that
16 “The islands are required for defence purposes. There is no intention of permitting prospecting
17 for minerals or oils on or near them.”¹⁰⁴

18 65. We would say that the clear and unambiguous wording of the 1965 understanding and the
19 negotiating record demonstrate that at present Mauritius has neither ownership nor sovereign
20 rights over oil or gas or minerals on the BIOT continental shelf.¹⁰⁵

21 66. Let me go back, if I may, to one of the documents on which Mr. Reichler relied. It is at tab 8.7
22 in Mauritius’ folder. This is a Foreign Office memo from 1970 about oil and gas in the Chagos
23 Archipelago. Page 2 sets out the United Kingdom position very clearly, and it notes that “This

¹⁰³ 1965 Understanding, para 22(viii), UKCM, para 2.112.

¹⁰⁴ UKCM, para 2.113 and MM, Annex 29.

¹⁰⁵ UKCM, paras 2.83-85; 2.112-2116.

1 was fully understood by [Mr. Wilson, the Prime Minister] and the Mauritian Government at
2 the time. In fact, it was officially stated in the Legislative Assembly on 21 December.” Thus,
3 we would say that it was understood by Mauritius at the time of the independence negotiations
4 that sovereign rights over the continental shelf would remain vested in the United Kingdom
5 until the islands were no longer needed.

6 67. And the same applies equally to the harvesting of sedentary species. Mauritius claims that they
7 were included in the traditional fisheries undertaking given by the United Kingdom, or the
8 understanding given by the United Kingdom in 1965 and that a ban on harvesting them
9 contravenes its rights under Article 78(2).

10 68. The Rejoinder sets out the position as it existed in 1965.¹⁰⁶ There was no harvesting of
11 sedentary species at that time. Nor have any licences been issued since then. The wording of
12 the understanding reached in 1965, as Mr. Wood had suggested, cannot have been intended to
13 cover sedentary species.

14 69. So, the claim that Mauritius has “traditional fishing rights” with respect to those species simply
15 has no merit unless Mauritius can show that such a fishery existed in or before 1965, and it
16 hasn't made any attempt to do so.

17 **E. Marine pollution: article 194**

18 70. Let me turn to pollution. Mauritius makes two claims under article 194. First, it argues that
19 the United Kingdom has a duty to coordinate its policy on marine pollution with Mauritius. Its
20 second claim is that the United Kingdom must not legislate on marine pollution in a manner
21 that interferes with Mauritius' right to fish in the MPA.

22 71. Neither claim has any merit. Article 194(1) is simply the chapeau to the more specific
23 treatment of different sources of marine pollution set out in paragraph (3) of that article, and
24 these sources are then dealt with in much more detail by articles 207 to 212, and I said quite a

¹⁰⁶ UKR, paras 8.43 – 8.46.

1 lot about those this morning. So, the obligation to endeavour to harmonize policies on marine
2 pollution cannot be understood in isolation from the differing standards laid down by those
3 articles. Mauritius has made no effort to elaborate this point.

4 72. But let me just give you one illustration. Article 211 requires states to establish international
5 rules and standards for the prevention and control of marine pollution from ships. As we saw
6 this morning, they have to do so through the IMO and the MARPOL Convention provides all
7 the detailed rules and standards. So, there you've got international regulation of the problem.

8 73. Now, contrast that with article 207 on land-based pollution. It is noticeably and deliberately
9 in much weaker terms. It simply says that states "shall endeavour" to harmonize their policies
10 at the appropriate regional level. Now, in this part of the Indian Ocean the appropriate regional
11 forum is probably the Nairobi Convention for the Protection, Management and Development
12 of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Western Indian Ocean adopted in 2010. You
13 won't find anything about that in Mauritius' pleadings.

14 74. Mauritius could of course have placed coordination of policy on marine pollution on the
15 agenda of the bilateral talks with the United Kingdom in 2009, or subsequently, but it did not
16 do so. The first occasion on which the United Kingdom became aware that Mauritius regarded
17 marine pollution as an important issue of shared concern was when it received Mauritius'
18 Memorial in this case in August 2012.¹⁰⁷ What evidence is there of any cooperation by
19 Mauritius, I might ask?

20 75. As for the argument that pollution legislation may unjustifiably interfere with Mauritius' claim
21 to fish in the MPA and therefore violates article 194(4), this is frankly rather difficult to
22 understand. Pollution has been for many years strictly regulated in the MPA under existing
23 laws. These include:

24 1988 Environment Protection (Overseas Territories) Order¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ Arbitrators Folder, Tab 46.

¹⁰⁸ UKR, Annex 31.

1 1994 Prevention of Oil Pollution Ordinance¹⁰⁹, and the
2 1997 Regulation of Activities by Vessels Ordinance¹¹⁰

3 76. Mauritius has never in the past suggested that these laws have interfered with any of its fishing
4 activities in BIOT waters, nor has it ever raised the matter in bilateral talks, nor has it made any
5 reference in its pleadings to this legislation. The National Oceanographic Centre Report on the
6 MPA notes that there have been no marine oil-spill incidents,¹¹¹ and there is no suggestion that
7 bunkering of fishing vessels has been a problem. I think it's true that pollution caused by waste
8 discharges from supply vessels moored in the lagoon and from the BIOT patrol vessel have
9 been identified as a problem, and they're being dealt with. We've obviously discussed that
10 earlier in the proceedings.¹¹² The lagoon is outside the MPA, and the problem there has no
11 bearing on the claims made by Mauritius under article 194.

12 77. All I can say in conclusion on that point is the United Kingdom has no information on whether
13 Mauritian fishing vessels are likely to have difficulty complying with BIOT pollution laws or
14 with any future legislation. Perhaps Mauritius might like to provide us additional information
15 on that.

16 **F. There is no basis for an abuse of rights claim**

17 78. That brings me happily to the last point, but it's a substantial one, so it will take 10 minutes, and
18 that's the abuse of rights claim. This is now the fifth UNCLOS case in which one party has
19 alleged a violation of article 300, and so far as I can tell, it's the only one to come to argument
20 on the merits.¹¹³ There is therefore little or no jurisprudence, so let me start with the questions
21 of law that arise when article 300 is pleaded, and I have got four propositions.

¹⁰⁹ UKR, Annex 42.

¹¹⁰ UKR, Annex 50.

¹¹¹ NOC Report, UKCM, Annex 102, UKAF, Folder 1, Tab 17, p. 11.

¹¹² Report by the BIOT Environment Adviser, March 2013.

¹¹³ The others are: *Swordfish*, *Mox Plant*, *Southern Bluefin Tuna*, and *MV Louisa*.

1 79. First, abuse of rights is not an independent basis of claim, and Mauritius appears to have
2 conceded this point, and I don't think I need to say any more about it.

3 80. Second, the burden of proving abuse of rights is on the party alleging it. In this respect the
4 normal rules of international litigation apply, and Mauritius does not argue otherwise.
5 However, unlike Professor Crawford, we would say that Mauritius has failed even to adduce
6 prima facie evidence of improper purposes or bad faith.

7 81. Third, clear and convincing proof of injury is required. Professor Crawford did not mention
8 that point in his oral argument, but Mauritius does rely in its written pleadings on the section on
9 abuse of rights in the *Max Planck Encyclopaedia*, written by the late and much-lamented Alex
10 Kiss, so let me quote what he says on the subject, and you can see it in front of you on the
11 screen there. He says: "The fact of injury resulting from an abuse of rights is a fundamental
12 element in the implementation of that principle," and he goes on to refer to the *Trail Smelter*
13 *Arbitration*. He says: "The abuse should be 'of serious consequence' and the injury
14 established by clear and convincing evidence."¹¹⁴ There is arguably good reason for a
15 requirement of serious injury because rights may be abused without that amounting to a breach
16 of treaty. I would suggest that without serious injury there would perhaps be no reason for a
17 court to adjudicate on such a claim of abuse.

18 82. Mauritius has made much of its alleged fishing rights in BIOT waters, but it can scarcely say
19 that their termination after many years of very limited use has caused it serious economic
20 injury. Nor can it claim serious injury to its legal rights: at best, article 56(2) requires that due
21 regard be paid to its claim to fish in BIOT waters. That limited obligation has to be read in
22 conjunction with article 58(3) which requires other states to have due regard for the rights and
23 duties of coastal states, and to comply with their laws and regulations. And that article and the
24 obligation of foreign fishing vessels to comply with coastal state laws set out in article 62(4)

¹¹⁴ UKCM, Authority 75, at para 31.

1 renders any claim to fish in the EEZ highly contingent and terminable when the coastal state
2 has reasonable grounds for doing so. If proof of serious injury is required for an abuse of rights
3 claim to succeed, then I would suggest that Mauritius fails at the first hurdle.

4 83. That brings me to my fourth point, that the rights in question must have been used in an abusive
5 manner. Mauritius contends, first, that this means they must not be exercised for a purpose
6 different from the one for which they were created. Second, it says that the use to which they
7 are put must be capable of fulfilling the purpose for which they were created. And these are
8 distinct issues and I am going to deal separately with them.

9 84. The first claim amounts to saying that the purpose of the MPA is not what it is said to be by the
10 government. And to prove its case on improper purposes, Mauritius must somehow persuade
11 you that the Foreign Secretary – and presumably his officials – were motivated by some
12 inadmissible purpose that is extraneous to their powers under UNCLOS. If true, the Foreign
13 Secretary and his officials would have been responsible for a quite enormous charade over a
14 period of nearly two years.

15 85. What does Mauritius cite as evidence for that? Well, it cites a Wikileaks document, it refers
16 to the High Court testimony of the Mr. Roberts, the BIOT Administrator, and to a briefing
17 paper circulated over a year prior to the declaration of the MPA. It also draws attention to the
18 advice given by officials. The United Kingdom has set out its views on Wikileaks documents
19 at paragraph 8.64 of the Counter-Memorial. In cross-examination under oath Mr. Roberts
20 flatly denied making the alleged ‘Man Friday’ remark or having any ulterior motive.¹¹⁵ Ms.
21 Yeadon denied that he made any such remark. The High Court dismissed the allegation. The
22 briefing paper does not support the claim made by Mauritius about preventing resettlement.
23 But even if it did, a briefing paper does not constitute proof of clear and convincing proof of
24 ulterior political motive, nor does the advice given by officials. None of this, we would

¹¹⁵ MM, Annex 174, day 2, pp. 34-36

1 suggest, adds up or comes near to the necessary evidential burden which Mauritius must
2 discharge to prove this claim, which in our view is wholly unfounded.

3 86. Professor Crawford referred to the MPA as a “multi-purpose enterprise” with political aims.

4 What is the implication here? If the implication is that there is some ulterior and inadmissible
5 purpose behind the MPA, what is it? Professor Crawford mentioned only the government’s
6 desire to improve its image after the scandals of Iraq and extraordinary rendition. What is the
7 implication of that? That politicians should not have additional public relations advantages in
8 mind when they use powers conferred by treaties to achieve otherwise legitimate objectives
9 that are wholly consistent with the object and purpose of the treaty in question? Australia made
10 the same argument in the *Whaling Case*, when it drew attention to statements made by
11 Japanese politicians and officials who appeared to have non-scientific motives in mind when
12 they established the scientific whaling programme. The Court dismissed that argument in a
13 short sentence.¹¹⁶ “Accordingly, the Court considers that whether particular Government
14 officials may have had motivations that go beyond scientific research does not preclude a
15 conclusion that a program is for purposes of scientific research.” I would suggest that you
16 should dismiss that allegation in a similarly short sentence.

17 87. Nor, given the evidence on which the MPA decision was based, is it plausible to say that the
18 government was acting for some extraneous purpose. You may have seen the Report on the
19 MPA drawn up by the National Oceanographic Centre which sets out the scientific rationale;
20 you have heard that the creation of the MPA conforms to policies for the Overseas Territories
21 set out in white papers in 2009 and 2012; you are familiar with the negotiations and
22 consultations between the two governments which took place in 2009 and 2010; and you have
23 no doubt read or seen or probably will read the Public Consultation document in November

¹¹⁶ *Whaling Case*, at para 97: “Accordingly, the Court considers that whether particular government officials may have motivations that go beyond scientific research does not preclude a conclusion that a programme is for purposes of scientific research within the meaning of Article VIII.”

1 2009. There is ample evidence here to demonstrate the real purpose for creating the MPA and
2 for concluding that it was reasonable to proceed as proposed.

3 88. The decision to establish one of the world's largest MPAs is clearly a legally significant policy
4 decision, and an example of state practice. That it was known to be controversial, or that some
5 officials gave contrary advice, or that it was opposed by the multinational fishing industry,
6 does not show that it is not fully consistent with the object and purpose of UNCLOS or with
7 international policy on the marine environment. In our view that is more than sufficient to
8 show that the United Kingdom's sovereign rights in respect of conservation and management
9 of BIOT fish stocks and the protection and preservation of the marine environment were used
10 for the purposes for which they were conferred.

11 89. If you bear with me, I can get to the end in five minutes. Mauritius' second argument is that
12 the MPA is not reasonably capable of fulfilling its declared purpose, and I clearly need to deal
13 seriously with that. In its Memorial and in its oral argument last week Mauritius refers to the
14 failure to enact detailed regulations and to appropriate a budget; of effective enforcement; and
15 the exclusion of Diego Garcia.¹¹⁷ These allegations have all been dealt with by Ms. Nevill and
16 in the written answers given to Judge Wolfrum, and we regard all of them as misconceived.

17 90. But while refraining from challenging the science on which the MPA is based, Mauritius has
18 tried to suggest that that science does not justify interfering with the right to fish in the MPA. In
19 effect, if I understand him correctly, Professor Crawford seemed to be inviting you to uphold
20 the MPA but conclude there is no sufficient evidential basis for a no-take policy on fishing.
21 There are two responses to this argument.

22 91. First, it's not an abuse of rights claim. As I have now said several times, what we are faced with
23 here is a need to balance the competing rights of coastal states and of others fishing in their
24 EEZ, and the relevant rules are articles 56, 58, 61 and 62. So the question, we would suggest, is

¹¹⁷ MM, paras. 7.94-7.97.

1 whether in closing the MPA to foreign fishing to Mauritian fishing the United Kingdom has
2 acted consistently with those articles, and that is not an appropriate question for an abuse of
3 rights discussion.

4 92. Secondly, even if I am wrong, Mauritius has not shown that the decision to ban all commercial
5 fishing in the MPA lacks scientific justification. All it can point to are the differing opinions of
6 scientists about whether to ban fishing or continue the previous policy. It also points to
7 concerns about effectiveness, but those I think we have responded to. It is hardly news that
8 scientists disagree about the evidence, and Ms. Nevill has summarised the debate within the
9 NOC Workshop and drawn your attention to the reasons for a no-take policy and the strong
10 support they received there.

11 93. But I would suggest – this is a rather important point—that justifying measures of the kind
12 taken by the United Kingdom, in order to conserve fish stocks, biodiversity and the marine
13 ecosystems on which they depend does not require strong and cogent scientific evidence. It
14 certainly doesn't require scientific consensus, even assuming there is such a thing. Mauritius is
15 a party to the Fish Stocks Agreement. It has endorsed the application of a precautionary
16 approach to the management of fish stocks in precisely the circumstances of this case. It is
17 bound by the terms of that treaty and it is bound to respect measures adopted by coastal states
18 implementing that treaty, even if those measures abrogate fishing licences formerly held in
19 respect of the area now covered by the BIOT MPA.

20 94. And let me draw your attention to articles 6(1) and 6(2) on the screen.

21 1. States shall apply the precautionary approach widely to conservation, management
22 and exploitation of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks in order to protect the
23 living marine resources and preserve the marine environment.

1 2. States shall be more cautious when information is uncertain, unreliable or
2 inadequate. The absence of adequate scientific information shall not be used as a reason for
3 postponing or failing to take conservation and management measures.

4 95. Now, the implications of article 6(2) are obvious: the United Kingdom is entitled to be cautious
5 about conservation of fish stocks and coral reefs and endangered species and biodiversity in
6 the MPA. It does not have to postpone action until it has irrefutable proof that the conservation
7 measures it proposes to take are necessary and will be effective. If need be, it can proceed
8 while the scientists carry on with the necessary research.

9 96. I might in that connection cite the *Asbestos Decision* in the Appellate Body of the WTO, where
10 it said that the Government may ‘rely in good faith, on scientific sources which, at that time,
11 may represent a divergent, but qualified and respected, opinion’.¹¹⁸ In other words the science
12 does not have to be undisputed – and good science often is.

13 97. So, it follows, I would suggest, that if Mauritius wishes to cast doubt on the scientific
14 justification for the no-take MPA next week, it will have to provide much stronger and far
15 more cogent evidence that clearly and convincingly contradicts the existing scientific and
16 environmental basis for the no-take policy on fishing. Notwithstanding anything said by
17 Mauritius last week, it comes at the moment nowhere near doing so.

18 98. And it needs to be said that the science which underpins the BIOT MPA is the same science
19 which underpins the creation of other MPAs worldwide – BIOT is only one of the big seven
20 such zones established by coastal states.¹¹⁹ Other MPAs have been adopted by the OSPAR
21 Convention parties.¹²⁰ More are planned. The creation of large no-take MPAs does represent

¹¹⁸ *EC – Measures Affecting Asbestos and Asbestos-Containing Products*, WT/DS135/AB/R (2001), para. 178.

¹¹⁹ UKR paras 3.38-44.

¹²⁰ Scott, “Conservation on the High Seas: Developing the Concept of the High Seas Marine Protected Areas”, 27 *IJMC* 849 (2012), UKR Authority 38.

1 an internationally endorsed response to growing pressure placed on the marine environment by
2 unsustainable fishing. Destroy this one and you destroy all of them.

3 99. Mr. President, Judge Wolfrum asked a question about the scientific basis of MPAs, and this is
4 perhaps the right moment to answer him. At tab 74 you will find information provided by the
5 United Kingdom in response to that question. I should explain, this is a brief memo which has
6 been drafted by Professor Sheppard, who was the former BIOT scientific adviser. I should
7 stress that it is not submitted as expert evidence –

8 PRESIDENT SHEARER: I should allow Professor Sands to make his
9 intervention. What was it?

10 PROFESSOR SANDS: Mr. President, this has been the subject of discussion
11 between the Parties. The document that is tendered, we understand, is tendered by and on behalf
12 of the United Kingdom. It is authored by the United Kingdom, not by any other person. It is on
13 that basis that we have given our consent to that document being put forward, in response to a
14 question put. The sponsorship is that of the United Kingdom and no other person.

15 Thank you, Mr. President.

16 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you for the clarification.

17 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Yes, Mr. President. I'm grateful for that clarification.
18 That is exactly the position.

19 100. But what it does is to summarize the findings in the scientific literature, and it provides a
20 bibliography, and I hope that may be what Professor Wolfrum was asking for. And, of
21 course, if we can assist the Tribunal further by providing additional scientific material, we
22 will try our best to do so.

23 101. Mr. President, I think this is my last point. I have argued the abuse of rights case largely on
24 the same basis as Mauritius. Even on Mauritius' view of the law it seems clear that it has no

1 case. It falls well short of showing anything that Professor Kiss would identify with his
2 account of abuse of rights.

3 102. But for the sake of completeness, let me take you back to Article 297(3)(b) because we
4 would suggest that in this context, this fisheries context, the appropriate way in which to
5 deal with an abuse-of-rights claim is within the context of Article 297(3)(b), which does set
6 out a variety of grounds under which it is possible to challenge measures taken with respect
7 to the conservation and management of fish stocks in the exclusive economic zone.

8 103. So, our contention with respect to that article is that, in this context, it provides an
9 exclusive remedy for allegations focused on abuse of rights by coastal States with regard to
10 fisheries in the exclusive economic zone. And for that reason, we would suggest that it is
11 entirely inappropriate to look at that particular claim under Article 300.

12 So, Mr. President, Members of the Tribunal, it has been a rather long day, that
13 brings me to the end of my submissions for this afternoon. I will be happy to answer any
14 questions. If there are none, that concludes the United Kingdom's first-round arguments, and on
15 behalf of all my colleagues, may I wish you and our friends on the other side a pleasant weekend,
16 and we look forward to reassembling on Monday.

17 Thank you.

18 PRESIDENT SHEARER: Thank you, Professor Boyle. You took the words out
19 of my mouth about the forthcoming weekend, I think we all deserve a break.

20 And the latitude that I extended to the United Kingdom in relation to questions and
21 some we had gone a bit over time, I'm very happy, the Tribunal is very happy to extend the same
22 latitude to the Mauritius side, if they need it.

23 PROFESSOR BOYLE: Mr. President, we are very grateful to you for doing that.

1 PRESIDENT SHEARER: And so this brings the 50 round of arguments to an end,
2 and we meet on Monday morning at 9:30 to begin the second round of arguments, and we will hear
3 from Mauritius at that time.

4 So, thank you very much. Good evening.

5 (Whereupon, at 5:50 p.m., the hearing was adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Monday, May
6 5, 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, *810, 905*
ability, *772, 804*
able, *815, 837, 844, 886*
abolish, *841*
above, *786, 809, 855-856*
abrogate, *904*
Absence, *798*
absence, *781, 789, 849, 854, 874, 905*
absent, *841, 853*
absolute, *841-844, 853-854, 856*
absolutely, *773, 779, 782, 789, 833-834, 841, 863*
absurd, *808, 823, 872*
absurdity, *804*
abundant, *790, 792*
abundantly, *794, 797*
Abuse, *825, 874*
abuse, *784, 791, 823, 825, 875-876, 899-901, 903-904, 906-907*
abused, *900*
abusive, *901*
accept, *791, 797, 804, 814, 823, 834, 852, 863, 878, 886*
acceptable, *843-844, 851*
acceptance, *811, 831, 846*
Accepted, *800*
accepted, *801, 819, 825, 828, 843, 857-858, 875*
accepts, *874*
access, *776, 779-780, 784, 805-806, 820-823, 826, 842, 877, 883, 896*
accidental, *890*
accommodate, *881*
accord, *867*
accordance, *807, 818-819, 821-822, 849, 856*
accorded, *785, 844-845*
according, *782, 793, 841, 864, 871*
Accordingly, *902*
accordingly, *779, 822-823, 866*
account, *793, 800, 804, 807, 822, 826, 852, 862, 878-879, 890, 894, 907*
accurate, *838, 852, 909*
accurately, *779*
achieve, *798, 902*
achieved, *841*
achieves, *803*
acknowledged, *830*
ACP, *773*
across, *797, 828, 880*
acted, *790, 796, 889, 904*
acting, *772, 822, 835, 858, 875, 902*
action, *777, 784, 854, 881, 905, 909*
Activities, *853, 873, 899*
activities, *798, 804, 814, 877, 889-890, 899*
activity, *872*
acts, *857*
actual, *786, 841-842, 851, 863*
actually, *775, 782, 785-786, 832, 834-835, 854, 862-863, 880, 887, 890*
add, *785, 830, 836, 838, 867, 893*
added, *829-832, 840*
addition, *778, 829, 854, 870*
Additional, *881*
additional, *869, 899, 902, 906*
address, *779, 788, 794, 798, 830, 840-841, 850, 867, 876, 882-883, 886*
addressed, *772, 792, 816, 865, 884*
addressing, *789*
adds, *784, 870, 876, 902*
adduce, *900*
adequate, *878, 905*
adjacent, *817-818, 893-895*
adjourned, *839, 908*
adjournment, *833*
adjudicate, *900*
adjudication, *811*
Administrator, *901*

Admissibility, 808
 adopt, 800
 adopted, 801, 808, 812, 826, 889, 894-895, 898, 904-905
 adopting, 816
 adoption, 807
 advance, 824, 889-890
 advanced, 874, 890
 advantages, 777, 902
 advice, 782, 901, 903
 advised, 888
 Adviser, 899
 adviser, 906
 Advisory, 873
 advisory, 784
 advocated, 806
 advocating, 812
 Affairs, 779, 787, 848, 878
 affected, 890
 Affecting, 905
 affects, 791
 affirmation, 848
 aforementioned, 796
 afraid, 885
 Africa, 787, 793, 821
 afternoon, 789, 802, 822, 827-828, 832, 834, 890, 907
 afterwards, 776
 agenda, 776, 898
 agents, 837
 aggregating, 818
 aggregation, 818
 ago, 858, 861, 887
 agree, 777, 784, 802, 820-821, 832, 837, 864, 873, 881, 885-886, 894
 agreed, 777-778, 788, 803, 808, 819, 823, 828, 830, 832-833, 836-837, 844-845, 851-853, 863-864, 884, 886
 agreeing, 776, 854
 Agreement, 789, 808-809, 812, 816, 818-820, 827, 831, 864, 874, 876, 891, 893, 895-896, 904
 agreement, 788, 809, 819-823, 830-831, 834, 838, 840, 845-849, 854-855, 857, 859, 862, 864-865, 877, 880-881, 885
 agreements, 821, 846, 850, 863, 865, 873
 agrees, 777, 804
 agricultural, 831
 ahead, 831, 888
 aimed, 810, 857
 aims, 791, 794, 902
 air, 850
 aircraft, 798
 airspace, 868
 airstrip, 842
 Alan, 789, 874
 albeit, 833
 alert, 838
 Alex, 900
 alia, 848
 allay, 884
 allegation, 775, 781-782, 874, 901-902
 allegations, 785, 903, 907
 allege, 801, 813
 Alleged, 785, 874
 alleged, 772, 776, 781-786, 788, 791, 813, 820, 822-823, 827-829, 834, 856, 859-861, 875, 880, 890-891, 899-901
 allegedly, 780, 785-786, 862, 885
 alleges, 793, 895
 alleging, 900
 allergy, 851
 allocate, 826
 Allocation, 892
 allocation, 805, 817, 826, 877
 allow, 796, 841, 877, 880-881, 906
 allowable, 805-806, 814, 826
 allowed, 783, 815
 allows, 809, 822
 Almost, 791
 almost, 805, 809, 822, 824, 838
 alone, 777, 785, 859, 861
 already, 771-772, 776, 781, 785-786, 808-809, 816, 824-825, 828, 833, 840, 845, 853, 859, 861, 867, 869, 875-876, 883, 887, 890
 alter, 790-791
 altered, 824
 alternative, 819, 860
 Alternatively, 819
 Although, 795, 865
 although, 784, 825, 828, 832, 834, 846, 852-853, 861, 872, 891
 altogether, 830
 ambassador, 777
 ambiguous, 808
 ambit, 803, 874
 amenable, 807
 amend, 778-779
 amended, 841, 844
 amendment, 830-831, 840
 amendments, 832, 836
 American, 774, 844
 amicable, 888
 among, 805, 807, 826, 866
 amounted, 785
 amounting, 900
 amounts, 820, 901
 ample, 822, 894, 903
 amply, 890
 anadromous, 890
 analogous, 872
 analogy, 878
 analyse, 864
 analysis, 800, 843, 847, 857
 and, 792, 818, 828
 Annex, 772, 775-776, 781, 784, 786, 788, 792-794, 817-819, 832, 838, 850-851,

854, 856, 858,
 880, 882-885,
 888, 892, 896,
 898-899, 901
 annex, 832, 857
 annexed, 794, 838
 Annexes, 775, 784,
 854, 891
 annexes, 799, 801,
 837, 854
 announced, 866
 announcing, 783
 annual, 892
 another, 777, 811,
 826, 830, 833,
 840, 846, 849,
 852-853, 859,
 866, 885
 answer, 794, 809,
 813, 816, 830,
 833, 840, 846,
 864-866,
 882-884, 888,
 906-907
 answered, 794,
 837, 886
 answers, 866, 903
 Antarctic, 892
 anticipated, 784,
 882
 Anticipating, 818
 anyway, 833, 866,
 874
 apart, 791, 799,
 817, 846
 apologise, 803
 apologize, 830,
 832, 880
 apparently, 784
 appear, 780,
 788-789, 842,
 845, 873, 884-885
 appeared, 828,
 851, 872, 902
 appearing, 829
 appears, 780-781,
 785, 829, 836,
 850, 854, 900
 Appellate, 905
 applicability, 795
 applicable, 790,
 798-799, 817,
 819-820, 848,
 876, 894
 Application, 870
 application, 771,
 804, 818-820,
 824, 871, 904
 applied, 808, 819,
 847, 852, 854,
 866, 877, 894
 applies, 796, 810,
 826, 838,
 862-863, 877, 897
 apply, 791, 820,
 862, 877, 900,
 904
 applying, 844, 852,
 863
 appoint, 865
 apposite, 854
 appreciate, 837
 approach, 776-777,
 854, 904
 appropriate, 802,
 812, 844, 890,
 895, 898,
 903-904, 907
 approve, 828
 approved, 777, 865
 April, 781-782, 842,
 854, 878-879,
 888-889
 Arab, 808
 Arabia, 887
 arbitral, 817
 arbitrarily, 826, 860
 arbitrariness, 823
 arbitrary, 826, 860
 Arbitration, 876,
 900
 arbitration, 807,
 820
 ARBITRATOR, 780,
 788-789,
 812-814, 816,
 830-835, 850,
 855, 861-866,
 885-887
 Arbitrators, 898
 arbitrators, 881
 archipelagic, 799,
 872, 874
 Archipelago,
 773-775,
 779-780,
 782-784, 787,
 832, 835, 841,
 844, 848-849,
 856, 883, 896
 Area, 782, 787-788,
 790, 793, 805,
 820, 823-824,
 826, 873, 875,
 878-880, 893
 area, 778, 789-790,
 792, 796, 799,
 813, 844, 850,
 865, 890, 904
 Areas, 905
 areas, 778, 794,
 807, 818, 844,
 849, 856, 894
 Aren, 863
 Argentina, 859
 arguably, 900
 argue, 790, 808,
 817, 823, 875,
 900
 argued, 790, 805,
 826, 863, 906
 argues, 797-798,
 806, 818, 824,
 828, 897
 arguing, 808
 argument, 771,
 786, 798, 800,
 803-804,
 806-807,
 809-811,
 819-820, 844,
 846, 851, 860,
 863, 865, 869,
 872-876, 878,
 882, 891, 894,
 898-900, 902-903
 arguments,
 790-791, 803,
 827, 829, 872,
 874, 876, 896,
 907-908
 arise, 899
 arises, 855
 arising, 811, 828
 Armed, 853
 around, 782, 784,
 787, 789, 793,
 818, 863
 arrange, 775
 arranged, 879
 arrangement, 846,
 863, 865
 arrangements,
 832, 847, 850
 arranging, 773
 Art, 857
 art, 822
 Article, 771,
 775-776,
 782-784,
 787-788,
 790-791,
 794-806,
 808-814,
 816-817,
 819-828, 849,
 868-874,
 890-891,
 893-894,
 897-898, 902, 907
 article, 771,
 789-790,
 795-796,
 799-803,

- 805-806,
 808-810, 812,
 816-827,
 876-877, 881,
 890, 893-895,
 897-900, 905, 907
- Articles, 789, 797,
 828, 869, 872,
 875, 893
- articles, 785,
 798-803,
 815-816,
 818-820,
 822-823, 827,
 870, 875-876,
 890, 893-894,
 897-898, 903-904
- articulated, 812
- articulates, 802
- articulating, 780
- artificial, 799
- Arts, 890
- Asbestos, 905
- aside, 834
- aspect, 803
- aspects, 816, 842,
 847
- Assembly, 834,
 854, 867, 897
- asserted, 825, 828,
 873
- asserting, 784
- assertion, 790, 804
- assertions, 784
- assessing, 847
- assessment, 797
- assist, 827, 837,
 906
- assisted, 837, 909
- assists, 855, 873
- assume, 809, 814
- assumed, 874
- assumes, 842, 857
- assuming, 777,
 867, 904
- assumption, 842
- assurance, 848,
 851-852
- assurances, 845,
 848, 850-852, 885
- assure, 789, 863
- astonishing, 812
- attached, 846
- attempt, 785, 800,
 819, 833, 851,
 872, 885-887,
 889, 894, 897
- attempted, 850
- attempts, 822,
 881, 887
- attended, 830
- attention, 776,
 812-813, 819,
 829, 844, 855,
 874, 891-892,
 894, 901-902, 904
- attitude, 882, 892
- Attorney, 792
- attributes, 785
- AU, 787
- au, 818
- August, 792, 794,
 898
- Aust, 858
- Australia, 848,
 853-854, 892, 902
- Auth, 859
- authored, 906
- authorisation, 881
- authorities, 835,
 857-858, 883
- Authority, 808,
 810-811, 848,
 859, 900, 905
- authority, 800,
 861, 876
- autonomous, 866
- available, 818, 826,
 834, 837-838,
 841-842, 844,
 856, 867
- availed, 895
- avec, 873
- avoid, 788, 871
- awaiting, 865
- Award, 859
- aware, 775, 788,
 830, 834, 857,
 898
- away, 815, 822,
 838, 842, 895
- 815, 824-826,
 880, 883, 895,
 897, 904
- Banks, 792
- banned, 793, 806,
 815
- banning, 790, 797,
 860
- Barbados, 817
- bargain, 864
- Barrier, 792
- barriers, 782
- based, 821, 826,
 898, 902-903
- basic, 807, 845, 874
- basis, 771, 781,
 785-787,
 790-791, 796,
 801-802,
 806-807, 825,
 830, 842, 860,
 875, 890,
 899-900, 903,
 905-906
- battle, 815
- Batu, 859
- BE, 892
- bear, 774, 903
- bearing, 824, 846,
 895, 899
- bears, 818
- became, 898
- Bechuanaland, 857
- become, 773
- becoming, 855
- bed, 868
- been, 883
- beg, 827
- begin, 771, 795,
 816, 876, 908
- beginning, 811,
 878, 888
- behalf, 789, 834,
 851, 906-907
- behind, 869, 902

B

- back, 774, 780-781,
 788, 802,
 805-806, 816,
 822, 825, 828,
 831-837, 845,
 847, 850-852,
 861-862, 864,
 866-867, 871,
 877, 881-882,
 885, 893-894,
 896, 907
- background, 772,
 786, 829, 865,
 870
- bad, 807, 841-842,
 900
- bag, 859
- Bahrain, 808
- balance, 871, 894,
 903
- balanced, 823
- balances, 822
- balancing, 822
- ban, 778-780,
 790-794,
 796-797, 804,
 806, 809-810,

believe, 863, 865
 believes, 779
 Bellingham, 787
 belong, 811
 beneficial, 792, 815
 benefit, 792-794, 832, 843-844, 848-849, 856, 860-861, 864, 896
 benefits, 793, 877
 best, 777, 785, 798, 802, 814, 824, 832, 877, 900, 906
 Betch, 859
 better, 832
 between, 772, 774, 776, 778, 780, 782, 793, 808, 814, 816-818, 823, 825, 828-829, 833-834, 837, 846-850, 870, 878, 880-882, 885, 887, 889, 891, 894-895, 902, 906
 beyond, 805-806, 844, 868, 892, 896, 902
 bibliography, 906
 big, 834, 855-856, 905
 bilateral, 778-779, 782, 788, 860, 870-872, 878-885, 888-891, 894, 898-899
 bilaterally, 895
 binding, 772, 774, 780, 785, 811, 819, 827-828, 832, 834-835, 846-848, 850, 852, 855-858, 860-864, 876
 biodiversity, 790, 792-794, 810, 904-905
 biological, 810
 biomass, 792-793
 BIOT, 774-775, 777-778, 780, 789, 791-792, 797, 801, 804, 807, 811, 817-818, 824, 826, 835, 843-844, 860-861, 880-881, 891-896, 899-901, 903-906
 bit, 775, 814, 833, 836-837, 850, 861, 868, 876, 886, 907
 bite, 847
 Blair, 772-773
 Bluefin, 819-820, 899
 board, 773
 boats, 818
 Body, 905
 body, 840, 891, 895
 bonne, 873
 Boolell, 787-788, 883-887
 both, 773, 780, 792, 808, 812, 817-818, 820-821, 823, 830, 833, 837, 857, 865, 871, 873, 875, 884-885, 890, 893, 895-896
 bother, 877
 bothering, 862
 Botswana, 857
 bottom, 772, 774, 800, 832
 bound, 828-829, 834-835, 849, 853-855, 863, 904
 boundary, 816, 858
 box, 818
 boxes, 818
 BOYLE, 789, 795, 812-814, 827, 885-887, 906-907
 Boyle, 788-789, 795, 812, 816, 827-828, 860-861, 874, 885, 887, 907
 Branca, 859
 breach, 772, 774-776, 778, 781-785, 790, 827-828, 842, 869, 875, 878, 890, 900
 breaches, 772, 780, 782, 784, 828, 869, 874
 breaching, 869
 break, 795, 812, 816, 836-838, 866-868, 907
 Brief, 795, 816, 868
 brief, 811, 906
 briefing, 879, 901
 briefly, 791, 797, 801, 816, 820, 841, 866, 873-874, 876, 878, 890, 893, 896
 bring, 797, 813, 818, 852, 860, 871, 874, 888
 bringing, 803
 brings, 792, 797, 820, 823-825, 878, 888, 893, 899, 901, 907-908
 Britain, 844
 British, 775-776, 778, 782, 786-787, 791, 793-794, 828-829, 841, 844, 846-849, 851-852, 859, 863, 878, 881-884, 888, 891
 broad, 784, 797, 805, 809-810, 868, 871, 873
 broaden, 814
 broader, 805, 894
 broadest, 784, 798, 842, 876
 broadly, 809-810, 814, 875
 broke, 880
 brought, 774, 782, 784, 859, 891, 895-896
 Brown, 774, 782-784, 786-788, 861-862, 884
 brs, 818
 brsShop, 818
 budget, 903
 build, 799
 built, 851
 bullet, 777
 bullied, 815
 bullying, 815
 bundle, 773-774, 777-778, 783
 bunkering, 899
 burden, 818, 836, 900, 902
 Bureau, 818
 busy, 837
 bypass, 885

- bypassed, *780*
- C**
- Cabinet, *867, 879, 883, 885*
- cables, *795-797*
- call, *789, 827, 863, 865, 874, 877*
- called, *780, 846, 854, 889*
- calm, *850*
- came, *786, 789, 889*
- campaign, *878-879*
- Canberra, *818*
- cannot, *781, 797, 805, 808-809, 816, 822-823, 826, 841, 843, 859-860, 869-871, 890, 892, 897-898*
- capable, *801, 901, 903*
- capacity, *805, 814*
- Caprivi, *858*
- careful, *795, 836, 845*
- carefully, *785, 794-795, 845*
- carries, *800*
- carry, *812, 858, 881, 905*
- carte, *826*
- carved, *804*
- Case, *819, 853-854, 877, 892, 902*
- case, *771-772, 778, 783, 785-786, 788-791, 796-797, 803-804, 806, 824-827, 830, 833-834, 836, 840-841, 843, 852-853, 855-865, 868, 870, 873-877, 880-881, 893-894, 898-899, 901, 904, 906-907*
- Cases, *876, 896*
- cases, *813, 823, 854, 861, 877-879*
- cast, *772, 872, 905*
- casual, *853*
- catch, *793, 805-806, 810, 814, 826*
- catches, *793, 818*
- catching, *818*
- categorical, *845*
- categories, *772, 795, 811*
- category, *877*
- caused, *885, 899-900*
- cautious, *905*
- caveat, *838*
- caveats, *838*
- cease, *786, 842*
- ceased, *849*
- ceases, *809*
- cede, *856*
- centimeter, *775*
- centimeters, *775*
- central, *778*
- Centre, *792, 794, 899, 902*
- Certain, *810*
- certain, *795, 807, 811, 842, 846, 850, 856, 861, 881*
- Certainly, *876, 887*
- certainly, *775, 784, 788-789, 865, 893-894, 904*
- CERTIFICATE, *909*
- certify, *909*
- cession, *855-856*
- cetera, *814, 832, 867*
- Chad, *808*
- Chagos, *773-774, 778-780, 782-784, 787, 792-793, 832, 841, 844, 848-849, 854, 856, 861, 864, 878, 883, 896*
- chagos, *793*
- Chagossian, *835, 882, 888*
- Chagossians, *773, 783, 861, 881, 888*
- chaired, *859, 867*
- challenge, *784, 790, 804-805, 812, 815, 907*
- challenged, *813, 824*
- challenges, *771*
- challenging, *804, 812, 817, 903*
- Chamber, *873*
- chance, *777*
- change, *783, 787, 817, 844, 851, 856*
- changed, *856*
- changes, *855-856, 881, 883*
- chapeau, *897*
- Chapter, *797, 846*
- chapter, *794, 797*
- character, *800, 819*
- Characterisation, *791*
- characterisation, *791*
- characterise, *797, 809*
- characterised, *804*
- Characterising, *790*
- characterising, *826*
- characteristics, *888*
- characterize, *772, 830*
- characterized, *781*
- characterizes, *833*
- charade, *901*
- check, *832*
- checked, *867*
- Chief, *777, 879, 882*
- Chile, *808, 859*
- CHOGM, *884-886*
- choose, *841*
- chose, *858, 889*
- chosen, *819*
- Christopher, *865*
- chronology, *831*
- Churchill, *893*
- circulated, *901*
- circumstances, *786, 805, 812, 853-854, 860-861, 875, 877-878, 886, 889, 894, 904*
- cite, *877, 901, 905*
- cited, *806, 808*
- cites, *806, 901*
- citing, *784*
- citizens, *783*
- civil, *859*
- Claim, *785*
- claim, *771-772, 775-776, 781-782, 784-785, 790,*

797, 805-806,
 818, 820,
 823-828, 855,
 857, 860, 862,
 876-877, 884,
 889, 891,
 897-903, 907
 Claimant, 862
 claimed, 804, 825,
 890
 claims, 771,
 789-791, 793,
 796, 798, 816,
 820, 823-828,
 859, 874-876,
 892-893, 897, 899
 clarification, 836,
 845, 864, 906
 clarifications, 845
 clarify, 851
 clarifying, 866, 887
 clarity, 833-834,
 853, 861
 clauses, 800
 CLCS, 879
 clear, 776-777,
 783, 787, 794,
 797, 803, 806,
 808, 812, 830,
 834-835, 844,
 847-848, 853,
 855, 880-883,
 885-887, 889,
 894, 896,
 900-901, 906
 Clearly, 783, 869
 clearly, 773, 783,
 787, 791, 794,
 811, 816,
 872-873, 882,
 884, 886-888,
 894, 896, 903,
 905
 clinical, 822
 clip, 776
 clock, 812
 close, 793, 828,
 836, 870
 closed, 844, 885
 closer, 842, 859
 closest, 817
 closing, 904
 clue, 835
 CM, 792
 Cm, 792
 coalition, 782
 Coastal, 807, 898
 coastal, 771, 780,
 785, 790, 793,
 795-796,
 798-802,
 804-807,
 810-811,
 813-815,
 817-818,
 821-823,
 825-826,
 875-878, 890,
 892-896,
 900-901,
 903-905, 907
 codified, 870,
 877-878
 codify, 869
 cogent, 904-905
 coherence, 803,
 823
 coherent, 823
 colleagues, 832,
 866-867, 907
 collectively, 798
 Colonial, 836, 867
 colonial, 864-865
 colonialist, 835
 Colonies, 896
 colonies, 866
 Colony, 847, 865
 colony, 846
 combined, 820
 come, 773, 783,
 802-803,
 805-806, 822,
 825, 828,
 833-835, 845,
 847, 850-852,
 858, 860-862,
 864, 866, 875,
 877, 881,
 885-886, 893, 899
 comes, 775,
 779-780, 783,
 814, 825,
 834-835, 843,
 846, 857,
 860-861, 863,
 869-871, 902, 905
 coming, 777, 779,
 817, 828, 832,
 835, 844-845,
 855-856, 858,
 861, 873, 882
 Command, 792
 comment, 779,
 865, 881
 Commentary, 801,
 811, 822, 869-871
 commentary,
 871-872
 comments, 865
 commercial, 774,
 790-793,
 796-797, 804,
 806, 810, 824,
 826, 860, 880,
 895, 904
 commercially, 792
 Commission, 774,
 794, 816-817,
 820, 848-849,
 870, 891-893, 895
 commission, 819
 Commissioner,
 776, 878, 882,
 885
 commissioner, 884
 commitment, 786,
 799, 835, 841,
 844, 846, 848,
 850, 852-853,
 857, 873, 884
 commitments,
 857, 862-863, 865
 committed, 777
 Committee, 793,
 817-818, 867, 892
 common, 775, 798,
 876-877
 Commonwealth,
 774, 788, 878,
 886
 communication,
 855, 859
 communications,
 772, 857, 884
 communiqué, 785,
 880
 community, 888
 comparable, 799,
 872, 892
 compass, 833
 compatibility, 825
 compatible,
 779-780, 822, 883
 competence, 807
 competences, 814
 competent, 807
 competing, 808,
 903
 complain, 819, 892
 complains, 879
 complaint,
 778-779, 781, 851
 complaints, 880
 complete, 805,
 811, 826, 889
 completely, 778,
 811
 completeness,
 824, 907
 complex, 823, 894
 complexity, 816
 compliance, 776,

868-872
 complicated, 825
 complied, 876, 893
 compliments, 848-849
 comply, 783, 799-800, 871, 900
 complying, 899
 comprise, 775
 comprised, 857
 comprising, 859
 compromise, 807-808
 Compulsory, 825
 compulsory, 790, 795, 797, 803-807, 809-811, 815-817, 819, 821, 825-826
 computer, 909
 conceded, 783, 900
 conceivable, 842
 conceivably, 859
 concentrates, 817
 Concept, 905
 concepts, 876
 concern, 772, 782, 784, 790-791, 815, 841, 886, 892, 898
 concerned, 779, 799, 803, 815, 822, 825, 852, 885, 888
 Concerning, 877, 892
 concerning, 783, 795, 798, 804, 810, 813-814, 820, 825-826, 851, 853, 876
 concerns, 785, 830, 852-853, 868-869, 874, 877, 885, 904
 conciliation, 805-806, 811, 819-820, 823, 825-826
 conclude, 846, 903
 concluded, 858
 concludes, 771, 788, 800, 819, 827, 883, 907
 concluding, 903
 Conclusion, 787
 conclusion, 790, 803, 810, 817, 823-824, 873, 875, 880, 883, 888, 899, 902
 conclusions, 829, 869, 882
 conditioned, 811
 conditions, 799, 805-806, 817, 844-846, 854
 conducive, 778
 conduct, 800, 818
 conducted, 881
 conducting, 797
 Conf, 807
 confer, 797, 803
 Conference, 861, 866
 conference, 806, 867, 888
 conferences, 801
 conferred, 902-903
 confers, 795, 801, 804
 confidential, 859
 confined, 895
 confines, 826, 836
 confirm, 808
 confirmation, 808, 852, 858
 confirmed, 822, 845, 889
 confirming, 845
 confirms, 792, 808
 conform, 801
 conformité, 873
 conformity, 869-870, 873
 conforms, 902
 confusion, 847
 Congo, 853
 conjunction, 900
 connection, 800, 812-813, 905
 connotes, 873
 conscious, 783
 consensus, 806-807, 812, 904
 consent, 841-843, 846-847, 854, 862, 864, 875, 906
 consented, 773
 consequence, 900
 consequences, 823
 Conservation, 792-793, 905
 conservation, 774, 784, 791-794, 797, 799, 801-806, 809-810, 814, 817, 823, 826-827, 877, 891, 894-895, 903-905, 907
 conserve, 790-792, 794, 799, 805, 815, 904
 consider, 786-787, 797, 831, 840-841, 843, 849, 865
 considerable, 799, 828
 consideration, 776, 782, 822, 855-856, 861, 864, 878, 880, 890
 considered, 843, 849, 866, 879
 considering, 786, 879
 considers, 779, 858-859, 902
 consistency, 803, 823
 consistent, 802, 810, 815, 823, 834, 843-844, 853-854, 857-858, 868, 902-903
 consistently, 857, 904
 consists, 813
 constitute, 798, 800, 802, 825, 895, 901
 Constitutional, 866
 constitutional, 847, 865-866
 constrained, 889
 construction, 842, 862
 constructive, 777, 889
 construe, 810
 construed, 843, 850
 construing, 841
 consult, 781, 816, 824, 866, 875, 877-879, 890
 Consultation, 777, 793, 875-876, 881-884, 888-889, 891, 902
 consultation, 777-781, 789, 793-794, 828, 860, 875-885, 888-891, 893, 895

Consultations, 877, 883
 consultations, 837, 860, 878-879, 881-884, 888-889, 902
 consulted, 866, 875-876, 879, 885, 892
 consultee, 882
 consulting, 890
 contacts, 786, 880
 contained, 811, 828, 852, 870, 879
 Containing, 905
 containing, 847
 contains, 828, 852
 contemplated, 845, 893
 contemporaneous, 775
 contend, 851
 contending, 857, 871
 contends, 824, 841, 853, 855, 859, 869, 901
 content, 800-802, 834-835, 854, 858, 868
 contention, 786-787, 861, 907
 contentions, 852
 contents, 852
 context, 773, 775, 780, 789, 794, 796-798, 807, 822, 825, 848, 852, 859, 861-862, 864, 869, 872, 877, 890, 907
 contextual, 803
 Continental, 896
 continental, 791, 823-824, 848-849, 875-876, 896-897
 contingencies, 864
 contingent, 901
 continue, 836, 880-881, 889, 904
 continued, 776, 783
 continues, 780-781, 813, 864
 continuing, 777
 contract, 847, 864-865
 contradict, 896
 contradictory, 808
 contradicts, 800, 891, 893, 905
 contrary, 786, 808-809, 821, 823, 828, 844, 846, 849, 903
 contrast, 829, 852-853, 860, 898
 contrasts, 800, 892
 contravenes, 823, 897
 contravention, 796, 798, 825
 contribute, 774, 793
 control, 802, 895, 898
 controlled, 794
 controversial, 892, 903
 convenient, 795, 816, 836
 Convention, 781, 783-785, 788-790, 794, 796, 798-799, 801-804, 806-808, 811-815, 819-826, 849, 868-869, 871-877, 890, 896, 898, 905
 convention, 811, 816, 869
 conventional, 873
 conversant, 783
 conversation, 774, 778
 convey, 873, 880
 conveyed, 879
 convincing, 886, 900-901
 convincingly, 905
 cooperate, 784, 800, 802, 816, 890, 892, 895
 cooperated, 891-892
 cooperation, 778, 816, 818-819, 875, 891-895, 898
 cooperative, 838
 coordinate, 802, 897
 coordinates, 818
 coordination, 875, 898
 copies, 867-868
 coral, 790, 792-794, 805, 810, 905
 core, 825
 corner, 772, 818
 correct, 813, 830, 832-834, 852, 857, 893
 corrected, 838
 correcting, 852
 correction, 840
 correctly, 813, 824, 903
 correlation, 814
 correspondence, 789, 851, 881, 885-887
 corresponding, 835
 corrigendum, 837
 costal, 795
 couldn't, 882
 Council, 787, 828-829, 831, 834, 845-847, 853-854, 865
 council, 865
 Counsel, 812
 counsel, 909
 Counter, 811, 817-818, 824, 851, 874, 882, 896, 901
 countries, 793, 798, 821, 891
 couple, 814, 837
 course, 774, 777-778, 782-785, 791, 793, 819, 821-823, 828-829, 831, 835-836, 838, 841, 844, 846-847, 850, 853, 857, 866, 868, 872, 876, 898, 906
 Court, 857, 901-902, 909
 court, 805, 815, 823, 858, 900
 courtesy, 838
 courts, 847
 cover, 796-797, 802, 871, 880, 897
 covered, 790, 813, 850, 874, 891, 904

covers, 799, 805, 841
 coy, 877
 crack, 868
 Crawford, 846, 850-852, 863, 900, 902-903
 create, 871
 created, 778, 807, 815, 824, 860, 901
 creating, 794, 903
 creation, 782, 793, 796-797, 815, 824, 875, 902, 905
 Criteria, 892
 criteria, 802, 852-853, 862, 878
 critical, 851, 892
 criticism, 892
 criticized, 779
 cross, 901
 Crown, 847
 CRR, 909
 crucial, 796, 878
 crystallized, 783
 curiosity, 793
 curiously, 852
 current, 787, 823, 857-858
 currently, 876
 custom, 870
 customary, 846, 873, 875-876, 890
 cuts, 828

D

daff, 818

daily, 890
 data, 774, 818
 date, 782, 830, 862, 881, 883-884, 886-887, 889
 dated, 772, 833, 854, 883, 885
 dates, 884
 DAVID, 909
 David, 909
 Day, 772, 775-776, 784, 786, 828, 891
 day, 771, 779, 788, 813, 829, 839, 841-843, 846, 851, 859, 867-868, 871-873, 879, 882, 884, 888, 892, 901, 907
 days, 781
 de, 873
 dead, 830
 deadline, 888
 deal, 791, 806, 812, 815-816, 825-826, 828, 847, 854, 873, 876, 886-887, 890, 901, 903, 907
 dealing, 788-789, 814, 850, 885
 deals, 795, 799, 846, 870
 dealt, 783, 799, 837, 876, 886, 890, 896-897, 899, 903
 Dear, 830
 debate, 786, 869, 904
 debates, 783

debating, 798
 December, 772-774, 785, 788, 849, 854, 861, 883-885, 897
 decent, 798
 decide, 876
 decided, 837, 878, 884, 896
 Decision, 905
 decision, 777, 782, 784, 811, 819, 834, 848, 867, 876, 879, 881-882, 888-889, 892, 902-904
 decisive, 806, 808, 820
 Declaration, 861-862, 877
 declaration, 781, 785, 789-790, 805, 825, 828, 860, 875, 878, 889-890, 892, 901
 declared, 782, 786, 860, 903
 declaring, 878
 declined, 891
 deeply, 815
 default, 793, 892
 Defence, 867
 defence, 843-844, 851, 896
 defends, 858
 defense, 775
 defensive, 776, 858
 defers, 819
 deficient, 833, 840
 define, 877
 defined, 809, 872
 defines, 801
 definite, 880

definition, 801
 definitively, 858
 degradation, 792
 delay, 888
 delayed, 882
 delegate, 807
 delegation, 784-785, 830-831, 840, 842-843
 delegations, 886
 deliberate, 815
 deliberately, 804, 898
 delight, 782
 delimit, 877
 Delimitation, 808
 demands, 854, 895
 demonstrate, 815, 890, 896, 903
 demonstrated, 782
 demonstrating, 861
 denial, 825-826
 denied, 901
 deny, 876
 departure, 835
 depend, 904
 dependence, 861
 dependent, 862, 895
 depends, 885-886
 depleted, 793, 895
 deploy, 846
 deprives, 820
 derive, 844
 described, 809, 853, 863-864, 885, 893
 describing, 872
 description, 786
 descriptive, 868-871
 deserve, 907
 design, 889

designated, 843
 designed, 812, 815, 823, 889
 desirable, 847
 desire, 902
 desist, 842
 despatch, 845
 despatched, 844
 Despite, 782, 861
 despite, 784
 Destroy, 906
 destroy, 906
 detach, 844
 detachment, 831-832, 847, 854-855, 864-865
 detail, 799, 802-803, 827, 897
 detailed, 803, 805, 881, 898, 903
 determination, 826, 864
 determine, 826, 858
 determining, 805
 develop, 797, 861
 developed, 853
 Developing, 815, 905
 developing, 821
 Development, 877, 898
 development, 779, 802, 883
 devices, 818
 devoir, 873
 dialogue, 774, 893-894
 Dickson, 846-847, 866
 Diego, 773-774, 780, 783, 830, 840, 843, 903
 difference, 866, 886-887
 differences, 816
 Different, 887
 different, 771, 787, 798, 806, 812-813, 822, 832, 846, 850, 857-859, 887, 897, 901
 differently, 787, 862
 differing, 898, 904
 difficult, 825, 833, 862, 898
 difficulties, 888
 difficulty, 841-843, 867, 885, 899
 diligence, 802
 diplomatic, 801, 886-887
 directed, 801, 837, 865
 direction, 909
 directly, 802, 818, 885-886, 895
 disagree, 904
 disagreement, 869
 disappears, 876
 discern, 784
 discharge, 815, 902
 discharges, 899
 disclosed, 774, 875
 discovered, 848-849, 896
 discrete, 874
 discretion, 811, 842
 discretionary, 804-805, 810-811, 817
 discuss, 771, 775, 777, 786, 882, 885
 discussed, 772-773, 776, 780, 829, 836, 878-879, 884, 891-892, 899
 discussing, 773
 discussion, 773, 832, 836, 861, 904, 906
 discussions, 776-778, 889, 891, 895
 disentangle, 859
 disjointed, 826
 dismemberment, 846
 dismiss, 902
 dismissed, 805, 901-902
 dispatch, 836
 dispose, 806
 disposed, 804
 Dispute, 808
 dispute, 771-773, 775-778, 780, 783-786, 790-797, 801, 803-809, 812-813, 815, 817-826, 875
 disputed, 858
 Disputes, 804, 811, 817, 873
 disputes, 790-791, 795-798, 804, 806-813, 815-817, 820-821, 823
 disregard, 884
 dissatisfaction, 845
 dissatisfied, 845
 dissect, 865
 distant, 815, 823, 895-896
 distinct, 901
 distinction, 815
 divergent, 905
 divided, 772, 811
 division, 772
 divorced, 843
 Docs, 807
 Doctrines, 859
 document, 772-773, 776, 778-779, 781-783, 786, 793-794, 829-831, 840-841, 843, 845, 847-852, 857-858, 863, 867, 879-880, 882-883, 901-902, 906
 documentary, 890
 documentation, 775, 833, 838, 846, 858-860
 documents, 771-773, 776, 781, 785-787, 793, 828-829, 833, 838, 848, 850, 855, 862, 875, 882-883, 892, 896, 901
 doing, 791, 799, 801, 832-833, 859, 873, 891, 901, 905, 907
 doit, 873
 domestic, 829, 835, 842-844, 847-848, 859, 861, 864
 done, 780, 814, 832, 835, 844, 881
 door, 871
 double, 832
 doubt, 774, 788, 794, 824, 830, 852, 854,

886-887, 892,
902, 905
down, 772, 779,
783, 799, 818,
833-834,
851-852, 880, 898
draft, 777, 811,
830, 833, 847,
870, 879
drafted, 906
drafters, 821,
870-871, 873
drafting, 842
drafts, 777, 811
draftsman, 798
draw, 812, 819,
829, 844, 869,
882, 904
drawn, 776, 812,
855, 878, 892,
894, 902, 904
draws, 901
drew, 891, 902
DS, 810, 905
due, 783, 800, 802,
819, 822, 856,
865, 872, 874,
885, 888, 890,
900
Dumping, 799,
801, 803
dumping, 799
Dumpty, 794
During, 774, 787
during, 774, 778,
788, 806-807,
838, 867,
878-879, 884
duties, 799, 801,
817, 822, 890,
900
Duty, 800
duty, 799-800, 816,
871, 897

E

each, 795, 830,
846, 872, 884,
887-888
earlier, 781, 784,
825, 864, 890,
899
early, 836, 857,
875, 878-880
earth, 782
easier, 813, 815
easily, 835, 843,
880
East, 793
east, 817
easy, 772, 859
EC, 905
Economic, 791,
793, 795-796,
799-801, 804,
806, 810,
814-815,
817-818,
822-823, 827
economic, 779,
793, 801, 875,
883, 890, 900,
907
economy, 794, 895
ecosystem, 792
ecosystems, 792,
904
edn, 893
EEZ, 791, 799,
804-807,
809-811,
815-816,
819-823, 825,
877, 901, 903
EEZs, 817, 821
effect, 771, 784,
790, 802, 806,
821, 838,
841-842,
847-849, 864,
867, 869-870,
874, 884, 893,
903
effected, 830-831
effective, 903, 905
effectively, 805,
815, 831
effectiveness,
894-895, 904
effects, 864
effectuer, 873
effort, 898
efforts, 887
eight, 836, 876
Either, 820, 826
either, 780, 816,
818, 821, 826,
858, 877, 889,
891, 895
El, 859
elaborate, 898
elaboration, 807
elasmobranch, 793
elected, 846,
852-853, 860, 867
election, 888-889
element, 772, 790,
823, 831, 863,
868, 870, 900
elementary, 794
elements, 846, 859
elevate, 847, 864
eleven, 879
eliminates, 793
elles, 873
elliptical, 845
elsewhere,
792-793, 799,
820, 838
email, 776
embark, 883
embracing, 777

emerged, 772
Emphasis, 778
emphasis, 829,
861, 894
emphasise, 800,
855
emphasised, 775,
869, 871
emphasises, 805,
884
emphasize, 835
employed, 798,
873, 909
empower, 798
en, 873
enable, 774
enables, 794
enact, 903
enactment, 849
enclosed, 830, 832,
836, 844
encompassed, 873
encourage, 802
Encyclopaedia, 900
end, 777, 779, 813,
824-825, 832,
835, 837, 844,
868, 880, 884,
888-889, 891,
895, 903, 907-908
endangered,
793-794, 805,
810, 905
endeavour, 800,
841, 898
ended, 868, 871,
873, 888
ending, 813, 878
endless, 875
endorse, 884
endorsed, 812,
904, 906
endorsing, 799
enforce, 798

enforceable, 847
 enforcement, 903
 engage, 782, 787, 884, 889
 engagement, 893
 England, 816
 English, 873
 enjoyed, 870
 enjoyment, 779, 883
 enormous, 901
 enough, 880
 ensure, 802, 815, 832, 841-842, 894
 ensured, 880, 889
 ensures, 823
 ensuring, 831, 833
 entail, 875
 entailing, 811
 enter, 894
 enterprise, 902
 entirely, 781, 793, 797, 800, 802, 810, 815, 833, 843-844, 860, 864, 871, 881, 886, 893, 907
 entirety, 871
 Entities, 873
 entities, 846
 entitled, 843, 849, 857, 860, 905
 entitlement, 856, 860
 entry, 818
 enumerate, 844
 enumerated, 845
 Environment, 813, 877, 898-899
 environment, 790, 792, 794-796, 798, 801-802, 809, 813-814, 816, 825, 903-904, 906
 Environmental, 792, 878
 environmental, 777-778, 790-794, 796-797, 804, 806, 808-810, 812, 856, 905
 environmentally, 809-810
 envisaged, 819, 883-884, 887, 893
 envisages, 886
 EPPZ, 793
 equally, 797, 820, 897
 equitable, 877
 equivalent, 771, 803, 845
 Eritrea, 859
 esp, 818
 especially, 837, 866
 essential, 876-877
 essentially, 816, 824, 826, 834, 887, 889, 891
 establish, 772, 774, 776, 784-785, 793, 835-836, 844, 857, 859, 864, 869, 871, 891, 898, 903
 established, 798-799, 810, 817, 852-854, 879, 891, 894, 900, 902, 905
 establishes, 829, 831, 857, 868
 establishing, 793, 828, 852, 861, 870, 878
 establishment, 778, 782, 787, 792, 814
 estoppel, 859
 et, 814, 832, 846, 867, 873
 être, 873
 EU, 773
 European, 773
 evade, 822, 826
 Even, 791, 809-810, 824, 826, 876, 878, 906
 even, 772, 784-785, 788, 790, 794, 797, 801, 804-805, 809-810, 817, 821, 826, 844, 853, 855-856, 861, 875-876, 880, 890, 900-901, 904
 evening, 867, 908
 event, 775, 784, 808, 843, 848, 852, 893
 events, 844
 eventual, 779, 883
 everybody, 830
 everyone, 771
 everything, 791, 814, 838, 864, 881, 886
 evidence, 817-818, 824, 834, 854, 887, 889-891, 893-894, 898, 900-906
 evident, 843
 evidential, 892, 902-903
 Evidently, 859
 evidently, 843, 852
 evil, 881
 evinced, 855
 evolutionary, 810, 812
 ex, 835, 851
 exactly, 774, 806, 808, 812, 831, 838, 886, 906
 examination, 901
 example, 784, 797, 799, 814, 832, 844, 848, 856-857, 866, 903
 examples, 781
 except, 813
 exception, 799, 810
 exceptional, 792
 exceptionally, 876-877
 excercent, 872
 excess, 870
 excessively, 815
 exchange, 771-772, 774, 782-787, 880, 887
 exchanged, 772
 exchanges, 772, 829
 excised, 848
 excision, 848
 exclude, 804, 806, 819
 excluded, 790-791, 804-805, 811, 817, 856
 excludes, 804, 819-821, 825
 excluding, 774, 806
 exclusion, 791, 804-806, 808-811, 844, 903
 Exclusive, 791, 793, 795-796, 799-801, 804, 806, 810, 814-815, 817-818, 822, 827
 exclusive, 801, 807, 849, 875,

877, 890, 896,
 907
 exclusively, 823
 exécuté, 873
 Executive, 787, 817
 executory, 869
 exemplary, 892
 exemplifies, 877
 exempts, 804
 exercisable, 822
 exercise, 774, 791,
 795, 804, 807,
 811, 817-818,
 842, 849, 860,
 868-870, 872, 885
 exercised, 774,
 793, 796, 804,
 807, 811, 821,
 869-870, 872,
 877, 901
 exercising, 806,
 875, 878
 exhaustive,
 870-871
 exhaustiveness,
 870
 exist, 803
 existed, 833, 897
 existence, 771-772,
 775-776,
 783-785, 828,
 833, 841, 846,
 852, 855-858,
 860, 862, 877
 existent, 895
 existing, 777, 780,
 895, 898, 905
 expect, 797
 expected, 796,
 857, 878, 880
 expert, 906
 Explain, 886
 explain, 804, 809,
 876, 880-881,
 894, 906
 explained, 772,
 792, 794,
 808-809, 824,
 859, 867, 879,
 890-891, 894
 explaining, 850,
 881
 explanation, 802,
 850, 860, 862
 explanations, 865
 explanatory, 867
 explicit, 793
 exploit, 796, 804,
 815, 823
 exploitation,
 779-780, 793,
 796, 801, 824,
 849, 883, 891,
 904
 exploited, 792, 856
 exploiting, 849
 exploration, 801,
 824, 849
 explore, 826
 exploring, 849
 express, 852, 859,
 881, 890
 expressed, 782,
 784, 791, 800,
 859, 892
 expressly, 810,
 821-822, 874,
 885, 890
 extend, 796, 805,
 907
 extended, 888, 907
 extends, 849
 extension, 888, 896
 extensive, 792,
 809, 815, 870
 extent, 825,
 828-830, 842,
 869, 871, 877,
 887
 External, 848
 extract, 773,
 782-783, 846
 extracted, 809-810
 extraneous,
 901-902
 extraordinary, 892,
 902
 extreme, 841
 extremely, 816, 833
 extremes, 871
 eye, 829, 846, 869
 eyes, 772
 factual, 861
 FADs, 818
 failed, 784, 803,
 816, 900
 failing, 819, 905
 fails, 901
 failure, 781, 783,
 891-892, 896, 903
 failures, 781
 faintly, 829
 fair, 830, 856
 Fairly, 895
 fairly, 791, 834, 894
 faith, 835-836,
 841-842, 871,
 878, 889, 900,
 905
 fall, 796, 804, 807,
 810, 814, 817,
 821-822, 873,
 875, 877
 fallen, 838
 falling, 807
 falls, 790-791, 797,
 806, 809-810,
 820, 824, 826,
 877, 907
 familiar, 902
 fantasy, 879
 far, 772, 779,
 785-786,
 798-799, 815,
 818, 830, 834,
 841, 843, 845,
 852-854,
 868-869, 874,
 881, 884-886,
 899, 905
 fashioned, 896
 fast, 868
 fatal, 804
 fault, 887
 favour, 888, 892
 favoured, 806
F
 face, 777, 821
 faced, 903
 facie, 900
 facilitate, 818
 Facilitator, 882
 facilitator, 888
 Facilitators, 888
 facilities, 834,
 841-842
 facility, 842, 853
 fact, 775-777, 786,
 789, 791, 808,
 810, 828, 831,
 834-836, 843,
 845, 848,
 850-854, 857,
 860, 865,
 868-869, 874,
 876, 878, 882,
 894, 897, 900
 factor, 852, 854,
 858, 866
 factors, 853-854
 facts, 785-787,
 829, 841,
 855-856, 861,
 874, 877-878,
 880, 887, 891

FCO, 774, 779,
 781, 787
 February, 774,
 781, 873, 879,
 884-885, 888, 892
 fed, 784
 feed, 785, 789
 feel, 803
 feeling, 807, 858,
 865
 feels, 849
 fees, 775
 felt, 859, 883
 few, 778, 781, 834,
 837, 868, 879
 Fifth, 879
 fifth, 876, 899
 figure, 793
 files, 793, 886, 892
 final, 781, 792,
 794, 807, 811,
 830-831, 837,
 840, 855, 867,
 879, 885
 Finally, 791, 796,
 802, 843, 854,
 861, 873, 895
 finally, 808,
 875-876, 881, 883
 financially, 909
 find, 777, 794, 797,
 800, 816, 818,
 829, 833, 865,
 880, 882, 884,
 889, 892, 898,
 906
 findings, 906
 fine, 789
 finished, 788
 firm, 829, 863
 First, 782, 786,
 790, 792, 798,
 804, 806, 808,
 837, 848, 851,
 856-857,
 859-860, 872,
 876, 878, 894,
 897, 900, 903
 first, 771-772,
 775-776, 778,
 780, 783, 789,
 793, 797, 800,
 809, 811, 813,
 819, 827-829,
 832, 837,
 840-841, 844,
 850, 853, 855,
 869, 875, 879,
 881-882, 884,
 898, 901, 907
 Firstly, 838, 875
 firstly, 792, 805
 Fish, 789, 805,
 808-809, 812,
 816, 818, 827,
 874, 876, 891,
 893, 895-896, 904
 fish, 772, 774,
 790-795,
 802-806,
 809-810,
 815-818,
 820-821,
 823-824, 841,
 843, 854,
 856-857, 877,
 879, 890-891,
 894-898,
 900-901,
 903-905, 907
 fished, 817
 Fisheries, 792,
 876-877, 891,
 895-896
 fisheries, 774,
 779-780, 784,
 790, 794-795,
 803-806,
 809-812, 815,
 817-818,
 820-827, 875,
 883, 891,
 894-897, 907
 fishermen, 816,
 844, 856
 fishery, 816, 895,
 897
 fishes, 792, 893
 Fishing, 799
 fishing, 772-776,
 778, 780,
 790-794,
 796-797, 799,
 804, 806,
 809-810, 815,
 817-818,
 820-835,
 840-845,
 850-858,
 860-863, 865,
 873-874, 880,
 891, 894-897,
 899-900, 903-906
 fit, 779, 785, 798,
 803, 842, 870-871
 five, 773, 831-832,
 836, 838, 844,
 875, 903
 flag, 798-799
 flatly, 893, 901
 flawed, 822
 floor, 788
 flow, 782, 823
 flying, 799
 fn, 809
 focus, 802, 825,
 828, 852, 856,
 870
 focused, 832, 841,
 844, 850, 852,
 889, 907
 focusing, 863
 focussing, 855
 foi, 873
 Folder, 771, 776,
 785, 793-794,
 800, 818,
 829-830, 832,
 841, 844-846,
 848, 851, 869,
 898-899
 folder, 794, 800,
 851, 880,
 882-883, 896
 Folders, 840
 folders, 818
 follow, 772, 798,
 800, 809, 831,
 842, 844, 854,
 869, 881-882, 884
 followed, 789, 813
 Following, 819, 860
 following, 772,
 786, 791, 832,
 841-842, 856,
 861, 879,
 881-882, 887, 889
 follows, 785, 793,
 803, 805, 820,
 828-829, 832,
 843, 847-848,
 880, 893, 905
 fondness, 852
 footnotes, 837
 footwork, 777
 for, 784
 force, 824
 foregoing, 909
 Foreign, 778-779,
 782, 786-788,
 821, 859,
 878-879, 881,
 883-886, 888,
 896, 901
 foreign, 796, 804,
 818, 821-822,
 891, 900, 904
 foremost, 841
 Forget, 834-835,
 854
 forgotten, 887
 form, 771, 811,
 832, 842,
 847-848, 853,

855, 859, 861,
863, 909
formal, 847
formally, 879
formed, 830-831,
840
former, 777, 782,
784, 829, 851,
906
formerly, 904
forming, 772, 851
forms, 872
formulate, 851
formulated, 781,
785, 846
formulating, 850
formulation, 869,
874
formulations, 871
forth, 870
forthcoming, 907
fortiori, 820-821
forum, 891,
893-894, 898
forums, 807
forward, 773, 781,
806, 830,
833-836, 850,
856, 863, 906-907
found, 775, 794,
799, 817, 871
foundation, 816,
876
founded, 871-872
four, 790, 817, 832,
836, 844,
888-889, 899
Fourth, 879
fourth, 779, 875,
901
fragile, 792
fragmented, 826
framework,
779-780
France, 782, 848,

853-854
frankly, 898
free, 806, 846, 856,
865
freedom, 796-798,
802, 815, 854,
872
freedoms,
795-796,
801-802, 822, 872
French, 872-873
Friday, 771, 779,
786, 797,
803-804, 838,
866, 901
friend, 804, 832,
846, 850, 868
friendly, 809
friends, 867, 907
front, 878, 900
Frontier, 859
fulfilling, 901, 903
full, 793, 812, 816,
836, 879, 891
fully, 783, 844,
857, 876, 878,
880, 889, 897,
903
functioning, 782
fundamental, 900
fundamentally,
800, 808, 896
further, 773, 777,
785-786, 792,
825, 837, 862,
865, 880-881,
883-886, 889,
893, 906, 909
futile, 782, 785-787
futility, 783,
785-787
future, 773, 794,
824-825,
833-834,
840-841, 848,
877, 899

G

889, 897,
901-903, 906
gives, 774, 796, 822
giving, 777, 869
glad, 773
glean, 781
GoM, 777
Gordon, 774,
782-784,
786-788,
861-862, 884
got, 775, 815, 830,
837-838, 880,
886, 898-899
gov, 818
governed, 801,
846-847, 850, 870
governing, 800
Government,
773-774, 779,
782, 784,
786-788,
828-829, 838,
841-842, 844,
847-852, 864,
867, 880-881,
886, 896-897,
902, 905
government, 859,
879, 881,
888-889, 901-902
governmental, 786
governments, 859,
880, 887-888, 902
Governor, 833,
836, 845, 854,
865
grant, 841-843, 864
granted, 811, 831,
833-834,
840-843,
853-854, 870
granting, 824, 842
grappling, 864
grasped, 887
grateful, 837-838,

gain, 882
gaps, 813, 816
Garcia, 773-774,
780, 783, 830,
840, 843, 903
gas, 896
gave, 780, 782,
851, 864, 903
Gayan, 806-807
General, 792, 868
general, 781, 794,
796, 800-802,
810, 812-813,
835, 846, 868,
870-872, 875-877
Generally, 800
generally, 784,
837, 873
Geneva, 896
genuine, 777
geographical, 870
Germany, 876
gets, 776, 783,
810, 854, 864
getting, 836
give, 780, 808-809,
813, 822, 825,
829, 841, 864,
870, 874, 887,
889-890, 898
Given, 876, 892
given, 782, 784,
786, 797, 815,
827, 837, 842,
847-848,
851-852, 855,
857-858,
860-861,
864-865, 867,
872, 878-880,
883, 886-887,

868, 906-907

Great, *792*
great, *815*
greater, *887, 896*
greatly, *837*
GREENWOOD,
780, 788-789,
830-835, 855,
864, 885-887
Greenwood,
788-789, 793,
830, 837, 840,
865-867,
881-884, 888
ground, *775*
grounded, *781-783*
grounds, *772, 777,*
823, 826, 863,
901, 907
group, *811*
groups, *875, 882*
growing, *906*
Guiding, *852-854,*
860
gun, *884*

H

Hague, *782-783*
half, *798, 800*
halfway, *851*
halt, *860*
hampering, *869*
hand, *772, 788,*
818, 834, 867,
892
handing, *842*
handled, *787*
hands, *812*
handwritten, *829,*
831, 836
Hansard, *786*

happen, *807, 870*
happened, *830,*
834, 841,
860-861, 879
happening, *782,*
830-831, 833, 836
happens, *895*
happily, *899*
happy, *774, 815,*
856, 881, 907
hardly, *782, 873,*
904
harm, *877-878*
harmed, *895*
harmful, *818*
harmonise, *800*
harmonize, *824,*
898
harvested, *824*
harvesting, *791,*
796, 805, 814,
842, 897
head, *884*
headed, *814, 868*
heading, *795*
Heads, *774, 788,*
886
hear, *833, 835,*
855, 908
heard, *788, 791,*
902
hearing, *839, 856,*
908
heart, *798*
heavily, *772*
heavy, *792*
hedged, *853*
held, *792, 794, 904*
Help, *780*
help, *794, 808,*
833, 835, 880,
887
helpful, *833, 858,*
882

helpfully, *788, 800*
hence, *872*
Hendry, *846-847,*
866
Henry, *787*
hereby, *909*
Higgins, *859*
High, *774, 776,*
794, 848-849,
878, 882,
884-885, 901, 905
high, *804, 818,*
872, 877, 894
higher, *788, 832*
highest, *792*
Highett, *859*
highlight, *791, 829,*
855-856, 874
highlighted, *784,*
856
highly, *781, 791,*
816-817, 890,
895, 901, 904
hint, *773-774, 777,*
781, 783, 842
historic, *772, 861*
historically, *774*
hit, *777*
HMG, *840, 845*
Hoffmann, *846, 855*
hold, *782, 784,*
786-789, 823,
827, 838, 861,
884-885, 888
homework, *833*
Honorable, *787*
honorable, *783*
honour, *848-849*
hoof, *865*
hope, *788, 816,*
837, 863, 871,
883, 888, 906
hopefully, *817, 837*
hoping, *795*

Hotel, *830, 833*
House, *851-852,*
855, 861-865, 896
However, *900*
however, *777, 810,*
814, 870, 894
http, *793, 818, 892*
hub, *773*
huge, *834, 861*
hull, *815*
humanitarian, *773*
Humpty, *794*
hurdle, *783, 853,*
901
hypothesis, *809*
hypothetical, *791*

I

Ibid, *801, 811*
Iceland, *876*
Icelandic, *876-877,*
896
ICJ, *784, 819,*
852-853, 863,
876-877, 892
ICLQ, *812*
idea, *777-778, 794,*
879
identified, *801,*
812, 899
identifies, *791, 802*
identify, *825, 855,*
882, 907
identifying, *862*
ignore, *793, 808,*
822, 890
ignored, *784, 880*
ignores, *810*
II, *801, 822, 857*

ii, 784, 853
 III, 806-807, 812
 iii, 812, 854-855
 IJMCL, 905
 ILC, 852-854, 860, 869
 illegality, 782
 illustration, 898
 ILR, 876, 881
 image, 902
 imagined, 809
 immediate, 774, 838, 869
 immediately, 776, 804, 866
 IMO, 815, 898
 impact, 773, 793, 797, 804, 818
 impaired, 798
 impermissible, 785
 implausible, 809, 855
 implement, 889
 implementation, 871, 889, 900
 implementing, 793, 904
 implication, 902
 implications, 773, 893, 905
 implicit, 877
 Import, 810
 importance, 783, 792, 860
 important, 773, 778, 787, 792, 794, 831, 854, 857, 863, 869, 898, 904
 imposed, 870
 imposing, 797
 impossible, 805, 830
 imprecise, 859
 improper, 900-901
 improve, 902
 inaccuracies, 852
 inadequate, 880, 905
 inadmissible, 901-902
 inapplicable, 790, 878, 893
 inapposite, 859
 inappropriate, 779, 883, 907
 Incidents, 870
 incidents, 871, 899
 include, 792, 794, 814, 819, 832, 841, 890, 898
 included, 775-776, 806, 825, 890, 896-897
 includes, 810
 including, 771, 780, 789, 791, 796-797, 799, 806-807, 819, 821, 847, 849, 861, 879-880
 inclusion, 805, 856
 incoming, 889
 incompatible, 771, 779, 789, 821, 883, 896
 inconsistency, 833
 inconsistent, 787, 790
 incorporate, 802
 incorporated, 812, 820, 830-831, 840, 890
 incorporates, 808
 incorporating, 822
 incorrect, 852
 increasingly, 835
 Indeed, 772, 776, 784, 799, 809, 895
 indeed, 787, 802, 805, 811, 816, 822, 826, 842, 862, 868, 873-874, 879, 881, 886-887, 890-891
 indefinitely, 880-881
 independence, 848, 850, 852, 862, 865-867, 897
 independent, 780, 866, 900
 independently, 884
 Indian, 775, 792-793, 816-817, 848, 851, 891, 895, 898
 indicate, 801
 indicated, 783, 787, 805, 817, 836, 882, 896
 indicates, 801, 885
 indicating, 850
 indication, 813, 884
 indirectly, 874
 indisputably, 809
 individual, 872
 individuals, 882
 Indonesia, 808
 industry, 895, 903
 inevitably, 785, 790, 803
 inexplicable, 888
 inference, 821
 influence, 889
 inform, 800, 832, 848, 893
 information, 773, 782, 878-881, 893, 899, 905-906
 informed, 838, 844, 878, 880, 889
 informing, 801
 infringe, 872
 infringement, 849
 inhabitants, 829
 initially, 785, 878, 889
 initiating, 785
 injury, 900-901
 inkling, 860
 innocent, 799, 821, 869
 inside, 809
 insight, 782, 860
 insist, 857
 insisted, 803
 Insofar, 789
 insofar, 778, 805, 823, 826-827
 inspection, 842
 installation, 783
 instances, 881
 instead, 775, 798, 840, 851, 869
 institution, 788
 instructions, 856, 866, 886
 instructive, 784
 instrument, 847, 858-859
 instruments, 801, 847
 Int, 800
 Integration, 779, 787
 intended, 794, 805, 842, 844, 847-848, 868-869, 871, 897
 intent, 819, 854, 869
 intention, 796, 828-829, 834-835,

- 840-841, 850,
853-855, 863,
870-871, 874, 896
- inter, 812, 848
- interest, 859, 884
- interested, 826, 909
- interesting, 886
- interests, 843-844,
872, 894
- interfere, 815,
824-825, 898
- interfered, 797,
824, 899
- interference, 795
- interferes, 876, 897
- interfering, 903
- internal, 773, 829,
851, 858-860, 890
- internally, 859
- International, 779,
787, 799-800, 857
- international, 790,
794, 796,
798-803, 813,
815-816,
825-826, 828,
842-844,
846-848, 850,
853, 856,
858-859,
862-865,
868-873,
875-877, 881,
898, 900, 903
- internationally,
798, 803, 846,
906
- interpret, 796-797,
814, 820, 841,
858, 873
- interpretation,
796, 802, 804,
812-813,
819-821,
823-824, 834,
842, 852-854,
857, 871-874
- interpretative, 841
- interpreted,
807-808, 819, 871
- interpreting, 808,
854, 871
- interrupt, 780, 795
- intervention, 891,
906
- interventions, 865
- intrinsic, 807
- introduce, 800,
832, 848
- introduced, 790,
869, 872, 889
- introducing, 869
- Introduction, 827
- introduction, 860
- introductory, 868
- invest, 791
- invitation, 771
- invite, 797, 827
- invited, 789, 882
- invites, 812
- inviting, 903
- invoke, 818-819
- invoked, 784, 823
- invokes, 823
- involve, 877, 894
- involved, 775, 847
- involves, 796, 809,
823-824, 869
- involving, 819
- IOTC, 793,
817-820, 891-895
- iotc, 793, 892
- Iraq, 902
- irrefutable, 905
- irrelevant, 790,
803, 809-810,
818, 820, 893
- Island, 857
- island, 783, 830
- Islands, 851, 854,
856, 864
- islands, 773, 779,
783, 799, 829,
835, 848, 850,
859, 861, 865,
883, 896-897
- Isn, 862
- isn, 780, 835
- isolation, 822, 843,
864, 898
- issue, 773,
778-783,
786-789, 794,
798, 824, 829,
834-835, 838,
841, 849, 857,
859, 861, 866,
869, 883-884,
892, 896, 898
- issued, 794, 844,
856, 897
- issues, 775,
779-780,
782-783, 789,
798, 806, 811,
815, 817, 860,
874, 883, 887,
891, 901
- issuing, 775, 842
- it, 824
- Italian, 859
- ITLOS, 873
- itself, 802-803,
818, 840, 855,
867, 892, 895
- IV, 893
- iv, 858
- IWC, 892
- IX, 846
- J**
- Jamahiriya, 808
- January, 773, 775,
780, 785,
878-879, 891
- Japan, 892
- Japanese, 892, 902
- Jennings, 859
- Joanne, 781
- join, 882
- Joint, 895
- joint, 775, 785,
879-880, 882,
889, 891
- Judge, 788-789,
793, 797,
830-831, 840,
845-846, 850,
855, 864-867,
881-884, 888,
903, 906
- judge, 798, 856,
866, 875
- Judges, 771, 776,
785, 829-830,
832, 837,
840-841,
844-846, 848,
851, 859, 869
- Judgment, 808,
853, 857, 859,
877, 892
- judgment, 817, 823
- judicial, 807
- July, 776, 780,
784-787, 831,
833, 840, 856,
878-881, 891
- junctions, 784
- June, 781-783,
786, 792
- Jurisdiction, 808,

816, 820,
823-824, 876
jurisdiction, 779,
789-791,
794-798, 801,
803-811, 813,
815-817,
819-827, 848,
894, 896
jurisdictional,
788-789, 791,
806, 809, 814,
816
jurisprudence,
811, 847,
852-853, 855,
859, 863, 899
justiciable, 868
justification,
904-905
justified, 826
justify, 790, 903
justifying, 904
juvenile, 818

808, 812, 874,
882, 886, 893,
904
King, 887
Kingdom, 774-775,
782-784,
786-792, 797,
801, 803,
806-807,
810-811, 816,
819, 823-824,
828, 832,
835-836,
841-843,
846-851,
855-858, 860,
862-865,
874-880,
882-885,
887-899, 901,
903-907
Kiss, 900, 907
known, 794, 808,
903
Kosheri, 859
Kuwait, 887

K

Kailesh, 777
Kampala, 774, 787
KASDAN, 909
Kasdan, 909
Kasikili, 857
KATEKA, 864
Kateka, 865-866
keep, 815
Keith, 859
kept, 832, 844
key, 793, 811, 815,
822, 828, 853,
860, 870, 878,
881, 883, 894
kind, 786, 797,

L

la, 826
label, 829
labels, 828
Lac, 876-877,
879-881
lack, 779, 819, 891
lacks, 811, 904
lagoon, 899
laid, 797, 799, 898
lamented, 900
Lancaster,
851-852, 855,
861-865, 896

875-877, 880,
899, 906
land, 898
landed, 793
language, 793,
801, 853-856,
871-873, 881, 890
Lanoux, 876-877,
879-881
large, 818, 835,
878-881, 905
largely, 832, 846,
889, 906
larger, 818
largest, 792, 903
Last, 797, 804, 875
last, 771, 773, 779,
786-789, 791,
814, 825-826,
828-829, 835,
847, 872-873,
889, 899, 903,
905-906
late, 829, 854, 900
Later, 896
later, 786, 805,
828, 830,
834-835, 852,
863, 866-867,
879-880, 885,
888-889
latitude, 907
latitudes, 817-818
latter, 814, 840
launched, 778,
878-879
launching, 885
Law, 794, 800, 808,
813, 815-816,
826, 846, 873,
893
law, 794, 819, 828,
842-844,
846-848, 850,
853, 856, 859,
863-865,
868-873,
875-877, 880,
899, 906
lawful, 795
laws, 796, 799-801,
814-815, 817,
824-825, 898-900
laying, 795-796
lead, 828
leading, 875
leads, 823, 847,
857, 896
leak, 879
learned, 798, 850,
879, 887
lease, 831
least, 783, 792,
852-853, 879
Leave, 834
leave, 786, 788,
806, 821, 831,
850, 855, 866,
889
leaves, 823, 835
led, 811, 840, 855,
881
Ledge, 859
left, 818, 843, 859,
867
Legal, 868
legal, 782, 784,
801, 823, 828,
835, 846-847,
852, 854,
856-861,
869-870,
872-873, 875,
878, 900
legality, 771, 790
legally, 772, 828,
834, 847-848,
852, 855-856,
860, 903
legislate, 897
legislation, 825,
848-849, 898-899
Legislative, 834,

- 854, 867, 897*
 legislative, *865, 881*
 legitimate, *881, 894, 902*
 length, *803, 809, 896*
 les, *873*
 less, *773, 784-786, 854*
 letter, *772-774, 779-780, 788, 829-831, 833, 836, 840, 844, 850-852, 854-855, 861, 863, 883-887*
 letters, *851-852, 887*
 level, *788, 846, 863-865, 869, 898*
 levels, *828, 863, 889*
 Libyan, *808*
 licence, *775, 857*
 licences, *775, 818, 824, 826, 842-844, 856, 897, 904*
 license, *849*
 licensed, *843*
 licenses, *835*
 licensing, *891*
 lie, *873*
 lies, *806*
 Life, *799*
 lifted, *865*
 light, *786, 829-830, 855, 860*
 Ligitan, *808*
 likely, *777, 838, 882, 890, 899*
 likewise, *786, 821, 825, 873*
 limb, *780, 790, 806*
 limit, *870-871*
 Limitations, *795*
 limitations, *795, 870*
 limited, *795, 805, 829, 834, 853-854, 861, 877, 894, 900*
 limits, *790, 870*
 line, *772, 789, 810, 813, 841, 846-847, 851, 857, 861, 868-869, 871-872*
 lines, *775, 829, 842, 853, 859, 868, 871, 873*
 linguistic, *873*
 list, *795, 837*
 listening, *827, 881*
 literature, *792, 809, 906*
 litigation, *823, 826, 900, 909*
 little, *785, 795, 797, 814, 823, 825, 833-836, 850, 861, 876, 886, 888, 899*
 living, *790-797, 799, 801-806, 808-811, 814-815, 817, 827, 895, 904*
 ll, *775-776, 780-781, 788, 800, 802, 804, 806, 814, 816, 832, 835, 837-838, 841, 845-846, 848, 851, 856, 868-869*
 local, *792*
 locally, *777*
 locate, *797*
 Loewenstein, *804*
 logic, *808, 819-820, 871*
 London, *774, 799, 801, 803, 847, 867, 878*
 long, *779-780, 793, 808, 816, 831, 835, 837, 861, 882-883, 887, 907*
 longer, *797, 851, 897*
 longitudes, *817-818*
 longstanding, *824*
 look, *773, 782-783, 794, 801, 828, 834, 840, 846-848, 862-863, 865-866, 884, 894, 907*
 looked, *886*
 looking, *795, 797, 806, 827-828, 833-836, 863-864, 869, 872, 887*
 looks, *830, 841, 863, 887*
 loose, *831*
 lose, *889*
 lot, *838, 868, 898*
 Louis, *793-794, 878-879*
 Louisa, *899*
 Lowe, *893*
 lunch, *789, 833, 836-838*
 luncheon, *837*
 luxury, *858*
M
 MacDonald, *879*
 Macdonald, *772, 775-776, 781, 784-785, 829*
 machinery, *807, 812*
 Madagascar, *807*
 made, *773, 777, 783-785, 788-789, 791, 797, 800, 804, 807, 811-812, 819, 826, 828, 830-831, 837-838, 847-848, 852-853, 855, 857, 859-863, 865, 873, 875-877, 881-883, 887, 891, 893, 897-902*
 mail, *776*
 main, *814, 874*
 mainly, *895*
 Majesty, *838, 851, 867*
 major, *815*
 Malaysia, *808, 859*
 Man, *901*
 manage, *790-791, 799, 805, 815*
 managed, *885*
 Management, *792, 898*
 management, *791-794, 797, 799, 801-806, 809-810, 814, 817, 827, 877, 879, 889, 891,*

894, 903-905, 907
 manages, *895*
 mandates, *825*
 mandatory, *872-873*
 manifestly, *808, 825*
 manner, *822, 883, 897, 901*
 manuscript, *772, 830, 832-833, 836, 844*
 Many, *806-807*
 many, *775, 800, 806-807, 811, 815, 821, 882, 885, 892, 898, 900*
 map, *817-818, 893*
 March, *784, 850-852, 855, 863, 878, 881, 884-885, 888, 899*
 margins, *774, 787-788*
 Marine, *782, 787-788, 790, 793, 805, 813-814, 820, 823-824, 826, 875, 878-880, 897-898, 905*
 marine, *778, 789-794, 796, 798-799, 801-803, 805, 809-811, 813-814, 816, 824-825, 875-876, 878, 897-899, 903-904, 906*
 Maritime, *799, 808*
 maritime, *776, 792, 816*
 MARPOL, *799, 801, 803, 815, 898*
 match, *816*
 material, *808, 858, 870, 881, 906*
 matter, *772, 779, 783, 793, 800, 829, 837, 840, 842-844, 846, 852-854, 859, 864, 873, 875, 880, 884-887, 899*
 matters, *782, 807, 828-831, 837, 840, 845-847, 860, 891*
 Mauritian, *774, 776-779, 781, 783-786, 806-807, 817-818, 823, 828-831, 840-843, 845, 847-848, 850-851, 853, 856, 858, 860-862, 878-880, 883-884, 889, 891, 894, 897, 899, 904*
 Mauritians, *856, 882*
 Mauritius, *771-791, 793-794, 796-798, 800-812, 816-829, 831-836, 838, 840-845, 847-886, 888-908*
 Max, *900*
 maximum, *832*
 meal, *826*
 mean, *809, 833, 838, 842, 850, 874*
 meaning, *796-797, 800, 804, 807-808, 835, 842-843, 858-859, 869, 871, 873, 902*
 meaningful, *880, 889*
 meaningfully, *774*
 means, *783, 786, 798, 821-822, 845, 881-882, 890, 901*
 meant, *780, 831, 833, 835, 861*
 measure, *784-785, 790, 794, 809, 813, 895*
 Measures, *905*
 measures, *793-794, 799, 802, 894-895, 904-905, 907*
 mechanism, *823, 883*
 meet, *774, 777, 783, 872, 886, 908*
 Meeting, *774, 788, 807, 840-841, 886, 892*
 meeting, *773-777, 781-782, 784, 786-787, 820, 828-830, 832, 840, 845, 851-852, 862-863, 866-867, 879-882, 884-887*
 meetings, *775-776, 785, 878-879, 881, 891-892*
 meets, *862*
 meld, *866*
 Member, *827*
 member, *784, 891-892, 894*
 Members, *771, 787-789, 795, 803, 827, 837, 840, 874, 907*
 members, *789, 794, 803, 812, 826, 865, 893-894*
 membership, *893*
 memo, *896, 906*
 memoranda, *859*
 memorandum, *781*
 Memorial, *788, 811, 817-818, 824, 850-851, 858, 862, 874, 883-884, 896, 898, 901, 903*
 memorial, *882*
 Mensah, *797*
 mention, *778, 785, 812, 840, 900*
 mentioned, *803, 870, 885, 902*
 mere, *845*
 merely, *800, 805, 809, 812, 822, 858, 868, 870-871*
 merit, *897*
 merited, *803*
 merits, *777, 789, 795, 825-827, 870, 874, 899*
 message, *816*
 met, *787, 851-852, 856, 861, 882*
 meteorological, *842*
 method, *819*
 MFA, *779*
 MICHAEL, *866*
 Michael, *782, 855, 865-866, 868, 896*
 microphone, *788*
 mid, *833*
 Middle, *859*

- might, 774,
784-785, 793,
796, 807, 809,
815-816,
825-826, 831,
833-836,
845-846, 856,
858, 860-861,
866, 868, 880,
884, 886, 894,
896, 898-899, 905
- migratory, 781,
791, 816-817,
890, 895, 904
- miles, 817, 895
- Miliband, 788, 889
- military, 783
- Mills, 877, 879-880
- mind, 775, 784,
878, 902
- minded, 892
- mine, 865
- mineral, 824, 831,
861, 865
- minerals, 823-824,
845, 848-850,
855-856, 896
- minimal, 860
- Minister, 772-774,
776-778,
782-784,
786-788, 834,
848-850, 867,
878-879,
882-883, 885, 897
- Ministerial, 788
- Ministers, 772,
779, 788,
828-829, 831,
834, 838,
845-847,
853-854, 862,
865, 884-885, 887
- minute, 816,
832-833, 840,
861, 868
- minutes, 828, 830,
832-833, 837,
864, 867-868,
899, 903
- Miscellaneous, 860
- miscellaneous, 784
- misconceived, 785,
876, 903
- misconstrued, 849
- misguided, 808
- misjudgement, 886
- missing, 823, 854,
888
- mission, 782
- misunderstand, 861
- misunderstanding,
884-885, 887
- misunderstandings,
885
- misunderstands,
894
- misuse, 796, 802
- mixed, 859
- MM, 781, 816, 854,
856-857, 880,
883, 885, 888,
896, 901, 903
- moderate, 854
- modern, 809
- Mohamed, 830
- moment, 777, 782,
795, 813, 834,
845, 850-851,
859, 862, 865,
877, 879, 881,
885, 887, 905-906
- momentarily, 809
- Monday, 907-908
- Monsieur, 834
- months, 879, 882
- moored, 899
- Moreover, 799, 810
- moreover, 825
- morning, 771-772,
779, 803, 812,
825, 827, 876,
890, 893, 898,
908
- Most, 871
- most, 775, 791,
800, 817-818,
822, 847, 869,
875, 877-878,
890, 896
- motivated, 901
- motivations, 902
- motive, 901
- motives, 902
- mouth, 907
- move, 776, 785,
788, 796,
840-841, 843,
850, 855-856, 874
- moved, 859
- moves, 781
- Moving, 870
- moving, 850
- Mox, 899
- MPA, 771-772,
775-782,
784-794,
796-797,
803-807, 809,
811, 816-818,
820, 823-826,
828, 860,
875-885,
889-899, 901-905
- MPAs, 903, 905-906
- MS, 800, 811
- Ms, 772, 775-776,
781, 784-785,
788, 792, 829,
843, 850-851,
855-856,
858-859,
878-879,
881-882, 885,
889, 891, 901,
903-904
- much, 771, 780,
789, 813,
815-816,
827-828, 832,
836-837, 844,
850, 854,
857-859,
865-866, 868,
872-873, 894,
897-898, 900,
905, 908
- multi, 902
- multilaterally, 895
- multinational, 903
- multiple, 809, 856,
873
- multitude, 771
- Muscat, 892
- must, 794, 803,
805, 808,
819-822, 824,
833, 840, 854,
857, 867,
872-873, 876,
878, 885, 897,
901-902
- mutandis, 812
- mutatis, 812
- mutterings, 784
- mutual, 778
- MV, 899
- myself, 812, 865

N

- Nairobi, 898
- namely, 862
- Namibia, 857
- narrow, 806, 813
- National, 792, 794,
817, 899, 902

national, *790, 798, 800-801, 807, 817, 863, 888, 894*
 nationals, *799, 824, 857, 894*
 nations, *815, 866*
 natural, *776, 792, 801, 843, 849, 876-877*
 nature, *801, 844, 853, 857*
 navigation, *795-798, 802, 815, 822, 872*
 navigational, *842*
 nd, *781, 786-787, 807*
 nddelegate, *806*
 near, *773, 818, 830, 848-849, 861, 896, 902, 905*
 nearest, *878*
 nearly, *901*
 necessarily, *790, 859, 881*
 necessary, *784, 802, 844, 861, 880-881, 894, 902, 905*
 need, *773-775, 783, 800, 815, 869, 881, 896, 900, 903, 905, 907*
 needed, *847, 851, 861, 897*
 needing, *862*
 needless, *807*
 needs, *829, 835, 844, 847, 868, 894, 905*
 negotiate, *802*
 negotiated, *799, 806-807, 840*
 negotiating, *806-807, 810, 812, 815, 823, 894, 896*
 negotiation, *816, 854*
 negotiations, *793, 807, 854, 877, 890, 894, 897, 902*
 negotiator, *798*
 neighbouring, *807*
 Neither, *778, 806, 897*
 neither, *776, 793, 796, 802-803, 835, 871, 896, 909*
 Network, *878*
 neutral, *871*
 never, *787-788, 823-824, 828, 841, 853, 861, 887, 891-892, 899*
 Nevill, *776, 788, 792, 878-879, 881-882, 885, 889, 903-904*
 New, *853-854*
 new, *772, 782, 786-787, 790, 824, 889*
 news, *904*
 newspapers, *879*
 next, *773, 775, 777-779, 783, 788, 831, 836, 848-849, 853, 861, 867, 884, 905*
 NGO, *879*
 NGOs, *878-879, 888*
 nine, *836, 879*
 nm, *823*
 NOC, *899, 904*
 Non, *771*
 non, *780, 818, 828, 835, 870, 872, 875, 895, 902*
 None, *799-801, 901*
 none, *798-799, 801, 803, 823, 848, 855-856, 876, 879, 907*
 nonetheless, *842, 846*
 noon, *816*
 Nor, *817, 892, 895, 897, 900, 902*
 nor, *776, 796, 799, 801, 803, 808, 823, 825, 871, 875, 882, 891, 893, 896, 899, 901, 909*
 normal, *900*
 normally, *795, 800, 812, 875-876*
 normative, *800*
 Nostalgia, *896*
 Notably, *777*
 notably, *771, 798, 861*
 Note, *778-779, 849, 883-888*
 note, *771, 781, 785-786, 795, 807, 819, 829-830, 836, 845, 849, 859, 878, 882-884*
 noted, *784, 842, 857*
 notes, *811, 817, 822, 890, 896, 899*
 Nothing, *892*
 nothing, *771, 776, 783, 786, 795-797, 808, 820, 822, 825, 830, 836, 842, 845, 847, 853, 871, 895*
 notice, *795-796, 805*
 noticeably, *898*
 noticing, *793*
 Notification, *785*
 notification, *878*
 notified, *893*
 notion, *807, 862*
 Notwithstanding, *905*
 novel, *796*
 November, *774, 778-779, 786-787, 831, 834, 842, 844-845, 848-849, 881-883, 902*
 nowhere, *771, 775, 803, 810, 818, 840, 861, 905*
 NR, *817*
 Nuclear, *834-835, 844, 847-848, 852-855, 861-863*
 number, *844, 856, 875, 880*
 numbering, *800, 811*
 numerous, *892*
 NYUJ, *800*

O

oath, *901*
 object, *772, 815, 842, 872, 891, 902-903*

objected, 892
 objecting, 831
 objection, 788, 800, 856
 objections, 787
 objectives, 791-792, 809, 902
 obligate, 841
 obligation, 802, 804, 811, 835, 843, 857-858, 868-873, 875, 878, 890, 894-895, 898, 900
 Obligations, 873
 obligations, 771, 775, 789, 828, 857, 860, 868, 893
 obliged, 817, 856, 883
 obscure, 808
 observations, 837
 observe, 822
 observed, 777, 800
 obstacle, 806, 884
 obstructing, 892
 obtain, 841
 obtained, 782, 841
 obvious, 774, 791, 797, 803-804, 808, 810, 817-818, 821, 823-824, 841, 843, 870, 886, 888, 894, 905
 Obviously, 798
 obviously, 771, 775-776, 788, 791, 796-797, 810, 815, 835, 837-838, 842, 867, 869, 871, 877-878, 887, 895-896, 899
 occasion, 898
 occasions, 783, 817, 884, 892
 occupy, 828
 occur, 817, 893
 occurred, 881, 887, 896
 occurs, 799
 Ocean, 775, 792-793, 816-817, 848, 851, 891, 895, 898
 ocean, 793-794
 Oceanographic, 794, 899, 902
 Oceanography, 792, 794
 October, 776, 829, 831-833, 840, 844-845, 878-879, 881-882, 889
 odd, 788, 842
 oddity, 842
 oddly, 872
 odds, 842
 of, 808
 offer, 812, 836, 846
 offers, 818, 824
 Office, 836, 848-849, 859, 867, 879, 881, 886, 896
 office, 848, 889
 offices, 841-842, 844
 Official, 782, 807
 official, 773, 866-867
 officially, 897
 officials, 774-775, 778, 829, 860, 880, 901-903
 offshore, 849
 often, 905
 Oil, 899
 oil, 799, 815, 824, 845, 849, 855-856, 896, 899
 oils, 848, 850, 896
 Okay, 866
 okay, 836, 865-866
 old, 896
 Oman, 892
 omission, 779-780, 823, 840, 883, 890
 on, 899
 once, 783, 786, 879, 887, 889, 891
 One, 834, 854, 857-858, 869, 873
 one, 773, 775-776, 779, 781, 783-786, 788, 792-793, 795-796, 804, 808-809, 814-815, 818, 826, 830, 832-836, 838, 840-850, 852, 854-855, 857-866, 870, 872-873, 877, 880-885, 887-888, 892, 894, 896, 898-899, 901, 903, 905-906
 ongoing, 775, 884
 online, 818
 only, 778, 786, 790, 796, 798, 801, 803-804, 807-808, 813-814, 817-818, 821, 823, 825, 829, 831, 834, 838, 841, 849, 852-854, 863, 865, 868, 871-872, 878, 882, 884, 888-889, 891, 894, 896, 899, 902, 905
 onsultation, 882
 onus, 895
 open, 865, 868, 871, 873, 885, 893
 opened, 821
 opening, 802, 810
 operate, 798-799
 Opinion, 873
 opinion, 784, 831, 905
 opinions, 904
 opportunities, 894-895
 opportunity, 774, 783, 835, 851, 889
 opposed, 807, 856, 870, 903
 opposite, 797, 806, 812, 867
 opposition, 776-777, 844
 options, 879-881
 oral, 874, 900, 903
 Order, 898
 order, 795, 803, 815, 822, 824-825, 828, 856, 877-878, 904
 Ordinance, 861, 899
 ordinary, 796-797, 804, 807-808, 869, 871

org, 793, 892
organisation, 893
Organization, 799
organization, 893
organizations, 801-802
oriented, 863
original, 778, 829-832, 840
OSPAR, 905
Other, 890, 905
other, 775, 783, 788, 791-792, 794-810, 818-819, 822, 825-826, 833, 837-838, 843, 846-847, 850, 854-856, 858, 862-863, 868-873, 875, 877-878, 881, 883-884, 887-888, 890, 894-895, 900, 905-907
others, 847, 861-862, 899, 903
otherwise, 827, 833, 847, 857, 870, 877-878, 900, 902, 909
out, 777, 779, 782-783, 788, 791, 795, 800, 802, 804, 807-808, 811-812, 815-818, 823-825, 828, 830-832, 834, 838, 841, 848-849, 851, 855-856, 861-862, 867, 871, 873, 875, 877-878, 882-883, 885, 888, 891, 895-897, 900-902, 907
outcome, 815, 880, 909
outlined, 814, 825, 879
outset, 828
outside, 778-779, 791, 794, 797, 809-810, 817, 824, 883, 899
over, 772-774, 779-780, 782, 784, 787, 789-791, 795-797, 803-806, 808-810, 815-817, 820-821, 823-825, 827, 833, 842, 849, 853, 855, 859-860, 865, 868-870, 876, 882-883, 888, 891, 895-897, 901, 907
overflight, 795-797
overlapping, 792
overleaf, 773-774, 779-780, 849
overlooked, 778
overplayed, 887
overriding, 822
Oversea, 867
Overseas, 787, 791-792, 846, 898, 902
overseas, 791, 846-847
overt, 857
overtake, 885

overtaken, 780
overturn, 812
overwhelming, 807
overwhelmingly, 803, 888
owe, 868
own, 790, 806, 815, 817, 819, 825, 837, 842, 847, 858, 882, 895
ownership, 848-850, 896
Oxman, 800-802

P

Pacific, 821
package, 806, 812, 826, 833, 840, 863, 865
pacta, 872
Page, 772-773, 779, 830, 840, 896
page, 772-774, 776-779, 782-783, 786, 800, 811, 818, 829, 832, 836, 842, 845, 868
pages, 775, 811, 867
pagination, 772
paid, 890, 900
Palace, 830, 833
pale, 896
Paper, 791-792
paper, 773, 782, 792, 901
papers, 830, 902

par, 873
para, 771, 775, 786, 792, 806-809, 811, 824, 843, 853-854, 856-857, 859, 873, 877, 880, 883, 888, 892-893, 896, 900, 902, 905
Paragraph, 783, 795, 831, 834, 836, 841, 844-845, 880
paragraph, 773-774, 776-777, 779, 783, 785, 787, 795-796, 811, 832, 843-845, 849, 851, 853-855, 857, 869-870, 874, 885-886, 896-897, 901
paragraphs, 778-780, 795, 802, 832, 848, 851, 882
parallel, 884
parameters, 826, 878
paras, 771, 808, 810, 816-817, 853, 879, 883, 890, 896-897, 903, 905
parcel, 867
pardon, 827
park, 794
Parliament, 866-867
parliamentary, 783
parse, 816

Part, 794, 796,
 798-799, 802,
 805, 814,
 819-820, 822-823
 part, 772, 780, 795,
 797-798, 803,
 806, 810,
 813-814,
 822-823,
 826-828,
 830-831, 834,
 840, 847, 849,
 851, 854-856,
 863, 867, 872,
 876, 887, 896,
 898
 partial, 860
 participants, 811,
 847
 participated, 891
 participation, 818,
 891-892, 895
 particular, 785,
 789, 791,
 800-801, 808,
 814, 822,
 828-829,
 844-845,
 851-853, 859,
 862, 872, 875,
 888, 890, 902,
 907
 particularly, 773,
 777, 782, 793,
 815, 818, 882
 Parties, 780, 821,
 830, 833,
 837-838, 847,
 863, 906
 parties, 782, 793,
 802, 808-809,
 812, 818-820,
 823, 828, 873,
 875, 878, 889,
 891, 894, 896,
 905, 909
 partly, 893
 parts, 813
 Party, 830, 835
 party, 881,
 899-900, 904
 pass, 853, 880
 Passage, 870
 passage, 774, 783,
 799, 821, 846,
 869, 872, 881,
 883
 passages, 811, 867
 passed, 838, 867
 passes, 787
 passing, 807
 past, 829, 864, 899
 patrol, 899
 Pause, 886
 pause, 866
 pausing, 782, 846,
 869
 PC, 818
 pd, 892
 pdf, 793, 818
 Pedra, 859
 pelagic, 792
 people, 792-793,
 807, 835,
 864-865, 867
 perceived, 785
 perfect, 795
 perfectly, 886
 performance, 841,
 857
 Perhaps, 813, 881,
 899
 perhaps, 797, 813,
 826, 831,
 834-835, 837,
 860, 877, 881,
 900, 906
 period, 776, 833,
 850, 866, 878,
 882, 901
 permission, 842
 permit, 843
 permitted, 843, 861
 permitting, 896
 perpetual, 841,
 853-854, 856
 perpetuating, 833
 perpetuation, 833
 perplexed, 779
 persist, 851, 857
 person, 906
 personal, 859
 personality, 859
 personally, 777
 Persons, 873
 persons, 838
 perspective, 852
 persuade, 777,
 791, 901
 persuades, 809
 persuasive, 806,
 873
 Peru, 808
 peter, 885
 peters, 885
 phase, 866
 phrase, 798-799,
 802, 843
 phraseology, 796,
 799
 physical, 792
 pick, 832-833, 860,
 874
 picked, 828
 picture, 836, 860
 piece, 888
 pilotage, 797
 pin, 833
 pinned, 781
 pipeline, 797
 pipelines, 795-797,
 802
 place, 777-779,
 788, 797, 855,
 866, 869, 873,
 881, 887, 895,
 902
 placed, 786, 836,
 858, 898, 906
 places, 874-875
 placing, 860
 plain, 776, 786, 791
 Plainly, 884
 plainly, 787, 796
 plan, 879
 Planck, 900
 plane, 863-864
 planned, 773, 888,
 905
 planning, 849
 plans, 773
 Plant, 899
 plausible, 902
 play, 859
 plead, 803
 pleaded, 899
 pleadings, 791,
 808, 837, 856,
 864-865,
 874-875, 898-900
 pleasant, 907
 Please, 866
 please, 780, 813,
 845
 pleased, 773
 pleasure, 774, 789
 Plenary, 807
 plenary, 866
 PM, 777-778
 podium, 788, 827,
 874
 Point, 836, 844
 point, 771-772,
 774, 776, 778,
 781, 784-785,
 788-789,
 793-798,
 802-804, 810,
 812, 814,

816-817, 820,
 823, 825,
 830-831,
 834-838,
 840-841, 845,
 850, 854,
 858-866, 869,
 871-879,
 881-883,
 885-888, 891,
 893-896,
 898-901, 904, 906
 pointed, 782, 817,
 824, 854, 867,
 873, 882, 896
 pointers, 833
 Points, 845
 points, 777,
 782-783, 786,
 788, 790, 793,
 800, 822, 829,
 832, 844-845,
 848, 851, 853,
 857, 860,
 868-869, 872,
 875-876, 878,
 888, 890, 904
 Pol, 800
 policies, 824, 889,
 898, 902
 Policy, 867
 policy, 791-792,
 799, 812, 824,
 859, 875, 879,
 881-882,
 897-898, 903-905
 polite, 785
 political, 777, 826,
 835, 847, 857,
 901-902
 politically, 856
 politicians, 889, 902
 polluted, 792
 Pollution, 898-899
 pollution, 791, 796,
 798-799,

802-803,
 814-815,
 824-825,
 875-876, 897-899
 poorly, 792
 Port, 793-794,
 878-879
 port, 798
 portray, 803, 835,
 843
 pose, 877
 posed, 846
 positing, 841
 position, 777, 779,
 781-782, 806,
 808, 835,
 837-838, 843,
 848, 855-856,
 858-859, 863,
 896-897, 906
 positions, 806
 positive, 777, 888
 possess, 790, 796
 possession, 859,
 881
 possibility, 815,
 825, 862, 877,
 879, 887
 possible, 784, 815,
 818, 837, 844,
 846, 889-890, 907
 possibly, 809, 881
 Post, 775
 post, 785, 848, 852
 postpone, 905
 postponing, 905
 potential, 773, 780,
 793
 power, 786, 796,
 802, 822
 powerful, 808
 powers, 804-807,
 810-811, 815,
 901-902
 pp, 807, 843,
 891-892, 901

practicable, 841,
 843
 practically, 865
 practice, 821, 833,
 835-836, 843,
 855-858, 903
 Pre, 771
 pre, 772, 777, 856
 precautionary, 904
 precedent, 877
 precedents,
 876-877
 preceding, 787
 precise, 800-802,
 828, 835, 887
 precisely, 779-780,
 782-783, 788,
 791, 825, 850,
 855, 872, 904
 preclude, 885, 902
 precludes, 806
 preclusion, 859
 predicated, 847
 prefer, 886
 preference, 812,
 831, 833-834,
 840-843, 853-854
 preferences, 840
 preferential, 834,
 896
 prejudice, 779, 883
 preliminary, 848
 Premier, 867
 préparatoires, 808
 prepared, 832, 884
 prescient, 807
 presence, 774
 present, 778, 797,
 822, 824, 831,
 860, 869-870,
 872-873,
 875-877, 896
 presentation, 771,
 843

presentations, 861
 presented, 826
 presents, 848-849
 Preservation, 792,
 813-814
 preservation, 790,
 792, 798,
 801-802, 814,
 816, 825, 903
 preserve, 904
 preserving, 809
 preside, 865
 PRESIDENT, 771,
 788-789, 795,
 812, 816, 827,
 836-838, 840,
 866, 868, 874,
 906-908
 President, 771,
 787-789,
 794-795, 803,
 812, 816,
 826-827, 840,
 865-866, 874,
 894, 906-907
 press, 794, 891
 pressed, 845
 pressure, 792, 906
 Presumably, 826
 presumably, 835,
 840, 901
 presume, 780, 830
 presuppose, 793
 pretend, 853
 pretty, 857
 prevail, 799
 prevails, 809
 prevent, 802, 804,
 812, 895
 preventing, 799,
 901
 Prevention, 899
 prevention,
 798-799, 802, 898

previous, 787, 802, 867, 904
 previously, 792, 815, 825
 prima, 900
 primarily, 801, 811
 Prime, 772-774, 776-778, 782-784, 786, 788, 834, 848-850, 867, 878-879, 882-885, 887, 897
 principal, 772, 828
 Principle, 853-854, 860, 877-878
 principle, 778, 805, 807, 810, 847, 852, 880, 882, 900
 Principles, 852-854, 860
 principles, 861
 prior, 772, 858, 878, 901
 private, 859
 pro, 862
 probably, 813, 816, 847, 878, 880, 898, 902
 problem, 778, 865, 886-887, 898-899
 problems, 778
 procedure, 807, 811, 813, 819
 procedures, 795, 807, 819
 proceed, 782, 820, 838, 861, 881, 883-884, 888-889, 903, 905
 proceeded, 786, 807, 884
 proceeding, 881, 883, 909
 proceedings, 771, 784-785, 788, 805, 819, 828, 858, 892, 899, 909
 process, 863, 875, 881, 893
 processes, 858, 883
 processing, 817
 proclaiming, 790
 Proclamation, 794
 proclamations, 793, 856
 produce, 808, 886
 produced, 864
 production, 867
 productively, 778
 Products, 810, 905
 Prof, 868, 871-873
 PROFESSOR, 789, 795, 812-814, 827, 837, 885-887, 906-907
 Professor, 785, 788-789, 795-796, 800-802, 812, 816, 827-828, 837-838, 846, 851-852, 860-861, 868-871, 873-874, 887, 900, 902-903, 906-907
 program, 902
 programme, 902
 progress, 773, 779-780, 837-838, 844, 867, 883
 progressive, 810
 prohibited, 794
 Prohibition, 810
 project, 779-780, 782, 784, 788, 883-884, 889
 promised, 876
 promote, 792, 812
 promoter, 882
 proof, 900-901, 905
 properly, 830, 833, 865
 property, 876-877
 proposal, 772-773, 775, 878-880, 882, 888-889
 proposals, 891
 propose, 783, 867, 878
 proposed, 772, 779, 867, 879-881, 889, 903
 proposes, 905
 proposition, 800
 propositions, 899
 prospecting, 850, 896
 prospective, 788
 prospectively, 834
 protect, 792, 795-796, 802, 815, 823, 874, 904
 Protected, 782, 787-788, 790, 793, 805, 820, 823-824, 826, 875, 878-880, 905
 protected, 778, 789-790, 792, 794, 796, 799, 861
 protecting, 809-810
 Protection, 792, 813-814, 898
 protection, 778, 790, 792-793, 796, 798, 801-802, 814, 816, 825, 833, 903
 protest, 781
 protocol, 773
 prove, 901-902
 provide, 798, 802, 805, 816-817, 821, 835, 838, 878, 883, 899, 905
 provided, 790, 795, 801, 809-810, 823, 860, 872, 881, 893, 906
 provides, 790, 801, 803, 805, 808, 821, 834, 851, 870, 873, 898, 906-907
 providing, 813, 906
 proving, 818, 900
 provision, 796, 800, 804, 815, 819-822, 831, 841, 868, 872-873
 provisions, 771, 781, 797-798, 800-802, 808, 811-812, 821-822, 825-826, 828, 860, 868, 870, 872
 Public, 867, 881-884, 888-889, 902
 public, 777-778, 793-794, 831, 838, 878-879, 881-885, 888-889, 902
 publication, 837
 published, 791, 891
 Pulau, 808, 859
 pulled, 888
 Pulp, 877, 879-880
 purports, 849

purpose, 790, 792,
796-799, 801,
804-806, 809,
826, 849, 852,
869, 878,
880-882, 901-903
purposes, 772-773,
775, 778,
787-788, 791,
794, 800, 806,
809-810, 831,
851, 861, 864,
870, 896, 900-903
pursuant, 795,
821, 827-828,
842, 844, 856,
890
pursue, 773, 825,
882
Put, 804, 881
put, 782, 784, 786,
788, 803,
805-806, 830,
832-836,
846-847, 850,
855-856,
861-863, 865,
884-886, 901, 906
Puteh, 859
puts, 830, 864
putting, 782, 863,
884
puzzled, 859
puzzling, 852

Q

Qatar, 808
QC, 771, 827
quaint, 881
qualifications, 853

qualified, 850, 905
qualifier, 843
qualify, 848, 853,
859, 887
quality, 834
question, 771,
773-774,
788-789,
793-794, 807,
809, 812-814,
816, 818,
829-830,
832-834, 837,
840, 844-846,
848-850, 852,
855-857,
864-866, 869,
880-882,
884-886, 888,
891, 901-904, 906
Questions, 808
questions, 812,
827, 836-837,
840, 865-866,
870, 883, 899,
907
quickly, 807, 888
quid, 862
quiet, 777
quite, 804, 816,
820, 825, 835,
837, 856-857,
859, 862,
867-868, 880,
882, 885,
887-888, 890,
897, 901
quixotic, 829
quo, 862
quotas, 773, 854
quote, 791,
799-800, 804,
807, 900
quoted, 850
Quoting, 817

quoting, 851

R

radically, 842
raise, 782, 786,
812, 837, 866
raised, 771-772,
774-775, 780,
782-783,
785-786,
865-866,
891-892, 899
raising, 778, 782,
787, 812, 870,
874
Ramgoolam, 774,
776-778,
829-830, 832,
882, 884
Ranjeva, 807
Rather, 829
rather, 772, 778,
807, 813, 824,
829-830, 845,
859, 869,
873-874,
885-887, 898,
904, 907
rational, 860
rationale, 902
Raymond, 807
rays, 793
rd, 779, 829-830,
832-833, 836,
840-841, 851,
863, 867, 893
RDR, 909
RE, 793
re, 775, 795, 797,
815-816, 822,
831-838, 842,
850-851, 854,
863-864, 899
reach, 819
reached, 820, 824,
838, 846, 849,
851-852, 864,
896-897
reaction, 788
read, 780, 782,
797, 811, 814,
822, 841, 851,
859, 869-870,
880, 883,
886-887, 900, 902
reading, 795, 797,
806, 808-809,
813, 823, 836,
875, 877
reads, 892
ready, 771
real, 787, 903
reality, 795, 829,
836, 860, 895
realize, 830
really, 778-779,
782, 812, 835,
841, 864,
866-867, 879,
883, 891-892
realms, 843
reason, 790, 799,
805, 817, 820,
822, 860, 870,
888, 900, 905,
907
reasonable, 888,
901, 903
reasonably, 903
reasoned, 880
reasoning,
811-812, 820, 847
reasons, 774, 782,
791, 793, 798,
800, 806, 808,
816, 822,

824-826, 856,
 875, 890-891, 904
 reassembling, 907
 reassurance, 838
 reassure, 778
 reassured, 777
 recall, 771-773,
 775, 777, 781,
 784, 797, 819,
 829, 834, 838,
 840, 848, 850,
 858, 868,
 870-871,
 884-885, 891,
 893, 896
 recalled, 848, 860
 receive, 785, 849
 received, 829-830,
 840, 867, 898,
 904
 receiver, 887
 receives, 861
 receiving, 887
 recent, 818, 892
 recess, 795, 816,
 868
 recipient, 886
 recognition, 780
 recognize, 832
 recognized, 870
 recommend, 832
 recommended, 837
 reconciled, 831
 Record, 840-841,
 867
 record, 771, 776,
 778, 785-786,
 788, 806, 811,
 815, 828-830,
 832, 834, 836,
 840, 842,
 844-845, 848,
 850-853, 861,
 863, 867, 887,
 890, 892, 896,
 909
 recorded, 777,
 831, 909
 recording, 776
 Records, 807
 records, 775, 785,
 808, 844, 891
 recover, 794
 Recovering, 794
 recovery, 792
 red, 818
 redacted, 785
 reduce, 802, 876
 reduced, 834,
 856-857, 909
 reduction, 802, 844
 redundant, 869
 Reef, 792
 reef, 792
 reefs, 790,
 792-794, 805,
 810, 905
 refer, 811, 814,
 831, 842,
 848-849, 872,
 874, 882,
 884-885, 900
 Reference, 888
 reference, 772-773,
 775-777,
 779-784,
 786-787, 794,
 797, 802,
 807-808, 810,
 813-814, 818,
 828-831, 835,
 840, 842-845,
 848, 850-852,
 855, 859,
 862-863, 869,
 872-873, 877,
 885-887, 893, 899
 references, 772,
 775, 781, 784,
 829, 831, 837,
 894
 referred, 775, 785,
 794, 796, 798,
 802, 818-819,
 831, 836, 840,
 848, 852, 859,
 861, 864, 866,
 872, 881-882,
 889-890, 902
 referring, 814, 831,
 834, 862-863,
 865, 880, 887
 refers, 774, 793,
 795-796, 798,
 802-803, 814,
 831, 833-834,
 836, 840, 850,
 852, 863, 901,
 903
 reflect, 777, 779,
 813, 830,
 832-833, 836
 reflected, 828, 840,
 845, 852-854, 860
 reflecting, 845
 reflective, 777
 reflects, 785, 796,
 802, 828, 843,
 852, 863, 888
 reform, 773
 reformulation, 850
 refraining, 903
 refuse, 806
 refused, 826
 regard, 783,
 800-801, 804,
 807, 819,
 822-823, 826,
 872, 874-875,
 887, 889-891,
 893, 895, 900,
 903, 907
 regarded, 870,
 884, 898
 regarding, 772-773, 787,
 819, 845, 849,
 876-877
 regardless, 847,
 855, 893
 regards, 821, 844,
 880, 888, 891
 regime, 773, 823,
 825-826, 856, 865
 region, 817-818,
 860, 893
 Regional, 779, 787
 regional, 898
 regret, 885
 regulate, 796,
 798-799,
 801-803, 815, 822
 regulated, 792, 898
 regulates, 815, 821
 Regulation, 899
 regulation, 799,
 802, 824, 898
 regulations, 798,
 800-801, 814,
 817, 900, 903
 regulatory, 881
 Reichler, 828-829,
 832, 841-844,
 846, 848, 850,
 857, 859, 896
 reinterpreted, 820
 reinterpreting, 807
 reinventing, 896
 reiterate, 774, 780,
 802
 reiterated, 787,
 808, 812
 reject, 875
 Rejoinder, 771,
 775, 784, 807,
 809, 817, 832,
 859, 882, 897
 relate, 791, 827,
 849
 related, 775, 784,
 795, 810, 812,
 825, 844, 864,

909
 relates, 791, 805, 818, 837
 relating, 775, 794-796, 804, 806-811, 817, 821, 850, 857, 883
 relation, 771, 773, 775-776, 779-780, 784, 811, 833-834, 838, 845, 850, 856, 862, 866, 870, 872, 907
 relations, 846, 875, 878, 880, 902
 relationship, 793, 800, 823, 825-826, 870, 881
 relatively, 833, 854, 894
 release, 794
 relevance, 876
 relevant, 774, 797, 799-802, 808, 811, 822, 829, 831, 836, 838, 857-858, 861, 867, 869, 878, 880, 882, 888, 891, 894, 903
 Reliance, 786
 reliance, 774, 858-860, 873
 reliant, 772
 relied, 771, 773, 776, 778, 781, 783, 785, 787, 800, 828, 861, 863, 873, 875, 896
 relies, 772, 798, 800-802, 824, 855, 860, 862, 876-877, 890
 relocated, 809
 rely, 900, 905
 relying, 771, 786, 822, 856, 862
 remain, 808, 811, 824, 834, 841-842, 844, 885, 897
 remained, 865
 remaining, 816, 874
 remains, 852
 remark, 901
 remarkable, 892
 remarkably, 826, 877
 remedy, 806, 825-826, 907
 remember, 834
 remind, 794
 reminded, 857
 remit, 789
 remotely, 892
 remove, 809, 819
 removed, 827, 835
 rendering, 787
 renders, 901
 rendition, 852, 902
 renegotiate, 833
 renegotiation, 840
 renewal, 852
 repackaging, 826
 repeat, 851, 853
 repeated, 862, 875, 881, 887
 repeatedly, 829, 871
 repeating, 852
 repeats, 864
 replenish, 794
 Reply, 771, 784, 786, 789, 818, 862
 reply, 788, 854, 866, 884-885
 Report, 793-794, 817-818, 882, 892, 899, 902
 report, 792-794, 817-818, 837, 866-867
 reported, 867
 REPORTER, 909
 Reporter, 909
 reporting, 867
 Reports, 808, 853, 857, 859, 876-877
 reports, 892
 represent, 858-859, 905
 representations, 844, 880, 883
 representatives, 784-785, 787, 864-865
 represents, 807-808, 810
 Republic, 779, 883
 request, 826, 854, 893
 requested, 826, 879
 requests, 779
 require, 777, 798, 866, 890, 894, 904
 required, 773, 782, 785, 818, 835, 846, 861, 864, 877-878, 895-896, 900-901
 requirement, 797, 890, 900
 requirements, 787, 819, 830-831, 840, 861, 891
 requires, 799-800, 802, 824, 875, 878, 890, 898, 900
 requiring, 800, 834, 877
 requisite, 835, 853, 863
 research, 811, 902, 905
 resembling, 799
 Reserve, 793
 reserve, 793, 878
 reserved, 851
 resettle, 783
 resettlement, 778-779, 883, 901
 resident, 835
 residual, 819
 resist, 864
 Resolution, 864
 resolution, 779-780, 819, 883
 resolutions, 892
 resolve, 887
 resolved, 838, 887
 resort, 819
 resource, 792, 805
 resources, 776, 779, 784, 790-797, 799, 801-806, 808-811, 814-815, 817, 823-824, 827, 849, 861, 865, 876-877, 883, 889, 895, 904
 Respect, 800, 873
 respect, 771, 789, 791-792, 800-802, 804, 810-811, 816-817, 820, 823, 825, 827-828, 840, 842-844, 846-847, 852, 854-855, 858, 863, 871-872, 874-875, 885,

890-891, 894,
 897, 900,
 903-904, 907
 respected, 905
 respectfully, 886
 respective, 818,
 884
 respond, 783, 790,
 835, 856,
 865-866, 874,
 881, 886, 889
 responded, 772,
 882, 885, 904
 responding, 856,
 885
 responds, 884
 response, 773-774,
 787, 789, 803,
 808, 820, 845,
 849, 855, 873,
 875-876, 880,
 884, 886-887,
 889, 891, 906
 responses, 806,
 876, 903
 Responsibilities,
 873
 responsibilities, 819
 responsible, 901
 rest, 785, 803, 847
 resting, 867
 restricted, 833, 844
 restrictions, 772
 restrictive, 854
 rests, 812, 820
 result, 798, 808,
 883
 resulting, 900
 resume, 891
 reticence, 859
 return, 777, 805,
 837-838, 856,
 861, 865, 868,
 878
 returned, 851
 returning, 860

Rev, 817
 reveal, 882
 revenue, 857
 revert, 783,
 848-849, 896
 Review, 818
 revisit, 789
 revocation, 860
 revoke, 860
 revoked, 860
 revoking, 860
 richer, 793
 richly, 790
 rightly, 834, 890
 Rights, 825, 874
 rights, 771-775,
 780, 784,
 790-791,
 795-796,
 800-801, 804,
 806-807,
 810-811, 817,
 819, 822-835,
 840-845,
 849-858,
 860-861,
 870-878, 890,
 894, 896-897,
 899-901,
 903-904, 906-907
 Rio, 877
 riparians, 877
 rise, 780
 risk, 877, 881
 River, 877
 Robert, 859
 Roberts, 775, 858,
 882, 901
 Rocks, 859
 Roman, 836
 room, 807
 roughly, 813, 837,
 851
 round, 788, 826,

835, 853, 855,
 860-861,
 878-879, 881,
 884, 907-908
 Rowland, 851
 rule, 801, 854, 872,
 876-878
 rules, 790, 796,
 798-803,
 813-816, 823,
 825, 846,
 868-873, 898,
 900, 903
 running, 828, 834
 runs, 833
 Rural, 818
 Russian, 872
 Rwanda, 853

S

905-907
 Sander, 772, 829,
 843, 850-851,
 855-856, 859, 891
 SANDS, 837, 906
 Sands, 785, 796,
 837-838,
 868-873, 906
 satisfied, 806, 819,
 875, 891
 satisfies, 861
 satisfy, 819
 Saudi, 887
 save, 821, 861, 895
 saw, 829, 870, 898
 saying, 774, 776,
 778-781, 788,
 820, 829, 832,
 841, 843, 848,
 850, 857-859,
 862-865, 867,
 870-871, 883,
 886, 895, 901
 says, 773-774, 778,
 782, 787,
 790-791,
 793-796,
 800-801, 806,
 811, 819-820,
 822, 834,
 843-844, 854,
 860, 873, 876,
 883-885, 890,
 898, 900-901
 SC, 793, 817-818,
 892
 sc, 892
 scale, 878-880
 scandals, 902
 scarcely, 801, 900
 sceptical, 892
 scheme, 874
 schemes, 799, 890
 Schwebel, 859
 science, 777,
 792-793, 860,

903, 905
 Sciences, 818
 Scientific, 793,
 817-818, 892
 scientific, 792, 811,
 892, 902, 904-906
 scientists, 888,
 904-905
 scope, 809, 824,
 869, 873
 Scotland, 816
 Scott, 905
 scoured, 886
 screen, 817-818,
 826, 878, 900,
 904
 Sea, 794, 799, 813,
 815-816, 826, 893
 sea, 791, 795, 799,
 819-821, 823,
 848, 868-871, 874
 Seabed, 873
 seabed, 798,
 823-824,
 848-849, 890
 seafood, 773
 sealanes, 799
 search, 892
 Seas, 905
 seas, 792, 804,
 818, 872, 877,
 894
 Second, 790, 792,
 800, 806, 808,
 818, 840, 878,
 882, 900-901
 second, 771-772,
 779-780, 782,
 790, 792, 797,
 800, 804, 806,
 811, 813, 832,
 835, 837-838,
 840, 844, 849,
 852, 855,
 860-861, 870,
 875-876,
 878-879, 882,
 897, 903, 908
 Secondly, 786,
 829, 848, 852,
 856-857, 861,
 872, 888-889,
 895, 904
 secondly, 792, 805,
 828, 875, 884
 Secretary, 778,
 782, 786, 832,
 836, 866-867,
 878-879,
 883-886, 888,
 896, 901
 Section, 813
 section, 795, 815,
 818-819, 823,
 868, 900
 sections, 800
 secure, 832
 securing, 857
 Security, 792
 security, 774
 sedentary, 771,
 791, 823-824,
 842, 897
 Sedudu, 857
 See, 775, 784, 786,
 808, 810, 853-854
 see, 772-774,
 776-780,
 782-784,
 786-787, 795,
 818, 826,
 829-834, 836,
 840-842,
 844-849, 851,
 855, 857-858,
 862-865,
 867-870,
 872-874, 878,
 880, 882-884,
 888, 900
 Seeballuck, 879,
 884-885
 seeing, 856
 seek, 777, 787,
 861, 879, 893
 seeking, 786,
 830-832, 840,
 842-843, 853,
 859, 871, 875,
 884
 seeks, 843, 871
 seem, 814,
 886-887, 894-895
 seemed, 785, 825,
 903
 seemingly, 806
 seems, 794,
 803-804,
 824-825, 833,
 835, 865, 886,
 891, 906
 seen, 775-776,
 778, 802, 851,
 864, 902
 sees, 779, 781,
 783, 834-835,
 842, 850, 870,
 873
 Seewoosagur,
 829-830,
 832-833, 840
 selective, 826
 selectively, 874
 self, 864, 867
 semi, 866
 sending, 778
 sense, 777, 782,
 794, 798, 823,
 831, 836,
 841-842, 852,
 868, 871, 882
 sensible, 838
 sent, 779, 833,
 851, 884
 sentence, 814,
 832, 902
 sentences, 847
 separate, 817, 835,
 846, 860-861, 866
 separately, 780,
 783, 822, 869,
 901
 separation, 799,
 890
 September,
 828-830,
 832-834, 836,
 840-841, 844,
 850-851,
 866-867, 881
 seq, 846
 series, 827-828, 864
 serious, 782-783,
 803, 885, 900-901
 seriously, 797, 857,
 903
 servanda, 872
 servant, 859
 serve, 809
 serves, 874
 Session, 793, 818
 session, 806, 845
 Sessions, 807
 set, 795, 802,
 806-808, 825,
 832, 849, 851,
 855, 870, 875,
 877-878, 897,
 900-902, 907
 sets, 791, 802, 811,
 818, 834,
 896-897, 902
 setting, 788
 settle, 783, 823
 settlement, 786,
 807-808,
 811-813, 815,
 819-822, 826
 seven, 832, 836,
 875-876, 905
 Seventh, 876
 Several, 801

several, 782-783, 808, 864, 882-883, 903
 severe, 793
 Seychelles, 851
 shall, 797, 815, 819, 869, 872-874, 898, 904-905
 shape, 882
 share, 877
 shared, 775, 876, 894, 898
 shares, 876
 sharing, 775
 shark, 793
 sharks, 790, 793-794, 818
 sharp, 835
 SHEARER, 771, 788-789, 795, 812, 816, 827, 836-838, 840, 866, 868, 874, 906-908
 shelf, 791, 823-824, 848-849, 875-876, 896-897
 Sheppard, 906
 shift, 827
 ships, 798-799, 898
 shoehorned, 890
 short, 777, 786-787, 816, 844, 867, 902, 907
 shortly, 786, 788, 860
 show, 777, 786, 811, 815, 834, 850, 853, 855, 857, 861, 874, 878-879, 891, 895, 897, 903
 showed, 893
 showing, 907
 shown, 818, 853, 857, 904
 shows, 784, 792, 811, 856, 863, 881, 883, 889
 Shrimp, 810
 side, 786, 837, 847, 864, 868, 881, 887, 907
 sided, 860
 sides, 865
 sight, 860
 signally, 803
 signed, 777
 significance, 791, 822, 858, 892, 894
 significant, 855-856, 881, 903
 silence, 892
 similar, 784, 793
 similarly, 902
 simple, 771, 796, 820, 861
 Simply, 803
 simply, 782, 784, 791, 798, 801, 804, 806, 808, 814, 826, 832, 834-835, 871, 874, 880-882, 891, 893, 897-898
 Since, 830
 since, 804, 864, 867, 876-877, 887, 896-897
 Singapore, 859
 single, 812, 815, 858
 Sipadan, 808
 SIR, 866
 Sir, 782, 829-830, 832-833, 840, 855, 859, 865-866, 868, 896
 sir, 863
 sit, 836
 sites, 793, 892
 sitting, 838
 situated, 893
 situation, 788, 863
 situations, 815, 875
 six, 831-832, 836, 844, 879, 882
 Sixteenth, 793, 818
 sixth, 876
 sixties, 833
 skates, 793
 skipped, 870
 slightly, 776, 832, 835, 863, 881
 slotted, 842
 small, 816, 818
 Smelter, 900
 Smith, 830
 soft, 853
 SOLAS, 799, 803
 sole, 773, 881
 solely, 888
 solve, 823
 somebody, 832
 somehow, 771, 774, 780-781, 784-786, 810, 847, 864, 874, 901
 someone, 873, 886
 sometime, 785
 sometimes, 892
 somewhat, 887
 soon, 775, 837, 844
 Sorry, 830, 848
 sorry, 780, 789, 830, 836, 880
 sort, 847, 866
 SoS, 777
 sought, 781, 787, 791, 842, 845, 854, 856, 872, 889, 891
 sound, 896
 source, 857
 sources, 897, 905
 South, 859
 south, 817
 Southern, 899
 southwest, 818
 sovereign, 791, 795, 801, 804, 806-807, 810-811, 817, 822-823, 842-844, 849-850, 853, 855, 857, 866, 875, 877-878, 896-897, 903
 Sovereignty, 808, 859
 sovereignty, 771-772, 774-775, 778-784, 787, 791, 807, 821, 842, 844, 849, 860, 868-870, 872, 877, 883-884, 889, 891
 space, 828
 speaking, 787-788, 834, 865
 special, 825, 865, 870
 specially, 870
 species, 771, 781, 791, 793-794, 796, 805, 810, 817-818, 823-824, 842, 890, 897, 905
 specific, 775, 802, 819, 823, 853, 856, 870-872,

875, 890, 897
specifically, *790, 796, 837*
specified, *790, 796, 798, 800, 802-803, 816, 825*
specifies, *801*
specify, *800, 805*
speech, *790, 874*
spend, *795*
spill, *899*
Sponsoring, *873*
sponsorship, *906*
squarely, *791, 810*
squeezed, *774*
SR, *807*
st, *772-773, 782, 807, 829, 831-833, 840*
Staff, *777, 879, 882*
stage, *829-831, 864, 867, 875, 878, 880*
stages, *828*
stakeholders, *888*
stand, *785, 838, 851-852, 863, 894*
standard, *798, 800-801, 875, 880*
Standards, *800*
standards, *790, 796, 798-803, 813, 815-816, 825-826, 898*
standing, *818*
starkly, *800*
start, *771, 797, 807, 828, 879, 899*
starts, *869*
State, *771, 780, 785, 790, 795-796, 798-801, 804-805, 807, 810-811, 813-815, 817, 821-823, 825-826, 832, 836, 844, 847, 849, 852, 856, 858-860, 863, 866, 869, 875-876, 878, 896*
state, *849, 877-878, 890, 892-893, 895-896, 900-901, 903*
stated, *776, 783, 831, 840, 846, 896-897*
Statement, *771, 784, 786, 864*
statement, *845, 847, 853, 858, 862, 866, 870, 882*
Statements, *775, 847*
statements, *852, 854, 856, 859, 863, 902*
States, *795-796, 798-802, 804-808, 812-813, 815, 817-819, 822-823, 825, 847, 854, 857, 870, 872-874, 888, 894, 896, 904-905, 907*
states, *810, 875, 877-878, 881, 890, 892-895, 898, 900, 903-905*
stating, *803*
stationary, *818*
status, *820, 835, 840, 846-847, 856, 864, 868-869, 872*
stay, *877*
stenographically, *909*
step, *835*
steps, *844, 858*
still, *773, 785-786, 794, 803, 809-810, 822, 831, 850, 854, 860-862, 865, 879*
stipulates, *817*
stitch, *784*
Stocks, *789, 808-809, 812, 816, 818, 827, 874, 876, 891, 893, 895-896, 904*
stocks, *774, 781, 784, 790-794, 802-806, 810, 815-817, 820-821, 877, 879, 890-891, 894-896, 903-905, 907*
stop, *775, 816, 843*
stops, *889*
story, *886*
straddling, *781, 784, 791, 802, 816-817, 890, 895, 904*
straightforward, *804, 820, 874*
straits, *799, 872*
Strand, *830, 833*
strand, *771-772, 780, 785*
strands, *771-772*
strategic, *783*
streets, *777*
strengthens, *792*
Strenuous, *887*
stress, *906*
strictly, *865, 898*
stride, *777*
strikes, *788*
striking, *862*
string, *872*
strong, *851, 904*
stronger, *905*
strongly, *806, 892*
struck, *836*
stuck, *855*
sub, *795-796, 802, 844, 857*
subject, *778, 795, 800, 807, 811-812, 815, 819, 821, 823, 826, 838, 842-844, 846, 854, 865, 867, 869, 872, 892, 900, 906*
subjected, *815*
subjecting, *881*
subjects, *803, 892*
submission, *810, 814, 833, 846, 879*
submissions, *772, 785, 789, 828, 833, 843, 852, 868, 888, 907*
submit, *802, 811, 817*
submitted, *805, 830-831, 840, 906*
submitting, *858*
subparagraph, *853*
Subsequent, *855*
subsequent, *781, 830, 835-836, 851, 855-858, 860, 880*
subsequently, *828-829, 861, 898*
subsoil, *848-849, 868*

substance, 814-815, 826, 854, 889
substantial, 899
substantive, 773, 776, 811, 826
substitute, 882
succeed, 901
Success, 792
successive, 811
such, 846, 905
sudden, 861
suddenly, 863
sue, 796
sufficient, 797, 806, 813, 864, 903
sugar, 772-773, 854
suggest, 776, 797, 803, 814, 817, 819, 821, 840, 842, 852, 861, 871, 878, 883, 886, 889-890, 892-894, 900-905, 907
suggested, 825, 841, 872, 895, 897, 899
suggesting, 846
suggestion, 775-776, 784, 800, 847, 868, 870, 885, 899
suggestive, 870
suggests, 834, 872
sum, 872
summarise, 878
summarised, 904
summarises, 793
summarize, 906
Summary, 807, 817
summary, 818, 836, 889

summing, 832
sunt, 872
supervision, 909
supplemented, 879
supply, 899
support, 777, 783, 797, 806, 811, 873, 877, 901, 904
supported, 859, 871
supporting, 792
supports, 792, 797, 800
suppose, 824, 858, 860, 878
supposed, 832, 835
supposedly, 855
surely, 798, 878-879, 896
surplus, 805-806, 814, 826, 877
surpluses, 817
surprise, 787, 821
surprised, 809, 885-886
surprising, 797, 861
surprisingly, 821
surrounding, 792-793
survey, 802
suspects, 858
Sustainability, 792
sustainable, 792, 814
Swordfish, 899
swordfish, 817
sympathy, 831
system, 792, 848, 888
systems, 846

T

Tab, 771-772, 793-794, 800, 818, 829-833, 836, 840-841, 844-846, 848-851, 869, 880, 882-885, 898-899
tab, 773, 775-776, 779, 782-783, 785-786, 794, 831, 841, 848, 880, 896, 906
tabs, 785, 885
tail, 785
talked, 773
talks, 774-776, 778-780, 782, 788, 822, 878-879, 881, 883-885, 889, 891, 896, 898-899
tanker, 799
tankers, 815
target, 818
targeting, 817
task, 873
taught, 816
teasing, 846
Technical, 892
technology, 799
telegram, 845
telephone, 778
tells, 802, 830, 854
temptation, 864
ten, 836
tendered, 786, 906
tense, 872-873
tension, 807, 834
term, 779-780,

792-793, 799, 829, 831, 834, 842-843, 852, 883
terminable, 901
terminate, 822
terminated, 885, 888
termination, 791, 900
terminology, 803
Terms, 888
terms, 772, 781, 783-784, 790, 797-799, 805-806, 809-810, 814, 817, 819-820, 823, 834-835, 842, 848, 850, 852, 856, 859, 864, 872, 875-876, 885, 887-888, 892, 898, 904
Territorial, 808
territorial, 791, 819-821, 823, 848-849, 854, 868-871, 874
Territories, 791-792, 846, 898, 902
territories, 791-792, 846
Territory, 775, 787, 793, 848, 851
territory, 842, 846-848
test, 862, 880
tested, 880
testimony, 901
Tests, 834-835, 844, 847-848, 852-855, 861-863
tests, 834
text, 772, 795,

797-798, 801,
 807-808, 812,
 829, 841, 854,
 872-873, 877, 890
 textbook, 794
 texts, 872
 th, 773-774, 778,
 781-783,
 786-788, 807,
 831, 833, 840,
 848-849, 866,
 886, 892
 the, 771, 776, 792,
 859, 871, 903
 theirs, 812
 them, 841
 themes, 855-856
 themselves, 801,
 889
 there, 817
 thereafter, 838, 909
 thereby, 777, 806,
 860, 874
 Therefore, 813,
 862, 865
 therefore, 779,
 790, 804, 806,
 809, 814, 819,
 821-822,
 826-827, 831,
 855, 862,
 864-865, 881,
 886, 898-899
 thereof, 846
 thereon, 859
 thGovernor, 845
 thick, 775
 Third, 790, 811,
 878, 900
 third, 771, 777,
 779, 783, 804,
 813, 832, 836,
 840, 851,
 856-857, 869,
 875, 888
 Thirdly, 873
 849
 total, 778-780, 826,
 883
 totality, 794, 818,
 894
 touch, 775
 touched, 785
 Tout, 873
 towards, 779, 800,
 832, 844
 Trade, 779, 787
 trade, 814
 tradition, 861
 traditional, 828,
 861, 873, 897
 traffic, 799, 890
 Trafford, 830
 Trail, 900
 train, 789
 traité, 873
 transboundary,
 877-878
 Transcript,
 828-829, 837, 846
 transcript, 837,
 851, 909
 transcription, 909
 Transcripts, 837
 transfer, 863
 transferred, 865
 transit, 799, 872
 transpired, 886
 travaux, 808, 811
 travel, 888
 treat, 814
 treated, 771, 810,
 835
 Treaties, 808, 873
 treaties, 857, 866,
 902
 treatment, 823, 897
 Treaty, 862, 870
 treaty, 775, 846,
 858, 864,
 872-873, 900,
 902, 904
 Tribunal, 771-772,
 786-789, 795,
 797, 803, 817,
 820, 825, 827,
 836-837, 840,
 842, 858, 860,
 867-868, 874,
 906-907
 tribunal, 789, 794,
 803, 805, 812,
 817, 819, 823,
 825-826,
 858-859, 875,
 892, 894
 tried, 803, 885, 903
 Trinidad, 817
 troubling, 864
 true, 787, 803, 817,
 821, 880, 891,
 899, 901, 909
 truly, 823, 854, 872
 Trust, 793
 trust, 793
 try, 837-838, 863,
 866, 868, 884,
 888, 906
 trying, 779, 815,
 832-833, 838,
 881, 895
 Tuesday, 778
 Tuna, 816-817,
 819-820, 891, 899
 tuna, 793, 817-818,
 895
 turn, 773, 776, 786,
 791, 801, 803,
 813, 826,
 829-830, 832,
 841, 845, 848,
 857, 868-869,
 883-884, 890, 897
 Turning, 875
 turning, 860
 turns, 773
 turtles, 810, 818

Two, 888
 two, 772, 778, 780,
 782-783, 789,
 791-792, 798,
 802, 804, 806,
 808, 813-814,
 818, 822, 828,
 830, 832-833,
 836-838, 840,
 847-848,
 850-852,
 856-857, 863,
 865-866,
 869-871, 876,
 880, 883,
 885-888, 891,
 893-894, 897,
 901-903
 type, 847
 types, 805
 typewritten, 909
 typically, 800

U

UK, 772, 775-778,
 782, 784-785,
 787, 791, 794,
 829, 831, 835,
 837, 840-843,
 851-853, 855,
 857-860,
 868-869, 876,
 883-885, 888,
 892-893
 UKAF, 793-794,
 800, 818, 880,
 885, 899
 UKCM, 771,
 775-776, 784,
 786, 792-794,
 800, 808, 811,
 817, 848, 854,
 879-880,
 882-883, 888,
 891-892, 896,
 899-900
 UKR, 776, 806,
 808-810, 817,
 854, 856,
 858-859, 882,
 897-899, 905
 UKRej, 859
 ulterior, 826,
 901-902
 ultimately, 783,
 834, 860, 884
 umbrella, 780, 792
 UN, 807-809, 812,
 874, 896
 un, 793
 unable, 784, 837,
 874, 877, 888
 unacceptable, 831
 unambiguous, 806,
 809, 843, 896
 unambiguously,
 804, 810
 unanswered, 837
 uncertain, 905
 uncertainty, 847
 unclear, 814
 UNCLOS, 771-776,
 778, 780-786,
 788, 801,
 805-808,
 810-812, 816,
 818-828, 860,
 873-875, 891,
 893, 895, 899,
 901, 903
 Under, 845, 847,
 893
 under, 771, 776,
 780-782,
 784-785, 789,
 792, 794, 798,
 803, 805-806,
 808-811, 814,
 818-822,
 824-825,
 827-828, 834,
 842-843,
 845-849,
 863-864, 875,
 880-881,
 893-894,
 897-899, 901,
 907, 909
 underlying, 841,
 847
 undermine, 790,
 894
 undermined, 823
 undermines, 895
 underneath, 830
 underpinnings, 861
 underpins, 905
 understand, 772,
 776, 778,
 783-785, 788,
 795, 812, 814,
 824, 832-834,
 838, 855,
 861-864,
 866-867, 872,
 885-886, 898,
 903, 906
 understandable,
 896
 Understanding, 896
 understanding,
 773, 775, 784,
 814, 824,
 828-829,
 831-832, 836,
 838, 840-841,
 845, 848-850,
 852, 855-857,
 861, 864, 896-897
 understandings,
 827-828, 835,
 845-847, 849,
 851-852,
 855-856,
 862-863, 865
 understated,
 886-887
 understood,
 773-775,
 777-778, 784,
 792, 799, 843,
 845-846, 848,
 850, 863, 876,
 887, 897-898
 undertaken, 889
 undertaking,
 782-784, 788,
 828-829, 832,
 834-835, 852,
 855-856,
 860-864,
 876-877, 885, 897
 undertakings, 772,
 774, 780, 785,
 827, 851-852,
 854-856, 862,
 864, 870-872
 undertook, 885
 undisputed, 905
 undoubtedly, 825,
 863, 886
 unfortunate, 887
 Unfortunately, 887
 unfortunately, 887
 unfounded, 902
 UNFSA, 893
 unhappiness, 781
 unhappy, 892
 uniformly, 800
 unilateral, 776-777,
 781, 787-788,
 812, 854, 860-863
 unilaterally, 815,
 841, 846
 uninhabited, 792
 Union, 773
 unique, 777, 876
 United, 774-775,
 782-784,
 786-792, 797,

801, 803,
806-807,
810-811, 816,
819, 823-824,
828, 832,
835-836,
841-843,
846-851,
855-858, 860,
862-865,
874-880,
882-885,
887-899, 901,
903-907
unjustifiably, 824,
898
unlawfully, 790
Unless, 796, 827
unless, 804, 818,
820, 885, 897
unlicensed, 793
unlike, 817, 854,
900
unnecessary, 825
unpolluted, 792
unqualified, 843
unquestionably,
888
unravel, 807
unravelling, 865
unreasonable, 808,
823, 886-887
unreliable, 905
unreported, 793
unsurprising, 829
unsurprisingly, 779
unsustainable,
791, 793, 895,
906
untenable, 798
Until, 807
until, 777, 812,
839, 862, 881,
897, 905, 908
unusual, 847, 863,
882

unusually, 882
unworkable, 871
up, 774, 782, 789,
813, 816,
828-829,
832-833, 838,
844, 860-861,
874, 876, 878,
881-882,
884-886, 896, 902
uphold, 903
Uruguay, 877
USA, 843, 854
useful, 808, 866,
878
uses, 790, 795-796,
872
using, 861
usual, 784, 836
utility, 857
V
vain, 892
valid, 808
validity, 860, 865
validly, 847
valuable, 793
value, 894
variants, 799
variety, 881, 907
various, 772, 784,
789, 802, 806,
838, 865
VCLT, 857
ve, 771, 775-776,
794, 809,
815-816, 830,
837, 840,
845-846, 851,
867, 876, 880,

885-887, 890,
898-899
verb, 873
Verbale, 778-779,
883-888
verbale, 781,
882-884
versa, 804
version, 809, 837,
873
vessel, 773, 899
Vessels, 899
vessels, 817-818,
821, 842, 861,
894, 899-900
vest, 849
vested, 850, 897
vesting, 848
VI, 864
vi, 843-844, 851,
853
via, 803, 820, 823
vice, 804
vicinity, 774
video, 888
Vienna, 808, 873
view, 773, 787,
797, 807, 809,
812-813,
821-822, 826,
834, 858-859,
866-867, 869,
875, 880-882,
887, 902-903, 906
viewed, 822
views, 771-772,
782-787,
807-808,
858-859, 880,
882, 886, 901
vigueur, 873
VII, 817, 819
VIII, 902
viii, 851, 896
violate, 825

violated, 813
violates, 898
violation, 803, 813,
875, 899
violations, 874
Virginia, 801, 811,
822
virtually, 830
virtue, 791, 810,
827, 876, 883
vis, 777
visions, 808
visit, 773
vital, 864
voice, 844
Vol, 807
vol, 801, 822
Volume, 830, 832,
841, 846, 851
volume, 844, 850,
882
volumes, 830
vote, 807
vulnerable, 821

W

wait, 855-856, 864
wanted, 778, 806,
815, 830, 832,
838, 850, 866,
893
wants, 835
wary, 860
was, 885
Washington, 777
wasn, 832-834, 886
waste, 799, 899
water, 815, 823,
895-896

watercourses, 877
 waters, 773-774,
 790, 793, 803,
 817-818, 823,
 840, 849, 854,
 860-861, 872,
 880, 893-895,
 899-900
 way, 777, 783, 790,
 801, 820-821,
 826, 828, 838,
 840, 851, 856,
 858, 862-863,
 870, 886, 893,
 907
 ways, 871, 881
 we, 872
 weak, 876
 weaker, 873, 894,
 898
 Wednesday, 776,
 793, 882, 891
 week, 787, 789,
 791, 825-826,
 828-829,
 872-873, 875,
 903, 905
 weekend, 907
 weeks, 831, 834,
 879, 888-889
 weigh, 858
 weight, 858, 860
 welcome, 835
 welcomed, 880
 were, 793, 883
 weren, 849
 Western, 898
 Whaling, 892, 902
 whaling, 892, 902
 whatever, 813,
 832, 834, 860,
 863, 869, 875,
 893
 whereas, 833
 whereby, 848
 Whereupon, 839,
 908
 Whether, 855
 whether, 793-794,
 809, 814, 822,
 829, 832-834,
 836-838,
 846-847,
 854-855, 857,
 864, 866-867,
 869, 876, 880,
 885, 893, 899,
 902, 904
 which, 794
 whisper, 781
 whispered, 788
 White, 791-792
 white, 902
 whole, 783,
 796-797, 804,
 808, 815, 826,
 833, 837, 848,
 860, 871
 wholly, 811, 893,
 902
 whom, 882
 WHOMERSLEY,
 837-838
 Whomersley,
 837-838
 widely, 801, 904
 wider, 794
 Wikileaks, 901
 will, 771-775,
 777-780,
 782-783,
 786-791,
 793-797, 800,
 803-805, 807,
 809, 811,
 815-816,
 818-819,
 822-823, 826,
 828-832,
 834-838, 840,
 842, 844,
 848-851, 855,
 857-858,
 860-861,
 863-866, 868,
 870, 873,
 875-878,
 880-885,
 890-893, 899,
 902, 905-908
 willing, 836, 885,
 888
 Wilson, 897
 wish, 785, 828-830,
 860, 864, 888,
 907
 wished, 831, 838,
 889
 wishes, 780, 819,
 844, 848, 905
 wishing, 856
 withdraw, 883
 withdrawal, 826
 within, 773, 779,
 789-791, 793,
 795-797,
 803-808, 810,
 814, 818,
 820-823,
 825-827, 836,
 843-844, 854,
 862, 864,
 871-875, 877,
 893-894, 896,
 902, 904, 907
 without, 797-798,
 813, 815, 838,
 856, 858, 876,
 890, 900
 witness, 786, 882
 WOLFRUM,
 812-814, 816,
 831, 850,
 861-863,
 865-866, 887
 Wolfrum, 837, 845,
 864, 882, 903,
 906
 won, 866, 877,
 883, 898
 wonder, 836, 860,
 865, 895
 wondering, 837
 WOOD, 866
 Wood, 865, 896-897
 word, 772, 800,
 822, 845, 848,
 851-852, 855,
 861-862, 867, 873
 wording, 784,
 794-795, 798,
 800, 802, 804,
 809, 811, 816,
 828, 832,
 842-843, 849,
 853, 870, 872,
 896-897
 words, 796, 833,
 841, 843, 861,
 868, 870-872,
 877, 883, 894,
 905, 907
 WORDSWORTH,
 771, 780,
 788-789,
 830-833,
 835-836, 840,
 850, 856,
 862-866, 868
 Wordsworth, 771,
 780, 789, 827,
 830-832, 836,
 840, 850, 855,
 861, 864-866,
 868, 874, 890
 work, 777, 782,
 837-838, 892
 working, 838
 workings, 860
 Workshop, 904
 workshop, 792, 794
 world, 792, 867,
 903

worldwide, *905*
worth, *782, 787, 793*
worthwhile, *786*
wouldn, *783*
write, *886-888*
writer, *812*
writing, *788, 855*
writings, *812*
written, *776, 800, 808, 864, 874-875, 900, 903*
wrote, *848, 884*
WT, *810, 905*
WTO, *810, 905*
www, *793, 892*

Z

Zealand, *853-854*
zero, *806*
Zone, *791-793, 795-796, 799-801, 804, 806, 810, 814-815, 817-818, 822-823, 827*
zone, *776, 794, 801, 875, 890, 894, 907*
zones, *792, 817, 835, 905*

X

XII, *798, 802, 814*
XV, *794-796, 805, 819-820, 822-823*
XXIII, *819-820*

Y

Yeadon, *775, 781, 784, 858, 901*
year, *818, 896, 901*
years, *772, 831, 858, 866, 887, 898, 900-901*
Yemen, *859*
yesterday, *779, 781, 784, 837, 866, 868, 894*