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INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes the maritime claims made by the Government of Uruguay. It also reviews the maritime boundaries it has negotiated with its neighbors, Argentina and Brazil. Uruguay in 1998 implemented a law setting forth its baseline claims, including several segments of straight baselines, from which it measures the limits of its 12-mile territorial sea, 24-mile contiguous zone and 200-mile exclusive economic zone.

BASIS FOR BASELINE ANALYSIS

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (LOS Convention), which Uruguay ratified on December 10, 1992, reflects customary international law for the principles that underlie the proper and legal establishment of baselines. The rules for drawing baselines are contained in articles 5-11 and 13-14 of the LOS Convention. Article 5 states that "except where otherwise provided in this Convention, the normal baseline for measuring the breadth of the territorial sea is the low-water line along the coast." Paragraph 1 of article 7 is the paramount paragraph that establishes the geographical conditions that must be met should a coastal State elect to claim straight baselines in particular locations. This paragraph states that straight baselines may be drawn only in two specific geographic situations, that is, (a) "in localities where the coastline is deeply indented and cut into", or (b), "if there is a fringe of islands along the coast in its immediate vicinity".

The purpose of authorizing the use of straight baselines is to allow the coastal State, at its discretion, to enclose those waters which have, as a result of their close interrelationship with the land, the character of internal waters. According to the LOS Convention, "the sea areas lying within the lines must be sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of internal waters". By using straight baselines, a State may also eliminate complex patterns, including enclaves, in its territorial sea, that would otherwise result from the use of normal baselines.

A United Nations study stated that when determining whether "conditions apply which would permit the use of straight baselines it is necessary to focus on the spirit as well as the letter of the first paragraph of article 7" of the LOS Convention. And, as a noted geographer has stated, "proper straight baselines usually have a number of segments,

---

2 All miles in this study are nautical miles. One nautical mile equals 1,852 meters.
3 LOS Convention, article 7(1); also found in article 4(1) of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, 15 U.S.T. 1606, T.I.A.S. No. 639, 516 U.N.T.S. 205.
4 LOS Convention, article 7(3).
(each composed of several legs, interspersed with sections of the low-water mark of island and mainland coasts.... The length of individual legs is short and the baseline is rarely more than 24 nautical miles from an exposed coast". Article 14 of the LOS Convention acknowledges that a combination of methods is appropriate for determining the type of baselines in particular areas: "The coastal State may determine baselines in turn by any of the methods provided for in the foregoing articles to suit different conditions."

Neither the LOS Convention nor the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone place a specific distance limit on the length of a straight baseline. However, several analyses have suggested limits ranging from 24 to 48 miles. The position of the United States is that as a general rule baseline segments should not exceed 24 miles. The following analysis supports 24 miles as the ordinary maximum baseline length.

The maximum segment length of 24 miles is supported by a close reading of the relevant articles of the LOS Convention. Article 7(1) speaks of the "immediate vicinity" of the coast. Article 7(3) states that "the sea areas lying within the line must be sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of internal waters.” In both of these descriptions, the implication is strong that the waters to be internalized would otherwise be part of the territorial sea. It is difficult to envision a situation where international waters (beyond 12 miles from the appropriate low-water line) could be somehow “sufficiently closely linked” as to be subject to conversion to internal waters.

This implication is reinforced by article 8(2) which guarantees the right of innocent passage in areas converted to internal waters by straight baselines. Innocent passage is a regime applicable to the territorial sea (with a maximum breadth of 12 miles). Preservation of innocent passage carries over pre-existing rights in waters that were territorial in nature before the application of straight baselines.

Finally, Article 10 of the LOS Convention allows a coastal State to draw a closing line between the low-water marks of the natural entrance points of a bay that meets the geographic criteria set forth in that Article. The maximum length of such closing lines may not exceed 24 miles. Given the linkage to the territorial sea and the 24-mile...
limitation for bay closing lines, it follows that, as a rule, no straight baseline segment should exceed 24 miles. \(^{10}\)

**ANALYSIS OF URUGUAY’S MARITIME CLAIMS AND BOUNDARIES**

**Straight Baselines** \(^{11}\): Uruguay is bordered by Brazil to the north and east, and Argentina to the west. The southeast coastline of Uruguay faces the South Atlantic Ocean and its southern coastline fronts on the Rio de la Plata. Overall, the entire Uruguayan coastline from its border with Brazil to the entrance of the Rio de la Plata is smooth with no major indentations. The mainland coastline does not contain localities that are “deeply indented and cut into” or where there is “a fringe of islands.” With the exception of a few isolated islets, there are no offshore islands.

Article 14 of its Act No. 17.033 of 20 November 1998 sets forth Uruguay’s baseline claim (the geographical coordinates of the straight baseline turning points are reproduced in Annex 1 of this study) and states:

> The baseline for the measurement of the breadth of the territorial sea and of other maritime areas of Uruguay are the normal and straight baselines established in annex I (list of geographical coordinates and features specifying the baselines) of this Act, including the straight line which marks the outer limit of the Rio de la Plata from the maritime lateral limit with the Argentine Republic to Punta del Este, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty concerning the Rio de la Plata and the corresponding maritime boundary of 19 November 1973. The delineation of these lines is shown on the nautical charts which are annexed hereto as Annex II to this Act.

Uruguay has created 13 straight baseline segments ranging in length from 60 miles (segment 1-2 across its half of the mouth of the Rio de la Plata) to 0.3 miles (segment 16-17; see Table 1 and attached illustrative map).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length (nautical miles)</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Length (nautical miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{10}\) Roach and Smith, footnote 24, pp. 64-65.
\(^{11}\) Analysis of this straight baseline claim was based on NIMA charts NO 24000 (39th ed., August 9, 1997 (Corrected through NM 32/9, 1:990,526) and NO 23030 6th ed., Nov. 22, 1997 (Corrected through NM 47/97, 1: 778,790).
Starting in the south, Uruguay’s first baseline segment of approximately 60 miles connects points 1-2 and is a part of the Rio de la Plata closing line that it established in an agreement with Argentina. On November 19, 1973, Uruguay and Argentina signed a treaty defining their lateral maritime boundary in the Rio de la Plata and a continental shelf boundary seaward of the river closing line. One provision of this treaty reaffirmed the closing line at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata between Punta del Este (Uruguay) and Punta Rasa del Cabo San Antonio (Argentina) established in the Joint Declaration on the External Limit of the Rio de la Plata of 1961 and the Protocol of the Rio de la Plata of 1964.

This Rio de la Plata closing line claim was protested by the United States in 1963. According to the United States, Argentina and Uruguay did not assert an historic claim to these waters, but rather their claim took into account the provisions of Article 13 of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone regarding river closing lines. The U.S. protested on the grounds that this claim was counter to international law and that Article 13 “relates to rivers which flow directly into the sea which is not the situation of the Rio de la Plata which flows into an estuary or bay”. Thus, this is an invalid baseline from which to measure the breadth of its territorial sea because it exceeds 24 miles and because more than one state borders this body of water.

Basepoints 2 and 3 are situated on the west and south coast of Punta del Este, respectively, and the baseline between them is the normal baseline, or low-water line.

Along the next 7.5 mile stretch of smooth mainland coastline Uruguay has drawn straight lines between Points 3 and 4 (Punta del Vapor) and between points 4 and 5 (Punta Piedras). This coastline is neither deeply indented and cut into, nor fringed with islands. Thus, these segments exceed the provisions of Article 7 of the LOS Convention. And, in fact, the straight baselines have no impact on the outer limit of the territorial sea. About 6 miles seaward of the mainland in this area sits Islote de Lobos, a very small islet. Uruguay has established a low-water point (point 6) on this island from which to measure the territorial sea. The 12-mile limit drawn from this islet makes segments 3-4 and 4-5 irrelevant.

From point 5 through point 8, about 35 miles along the mainland coast, the baseline is the low-water line.

From point 8 (Cabo Santa Maria) to point 18 (Punta de la Coronilla) Uruguay has drawn 9 straight baseline segments, ranging in length from 0.3 miles (segment 16-17) to 24.6 miles (segment 9-10- see Table 1). While none of the baseline segments are

---


13 57 Am. J. Int’l L. 403-04 (1963); 4 Whiteman 342-43. It should be noted that the United Kingdom (1961) and the Netherlands (1962) also protested this claim for the same reasons. See Roach and Smith, 35.
excessively long, they all are drawn along a coastline that does not meet the LOS Convention geographic criteria.

Then, from point 18 (Punta de la Coronilla) to point 19, where the Brazil-Uruguay land boundary reaches the coast, Uruguay employs the normal (low-water line) baseline.

Uruguay’s mainland coastline from Punta del Este to the land boundary terminus with Brazil has a geographic consistency where the coastline, in its entirety, is relatively smooth with minor coastal curvatures. Yet, Uruguay has employed straight baseline segments in areas that have similar qualities as those areas where it has used the normal baseline, the low-water line. The straight baselines have enclosed very small areas that are not “sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of internal waters:” (as called for in Article 7(3) of the LOS Convention). Further, the straight baseline segments have virtually no impact on the outer limits of the territorial sea. There are no areas along the Uruguayan coastline where straight baselines would be appropriate.\footnote{14}

**Territorial Sea**: Prior to its 1998 law, Uruguay claimed a 200-mile territorial sea. Its new Act 17.033 claim of a 12-mile limit is the maximum allowed by the LOS Convention. Uruguay’s territorial sea area, as drawn from its claimed straight baselines listed in Annex 1, encompasses approximately 2,200 square nautical miles (n. miles).

Article 2 of the Act states that the executive authority “shall also adopt the regulations applicable to the passage of warships through the territorial sea.” International law does not permit a coastal State to require a foreign warship to seek the prior authorization of, or notification to, the coastal State as a condition of conducting innocent passage through its territorial sea.

**Contiguous Zone**: The LOS Convention allows coastal States to claim a 24-mile contiguous zone for the purposes of “customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary laws or regulations.” Uruguay’s 24-miles zone, as measured from its straight baselines encloses an area of approximately 4,450 square n. miles, or about 2,250 square n. miles seaward of the territorial sea limit.

**Exclusive Economic Zone**: The maritime boundary described below between Uruguay and the Government of Brazil, according to the original agreement, extended

\footnote{14}{The Government of the United States protested Uruguay’s straight baseline claim and several other provisions of its law in 2000.}
\footnote{15}{United States NIMA charts 23030 and 24000 were used to analyze Uruguay’s maritime claims.}
\footnote{16}{Decree 604/969 and Ordinance 1983, December 3, 1969. It should be noted that in this decree innocent passage within 12 miles of the baseline was permitted and navigation and overflight rights were guaranteed beyond 12 miles.}
\footnote{17}{LOS Convention, article 33(a).}
\footnote{18}{The area for the exclusive economic zone was measured using an electronic plenimeter and Operational Nautical Chart (ONC) R-24 (1:1,000,000).}
to the limit of the territorial sea. At the time the treaty was signed, both Brazil and Uruguay claim 200-mile territorial seas. Since then, both countries have reduced the breadth of their territorial sea limits to 12 miles. The 200-mile limit now reflects Uruguay’s exclusive economic zone limit as set forth in Article 4 of its 1998 Decree.\(^\text{19}\)

It is assumed that the change in the claimed legal status of the waters between Brazil and Uruguay has not affected the boundary treaty between the two States. From Uruguay’s declared straight baselines, the area of the exclusive economic zone is about 35,950 square n. miles.\(^\text{20}\)

Article 6A of Uruguay’s Act asserts that it has jurisdiction over the establishment and use of artificial islands, installations and structures, “regardless of their nature and characteristics.” To the extent that Article 6A purports to provide exclusive jurisdiction over artificial islands, installations and structures in the EEZ that do not have an economic or resource-related purpose, it is not in conformity with international law.

Article 8 of the Act purports to condition the carrying out of foreign military exercises and activities in the EEZ on the prior authorization of Uruguay. A coastal States rights and jurisdiction within the EEZ are subject to the rights and duties of other States as provided for in international law (Article 56, LOS Convention). The rights specifically preserved for the ships and aircraft of all States in the EEZ include the high seas freedoms of navigation and overflight, and other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to those freedoms, without the requirement to provide prior notification to or obtain prior permission from the coastal State (Article 58, LOS Convention). Those uses include military exercises and activities, including the use of arms and explosives. Thus, Article 8 has no foundation in international law.

Article 12 of the Act conditions the delineation of the course for the laying of submarine cables and pipelines on the continental shelf of Uruguay to the consent of the executive authority. Although the delineation of the course for the laying of “pipelines” requires the consent of the coastal State (Article 79, LOS Convention), there is no such requirement in the LOS Convention for the laying of submarine cables.

**Maritime Boundaries:**

**Argentina:** Uruguay and Argentina signed a continental shelf boundary on 19 November 1973.\(^\text{21}\) The boundary begins at the midpoint of the bilaterally-claimed Rio de la Plata closing line and extends seaward as an equidistant line, “determined by the

---

\(^\text{19}\) Brazil “rolled back” its 200-mile territorial sea claim to 12 miles by Law No. 8617, January 4, 1993. In the same law it established a 200-mile exclusive economic zone.

\(^\text{20}\) The area of the EEZ measured from the outer limit of the territorial sea is about 33,700 square n. miles, and from the outer limit of the contiguous zone limit it is approximately 31,450 square n. miles.

\(^\text{21}\) The boundary agreement entered into force February 12, 1974. See footnote No. 12 for additional sources.
adjacent coasts methods”. Initially, the continental shelf boundary extends as an perpendicular bisector to the closing line for about 113 miles. At this point Argentina’s Punta Medanos affects the course of the boundary. Later, Uruguay’s Isla de Lobos influences the equidistant line. The line terminates at a point 200 miles from Punta Medanos and Isla de Lobos.

Brazil: The maritime boundary agreement with Brazil was signed on July 21, 1972. The agreement established a single-line boundary that extends nearly perpendicular to the general direction of the coastline at an azimuth of 128° from true north, beginning at the mouth of the Chuy Stream. It terminates at the 200-mile limit of the respective States. And, given that this line is not equidistant to the two coasts, the 200-mile limit will intersect this boundary at different points.

---

22 Article 70 of the boundary agreement.
24 The agreed line is a rhumb line, a line of constant compass direction.
ANNEX 1

Act No. 17.033 of 20 November 1998

The Senate and the Chamber of Representatives of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay, meeting in general assembly, decree:

Article 1

The sovereignty of Uruguay extends beyond its continental and island territory and internal waters to the territorial sea, including its bed and subsoil and the airspace over it.

The breadth of the territorial sea of Uruguay is fixed at 12 nautical miles, measured from baselines determined in accordance with article 14 of this Act.

The outer limit of the territorial sea is the line every point of which is at a distance from the nearest point of the baseline equal to the breadth of the territorial sea.

Article 2

Ships of all States are recognized as having the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, provided that such passage is in conformity with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 (hereinafter referred to as “the Convention”), other rules of international law and such laws and regulations as Uruguay may adopt as a coastal State.

Nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous or noxious substances which wish to exercise the right of innocent passage shall observe the special precautionary measures established by the applicable international agreements and by such regulatory provisions as the executive authority may adopt for these purposes.

The executive authority shall also adopt the regulations applicable to the passage of warships through the territorial sea.

Article 3

The contiguous zone of Uruguay extends from the outer limit of the territorial sea up to a distance of 24 nautical miles from the baselines established in article 14 of this Act for measuring the breadth of the territorial sea.

---

In this zone, Uruguay shall exercise the control necessary to:

A. Prevent infringement of its customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary laws and regulations within its territory or territorial sea;

B. Punish infringement of the above laws and regulations committed within its territory or territorial sea.

**Article 4**

The exclusive economic zone of Uruguay extends from the outer limit of the territorial sea up to a distance of 200 nautical miles from the baselines established in article 14 of this Act for measuring the breadth of the territorial sea.

**Article 5**

In the exclusive economic zone of Uruguay has sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the natural resources, whether living or non-living, of the waters superjacent to the seabed and of the seabed and its subsoil, and with regard to other activities for the economic exploitation and exploration of the zone, such as the production of energy from the water, currents and winds.

**Article 6**

In the exclusive economic zone, Uruguay has jurisdiction with regard to:

A. The establishment and use of artificial islands, installations and structures.

   Uruguay has the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of such artificial island, installations and structures, regardless of their nature or characteristics;

B. Marine scientific research;

C. The protection and preservation of the marine environment.

In its exclusive economic zone, Uruguay shall also have the other rights and duties provided for in the Convention.

In the exclusive economic zone, all States enjoy, subject to the Convention, the freedoms of navigation and overflight and of the laying of submarine cables and pipelines, and other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to these freedoms, such as those associated with the operation of ships, aircraft and submarine cables and pipelines, where this does not affect the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of Uruguay and compliance with its obligations in this zone.
Article 7

Where the same stock or stocks of associated species (straddling species) occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to it on the high seas, Uruguay shall agree with the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area upon the measures necessary for the management and conservation of these stocks, which measures shall take into account and be compatible with the measures adopted in that regard by Uruguay in its exclusive economic zone.

In addition, Uruguay shall, taking into account the best scientific evidence available to it, adopt emergency management and conservation measures with regard to straddling fish stocks or highly migratory fish stocks in its exclusive economic zone; it shall extend such measures to the adjacent high seas area, in coordination, where applicable, with the States fishing for such stocks in that adjacent area, where a natural phenomenon would have adverse effects on the situation of one or more of the said species or their survival would be threatened as a result of human activity, through either fishing or pollution.

Article 8

The carrying out by other States of military exercises or any other military activities in the exclusive economic zone of Uruguay, particularly involving the use of arms, explosives or other aggressive or polluting means for any non-peaceful purpose shall in every case be subject to the authorization of the Government of Uruguay.

Article 9

The provisions of the preceding articles are without prejudice to the provisions of the Treaty concerning the Rio de la Plata and the corresponding maritime boundary, of 19 November 1979, particularly chapters XV (Navigation), article 72; XVI (Fishing), articles 73 to 77; XVIII (Research), article 79; and XX (Defence), articles 85 and 86.

Article 10

The continental shelf of Uruguay comprises the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond its territorial sea throughout the natural prolongation of its land territory to the outer edge of the continental margin.

The executive authority shall, through a special commission, chaired by a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and composed of representatives of the competent organizations, arrange for and coordinate the actions necessary to establish the outer edge of the continental shelf of Uruguay, in accordance with the provisions of article 76 of the Convention.
Article 11

Uruguay exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources.

“Natural resources of the continental shelf” means the mineral and other non-living resources of the seabed and subsoil together with living organisms belonging to sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil.

Article 12

The delineation of the course for the laying of submarine cables and pipelines on the continental shelf of Uruguay shall be subject to the consent of the executive authority and shall in every case be granted.

Article 13

Marine scientific research in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf of Uruguay shall in every case be subject to the authorization of the executive authority, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Convention and the regulations adopted by the executive authority in that regard.

Article 14

The baselines for the measurement of the breadth of the territorial sea and of the other maritime areas of Uruguay are the normal and straight baselines established in annex I (List of geographical coordinates and features specifying the baselines) of this Act, including the straight line which marks the outer limit of the Rio de la Plata from the maritime lateral limit with the Argentine Republic to Punta del Este, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty concerning the Rio de la Plata and the corresponding maritime boundary, of 19 November 1973. The delineation of these lines is shown on the nautical charts which are annexed hereto as annex II to this Act.

Article 15

The waters situated within the baselines established pursuant to article 14 of this Act form part of the internal waters of Uruguay.

Article 16

The lateral limits of the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf are those derived from the Treaty concerning the Río de la Plata and the corresponding maritime boundary, of 19 November 1973,
signed with the Argentine Republic, and from the Exchange of Notes signed on 21 July 1972 between the Eastern Republic of Uruguay and the Federative Republic of Brazil.

**Article 17**

“Nautical mile” means the international nautical mile, which is equivalent to 1,852 metres.

**Article 18**

The Uruguayan navy, through the Naval Oceanography, Hydrography and Meteorology Service, shall be responsible for the studies and works necessary to delineate the outer edge of the continental shelf, in conformity with the provisions of article 10 of this Act.

**Article 19**

The executive authority shall prepare the corresponding budgetary estimates to cover the costs of the above-mentioned studies, works and other actions relating to the preparation and updating of the charts referred to in articles 10 and 18 of this Act.

**Article 20**

The Ministry of Defence, through the Naval General Command, is entrusted with the monitoring and supervision of the maritime areas of Uruguay established by this Act. Such monitoring and supervision may be extended beyond those areas in exercise of the right of hot pursuit, in accordance with article 111 of the Convention, or in compliance with the obligations established by the rules of international law with regard to the conservation and management of fishing in the adjacent area and to maritime search and rescue.

**Article 21**

The executive authority shall adopt the regulations necessary for compliance with this Act.

**Article 22**

All legal regulatory provisions which conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

DONE in the Conference Room of the Uruguayan Senate in Montevideo on 10 November 1998.

MARIO FARACHIO  
Secretary  
[Signed]  

HUGO FERNANDEZ FAINGOLD  
President  
[Signed]
### List of geographical coordinates and features specifying the baselines of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical feature</th>
<th>Latitude South</th>
<th>Longitude West</th>
<th>Delineation of the line between those points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mid-point outer limit Rio de la Plata (articles 1 and 70 of the Treaty concerning the Rio de la Plata and the corresponding maritime boundary)</td>
<td>35° 38’.0 S</td>
<td>55° 52’.0 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intersection of line marking outer limit Rio de la Plata with W coastline of Punta del Este</td>
<td>34° 58’.2 S</td>
<td>54° 57’.2 W</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S end Punta del Este</td>
<td>34° 58’.4 S</td>
<td>54° 57’.1 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Punta del Vapor</td>
<td>34° 57’.9 S</td>
<td>54° 56’.4 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Punta Piedras Perimeter Isla de Lobos</td>
<td>34° 54’.3 S</td>
<td>54° 48’.4 W</td>
<td>Isolated Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SE end Islote de Lobos</td>
<td>35° 01’.7 S</td>
<td>54° 52’.0 W</td>
<td>Isolated Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Punta José Ignacio</td>
<td>34° 51’.0 S</td>
<td>54° 38’.1 W</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cabo Santa Maria</td>
<td>34° 40’.1 S</td>
<td>54° 09’.0 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Shoal E of start of Punto de La Paloma breakwater</td>
<td>34° 39’.3 S</td>
<td>54° 08’.2 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. E end Piedra Negra</td>
<td>34° 24’.1 S</td>
<td>53° 44’.8 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. E end Isla del Marco</td>
<td>34° 21’.0 S</td>
<td>53° 44’.3 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shoal Punta del Palmar</td>
<td>34° 04’.0 S</td>
<td>53° 44’.3 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Shoal Maria Pia</td>
<td>34° 03’.0 S</td>
<td>53° 32’.0 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Punta del Diablo</td>
<td>34° 02’.5 S</td>
<td>53° 32’.0 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Punta Mogote</td>
<td>34° 00’.1 S</td>
<td>53° 32’.0 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. NE end Isla Coronilla</td>
<td>33° 56’.3 S</td>
<td>53° 28’.7 W</td>
<td>Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Punta de la Coronilla</td>
<td>33° 55’.4 S</td>
<td>53° 30’.5 W</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Intersection of maritime lateral limit between Eastern Republic of Uruguay and Brazil with coastline</td>
<td>33° 44’.8 S</td>
<td>53° 22’.0 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Using the coordinates given for Point 12, the Shoal lies in a lagoon landward of the coast. The following UN-utilized coordinates, taken from the National Imagery and Mapping Agency Gazetteer website, were used for situating Point 12 on the coast: 34° 04’.00 S, 53° 32’.0 W.
Annex 2

Agreement Between the Government of Argentina and the Government of Uruguay Relating to the Delimitation of the River Plate and the Maritime Boundary Between Argentina and Uruguay

[Excerpt]

Chapter XIV

Lateral Maritime Boundary

Article 70

The lateral maritime boundary and the continental shelf boundary between the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Argentine Republic are defined by an equidistant line, determined by the adjacent coasts methods, which begins at the midpoint of the baseline consisting of an imaginary straight line that joins Punta del Este (Uruguay) and Punta Rasa del Cabo San Antonio (Argentina).

1 Agreement signed on 19 November 1973, entered into force on 12 February 1974.
ANNEX 3

Agreement between the Government of Brazil and the Government of Uruguay
Relating to the Maritime Delimitation between Brazil and Uruguay

Notes of Ratification Exchanged between the Brazilian Embassy and the
Uruguayan Minister of Foreign Affairs

With reference to the treaties and other instruments on this subject in force between Uruguay and Brazil — especially the Boundary Treaties of October 12, 1851, and May 15, 1852, and the related reports signed by the Boundary Commissioners, and, more recently, the Joint Declaration on Limits of Maritime Jurisdiction, signed by the Uruguayan and Brazilian Foreign Ministers on May 10, 1969, and the Joint Declaration of the Presidents of Uruguay and Brazil, signed on May 11, 1970 — the Uruguayan-Brazilian Joint Boundary Commission met in Rio de Janeiro, as Your Excellency is aware, for its 38th conference, with the intention of formally executing the above-mentioned Joint Declaration on Limits of Maritime Jurisdiction and Article 6 of the above-mentioned Declaration of the Presidents of Uruguay and Brazil.

Consequently, in the Report drawn up at the 38th conference, held on October 12, 1971, the Uruguayan-Brazilian Joint Boundary Commission established the mouth of Chuy Stream, whose bed has been recognized as unstable since the first Boundary Commission Report of June 15, 1853, as follows:

‘The location of the mouth of Chuy Stream shall be fixed at the point defined by the intersection of the line running from the present Chuy light in a direction nearly perpendicular to the general line of the coast, on the same bearing as the maritime lateral boundary (specified below), with the Atlantic Ocean. The maritime lateral boundary between the two countries shall be defined by the rhumb line which, starting from the above-established point, shall run on a bearing of 128 sexagesimal degrees (counting from true north) to the outside limit of the territorial sea of both countries. The extension of that rhumb line running inland passes by the Chuy light. Both of the Commission Heads also state that the principal marker No. 1 (reference marker), erected by the Joint Boundary Commission in 1853 near the left bank of Chuy Stream and on firm ground for better protection from the water, will be maintained in its original position, and that at the opportune time the necessary works to ensure that Chuy Stream will have its normal outlet at the above-established point will be undertaken.’

In view of the foregoing, I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that the Uruguayan Government agrees to adopt, jointly, with the Brazilian Government, the measures necessary to ensure the prompt execution of the works to fix the mouth of the Chuy Stream permanently at the point established by both parties.

---

1 Agreement signed on 21 July 1972, approved by Uruguayan legislature on 5 March 1974, entered into force on 12 June 1975.
This note and Your Excellency's note of this same date and context shall constitute an agreement on this matter.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the expressions of my highest consideration.

**Further Exchange of Notes Concerning the Implementation of the Agreement, Dated 12 June 1975**

I have the honor to inform Your Excellency that Uruguay [Brazil] has completed the domestic formalities for the approval of the text of the Agreement on the Final Establishment of the Chuy River Bank and the Lateral Sea Limit between the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Federal Republic of Brazil concluded at Montevideo by an exchange of notes dated July 21, 1972.

Consequently, I consider that this note and Your Excellency’s note of similar content and date determine the entry into force today of the aforesaid Agreement on the Final Establishment of the Chuy River Bank and the Lateral Sea Limit between the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Federal Republic of Brazil.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.