

**CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THE ORGANISATION
OF THE EXPERTISE ORDERED BY THE COURT**

1. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

5 July 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to the Court's Order dated 31 May 2016, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith information received from the experts as to the documents they will need before conducting the site visits, as well as details relating to the visits themselves.

Any observations or comments your Government might wish to make should be submitted by Tuesday 19 July 2016, at the latest. Any comments that either Party may wish to make on the reply of the other Party should be furnished by Tuesday 26 July 2016 at the latest.

I will thereafter organise a meeting with the Representatives of the Parties in order to discuss all practical aspects of the visits and to prepare the mission. In this regard, I have the honour to inform you that the experts will be accompanied by two staff members of the Registry.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

Annex to the letter

**Relevant information as to the documents to be provided by the Parties to the Registry
for the experts before the visits to the site, as well as
details relating to the visits themselves**

1) Documents and information to be provided by the Parties

***a)* Satellite images and aerial photographs**

- Available aerial photographs of the area;
- Time-series pairs of aerial photographs and satellite images of the area.

***b)* Maps**

- Maps of the area (either land use maps, land cover maps or geographical background maps);
- Cadastral maps of the area, as established by the national authorities;
- Historical maps or sketches of the area, preferably geo-referenced or at least referring to a spatial grid.

c) Other elements

- Reference triangulation points (with co-ordinates and description);
- Tide gauge time-series tables since 2009;
- Discharge data from the gauging station in the San Juan River closest to its mouth since 2009.

2) Site visits

a) Number of visits

The experts would like to conduct two site visits.

b) Length of the visits

The experts plan to spend five days in country during each visit. They will need to work at least three days on site during the first visit and two days during the second.

c) Dates of the visits

The experts would like to examine the site during both the wet and dry season (high and low discharge of the San Juan River).

They therefore suggest that the first visit should take place during the first half of December 2016 and the second at the end of March/beginning of April 2017.

d) Equipment and assistance required during the visits

The experts will need:

- a small speedboat (with an operator) to carry out reconnaissance work along the coast and the San Juan River. Permits and safety guarantees should be provided by the Parties;
- the assistance of local topographers, equipped with a duly calibrated Leica Differential Global Positioning System (DGPS);
- the assistance of two individuals (who would work for two days during each visit), equipped with hoes, picks and shovels, should they need to excavate a pit or trench to identify the boundary between the solid land of the headland (i.e., whether it is consolidated or loose fluvial sediment) and the starting-point of any sand feature (coastal sediments) enclosing Harbor Head/Los Portillos lagoon.

The experts may have to collect soil samples and would therefore need all the necessary permits to export them.

2. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

19 July 2016

I have the honour to refer to your letter dated 5 July 2016, reference 147134, attaching information received from the experts as to the documents they will need before conducting the site visits, as well as details relating to the site visits themselves in the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*. Costa Rica hereby sets out its observations and comments on the experts' information.

With respect to the site visits themselves, Costa Rica is ready to provide the experts with access to the area on the dates requested. Costa Rica notes that the first site visit proposed to take place during the first half of December 2016 is scheduled during a period of heavy rain, which may impede access to the area and/or hinder the scope of the activities that the experts can carry out.

Costa Rica looks forward to discussing the details of the site visits with the experts, as well as the timeframe and manner by which it will provide the experts with the requested material, during the upcoming meeting to prepare the mission. In the meantime, Costa Rica would be grateful to receive an indication of the date when the experts will present their report to the Court.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

3. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

19 July 2016

I have the honour to refer to the letter of the Court dated 5 July 2016 (Ref: 147133) concerning the case of *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and the Court's Order dated 31 May 2016, transmitting information received from the experts as to the documents they will need before conducting the site visits and other logistical arrangements.

In that regard, Nicaragua wishes to point out that some of the documentation of the *Certain Activities* case is relevant for the experts' analysis in the present proceedings, in particular the international instruments that regulate these matters and any other documents related to the starting point of the land boundary. In that sense, Nicaragua emphasizes that the first and most important documents for the determination of the starting point are those related to the location of Punta de Castilla, which is based on the Treaty of 1858, the Arbitral Award of President Cleveland of 1888 and the Arbitral Awards of General Alexander. The aforementioned documentation together with the Proceedings and the Minutes of the Binational Commission, contain the necessary coordinates and description of the starting point as has been explained before, but is summarized below for the benefit of the experts.

The 1858 Treaty established that the border "shall begin at the end of *Punta de Castilla*". Sometime afterwards, Nicaragua and Costa Rica were not in agreement on the exact location of the starting point of the boundary, and they resorted to arbitration by President Cleveland who reaffirmed the exact and fixed location of the starting point by explaining that "the boundary line [...] on the Atlantic side begins at the extremity of *Punta de Castilla* at the mouth of the San Juan de Nicaragua River, as they both existed on the 15th day of April 1858".

President Cleveland intended this point to be fixed and unmovable so as to not follow the changes in the River's mouth, and this is how Arbitrator Engineer Alexander understood it to be later on. Alexander went to great length to find "the exact spot which was the extremity of the headland of Punta de Castilla" in 1858, independently of the location of the mouth of the River, which had already changed at that time. He concluded that the fixed point of Punta de Castilla "ha[d] long been swept over by the Caribbean Sea" and determined that "under these circumstances it best fulfil[ed] the demands of the Treaty and of President Cleveland's award to adopt what is practically the headland of today", thereby confirming the fixed nature of Punta de Castilla and establishing the current location of the initial marker of the boundary. The precise coordinates of the initial marker placed by Alexander can be found in Proceedings X of 2 March 1898¹ and in Proceedings XX of 19 August 1899², and were established with great accuracy precisely because both "Commissions wish[ed] to conserve the monument as the sign for beginning the line"³ and "they have arranged to rebuild it at a point that can preserve it from invasions by the sea, and connecting it geodetically with the point it previously occupied"⁴. In other words, the parties felt bound to "preserve the position of said Punta de Castilla and the initial marker by means that facilitate the exact placement of those points at any given time"⁵.

¹ See Annex 1 (Nicaragua's Counter Memorial in the case of *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* (hereinafter referred to as "NCM"), Annex 5).

² See Annex 3 (NCM, Annex 9). See also Nicaragua's letter to the Registry dated 03 May 2016, Ref: HOL-EMB-092 (Annex 5) and Costa Rica's Memorial in the *Certain Activities* case, paras. 2.46-2.48, pp. 55-56 (footnote omitted).

³ See Annex 2 (Proceedings XVI, NCM, Annex 8).

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ See Annex 3 (Proceedings XX, NCM, Annex 9).

This same spirit prevailed during the negotiations held between 2003 and 2005. Thus this very same initial marker was agreed by the parties to be considered as the “initial point for maritime delimitation in the Caribbean Sea.”⁶

In conclusion, the legal aspect of the starting point of the maritime boundary was always considered as settled by the treaties and awards, and by the parties themselves, and only the technical aspect of the precise location of marker 1 determined by Arbitrator Engineer Alexander has been and still is a matter of contention between the parties.

Concerning the rest of the documents and information to be provided by the Parties before the visit to the site, Nicaragua wishes to inform the Court that it has already started to gather the available documents and will proceed to send them to the Registry as soon as practical.

Nicaragua would like to reiterate its previous statement concerning its disposition to assist the Court to the fullest possible extent in the organisation of the visit to the area, and in that sense Nicaragua, as sovereign of the River, offers to arrange for the speed boat for transportation. Furthermore, taking into account accessibility to the area, Nicaragua further suggests that the delegations should be transported to the airport located at the town of San Juan del Norte and should be accommodated at the best hotel located near the area, The Rio Indio Lodge⁷.

Finally, Nicaragua wishes to clarify that the comments that have been made in this note only concern the location of Punta de Castilla as the starting point of the maritime boundary, as no other issues on other topics have been raised in Costa Rica's Application or Memorial.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annexes omitted]

⁶ See Annex 4, Minute of the Fourth Technical Meeting of the Sub-Commission on Limits and Cartography, 24-27 November 2003 (NCM, Annex 15).

⁷ <http://therioindiolodge.com>

4. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

26 July 2016

I have the honour to refer to your letter dated 19 July 2016 (reference 147220), attaching a letter from Nicaragua (reference HOL-EMB-I 61) relating to the information received from the experts under cover of your letter dated 5 July 2016 (reference 147134) in the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*.

Costa Rica notes that in its letter Nicaragua does not confine itself to making observations or comments on the information requested by the experts, but advances legal arguments instead. In support of these arguments, Nicaragua annexes a number of documents to its letter. The annexed documents are not documents requested by the experts. In terms of the practical arrangements for the site visits, Costa Rica set out its proposals in its letter dated 3 May 2016 (reference ECRPB-036-16) and it anticipates discussion of these proposals in due course.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

5. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

26 July 2016

I have the honour to refer to your letter dated 19 July 2016 (Ref: 14 7219) concerning the case of *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and the letter of Costa Rica transmitted therewith dated 19 July 2016 (Ref: ECRPB-055-16), whereby Costa Rica conveyed its observations on the information received from the experts.

It is possible, as Costa Rica indicates, that there will be rain in the site during the month of December but that would be possible at almost any time of the year. There is a microclimate in the area to be inspected that involves frequent heavy rainfall. Nonetheless, this rainfall in that limited area does not affect the level of the waters of the San Juan that come from as far as Lake Nicaragua and from the Costarican mountains.

In that regard, Nicaragua would like to clarify that the rainy season in Nicaragua and Costa Rica in fact takes place from May to October. So, in fact, if the experts visit the site in December they would be doing so when the dry season has set in. Therefore, in order to allow the experts to examine the site during both the wet and the dry season, the Republic of Nicaragua kindly suggests that the first visit be carried out during the month of October or the first week of November at the latest.

This would allow another visit during the dry season in February or March that would give time for the experts to prepare their report and be commented by the Parties before the scheduled hearings in June 2017.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

6. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

31 August 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and in view of the meeting to be held tomorrow afternoon at 3 p.m., I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith a copy of an e-mail received from the experts appointed by the Court in the case, whereby they request certain information relating to the location of “Marker 1”.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

Annex to the letter (e-mail of experts Fouache and Gutiérrez, dated 31 August 2016)

Having examined the pleadings submitted by Costa Rica and Nicaragua in the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, we noted that the Memorial indicates that, in 2002, the Parties commenced negotiations on the limits in the Caribbean Sea and that

“The negotiations focused, in the first instance, on the identification of the location on the Caribbean coast of Marker 1, the demarcated point of the land boundary nearest the Caribbean coast set by Alexander and the boundary commissions in the late 1800s. It was determined that the location of Marker 1 is now several hundred meters seaward of the coast.” (Memorial, para. 2.33.)

In light of the fact that we have been asked by the Court to determine “the geographical coordinates of the land point which most closely approximates to that identified by the first Alexander Award as the starting-point of the land boundary” (Order of 31 May 2016, Operative part, para. 2, (b)), we would very much appreciate if we could access all the documents produced by the Parties at the time with regard to the said Marker.

7. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

7 September 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith a minute of the meeting I held with representatives of the Parties on 1 September 2016 in order to discuss the practical aspects of the expert mission called for by the Court in its Order of 31 May 2016. The minute also contains subsequent responses provided by the experts to questions raised by the Parties during that meeting.

May I take this opportunity to ask you if your Government can foresee any particular preparations which should be undertaken by the Court's delegation, including vaccinations or any other matter.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

Annex to the letter

Minute of the meeting held at the Peace Palace (Room 3) on Thursday 1 September 2016, at 3 p.m. (including subsequent responses of the experts to questions raised)

.....

The REGISTRAR welcomed the delegations of both Parties and thanked them for attending the meeting, which had been convened in order to discuss the practical aspects of the expert mission called for by the Court in its Order of 31 May 2016.

1. Dates for the visits

The REGISTRAR observed that the first question to be determined was the precise dates for the two site visits that the experts would undertake. He recalled that the experts expected to spend five days in country during each visit, and that they took the view that the first visit should take place in early December 2016 (rainiest period) and the second visit in late March or early April 2017 (driest period). He noted that during the lunch he had held with the two Ambassadors immediately prior to the meeting, it had been agreed that, in light of the fact that the oral proceedings would start in June 2017, it would be preferable if the second visit could take place as early as possible in order to provide adequate time for the experts to finalize their report and for the Parties to comment on it.

Following an exchange between the Parties, *it was agreed that the first visit would begin on Sunday 4 December 2016 and the second visit would begin on Sunday 12 March 2017, assuming those dates were acceptable to the experts. It was further agreed that the Parties would not meet with the experts before the mission unless the latter so wished.*

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed that the dates discussed were acceptable to the experts.

.....
The experts also committed to completing their report by the end of April 2017.

2. Composition of the delegation

The REGISTRAR then raised the question of the composition of the delegation. *It was agreed that each Party would appoint one or two individuals from its Ministry of Foreign Affairs to join the delegation and that the Party facilitating the logistics for any given part of the mission would also provide transportation and facilitate accommodation of those individuals. It was further agreed that, in addition to those representatives of the Parties, the delegation would be composed of the two experts, two officials of the Registry, two topographers (one from each country), two assistant topographers (one from each country) and two workers (one from each country).*

As the delegation would be moving between Costa Rica and Nicaragua during the mission, *it was agreed that the name, nationality and passport number of each member of the delegation would be provided to both Parties at least one month prior to the visit so that the Parties could arrange any necessary authorizations to ensure that border crossings for the delegation were as simple as possible.*

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that he also might be present to meet the delegation in San José and travel with it to the Río Indio Lodge; he added that the Agent of Nicaragua was most welcome to join him if he so wished.

3. Travel and accommodation

The PARTIES then discussed the first visit in more detail. *They agreed in principle that the Court’s delegation would arrive in San José de Costa Rica on Sunday 4 December 2016 on the direct Iberia flight from Madrid. The delegation would stay in a hotel close to San José airport for the night and then leave for a hotel near Isla Portillos (the Río Indio Lodge in Nicaragua) at 7 a.m. the following morning (Monday 5 December 2016). Depending on the weather conditions, the delegation would travel to the region either by plane (approximately 45-50 minutes to either San Juan de Nicaragua airport in Nicaragua or Barra del Colorado airport in Costa Rica) or by car (approximately 3 hours), and then by boat to the final destination (10-15 minutes). The delegation would stay at the Río Indio Lodge from 5 to 9 December. It would travel back to San José on 9 December and could fly out on the same day (the Iberia flight leaves San José at approximately 5 p.m.) or the following day.*

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that if the delegation flew in and out of San José, his Government could provide transport to the region, where the delegation would be staying on Nicaragua territory at the Río Indio Lodge. While the delegation was at the lodge, Costa Rica accepted that logistical support would be handled by Nicaragua. Costa Rica then could arrange transport back to San José at the end of the visit.

It was so agreed.

.....
The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated that his Government accepted that the first visit would be conducted in and out of San José but wished to leave open the possibility that the second visit could be conducted in and out of Managua. He requested that Costa Rica provide the characteristics of the airplane it planned to use to transport the delegation so that he could confirm that it could land at San Juan de Nicaragua airport, noting that it was the most convenient option in that the transfer from that airport to the Río Indio Lodge was not more than ten minutes.

4. Documents requested by the experts to be provided by the Parties

Having determined the dates for the visits, the REGISTRAR asked the Parties about when they would be able to provide the documents, maps and satellite images requested by the experts to prepare for the mission.

It was agreed that a deadline of 20 October 2016 would be observed for the Parties to provide all of the materials that had been requested by the experts, but that the Parties should provide some of the material in advance, in particular maps of the relevant area, which would allow the experts to plan a detailed itinerary.

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed with the experts that they require the remote sensing data and aerial photographs as soon as possible.

5. Organisation of the work and itinerary

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA suggested that it could be helpful, in order to plan the logistics, to know if the experts wished to begin work on the first day on site or simply to conduct a reconnaissance, and to have an idea of their subsequent itinerary.

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed with the experts that they intended to begin work upon arrival on 5 December 2016. They also proposed a tentative itinerary for the first visit according to which the delegation would spend 5-7 December 2016 carrying out the following tasks: (1) taking five reference points by GPS in the area of San Juan de Nicaragua airport; (2) traveling down the San Juan River to its mouth, surveying the river and taking GPS measurements; (3) surveying the coast between the mouth of the river and the north-eastern edge of Harbor Head Lagoon, either by foot or off-road vehicle; and (4) examining the eastern edge of Harbor Head Lagoon, where some markers have been placed in the past. The experts anticipate spending 8 December collecting additional data if necessary and exchanging information between topographers and experts. At a convenient time, they also would like to dig some small trenches (with hoe, pick and shovel), in particular on the eastern side of Harbor Head Lagoon, where solid land terminates and the sand spit starts.

6. Medical, emergency evacuation and security arrangements

The REGISTRAR then raised the question of medical and emergency evacuation arrangements for members of the delegation while at the site.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA said that his Government was planning to have a doctor stationed at the Río Indio Lodge for medical needs which may arise there. In the case of a major medical emergency, he observed that the closest Nicaraguan hospital to the site was in San Carlos.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA, for his part, stated that his Government was planning to have a doctor, a generator and first aid facilities on the beach between the mouth of the San Juan and Harbor Head Lagoon. He observed that, in Costa Rica, there were major hospitals in San José, with an additional hospital in Limon. He confirmed that his Government had identified a place where a small helicopter could land on the beach; this helicopter would be stationed a ten-minute flight away. In case of need to evacuate a larger group, Costa Rica would have an airplane stationed at Barra del Colorado airport.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated that his Government also planned to have a military helicopter stationed at San Juan de Nicaragua airport, and he requested that the Costa Rican delegation confirm that it would be able to enter Costa Rica if necessary to land in San José or another hospital in Costa Rica.

The REGISTRAR having enquired about security issues, it was observed that Nicaragua had a small military camp on the sandbank directly in front of Harbor Head Lagoon and that Costa Rica could have a small camp with officials from the Ministry of the Environment on the beach between the mouth of the San Juan and Harbor Head Lagoon. Further possible arrangements were discussed by the Parties.

7. Technical equipment

With respect to technical equipment necessary for the mission, the CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA confirmed that his Government owned a Trimble R10 GNSS Global Positioning System (GPS) and sought clarification whether this was the equivalent of the Leica Differential GPS requested by the experts.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA, for his part, sought clarification on the experts' position as to whether it was scientifically necessary to have two GPS devices, or whether the mission could rely on Costa Rica's device, assuming it was the equivalent of a Leica Differential GPS. He also stated that his delegation had spoken with a technical adviser who stated that such a mission taking place in a remote area would need a Rover in addition to the GPS device; he requested that the Registry confirm with the experts whether this was necessary, as the Rover was a costly piece of equipment. Concerning communications, he confirmed that reliable telephone communication was available at the Río Indio Lodge.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA added that his Government planned to have radios for use during the day while in the field, and it would also source a satellite telephone.

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed with the experts that (1) a Trimble R10 GNSS was an appropriate device; (2) it would be highly desirable that Nicaragua purchase an equivalent Trimble device to check the accuracy and have an alternative in case one device fails; and (3) a Rover is absolutely necessary to calibrate the GPS.

The REGISTRAR observed that Nicaragua had agreed to provide one speedboat for the delegation's use and asked if a second one could be available in case it became necessary.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated that this would be arranged.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that his Government had no problem with Nicaragua providing the speedboats, so long as the personnel operating them carried no more than small arms and that representatives of each country be allowed to be present in any boat transporting the delegation. He observed that the type of boats necessary would vary depending on the work they were to perform and asked whether the experts planned to carry out measurements at sea or whether the vessels were primarily for transport.

The REGISTRAR stated that this question would be put to the experts, noting however that it was his understanding that it was not possible to reach the land directly from the sea because of the waves. This understanding was confirmed by the Parties.

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed by the experts that they will use the boat to survey the San Juan River, while the coast line between the mouth of the San Juan and the north-eastern edge of Harbor Head Lagoon will be surveyed by foot or by off-road vehicle. In this regard, the experts asked for clarification on whether it is possible to land a boat on the bank of the San Juan River near the sea and continue by foot or off-road vehicle.

8. Food and water supply

.....

9. Other matters

.....

The REGISTRAR asked the Parties' positions on the exporting of soil samples, should this be necessary.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA responded that he had asked the Costa Rican Ministry of the Environment about this and was awaiting an answer, but he did not foresee any problem.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA observed that, at least for the first visit, international travel would be in and out of Costa Rica, so the question of exporting soil samples from Nicaragua did not arise, but in any case he could confirm that it would not pose a problem.

The REGISTRAR thanked the members of both delegations for what he considered had been a very fruitful meeting. It was observed that one additional meeting might prove necessary to finalize details closer to the first site-visit.

8. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

12 September 2016

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and acknowledge receipt of your letters dated 6 September 2016 (reference 147303), and 7 September 2016 (reference 147305), regarding the site visit by the experts appointed by the Court.

Costa Rica thanks the Court for the information contained in these letters, and takes due note of the composition of the Court's delegation. Costa Rica further wishes to state that, while in Costa Rican territory, the delegation will be accorded the customary immunities and protections recognised by the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of The United Nations.

Costa Rica further takes note of the agreement by the experts concerning the dates of the site visits, both in December 2016 and March 2017.

.....

Costa Rica takes note of the agreement of the parties, concerning practical issues and the exchange of information concerning the composition of the parties' delegations, inasmuch as it is understood that such arrangements are for the purpose of facilitating the transportation in, and the frequent crossing of both jurisdictions during the mission. To this end, both parties have agreed to exchange this information no later than the 4 of November 2016.

My Government is able to provide any additional details, or make any further arrangements, if the Court so requires.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

9. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

20 October 2016

I have the honour to refer to your letter of 5 July 2016 (reference 147134) transmitting information received from the Court-appointed experts as to the material they would like to receive in advance of their site visits.

In accordance with that request, Costa Rica herewith submits (in electronic format), the following:

- (a) aerial photographs (some of which are georeferenced);
- (b) discharge data from the area of Delta Costa Rica, December 2010-August 2016;
- (c) satellite and aerial images (some of which are georeferenced);
- (d) maps;
- (e) reference triangulation points (with co-ordinates and description), which is provided in a table format; and
- (f) tide data, 2009-2016.

A full list of all of these files is attached as Annex I to this letter. I enclose five USBs containing copies of all the relevant files.

Costa Rica remains at the Court's disposal to provide any further documents or information to assist the experts.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annexes omitted]

10. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

20 October 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letters 147133 and 147298 dated 5 July and 31 August 2016 respectively, as well as to the work session that took place on Thursday 1 September 2016, I have the honour to submit the information requested by the experts before conducting the site visits, comprised of 5 printed copies and 5 USB.

In that regard, I also wish to point out that some of the information requested was not available and has not been annexed, such as cadastral maps and the tide gauge data. In the case of the discharge data from the gauging station closest to the river's mouth, it's important to specify that such station is located more than a hundred kilometres from the river's mouth at a place called "El Castillo", and its relevance may be affected given the considerable distance. Nevertheless, if the experts were of the opinion that such information would indeed be useful for the present purpose, Nicaragua would submit it as soon as possible.

It should be noted that many of these maps/sketches, photographs, satellite images and Awards have already been made available to the Court in the previous joined cases (*Certain Activities/Road Case*).

The relevant Minutes of the Commission's Proceedings containing the Arbitrator's triangulation system and the minutes of the most recent bilateral negotiations have been annexed to Nicaragua's Counter Memorial, nevertheless most of them were submitted to the experts in a letter dated 19 July 2016 (HOL-EMB-161) commenting on the agreement between the parties to locate Marker I in order to use it as the starting point of the maritime boundary. The study produced by such agreement can be found in Costa Rica's memorial and has been annexed to this letter to facilitate access. Additionally, for the benefit of the experts Nicaragua has selected some of the maps/sketches showing the building arrangement of Greytown, particularly the location of Plaza Victoria, which is a central point to the Arbitrator's triangulation system.

.....

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annexes omitted]

11. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

20 October 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your note 147369 dated 7 September 2016 transmitting a summary of the working session that took place on Thursday 1 September 2016 and the response of the experts to some of the questions raised by the parties.

With respect to the technical equipment necessary for the mission, Nicaragua wishes to confirm to the Court that Nicaragua owns a Trimble R-4 and would like to seek clarification on whether this equipment could be a suitable substitute to the Leica DGPS requested by the experts or if it was necessary for Nicaragua to acquire some other equipment. Furthermore, in view of the nature of the survey works to be carried out by the experts, Nicaragua makes available to the Court a drone that could be most helpful to that endeavour.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

12. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

13 December 2016

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to a video transmitted by Nicaragua to the Court on 9 December 2016, taken in Isla Portillos, by a Nicaraguan operated drone.

This video was taken by Nicaragua outside the scope of the mission. It was transmitted to the Court and to Costa Rica once the on-site mission was finished. Other videos that were recorded during the mission were immediately transmitted to Costa Rica and to the experts appointed by the Court, on site. The video in question was transmitted to Costa Rica and a representative of the Court on the evening of Friday 9 December. Therefore, Costa Rica objects to its inclusion in the case file and to its being provided to the experts.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

13. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

13 December 2016

With regard to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to the first site visit of Court-appointed experts which took place from 4 to 9 December 2016, I wish to warmly thank both Parties for their gracious and efficient support of the mission, in particular the high level of cooperation between their delegations to ensure that the visit was a success. The Court is conscious of the difficult situation which prevailed on the ground due to Hurricane Otto and of the extra efforts that had to be undertaken by the Parties in order to ensure a safe and fruitful mission under the circumstances.

I would like to take this opportunity to duly record the exchange between the Parties of the following elements, documents, photographs and videos during the site visit:

- Average coordinates of the Marker found in 2003 by Costa Rica and Nicaragua (namely 10° 56' 03" N, 83° 40' 22.5" W), which average coordinates appear on page 28 of the PDF document entitled “Informe del INETER sobre trabajos tecnicos (mojon 1) 25 marzo 2003”. It is however duly noted that this document is not part of the pleadings and that both Parties reserve their position on it (emails dated 7 December 2016 from Claudia Loza, member of the Nicaraguan delegation, and Arnoldo Brenes, member of the Costa Rican delegation);
- Additional pictures of the monument found in 2003 (5 pictures, email dated 7 December 2016 from Claudia Loza);
- Videos and photographs taken by drone on 6 December 2016 (files DJI_0001 to DJI_0038);
- Videos taken by drone on 7 December 2016 (files v2 to v4 and vuelo 1).

I note that Costa Rica objects to the video footage taken by drone and sent by Nicaragua in an email dated Friday 9 December 2016 (see letter dated 13 December 2016 from H.E. Mr. Sergio Ugalde, Co-Agent of the Republic of Costa Rica (Ref.: ECRPB-146-16)). Therefore, until further notice, this video should not be used either by the Parties or by the experts.

May I recall that, during a meeting held on the 8 December 2016 at the Río Indio Lodge, the delegations of both Parties agreed to transmit to the Court, by Wednesday 21 December 2016, at the latest, the final coordinates (in WGS-84) taken by their respective topographical teams for the following points identified by the experts at that meeting:

Day 1 (Monday 5 December 2016)

P1 - River mouth, first

P2 - Vegetation

Transect - three elevations (S, H, R)

Day 2 (Tuesday 6 December 2016)

P3 – Lagoon, east

P4 – Lagoon, west

P5 – Channel

P1B - River mouth, second

Day 3 (Wednesday 7 December 2016)

Airport – AR1, AR2, AR3, AR4

C1 – Northwest corner of the British cemetery

Day 4 (Thursday 8 December 2016)
A2 – monument marked “A2”

It should be recalled that, along with the above coordinates, each Party is requested to provide the inclination of magnetic north calculated by their respective topographical teams.

On behalf of the experts, I would be grateful if your Government, when communicating the above information, could also make known its position on whether the marker found in 2003 was either A₁ or A_m, as identified in Proceedings No. XX of the Demarcation Commission (19 August 1899), and whether the average coordinates (namely 10° 56' 03" N, 83° 40' 22.5" W) recorded for this marker in 2003 can be used by the experts.

In addition, it would assist the experts if each Party could kindly provide the coordinates of the marker which they stated during the site visit was currently submerged near the north-western corner of the lagoon and make known its position on this marker.

Finally, the experts have observed that the copy of the sketch-map included in Proceedings No. X of the Demarcation Commission (2 March 1898) appears slightly distorted, as evidenced by the lack of parallelism in the background lines, and would be grateful if the Parties could provide a new version.

On behalf of the Court, I wish to thank your Government once again for facilitating and participating in the first site visit by Court-appointed experts. I take this opportunity to recall that a meeting to discuss arrangements for the second site visit will be held at the Peace Palace on Monday 23 January 2017, at 3 p.m.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

14. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

21 December 2016

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, concerning the transmission of the final coordinates (in WGS-84) taken by each party's topographical team, as referred in your letter of 13 December 2016 (reference 147804).

In this regard, I attach a document prepared by Costa Rica's National Geographic Institute (IGN), containing the information requested. I also attach copies of the two sketch-maps included in Proceedings No. X of the Demarcation Commission (2 March 1898).

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annexes omitted]

15. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

21 December 2016

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 147803 requesting the final coordinates taken by the topographical teams during the site visit and other information, I have the honor to transmit the pertinent documentation.

In particular, you request that our Government makes known its position on whether the marker found in 2003 was either A1 or Am as identified in Proceedings No. XX of the Demarcation Commission (19 August 1899); and whether the average coordinates (namely 10° 56' 03" N; 83° 40' 22.5" W) recorded for this marker in the 2003 report can be used by the experts.

On this point, Nicaragua wishes to inform that it would agree to the inclusion of this report in the pleadings and the use of the average coordinates in an attempt to calculate the position of Punta de Castilla. However, Nicaragua considers that the use of the average coordinates of the 2003 marker does not exclude the use of the coordinates of any other marker that might be located elsewhere.

As to Nicaragua's position on whether the marker found in 2003 was either A1 or Am, the September 2003 minutes of the Sub commission of Limits and Cartography¹ make evident that there were difficulties in identifying the marker found on the coast: "both delegations found a marker [which was part] of that triangulation, and it is not clear whether [the marker found] is the Main Marker or the Punta Castilla". The second visit in November 2003 also proved unsuccessful in attempting to identify with certainty the marker. During that second visit the team found "the same [marker] located during the first technical visit to Punta Castilla, which took place on February 21, 2003" and "an excavation was performed around the marker", but despite the fact that this allowed the team to confirm that "one of the sides was marked with letter 'A'" the other "accompan[ing] symbol [...] was illegible"², thus making it impossible to establish whether it was A1 or Am. Therefore, Nicaragua reserves its position on this issue and further attaches a photograph that recorded the effort made to identify it (Annex 3).

Equally, as Nicaragua mentioned -during the expert's visit- the 2003 team found another marker Type A "inclined and submerged"³ in the lagoon "by approximately 98 mts to the south of the first marker found on the coast on Tuesday 24 November". The coordinates and photographs of

¹ Minute of the Third Meeting of the Sub-Commission on Limits and Cartography, 4 September 2003 (NCM Annex 14, p. 243) ("*En la visita del 21 de Febrero de 2003, ambas delegaciones encontraron un mojón de esa triangulación, que no se tiene claridad si es el mojón Principal o el Punta Castilla, para lo cual hacen falta más mediciones en el campo y para determinar que otros monumentos se pueden hacer para la posteridad, como símbolo y para utilidad de los usuarios*".)

² Minute of the Fourth Technical Meeting of the Sub-Commission on Limits and Cartography, 24-27 November 2003 (NCM Annex 15, p. 250) ("*Se ubicó el Primer Mojón y se efectuó la medición con el GPS a las 10:00 a.m. por un período de 2.50 horas e igualmente se realizó una excavación en el contorno del mismo, en donde se descubrió en uno de sus lados la letra "A" acompañada de otro símbolo ilegible, confirmando que las dimensiones son iguales al diseño del modelo tipo A de los mojones fronterizos para los trabajos de demarcación de límites entre Nic. y C.R. de 1897 conforme a las Actas del Arbitro E.P. Alexander. Este mojón es el mismo ubicado durante la primera visita técnica a Punta Castilla que se realizó el 21 de Febrero del 2003*".)

³ Minute of the Fourth Technical Meeting of the Sub-Commission on Limits and Cartography, 24-27 November 2003 (NCM Annex 15, p. 251) ("*El guía -Julio Vargas- los llevó a ubicar un tercer mojón del modelo tipo A, el cual se encuentra inclinado y sumergido dentro de la Laguna los Portillo, aproximadamente a 98 mts, al sur del primer mojón encontrado en la costa el día martes 24 de noviembre; procediéndose a medirle su ángulo y la distancia a partir del mojón que se encontró primeramente y una de las posiciones de GPS auxiliary. Posteriormente el guía trató de ubicar dos mojones del mismo modelo tipo A que había visto en años anteriores, sin lograrlo*".)

the marker submerged in the lagoon are included in this document as Annex 2. Nicaragua would further suggest that during the next visit an attempt to find the marker(s) in the lagoon be made. This marker is in shallow water and not difficult to locate.

Nicaragua also wishes to take this opportunity to note Costa Rica's objection to the use of the coordinates of "Marker A2" in the triangulation as well as Costa Rica's questioning of its origin, which is not in line to what it has officially expressed in the past. For example, during the Third Meeting of the Sub-Commission⁴ Nicaragua made a first presentation and provided a copy of the advances of the technical study⁵ - entrusted to it by Costa Rica itself⁶ - which in fact includes "Marker A2" in the triangulation. Costa Rica and Nicaragua agreed from the very beginning to this inclusion and there was no doubt as to the origin of the said marker. The minutes recorded these two issues very clearly by specifying that "*INETER (Nicaraguan Institute of Territorial Studies) presented the 'Calculation of the geodesic position of Marker one from the land border between Nicaragua and Costa Rica' based on the location of Marker A2 which was found in restorable conditions, 100 years after its installation. Said marker will serve to determine the geodesic position of the starting point (Marker 1), in addition to the placement of the marker on the coast, which is linear to Marker A2 and Marker 1*"⁷. Nevertheless, should there be any doubt as to the origin of "Marker A2" Nicaragua is ready to agree to have it examined by experts and determine its origin in case it is decided that Marker A2 could be used for the calculation.

As to the inclination of the magnetic north calculated by INETER, Nicaragua is not able to provide this information due to an oversight at the time of the calculation since the team did not calculate the azimuths from the south, as it was the case during Alexander's period but rather from the north.

Additionally, Nicaragua wishes to inform the Court that it is currently working on finding an old city map of Greytown where both the Cemetery and Plaza Victoria are shown, with the hopes that this will facilitate the expert's work in finding the centre of the plaza for the triangulation. Furthermore, Nicaragua will attempt to clean the entire area that might be considered relevant for such task during the second visit of the experts.

Finally, with regards to the sketch map included in Proceedings X Nicaragua has annexed to this document the only two versions that it possesses of the sketch map.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annexes omitted]

⁴ Minute of the Third Meeting of the Sub-Commission on Limits and Cartography, 4 September 2003 (NCM Annex 14, p. 243)

⁵ The Technical Study by INETER is annexed to Costa Rica's Memorial (CRM, Annex 39, p. 341).

⁶ It should be noted that Costa Rica itself indicated that "due to INETER's progress on this topic IGN should not duplicate this work, and considered it would be adequate for INETER to provide the technical document through the official means once it had been concluded, for evaluation and acceptance, with the purpose of presenting it jointly" (NCM, Annex 16, p. 259).

⁷ Minute of the Fourth Meeting of the Sub commission on Limits and Cartography, 30 June 2005 (CRM, Annex 36, p. 319). ("*INETER presentó el 'Cálculo de la posición geodésica del mojón inicial de la frontera terrestre entre Nicaragua y Costa Rica', basado en la localización del mojón A2 que se encontró en condiciones rescatables, después de cien años de su instalación. Dicho mojón servirá para determinar la posición geodésica del punta de inicio (Hito 1), además de la colocación del mojón testigo sobre la costa, que es colineal entre el mojón A2 y el Hito 1*")

16. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

17 January 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and in view of the work session to be held on Monday 23 January 2017, at 3 p.m., I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith two informal preliminary lists of questions to be addressed. These lists are of course not exhaustive and simply aim at facilitating the discussions. The Parties are most welcome to supplement them.

I would be grateful if you could communicate to me the name of the members of your delegation for this work session.

Finally, I have the pleasure to confirm to Your Excellency that I will be hosting a lunch with the Ambassadors of the Parties on the same day, at 1 p.m., in the Judges' Restaurant at the Peace Palace.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

Annexes to the letter

Preliminary list of questions in view of the second site visit

1. Documents to be provided by the Parties

The experts would appreciate receiving old maps of Greytown showing both the cemetery and Plaza Victoria.

2. Travel and accommodation

.....

3. Site visit

(a) Dates

From 12 to 17 March 2017 (the experts would like to spend four days in the field).

(b) Delegations

For the Court:

- Two experts
- Two Registry staff members

For the Parties:

- How many representatives?

(c) Technical assistance

- Topographers and assistant-topographers with a Differential GPS
- Two/four workers (one/two from each country) with hoes, picks and shovels
- Drone pilot
- Two track-hoes/backhoes drivers

For all of them: authorizations from both countries for the above-mentioned persons to be on the site.

(d) Equipment

- Speed-boat: Nicaragua?
- Drone
- Two track-hoes/backhoes: one from each country (one will be used at Isla Portillos/Harbor Head, the other will be used in Greytown)?

Authorization for the machines to be on the site.

(e) Preparatory works

- Cleaning of the area around the marker situated inside the Lagoon (next to its western corner) that could not be inspected during the first site visit because it was under water;
- Possible pre-cleaning of the area identified by the experts as the probable location of Plaza Victoria.

(f) Practical aspects

- Daily transport from the hotel/other place to the site
- First aid kit
- Lunch/water supply

Additional list of points to be raised
(in light of lessons from the first visit)

- (1) Which elements, in the view of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, are part of the case file? In particular, should the data and documents requested by the experts (maps, satellite photographs, drone footage, etc.) be included?
- (2) Procedure to be followed if documents/data are communicated during the visit: to avoid any difficulties, the Ambassadors should ask their delegations to hand any new elements to members of the Registry and for them to agree that only members of the Registry will then

communicate those elements to the other Party and the experts (the Registry can thus ensure that everybody has the same files).

- (3) A reminder that, when the delegation is on site, its sole mission is to gather the data sought by the experts: the experts do not have to explain themselves and no one is there to put forward arguments in the case.
- (4) A reminder that any request made by one Party to the other must be presented sufficiently in advance of the beginning of the mission (to avoid any last-minute requests).
- (5) It needs to be agreed who will be at the airport to greet the Court's delegation and ensure that the two Parties will communicate with one another when the time comes.
- (6) Matters of on-site security and logistics (the Court expects the Parties to act in accordance with what was decided at the meeting of 1 September 2016, although this was not possible during the first visit because of the hurricane).
- (7) An assurance that any area that is excavated will be restored.

NB: The experts will have to work with a technician/engineer for the georeferencing.

17. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

19 January 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith the following message received electronically today, whereby the experts wish to ask two questions to the Parties:

“With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, we have the honour to submit to your Excellency herewith two questions we would like to ask the Parties.

Having been requested by the Court, in its Order dated 31 May 2016, to give the coordinates of several points, we asked each of the Parties to measure specific points we identified. It was thereafter agreed, during a meeting held on 8 December 2016 at the Río Indio Lodge, that the delegations of both Parties would transmit to the Court the final coordinates (in WGS-84) taken by their respective topographical teams for the points so identified.

It however seems that one of the topographical teams may have inverted two points, namely P1 and P1bis. May we recall that P1 is the name given to the point taken at the river mouth on the first day, upon our arrival at Isla Portillos, and that P1bis is the name of the point taken at the river mouth on the second day, at the precise time of the low-tide. We would expect that P1bis should be slightly to the west of P1.

We would be very grateful if both Parties could check the coordinates taken for these two points and send us updated data.

We would further like to know what reference GCS (Geographic Coordinate System) each Party used for its initial coordinates.

Thank you in advance for transmitting these two questions to the Parties.”

I thank you in advance for your attention on this matter.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

18. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

20 January 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and further to my letter No. 147953 of 19 January 2017, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency further questions and requests from the Court-appointed experts.

First, recalling that the Parties have provided different coordinates for the marker they found in 2003 (amounting to a difference on the ground of 126.68 meters), the experts would be grateful if each Party could indicate the reference GCS (Geographic Coordinate System) used for these coordinates, if this information is still available.

Secondly, the experts have asked if the following material could be made available to them during the March site visit:

- Tide table covering the period of the visit;
- Two metal detectors. An adequate model would be a Nokta Fors Relic (<http://noktadetectors.com/fors-relic-metal-detector.asp>);
- Metric tape 70 meters long;
- Wood survey stakes to define the prospecting areas.

Thirdly, the experts have requested that the following digging machines be made available during the mission:

- Tracked hydraulic excavator or rubber-tired backhoe loader for the beach;
- Bulldozer (track-type tractor) for Plaza Victoria (see tables annexed).

The experts have added that, in case the Parties cannot provide a digging machine for the beach, they should procure five to ten non-corrugated iron rods with sharp tips and a T-shaped handle (this could be easily manufactured by an ironsmith).

I thank you in advance for your attention on this matter.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

[Annex omitted]

19. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

24 January 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to your letter dated 19 January 2017 (reference 147953) conveying a message received from the experts with two questions for the parties.

The first question concerns the coordinates provided by the topographical teams for points P1 and P1*bis*. Costa Rica confirms that the coordinates for points P1 and P1*bis* (also identified as P6) previously sent by Costa Rica's team have been verified, and I confirm they were correctly indicated in the report submitted to the Court. These coordinates are the following:

ID	EAST(UTM)	NORTH(UTM)	TIME ZONE	LONGITUDE WEST	LATITUDE NORTH	NAME
P1	205021.989	1210725.286	17	83°41'54.95604957 22994"	10°56'25.53621 70834091"	RIVER MOUTH FIRST day
P1 <i>bis</i> (P6)	204966.090	1210750.500	17	83°41'56.80306067 74095"	10°56'26.33995 7529524"	RIVER MOUTH 2nd day

The second question asked by the experts is what reference GCS (Geographic Coordinate System) each Party used for its initial coordinates. The GCS used by Costa Rica's topographic team is as follows:

Name: UTM

Datum: WGS 1984

Time zone: 17 North (81W)

Geoid: EGM96 (Global)

Costa Rica remains at the disposal of the Court, and the experts, as may be required.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

20. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

24 January 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 147952 of 19 January 2017 requesting both parties to check the coordinates taken for two points and send updated data on this matter, I have the honour to inform you that after revisiting the information we have realized that there was in fact a mistake regarding the points mentioned in your letter.

In that regard, although the coordinates are correct, P1 and P1bis were inadvertently inverted by our topographical team. The following table contains the information as requested:

ID	Latitude (Global)	Longitude (Global)	Height (Global) (Metro)	Code name
P1bis	N10°56'26.78523"	W83°41'57.20133"	8.955	River mouth, second
P1	N10°56'25.98262"	W83°41'55.35290"	9.404	River mouth, first

Finally, I further confirm that Nicaragua's team used the World Geodetic System (WGS-84).

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

21. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

2 February 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency herewith a minute of the meeting I held with representatives of the Parties on 25 January 2017 in order to discuss the practical aspects of the expert mission called for by the Court in its Order of 31 May 2016, in particular the details of the second site visit by the experts scheduled to take place from Sunday 12 March 2017 to Friday 17 March 2017. The minute also contains subsequent responses provided by the experts to questions raised by the Parties during that meeting.

A similar letter has been sent to the other Party.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

Annex to the letter

Minute of the meeting held at the Peace Palace (Room 3) on Wednesday 25 January 2017, at 3.30 p.m. (including subsequent responses of the experts to questions raised)

.....

The REGISTRAR welcomed the delegations of both Parties and thanked them for attending the meeting, which had been convened in order to discuss the practical aspects of the expert mission called for by the Court in its Order of 31 May 2016, in particular the details of the second site visit by the experts scheduled to take place from Sunday 12 March 2017 to Friday 17 March 2017.

Documents requested by the experts to be provided by the Parties

The REGISTRAR observed that the experts had asked that the Parties furnish old maps of Greytown, if possible showing the cemeteries and Plaza Victoria. He observed that some maps had been communicated in October 2016, but none showing both the cemeteries and Plaza Victoria.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that his Government had submitted everything they had. The team in San Jose was doing further research, and if anything were to be found, it would be communicated immediately.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated that his Government had submitted several maps in October 2016, including some showing the church near Plaza Victoria. His team was also continuing to search Nicaraguan libraries and would submit any further maps it found without delay.

Travel and accommodation

The REGISTRAR then raised the question of travel and accommodation during the second site visit. It was recalled that, during the first site visit, the delegation had travelled through San José on arrival and departure, and it had been foreseen that, during the second site visit, the delegation would travel through Managua.

Following an exchange between the Parties, *it was agreed that the delegation would arrive in Managua on 12 March 2017, stay in a hotel across from the airport, depart Managua for San Juan del Norte on 13 March 2017 (at 7 or 8 o'clock in the morning), travel from San Juan del Norte to the Río Indio Lodge, stay at the Río Indio Lodge for four nights and travel back to Managua on 17 March 2017 in the morning. All travel from Managua to the site, at the site, and back to Managua would be arranged by Nicaragua. The Costa Rican delegation would be present at the airport in Nicaragua to meet the Court's delegation along with the Nicaraguan delegation; all transportation made available by Nicaragua to the Court's delegation would also be made available to the Costa Rican delegation; and all delegations would stay in the same hotels.*

.....

Composition of the delegation

The REGISTRAR then turned to the question of the composition of the delegation for the second site visit. He noted that the Court's delegation would consist of the same two experts and the same Registry staff members that had been present during the first site visit. He asked the Parties for information about their respective delegations.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA believed that his Government's delegation would be largely similar, although one of the topographers could be different. He stated that his Government wanted to request that, since Nicaragua had provided the drone pilot during the first site visit, Costa Rica do so for the second site visit. He emphasized that the individual would be from a private company and would be included in the list of Costa Rica's delegation.

The Co-Agent also stated that, during the second site visit, he planned to replicate what the Agent of Nicaragua had done during the first site visit: he would not meet the delegation in Managua or travel to the site, but would be present in San José to assist if needed.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA observed that he had travelled from Managua to San Juan del Norte on the final day of the December site visit to bid the delegation farewell, but unfortunately it seemed that he had arrived a few minutes after the delegation had already left. Concerning Costa Rica's request to provide a drone pilot for the second site visit, he wondered if Nicaragua could also provide its own.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA reiterated that, during the first site visit, a Nicaraguan drone pilot had been used. In order to keep a balance, his Government requested that Costa Rica furnish the drone and the pilot for the second site visit.

It was agreed that the Parties would exchange the full lists of their delegations through the Court prior to the site visit.

The REGISTRAR noted, for the sake of transparency, that the experts were using a technician in Abu Dhabi to make certain calculations. The individual was merely an assistant at the university and not considered an expert by the Court.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA did not consider this problematic, provided the individual was not taking part in the site visits and was only assisting with calculations at the university.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA considered that, if the individual was not part of the delegation, then it was simply a private arrangement of the experts.

The REGISTRAR emphasized that, ultimately, the experts were responsible for the report they would produce.

Equipment

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that it would be impossible for his Government to provide a backhoe for digging as requested by the experts. It would be very difficult from a logistic point of view to bring such a piece of machinery to the region and, more importantly, operating it in a protected wetland would raise serious environmental concerns, especially without knowing exactly where it would be digging. Such an operation would have to be reported to the Ministry of the Environment and permissions sought. There was not enough time to do this. His Government would, however, be able to provide sharpened iron rods, the alternative proposed by the experts. It would also provide the tide table requested by the experts. Concerning the tape measure they had requested, he asked that the experts be consulted as to whether a 50m one would be sufficient. With regard to metal detectors, his Government had some in its possession, but he could not confirm if they were the brand requested by the experts. He would provide this information at a later stage. He hoped that the metal detectors that Costa Rica already had would be sufficient as it was likely too late to start the public bidding process in order to buy different ones. Finally, with regard to the survey stakes, he stated that his Government could provide them and requested that the experts inform the Parties how many were required.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated, with regard to transportation, that the Nicaraguan navy would provide two boats and have one spare boat ready. Concerning the excavator, his Government also was not in a position to provide it. He suggested that the Parties provide extra diggers as an alternative. He suggested that each Government provide five sharpened iron rods.

Ms LOZA enquired as to the required height of the iron rods. Concerning the metal detectors, Nicaragua had a type "VMH3CS" one and she asked if it was an appropriate device. She also asked if two metal detectors per country were required or only two in total.

The REGISTRAR stated that the Court would transmit the enquiries to the experts for a response.

Views of the experts:

It was subsequently confirmed with the experts that:

- 1) A 50 m tape-measure should be sufficient;
- 2) With regard to the metal detectors:
 - A type "VMH3CS" (as suggested by Nicaragua) is an appropriate device;
 - A total of two metal detectors would be adequate (but spare batteries should be made available);
- 3) Some 40 wood survey stakes would be needed;

- 4) Six to ten iron rods of around 2 m long would be necessary.

In addition, the experts would appreciate if each of the Parties would make available two workers for excavation works as well as tools (at least three picks, three shovels and three hoes). In Greytown, they consider that it would be ideal if Nicaragua could make available six persons (and one or two chainsaws) in order to clean the vegetation if necessary.

Organisation of work

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA asked if he understood correctly that the cleaning of the area around Harbor Head Lagoon was supposed to take place only after the experts had arrived. With regard to the cleaning of the area of Plaza Victoria, he understood that this could be done in advance; this should not pose a problem, unless of course the proposed area was right at the location of the current airport.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that his Government had no problem if cleaning in the vicinity of Harbor Head Lagoon needed to be carried out simply to reach a location, or in a specific location, but if major cleaning works were carried out, this would raise environmental concerns. He asked what exactly was envisioned.

The REGISTRAR responded that it was his understanding that the cleaning in that area was mainly to access the marker in the western part of Harbor Head Lagoon.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA asked whether the marker was on land or in the lagoon.

Ms LOZA replied that they only had coordinates for it and were trying to determine where it was precisely.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that his Government consented to clearing in the immediate area of the coordinates. If the delegation would be searching on the beach, Costa Rica had no problem so long as any sand removed would be put back.

Ms LOZA recalled that Nicaragua had provided some photographs where the marker could be seen in the north-western corner of the lagoon when the water level was low.

Practical aspects of the site visit

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA stated that his Government would ensure that there were adequate snacks, food and water for the delegation during the site visit. It would also take care of daily transport from the hotel to the site.

Documents to be considered as forming part of the case file

The REGISTRAR observed that, while it would be for the Court to decide what documents were included in the case file, he wished to clarify the understanding of the Parties at this stage. He noted two types of documents: those provided in advance by the Parties in response to a request by the experts or the Court and those exchanged during the visits. So far as he had understood the situation, both Parties considered that all such documents formed part of the case file except the last video taken by the drone. He asked if his understanding was correct.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA stated that the Registrar's understanding was correct.

The AGENT OF NICARAGUA took the view that, in general, anything seen by the experts should form part of the case file. There could be certain exceptions, but they should not be the practice.

Medical, emergency evacuation and security arrangements

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA proposed that the medical, emergency evacuation and security arrangements from the first site visit be replicated for the second site visit. He observed, however, that the Parties were in the hands of the experts: if they wished to go into the field at a particular time which could pose a security risk (for example during a storm or heavy waves), the Parties could suggest they go at a different time, but it was ultimately the experts' decision.

Ms LOZA added that Nicaragua also planned to replicate the arrangements from the first site visit. The Nicaraguan navy would provide boats and security, and there would also be security present at the Río Indio Lodge. With regard to the doctors, she observed that, during the first site visit, the Nicaraguan doctor sometimes had not been allowed onto Costa Rican territory. She requested that, during the second site visit, he be allowed to travel with the delegation at all times. Indeed, both the Nicaraguan and Costa Rican doctors could be with the delegations at all times.

The CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA responded that if Nicaragua included the doctor in their delegation list, Costa Rica saw no problem with him accompanying the delegation at all times.

*

The REGISTRAR thanked the members of both delegations for the productive meeting.

22. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

14 February 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to the first point of the preliminary list of questions in view of the second site visit, conveyed in your letter dated 17 January 2017 (reference 147875). Costa Rica has not been able to identify additional old maps of Greytown than those already transmitted to the experts. Nevertheless, considering that the experts may wish to review any relevant material concerning the location of Plaza Victoria and the Cemetery, Costa Rica's National Geographic Institute has prepared the attached report, which may be helpful to that end.

In addition, and concerning your letter dated 20 January 2017 (reference 147957), specifically regarding the reference Geographic Coordinate System (GCS) used for coordinates for the marker found in 2003, Costa Rica wishes to inform that the reference GCS applied by Costa Rica is WGS84.

Costa Rica remains at the disposal of the Court, and the experts, to provide any additional information that may be required.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annex omitted]

23. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

22 February 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Court-appointed experts enquired whether the Parties could provide Ground Penetrating Radars (GPR) with a high frequency shielded antenna (100 MHz, 250 MHz), for use during the site visit scheduled to take place from 12 to 17 March 2017.

May I also take this opportunity to recall that the experts would appreciate receiving a tide table covering the period of the visit.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

24. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

24 February 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to the work session that took place on Wednesday 25 January 2017, I have the honour to submit additional information regarding the former town of Greytown.

In that regard, please find attached some documents that show both the cemetery and the Plaza Victoria, and a Panorama of Plaza Victoria itself. All of the above mentioned information has been obtained from readily available documents both on the Internet and several libraries. In order to facilitate the handling of the documents, an electronic version of the latter is provided with this letter.

Nicaragua is of the view that the information gathered so far should be adequate to locate the church and the centre of Plaza Victoria with great accuracy. In this respect, Nicaragua recalls that the coordinates of the church located at Plaza Victoria are shown in at least two maps, most notably the “Plano de la Bahía de San Juan del Norte marcando el punto de partida de la línea divisoria entre Costa Rica-Nicaragua levantado por las Comisiones respectivas el 30 de septiembre de 1897” and the map entitled “San Juan de Nicaragua or Greytown Surveyed by the U.S.S. Kansas”, both submitted to the Court in October 2016. Furthermore, it should also be possible to mathematically calculate such coordinates from the information contained in Minutes X of the Commission.

Finally, Nicaragua would like to note that the information submitted by Costa Rica through its letter ECRPB-032-17 dated 14 February 2017, consists of a unilateral and unchecked Report. Nicaragua disagrees with Costa Rica's interpretation regarding the location of Plaza Victoria and the Cemetery. Therefore it reserves its right to state its position on this question.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annexes omitted]

25. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

2 March 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the northern part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 148181 dated 22 February 2017, I have the honour to submit the tide table for this month.

Additionally, Nicaragua wishes to inform that unfortunately it does not possess a Ground Penetrating Radar as requested by the experts.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annex omitted]

26. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

3 March 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to refer to your letter dated 22 February 2017 (reference 148180). In this regard, Costa Rica attaches herewith a tide table covering the month of March 2017.

In addition, and concerning the experts' request to provide a Ground Penetrating Radar, Costa Rica may be able to do so. The equipment is not very large, but it would require to be operated by two technicians. These persons would need to be added to the delegation list.

Furthermore, and concerning the use of a drone to record images during the upcoming visit, Costa Rica confirms that its dimensions are 35 x 50 x 25 cm, with a reach of up to 2 km. It must be operated by two persons: one who flies the drone, and a second person who operates the camera.

Concerning the informal discussions with Nicaragua to facilitate the second mission of the experts, Costa Rica wishes to express that it has no objection to Nicaragua's delegation being equal in number as that of Costa Rica's delegation. In addition, and in spirit of equality of arms, should Costa Rica be the sole provider of the Ground Penetrating Radar, it would agree that Nicaragua be the sole provider of the metal detecting equipment.

Costa Rica will inform the Court on the composition of its delegation in the course of next week.

Costa Rica remains at the disposal of the Court, and the experts, to provide any additional information that may be required.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annex omitted]

27. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

8 March 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to refer to Nicaragua's letter dated 24 February 2017 (reference HOL-EMB-032), communicated by your letter of 27 February 2017, reference 148209.

Costa Rica would like to state that it stands by the contents of the IGN Report, transmitted on 14 February 2017, which was intended to assist the experts in locating Plaza Victoria and which was rejected by Nicaragua without any explanation or reasoning.

Nicaragua further states that “it should also be possible to mathematically calculate such coordinates from the information contained in Minutes X of the Commission”. Costa Rica disagrees. Barring the discovery of the metal marker at the centre of Plaza Victoria, there is not sufficient information in the Commission proceedings or on the available maps to calculate the coordinates of the centre of Plaza Victoria with a high degree of certainty.

Costa Rica also takes the opportunity to refer to a statement made by Nicaragua in its note HOL-EMB-300 of 21 December 2016, in relation to the use of Marker A2 in a possible triangulation to locate the position of Marker I. In this note, Nicaragua states that “Costa Rica and Nicaragua agreed from the very beginning to this inclusion and there was no doubt as to the origin of the said marker [Marker A2]”. This statement is not correct. In its note, Nicaragua quoted a paragraph of the minutes of the Fourth Technical Meeting of the Sub commission on Limits and Cartography, but omitted to quote the following paragraph that clearly states that “[t]he Delegation of Costa Rica thanked the presentation [by Nicaragua's INETER] and expressed that it will analyze the proposal”. This makes clear that Costa Rica did not agree, as Nicaragua alleged, that Marker A2 is a marker constructed by the Costa Rica-Nicaragua Demarcation Commission during the 19th Century, nor its use in a triangulation to locate Marker I.

Costa Rica remains at the disposal of the Court, and the experts, to provide any additional information that may be required.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

28. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

8 March 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 148337 transmitting information on certain issues addressed by Costa Rica.

Nicaragua wishes to confirm that it does possess a Ground Penetrating Rader (GPR) and that it will be able to provide it for the mission. The machine will be operated by someone from the Nicaraguan Institute of Territorial Studies (INETER).

With regards to the drone, Nicaragua takes note of Costa Rica's information and wishes to confirm that -should the need arise- Costa Rica could land at the San Juan de Nicaragua airport, provided that details on the flight, crew and equipment are notified in advance in order to arrange for the required authorization.

.....

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

29. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

20 March 2017

With regard to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, which has been joined with the case concerning *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to the second site visit of Court-appointed experts which took place from 12 to 17 March 2017, I wish to express, once again, my sincere gratitude to both Parties for their cooperation in supporting the mission and ensuring its success.

I would like to take this opportunity to duly record the exchange between the Parties of the following documents, photographs and videos during the site visit:

- GPR transects taken by Nicaragua on Monday 13 March 2017 (output; processed; raw);
- GPR transects taken by Costa Rica on Tuesday 14 March 2017 (12 files in DZT format);
- Videos and photographs taken by the Costa Rican drone on Tuesday 14 March 2017 (Video 1 Parte 1-3; Video 2; Fotos Parte 1 and Fotos Parte 2).

May I recall that, during a meeting held on 16 March 2017 at the Río Indio Lodge, the delegations of both Parties agreed to transmit to the Court, by Friday 24 March 2017, at the latest, the final coordinates (in UTM and sexagesimal format) taken by their respective topographical teams for the following points identified by the experts at that meeting:

River mouth 2: Prm2
Lagoon east 2: Ple2
Lagoon east beach: Pleb
Lagoon west 2: Plw2
Cemetery (2 to 10): Pc2-Pc10
Railway 1 and 2: Pr1, Pr2
Probing polygon (many points): Pp
Ship (1 to 3): Psh1-Psh3
GPR airport (NE, SE, NW, SW)

May I further recall that, during this same meeting, the delegations also agreed to provide the processed profiles taken by the GPR devices of their respective teams, indicating the system and the software used, as well as the methodology applied.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

30. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

24 March 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, concerning your letter reference 148409, dated 20 March 2017.

Costa Rica hereby attaches the final coordinates (in UTM and sexagesimal format) taken by Costa Rica's National Geographic Institute for the points agreed in the meeting held on 16 March 2017, together with a report by Costa Rica's National Museum, explaining the methodology and results of the survey carried out with use of the GPR.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annexes omitted]

31. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

24 March 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 148408 requesting the final coordinates taken by the topographical teams during the site visit and the processes files taken by the GPR devices. The said files are attached to the present letter.

Additionally, Nicaragua wishes to recall that, at the request of the experts, Nicaragua agreed that Costa Rica would arrange the videos taken by the drones during the two site visits in the same screen so as to allow for a comparison. In that sense, Nicaragua would like to enquire when this information will be provided by Costa Rica and delivered to Nicaragua.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ

[Annexes omitted]

32. THE REGISTRAR TO THE AGENTS OF THE PARTIES

28 March 2017

With reference to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, which has been joined with the case concerning *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, as well as to the Parties' letters with annexes dated 24 March 2017 (Refs.: HOL-EMB-059 and ECRPB-068-17), I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Court-appointed experts noted a discrepancy between the coordinates given by the Republic of Nicaragua and the Republic of Costa Rica for the point Prm2 (River mouth). They would, therefore, be grateful if both Parties could check the coordinates taken for this point and send updated data.

I thank you in advance for your attention on this matter.

(Signed) Philippe COUVREUR

33. THE CO-AGENT OF COSTA RICA TO THE REGISTRAR

30 March 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning the *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)*, and to your letter reference 148424, dated 28 March 2017. I also refer to Nicaragua's letter dated 24 March 2017 (reference HOL-EMB-059), communicated by your letter of 27 March 2017, reference 148419.

As requested in your letter 148424, Costa Rica's National Geographic Institute (IGN) revised the coordinates previously reported, and it was found that indeed a mistake was made incidentally while reporting the coordinates of the point Prm2 (River mouth). Attached to this letter is a new report from IGN with the corrected data.

Regarding Nicaragua's letter HOL-EMB-059 dated 24 March 2017, Costa Rica notes that the arrangement of the videos taken by both parties during the two site visits to allow for them to be viewed simultaneously was not included in among the information requested by the experts in your note 148409 of 20 March 2017. Nevertheless, in a spirit of good faith cooperation, Costa Rica had agreed to attempt perform this exercise to facilitate comparison. However, this task was very difficult, mainly because the videos by both parties were taken at different speeds. Additionally, while Costa Rica's video is composed of one single take, Nicaragua provided several partial takes. Thus, in these circumstances, Costa Rica is not currently in a position to offer to perform this exercise.

(Signed) Sergio UGALDE

[Annex omitted]

34. THE AGENT OF NICARAGUA TO THE REGISTRAR

3 April 2017

I have the honour to refer to the case concerning *Maritime Delimitation in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* which has been joined with the case concerning *Land Boundary in the Northern Part of Isla Portillos (Costa Rica v. Nicaragua)* and to your letter 148423 requesting updated information on the final coordinates taken by the topographical teams during the site visit.

In this respect, Nicaragua wishes to confirm the information submitted on 24 March 2017 (HOL-EMB-059), particularly with regards to the coordinates taken at the mouth of the river (Prm2), which have been duly verified. Nevertheless, Nicaragua remains at the disposal of the experts for any further enquiry.

(Signed) Carlos J. ARGÜELLO GÓMEZ
