



Equitable Principles of Maritime Boundary Delimitation

The Quest for Distributive Justice
in International Law

THOMAS COTTIER

EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES OF MARITIME BOUNDARY DELIMITATION

The Quest for Distributive Justice
in International Law

THOMAS COTTIER



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107080171

© Thomas Cottier 2015

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2015

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Cottier, Thomas, author.

Equitable principles of maritime boundary delimitation : the quest for distributive justice in international law / Thomas Cottier.

pages cm

ISBN 978-1-107-08017-1 (hardback)

1. Maritime boundaries. I. Title.

KZA1450.C68 2015

341.4'48-dc23

2014035077

ISBN 978-1-107-08017-1 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES OF MARITIME BOUNDARY DELIMITATION

Equity emerged as a powerful symbol of aspired redistribution in international relations. Operationally, it has had limited impact in the Westphalian system of nation states – except for maritime boundary delimitations. This book deals with the role of equity in international law, and offers a detailed case study on maritime boundary delimitation in the context of the enclosure movement in the law of the sea. It assesses treaty law and the impact of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It depicts the process of trial and error in the extensive case law of the International Court of Justice and arbitral tribunals and expounds the underlying principles and factors informing the methodology both in adjudication and negotiations. Unlike other books, the main focus is on equity and its implications for legal methodology, in particular offering further guidance in the field of international economic law.

THOMAS COTTIER is a full professor of European and International Economic Law at the University of Bern, Switzerland, and former Managing Director of the World Trade Institute. Much of his professional work has been dedicated to international economic law, in particular international trade regulation, working in the field both as an academic and a negotiator and chair and member of WTO panels.

For Silvia

MAPS

- 1 *North Sea Continental Shelf* (*Federal Republic of Germany v. Denmark*; *Federal Republic of Germany v. Netherlands*) Judgment, ICJ Reports 1969, p. 3 at p. 15. A–B: German–Danish Agreement, 9.6.65; C–D: German–Dutch Agreement, 1.12.1964; E–F: Dutch–Danish Agreement, 31.3. 1966, contested by the Federal Republic of Germany. The Court produced guiding principles of delimitation. It was not asked to draw a boundary line. 722
- 2 *Arbitration Between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic on the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf*, Decisions of the Court of Arbitration dated 30 June 1977 and 14 March 1978, Command Paper 7438, March 1979, reprinted in 18 ILM, p. 397 at 494. 723
- 3 *The 1981 Arbitration concerning the Border between the Emirates of Dubai and Sharjah*, E. Lauterpacht and C. J. Greenwood (eds.), *International Law Reports*, vol. 91 (Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 700. 724
- 4 *Continental Shelf* (*Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*), Judgment, ICJ Reports 1982, p. 18 at p. 90. 725
- 5 *Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area* (*Canada v. United States of America*), Judgment, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 246 at p. 346. 726
- 6 *Arbitration Tribunal for the Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary Between Guinea and Guinea-Bissau*, Award of 14 February 1985, transl. in (1986) 25 ILM, p. 251 at p. 307. 727
- 7 *Continental Shelf* (*Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. Malta*), Judgment, ICJ Reports 1985, p. 13 at p. 54. 728
- 8 *Court of Arbitration for the Delimitation of Maritime Areas between Canada and France, Case concerning de Delimitation of Maritime Areas between Canada and the French Republic* (1992) 31 ILM p. 1145 at p. 1148. 729
- 9 *Land, Island and Maritime Frontier Dispute* (*El Salvador v. Honduras: Nicaragua intervening*), Judgment, ICJ Reports 1992, p. 351 at p. 587; the map illustrates the Gulf of Fonseca, in the judgment no delimitation of the disputed maritime spaces, whether within or outside the Gulf were made. 730

- 10 *Maritime Delimitation in the Area between Greenland and Jan Mayen (Denmark v. Norway)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1993, p. 38 at p.80. 731
- 11 *Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA): Eritrea–Yemen Arbitration* (Second Stage: Maritime Delimitation) (17 December 1999), www.pca-cpa.org/showpage.asp?pag_id=1160 (last accessed 27 March 2014). 732
- 12.1 *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain*, Merits, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2001, p. 40 at p. 105. 733
- 12.2 (Enlargement of Map 12.1) *Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain*, Merits, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2001, p. 40 at p. 106. 734
- 13 *Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea intervening)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2002, p. 303 at p. 449. 735
- 14 *Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA): In The Matter of an Arbitration between Barbados and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago* (11 April 2006) (2006) 45 ILM, p. 800 at p. 869. 736
- 15 *Arbitral Tribunal Constituted Pursuant to Article 287, and in Accordance with Annex VII, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the Matter of an Arbitration between Guyana and Suriname*, Award of 17 September 2007, A-5. 737
- 16.1 *Territorial and Maritime Dispute between Nicaragua and Honduras in the Caribbean Sea (Nicaragua v. Honduras)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2007, p. 659 at p. 761. 738
- 16.2 (Enlargement of Map 16.1) *Territorial and Maritime Dispute between Nicaragua and Honduras in the Caribbean Sea (Nicaragua v. Honduras)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2007, p. 659 at p. 762. 739
- 17.1 *Maritime Delimitation in the Black Sea (Romania v. Ukraine)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2009, p. 61 at p. 132. 740
- 17.2 *Maritime Delimitation in the Black Sea (Romania v. Ukraine)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2009, p. 61 at p. 133. 741
- 18 *Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Bay of Bengal (Bangladesh v. Myanmar)*, Judgment, ITLOS Reports 2012, p. 4 at p. 129. 742
- 19 *Territorial and Maritime Dispute (Nicaragua v. Colombia)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2012, p. 624 at p. 714. 743
- 20 *Maritime Dispute (Peru v. Chile)*, ICJ Judgment of 27 January 2014, ICJ Reports 2014, p. 66. 744
- 21 *Conciliation Commission on the Continental Shelf Area between Iceland and Jan Mayen: Report and Recommendations to the Governments of Iceland and Norway*, Report and Recommendations to the Governments of Iceland and Norway of the Conciliation Commission on the Continental Shelf Area between Iceland and Jan Mayen (1981) 20 ILM, p. 797 at p. 828. 745

- 22 *Arbitration between Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia Concerning Portions of the Limits of Their Offshore Areas as defined in the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and the Canada-Newfoundland and Atlantic Accord Implementation Act*, Award of the Tribunal in the Second Phase, Ottawa, 26 March 2002, p. 96. 746

PREFACE

The twentieth century witnessed a new generation of national boundaries. Claims of coastal states to the continental shelf and an exclusive economic zone resulted in new entitlements. They called for co-ordination. In delineating these claims, the principle of equity took on a prominent role. Equity, beyond its traditional functions in legal history, emerged in a process of trial and error as the very foundation of the principles and methodology determining the delimitation of overlapping claims to marine space. As a result, it plays an important role in the allocation of marine resources. This field of study allows for insights to be gained into the modern role and function of equity in international law, assessing both the potential and the limitations of distributive justice in the society of nations.

The book undertakes a detailed analysis of the evolution and process of equity in contemporary international law of the sea. It focuses on the relationship of legal rules on delimitation, in particular equidistance, and of equitable principles and relevant factors. It explores the relationship of law and equity in complex individual cases and particular circumstances which do not lend themselves to the application of ready-made, hard and fast legal rules. The operation of maritime boundary delimitation is essentially based upon a genuine rule of equity. It is determined by a number of standards, employing in the final analysis a topical method of weighing and balancing different and competing interests in a methodologically sound manner. The study seeks to further clarify and contribute to the methodology which, in an abundant series of adjudicated and negotiated cases, has been subject to trial and error. No case is like another. Conclusions cannot be readily drawn. And yet, it is submitted that common and shared methodologies, features and consistencies can be identified and further developed. It is hoped that the book will make a contribution in conceptualizing underlying principles and the methodology which eventually may be applied to other fields of law.

The book starts with a review of traditional and contemporary functions of equity in international law, showing not only its complementary and corrective functions, but also the aspirations for justice in international law and relations. Part I of the book addresses the advent of the maritime zones and their limited implications for distributive justice. Part II deals with the new boundaries, reviewing state practice and the abundant case law based upon which the doctrine of equity evolved in a process of trial and error. Part III of the book develops the underlying principles of delimitation, identifies the standards to be taken into account and sets out the methodologies for the adjudication of complex cases and for negotiations.

This book is of interest both to the field of maritime boundary delimitation and to legal theory. It offers a complete analysis of more than fifty years of maritime boundary delimitation and should assist lawyers and diplomats in future negotiations and adjudication of complex cases. For legal theory, it is hoped that it is able to demonstrate that recourse to modern equity essentially entails a constructive approach, building on the underlying foundations of a particular concept, taking into account a host of pertinent factors and interests in a topical manner. The discussion of the relationship of equidistance and of equity offers insights into the relationship of rules and equity. Whether courts depart from the law on the basis of equity, or whether they take equitable principles into account in assessing exceptions to a rule, the process is inherently fact-intensive and creative. It is far removed from the traditions of syllogism and the idea of applying pre-existing rules to a particular fact. Relevant factors and interests need to be identified in a transparent manner and brought to the table and balanced against each other. The legitimacy of the decision depends greatly on the pertinence of reasoning and argumentation. Equity has come a long way from correcting the law, providing foundations and a proper methodology based upon which results are composed, rather than simply found.

Insights from maritime boundary delimitation therefore can also be rendered fruitful not only in related areas but also in other areas addressing fact-intensive issues of distributive justice in international law, even beyond the allocation of natural resources. It may inspire other fields of international law, in particular human rights, trade regulation, investment protection, competition law, and environmental

law. In conclusion, equity revisited reveals an innovative method of legal discourse in search of justice and solutions supporting peaceful and friendly relations among nations.

March 2014
Thomas Cottier

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Equity and this project have been companions of mine for much of my professional life. They strongly informed my thinking on law, justice and legal methodology long after my work moved on to include other areas of international law and of European law. The book describes legal developments of law and equity over roughly seventy years of maritime boundary delimitation since the 1940s. The process of doing so, writing intermittently, stretched to a period of no less than three decades of thinking and rethinking a topic which evolved into one of the main areas of practice in international law relating to natural resources.

Inspired by the emerging case law of the International Court of Justice following the 1969 *North Sea Continental Shelf* cases, I was privileged to take up research as a post-doctoral fellow at Wolfson College and the Faculty of Law of the University of Cambridge from 1984 to 1986. I am grateful to the College and the Faculty of Law for hosting me during what became a formative and important period of my life. I sincerely thank Jörg Paul Müller, Emeritus Professor of Constitutional and International Law at the University of Bern, Switzerland. He strongly supported and encouraged me at the time. I am indebted to the Swiss National Research Foundation for support enabling our young family to move to Cambridge, and laying the foundations for additional support for many other projects in the subsequent years of my research. I am grateful to my parents and my late father Paul in particular for sharing part of his salary to make ends meet at the time. I thank my family, Silvia, Annie, Samuel and Maurice for keeping fond memories of the Cambridge years.

I vividly recall discussions with the late Sir Derek William Bowett, Whewell Professor of International Law at the University of Cambridge. His advice, expertise and practical experience in the field were invaluable in conceptualizing and structuring the complexities of the subject matter. He taught me the practice of international law. He encouraged me to focus more on the legal intricacies of maritime boundary delimitation and less so on aspirational dimensions in the political debate on global

and intergenerational equity which eventually moved centre stage in work on international economic law. The hospitality of Betty and Derek has remained an example to me and my family. I cherish the memory of discussions with my fellow researcher Esa Passivirta at the old Squire Law Library. Much of what we stand for today was shaped in those days. The two years in Cambridge provided much of the theoretical backbone for my subsequent work, first as a trade negotiator in the GATT Uruguay Round from 1986 to 1993, and subsequently as a full professor of European and International Economic Law at the University of Bern and Managing Director of the World Trade Institute.

During all these subsequent years, work on the project on equity continued steadily, but at a slow pace and in different stages, whenever scarce time allowed for it. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, dominating discussions in the 1980s, entered into force in 1994. The case law of the International Court of Justice and of courts of arbitration continued to grow and became one of the most important areas of international litigation next to WTO law (my main area of practice and research today) and investment protection. Without the help from fellows and staff at the Institute of European and International Economic Law and the World Trade Institute of the University of Bern, the project would not have been able to be further developed and completed. I am most grateful for research assistance provided at the time by then doctoral students and research fellows Serge Pannatier, Krista Nadakavukaren Schefer, and Jonas Attenhofer. Their support was critical in editing, updating more recent developments, both in state practice and judicial dispute settlement and the growing body of academic literature on the subject. The work of Jonas has been essential in completing the manuscript over the past two years, incorporating recent case law and developments. Additional persons lent their hands and skills. Beatrice Wettstein retyped an early manuscript. Students at the time, Annie Cottier and Maurice Cottier took on summer jobs checking and completing footnotes. Subsequently, junior research fellows at the Institute, Ruth Peterseil, Christiane Fürst, Raffaella Iseponi, Maya Taylan and Maria Schultheiss assisted in checking and completing footnotes as well as in the compilation of the bibliography. They all moved on into successful careers upon leaving law school, and the book entails fond memories of working with them. Over the years, Susan Plattner reviewed and edited a number of chapters. It laid the foundation of a long-lasting co-operation at the World Trade Institute. Kathrin Rügsegger kindly compiled the maps. To all these persons, I am

immensely grateful. Shortcomings and omissions will remain. They are my own responsibility.

I am grateful to Cambridge University Press for having accepted the manuscript and to the anonymous reviewers for useful critique and suggestions. I am particularly grateful to Joanna Breeze, Sarah E. Green, Deborah Hey, Kim Hughes, Ramya Rangathan and Richard Woodham for all their careful effort and work in producing the book.

Throughout all these years, Silvia my beloved wife has been my companion and main support. She shared all the ups and downs of the project and beyond. To her this work is dedicated: for all we missed and for all we shared.

Bern
March 2014
Thomas Cottier

TABLE OF CASES

- Aegean Sea Continental Shelf (Greece v. Turkey)*, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, ICJ Reports 1976, p. 3. 62
- Aegean Sea Continental Shelf (Greece v. Turkey)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1978, p. 3. 62, 69, 250–251, 468, 683
- Application for Revision and Interpretation of the Judgment of 24 February 1982 in the Case concerning the Continental Shelf (Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1985, p. 192. 281, 479
- Arbitral Tribunal Constituted Pursuant to Article 287, and in Accordance with Annex VII, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the Matter of an Arbitration between Guyana and Suriname, Award of 17 September 2007* (hereinafter *Guyana v. Suriname Award*), International Court of Arbitration: www.pca-cpa.org/showfile.asp?fil_id=664 (last accessed 18 February 2012). 63, 76, 190, 321
- Arbitral Tribunal Constituted Pursuant to Article 287, and in Accordance with Annex VII, of the United Nations Arbitration Between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic on the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf*, Decisions of the Court of Arbitration dated 30 June 1977 and 14 March 1978, Command Paper 7438, March 1979, reprinted in 18 ILM (1979) p. 397.
- Arbitration Between Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia Concerning Portions of the Limits of Their Offshore Areas as defined in the Canada–Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and the Canada–Newfoundland and Atlantic Accord Implementation Act*, Award of the Tribunal in the Second Phase, Ottawa, 26 March 2002: www.cnsopb.ns.ca/sites/default/files/pdfs/phaseii_award_english.pdf (last accessed February 2014). 346, 746
- Arbitration Between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic on the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf*, Decisions of the Court of Arbitration dated 30 June 1977 and 14 March 1978, Command Paper 7438, March 1979, reprinted in 18 ILM 397, 662 (1979). 62, 96, 184, 198, 275, 361, 363, 383, 443, 531, 617, 646, 723
- Arbitration Tribunal for the Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary Between Guinea and Guinea-Bissau*, Award of 14 February 1985, transl. in (1986) 25 ILM 251.
- Award of the Arbitral Tribunal in the First Stage (Territorial Sovereignty and Scope of the Dispute)* from 9 October 1998 (hereinafter *Award of the First Stage*) Reports of International Arbitral Awards, vol XXII p. 209–332, United Nations 2006. 306

- Award of the Arbitral Tribunal in the Matter of Arbitration between Barbados and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago*, 11 April 2006 Reports of International Arbitral Awards vol. XXVII pp. 147–251 (United Nations 2008); (2006) 45 ILM 800–869. 318, 362
- Award of the Tribunal in the First Stage (Territorial Sovereignty and Scope of Dispute)*, Permanent Court of Arbitration, Award of 9 October 1998 (2001) 40 ILM 900. 306
- Award of the Arbitral Tribunal in the Second Stage (Maritime Delimitation) in the Matter of an Arbitration between Eritrea and Yemen*, 17 December 1999 (hereinafter *Eritrea v. Yemen* (Second Stage)) (2001) 40 ILM 983. 62, 306, 533
- Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited (Belgium v. Spain)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1970, p. 3. 230
- Beagle Channel Arbitration*, Report and Decision of the Court (1978) 17 ILM 634–79. 322, 533
- Canada: Supreme Court Judgment Concerning Jurisdiction over the Seabed and Subsoil of the Continental Shelf off Newfoundland* (Appeal heard, 22–24 February 1983. Judgment pronounced, 8 March 1984) (1984) 23 ILM 288–319. 79, 85
- Case Concerning Maritime Delimitation in the Black Sea (Romania v. Ukraine)*, Judgment, 3 February 2009, ICJ Reports 2009 p. 61. 187, 194, 327, 358, 363, 449, 524
- Case Concerning the Arbitral Award made by the King of Spain on 23 December 1906*, Judgment of 18 November 1960, ICJ Reports 1960, p. 192. 524
- Case Concerning the Land, Island and Maritime Frontier Dispute (El Salvador v. Honduras) Application by Nicaragua for Permission to Intervene*, Judgment, 13 September 1990, ICJ Reports 1990, p. 92. 300, 498
- Cayuga Indians (Great Britain) v. United States*, reprinted in: Reports of International Arbitral Awards, vol. VI, pp. 173–90, 179. 16
- Chorzow Factory (Jurisdiction) Case*, Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A No. 9, p. 31 (1927). 489
- Conciliation Commission on the Continental Shelf Area between Iceland and Jan Mayen: Report and Recommendations to the Governments of Iceland and Norway*, Report and Recommendations to the Governments of Iceland and Norway of the Conciliation Commission on the Continental Shelf Area between Iceland and Jan Mayen (1981) 20 ILM 797–842. 260, 344, 745
- Continental Shelf (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. Malta)*, Application to Intervene, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 3. 62, 295
- Continental Shelf (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya v. Malta)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1985, p. 13. 62, 77, 187, 294, 376, 409, 615, 728
- Continental Shelf (Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)*, Application to Intervene, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1981, p. 3. 62, 281
- Continental Shelf (Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1982, p. 18. 62, 74, 186, 240, 281, 358, 376, 479, 617, 653, 725

- Court of Arbitration for the Delimitation of Maritime Areas between Canada and France, Case concerning the Delimitation of Maritime Areas between Canada and the French Republic* (1992) 31 ILM 1145.
- Court of Arbitration for the Delimitation of Maritime Areas between Canada and France: Decision in Case Concerning Delimitation of Maritime Areas*, (1992) 31 ILM 1145–48. 62, 197, 298, 466
- Delaware v. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration*, Civil Action No 80–0565 (D.D.C.). 344
- Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary in the Gulf of Maine Area (Canada v. United States of America)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1984, p. 246. 61, 68, 183, 239, 248, 285–287, 376, 406, 444, 726
- Denmark v. Norway (Jan Mayen)*, ICJ Reports 1993, p. 53. 349–352, 387, 411, 477, 490, 547, 554–555, 570, 586
- Dispute concerning Delimitation of the Maritime Boundary between Bangladesh and Myanmar in the Bay of Bengal (Bangladesh v. Myanmar)*, Judgment, International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, 14 March 2012, Case No. 16. 88, 187, 332, 413, 450, 524, 616
- East Greenland Case* [1933] Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A/B No. 53 (Legal Status of Eastern Greenland). 569
- Electricity Company of Sofia and Bulgaria Case*, [1939] Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A/B, No. 778, p. 199. 672
- Exchange of Greek and Turkish Population Advisory Opinion* [1925] Permanent Court of International Justice, Series B No. 20, at p. 24. 648
- Fisheries Case (United Kingdom v. Norway)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1951, p. 116. 61, 106, 187
- Fisheries Jurisdiction (Federal Republic of Germany v. Iceland)*, Merits, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1974, p. 175. 61
- Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1973, p. 3. 109, 231, 674
- Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland)*, Merits, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1974, p. 3. 61, 109–110
- Free Zones of Upper Savoy and the District of Gex* [1929] Permanent Court of International Justice, Series A No. 22. 673
- Frontier Dispute (Burkina Faso v. Republic of Mali)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 1986, p. 554, para. 149. 6
- Gentini Case*, Ven Arb 1093 720, at 715. 521
- Judgment on Application for Revision and Interpretation of the Judgment in the Case Concerning the Continental Shelf (Tunisia v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)* (1986) 25 ILM 152–72. 477
- Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria (Cameroon v. Nigeria: Equatorial Guinea Intervening)*, Judgment, ICJ Reports 2002, p. 303. 6, 124, 186, 315, 362, 413–414, 448, 620, 664, 735