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SKETCH-MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norway/Sweden (Grishadarna) Arbitration</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK/France Arbitration: The Adjudicated Boundary</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dubai/Sharjah Arbitration</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1982 Tunisia/Libya Case</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gulf of Maine Case</td>
<td>DeVorsey/1990, p.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Guinea/Guinea-Bissau Arbitration</td>
<td>Portuguese Chart: 1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1985 Libya/Malta Case</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Canada/France Arbitration</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1999 Eritrea/Yemen Arbitration</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Qatar/Bahrain Case</td>
<td>ICJ Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cameroon/Nigeria Case (sub judice)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nicaragua/Honduras Case (sub judice)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Delimitation in the Gulf of Paria and Seaward Areas</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Argentina/Uruguay Agreement</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1968 Italy/Yugoslavia Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Italy/Tunisia Agreement</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Portugal/Spain Agreement</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement Description</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia/Bahrain Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brazil/Uruguay Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dominica/France (Guadeloupe and Martinique) Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tanzania/Mozambique Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Iran/Saudi Arabia Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Argentina/Chile Agreement</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>France/Monaco Agreement</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>India/Sri Lanka/Maldives Agreement (Tri-junction Point)</td>
<td>IMB, p.1406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Iceland/Norway (Jan Mayen) Agreements</td>
<td>IMB, p.1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tunisia/Libya Agreement (Joint Zone)</td>
<td>Miyoshi/1999, p.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>France/Spain Agreement (Special Zone)</td>
<td>Miyoshi/1999, p.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Japan/South Korea Agreement (Joint Zone)</td>
<td>Miyoshi, p.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Malaysia/Thailand and Malaysia/Vietnam Agreements (Joint Zones)</td>
<td>Miyoshi, p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau/Senegal Agreement (Joint Zone)</td>
<td>Miyoshi, p.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Colombia/Jamaica Agreement</td>
<td>Miyoshi, p.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>United Kingdom/Denmark (Faroe Islands) Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, forthcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Boundaries in the Gulf of Guinea</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Gulf of Guinea: The Geographical Framework for the Delimitation in the Cameroon/Nigeria Case</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Gambia/Senegal Agreement</td>
<td>IMB, p.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>USA/Mexico Boundary Beyond 200 Miles</td>
<td>IBRU Boundary and Security Bulletin, Volume 8, No.3, p.66 (adapted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Red Sea Boundaries</td>
<td>Dutch Hydrographic Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Honduras/United Kingdom (Cayman Islands) Agreement</td>
<td>UK Hydrographic Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Georgia/Turkey Boundary: A Demarcated Boundary</td>
<td>Admiralty Chart 2236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Cut-Off Effect Caused by the Use of Equidistance Positioned at the Optical Centre of the Map</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Prolongation of the land boundary: An Example of an Inequitable Situation</td>
<td>From Shalowitz/1962(1), p.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Equidistance Method: Opposite States</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Equidistance Method: Tri-junction Point</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Division of the Area of Overlapping of Entitlements through Equidistance: Oppositeness (1)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Division of the Area of Overlapping of Entitlements through Equidistance: Oppositeness (2)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Division of the Area of Overlapping of Entitlements through Equidistance: Adjacency (1)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Division of the Area of Overlapping of Entitlements through Equidistance: Adjacency (2)</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Method of Equidistances Offshore</td>
<td>Kennedy/1958, Diagram III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Method Based on Equidistances from the Boundary</td>
<td>Kennedy/1958, Diagram IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Pseudo-Equidistance: Example of Possible Difficulties</td>
<td>Kennedy/1958, Diagram V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pseudo-Equidistance: Oppositeness</td>
<td>Roubertou/1996, Figure 7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Pseudo-Equidistance: Adjacency</td>
<td>Roubertou/1996, Figure 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>“Méthodes de Lissage”</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>North Sea Cases: The German Sector Approach</td>
<td>ICJ/Pleadings/1968(1), p.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied to Opposite States to Favour State B</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied to Adjacent States to Favour State A</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Equiratio between “Z” and “Y” (to which island Y1 belongs)</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986b, p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Composite Equidistance/Equiratio Line</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied only to EEZ and CS Delimitation</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986a, p.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied to Opposite States</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986a, p.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied to Adjacent States</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Equiratio Applied to the North Sea Continental Shelf Cases</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986b, p.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tunisia/Libya: An Equiratio Approach</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986b, p.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Libya/Malta: An Equiratio Approach</td>
<td>Langeraar/1986b, p.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Half-Effect of Islands: Opposite Coasts</td>
<td>Beazley/1979, p.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Half-Effect of Islands: Adjacent Coasts</td>
<td>Beazley/1979, p.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Half-Effect of Islands: The Half-Angle</td>
<td>Beazley/1979, p.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>General Direction of the Coast: A Concept Subject to Different Interpretations</td>
<td>Francalanci/1989, Figure 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Coastal Length Between Points “A” and “B”: Three Possible Interpretations</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Enclaving and Semi-Enclaving</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Equidistance Starting from a Headland: The Recourse to a Bisector</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>UK/France Arbitration: The Delimitation Area</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Jan Mayen Case: The Delimitation Area</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Jan Mayen Case: Examples of Distance Ratios</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Jan Mayen Case: Alternative Lines with Similar Average Distance Ratio</td>
<td>Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>The Effect of Scale in the General Direction of the Coast</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Botswana/Namibia Case: The Main Channel</td>
<td>DJ Freeman, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Controlling Basepoints</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Macroleographical Aspects of Delimitation</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Coastal Length Comparison between Opposite States: The Trapezium Question</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Norwegian Trough: The Question of Natural Prolongation</td>
<td>Admiralty Chart 4010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Types of Continental Shelf Entitlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Miles – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Miles – 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>200 M Opening: Potential Inequitableness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Grey Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Grey Area Issue: Guinea/Guinea-Bissau Arbitration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Resource Allocation by Delimitation – 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Resource Allocation by Delimitation – 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Macrogeographical Perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Aspects of Coastal Geography (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Aspects of Coastal Geography (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Limits and Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Proportionality Aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Timor Sea: The Concession to Petrotimor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Maritime Areas Off the Northern Coasts of East Timor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Timor Sea: Geomorphological Aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Structural Models for the Island of Timor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>‘Eastern Lateral-Boundary’: Possible Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Australia / East Timor Maritime Boundaries: Proposed Solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 1

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.199 (adapted)
1969 NORTH SEA CONTINENTAL SHELF CASES:
OUTCOME AND CONTEXT

FIGURE 2
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.237 (adapted)
FIGURE 3
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.239 (adapted)
FIGURE 4

Source: Original
FIGURE 5
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.241 (adapted)
FIGURE 6
Source: DeVorsey/1990, p.11 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

GUINEA / GUINEA-BISSAU ARBITRATION

Source: Portuguese Chart: 1104 (adapted)

FIGURE 7
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

1985 LIBYA/MALTA CASE

FIGURE 8

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.247 (adapted)
FIGURE 9

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.251 (adapted)
FIGURE 10
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.253 (adapted)
FIGURE 11

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.255 (adapted)
FIGURE 12
Source: Original
FIGURE 13

Source: ICJ Website (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

FIGURE 14

Source: Original
FIGURE 15

Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

FIGURE 16
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.213 (adapted)
FIGURE 17
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.69 (adapted)
FIGURE 18

Source: IMB, p.1633 (adapted)
FIGURE 19

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.219 (adapted)
FIGURE 20
Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

BAHRAIN / SAUDI ARABIA AGREEMENT

PERSIAN GULF

Administered by Saudi Arabia, oil revenue shared with Bahrain (oil wells)

Boundary undetermined

FIGURE 21
Source: IMB, p.1494 (adapted)
FIGURE 22
Source: IMB, p.790 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

DOMINICA / FRANCE (Guadeloupe and Martinique) AGREEMENT

La Desirade
ILES LES SAINTES

DOMINICA

Guadeloupe (France)

ATLANTIC

CARIBBEAN

OCEAN

ST. LUCIA

ST. VINCENT
AND THE
GRENADINES

GRENADA

BARBADOS

Peninsula of the Caravel

FIGURE 23
Source: IMB, p.713 (adapted)
FIGURE 24
Source: IMB, p.897 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

FIGURE 25
Source: IMB, p.1525 (adapted)
FIGURE 26
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.227 (adapted)
Figure 27
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.225 (adapted)
FIGURE 28
Source: IMB, p.1406 (adapted)
FIGURE 30

Source: Miyoshi/1999 (adapted)
FRANCE / SPAIN AGREEMENT (Special Zone)

Bay of Biscay

Joint Development Zone

FIGURE 31
Source: Miyoshi/1999, p.31 (adapted)
FIGURE 32
Source: Miyoshi, p.13 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

MALAYSIA / THAILAND and MALAYSIA / VIETNAM AGREEMENTS
(Joint Zones)

FIGURE 33
Source: Miyoshi, p.15 (adapted)
FIGURE 34

Source: Miyoshi, p.39 (adapted)
FIGURE 35
Source: Miyoshi, p.24 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

BOUNDARIES IN THE GULF OF GUINEA

FIGURE 37
Source: Original
GULF OF GUINEA:
The Geographical Framework
For the Delimitation in the Cameroon/Nigeria Case

FIGURE 38
Source: Original
FIGURE 39

Source: IMB, p.853 (adapted)
FIGURE 40
Source: IBRU Boundary and Security Bulletin, Volume 8, No.3, p.66 (adapted)
**FIGURE 41**

Source: Dutch Hydrographic Office (adapted)
FIGURE 42

Source: UK Hydrographic Office (adapted)
FIGURE 43

Source: Admiralty Chart 2236 (adapted)
Towards the Conceptualisation of Maritime Delimitation

North Atlantic Ocean - Division on the Basis of Equidistance

Source: ICJ/Pleadings/1968(I), pp.34, 66-67 (adapted)

Figure 44
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FIGURE 45
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.237 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

FIGURE 46
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.237 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

PROLON GATION OF THE LAND BOUNDARY:
An Example of an Inequitable Situation

FIGURE 47
Source: Shalowitz/1962, p.231 (adapted)
EQUIDISTANCE METHOD
OPPOSITE STATES

2 to 7 - Turning Points of the Equidistance Line
B, D, E - Relevant Basepoints of State A
A, C, F, G, H - Relevant Basepoints of State B

FIGURE 48
Source: Francalanci/1994, p.201 (adapted)
FIGURE 49

Source: Francalanci/1994, p.203 (adapted)
EQUIDISTANCE METHOD: Tri-junction Point

FIGURE 50
Source: Original
FIGURE 51
Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

DIVISION OF THE AREA OF OVERLAPPING OF ENTITLEMENTS THROUGH EQUIDISTANCE - OPPOSITENESS

STATE B

200 M LIMIT FROM STATE A

50.87% OF AREA OF OVERLAPPING OF ENTITLEMENTS

49.13% OF AREA OF OVERLAPPING OF ENTITLEMENTS

200 M LIMIT FROM STATE B

STATE A

FIGURE 52
Source: Original
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FIGURE 53
Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

DIVISION OF THE AREA OF OVERLAPPING OF
ENTITLEMENTS THROUGH EQUIDISTANCE - ADJACENCY

FIGURE 54
Source: Original
FIGURE 55
Source: Kennedy/1958, Diagram III
FIGURE 56
Source: Kennedy/1958, Diagram IV
PSEUDO-EQUIDISTANCE:
EXAMPLE OF POSSIBLE DIFFICULTIES

FIGURE 57
Source: Kennedy/1958, Diagram V

+++ Boundary based on pseudo-equidistance

--- Imaginary coastline that would be crossed by a boundary based on pseudo-equidistance

P Imaginary prominent point on the coast of which no account is taken by the boundary based on pseudo-equidistance
PSEUDO-EQUIDISTANCE: Oppositeness

Equal number of basepoints chosen on each coast

FIGURE 58
Source: Roubertou/1996, Figure 7a (adapted)
PSEUDO-EQUIDISTANCE: Adjacency

Equal number of basepoints chosen on each coast

FIGURE 59
Source: Roubertou/1996, Figure 7b (adapted)
"MÉTHODES DE LISSAGE"

(A) PERPENDICULAR TO THE GENERAL DIRECTION OF THE COAST

(B) BISECTOR OF AN ANGLE IN A CASE OF ADJACENCY

(C) RADIAL LINE OF A CIRCUMFERENCE

(D) BISECTOR OF AN ANGLE IN A CASE OF OPPOSITENESS

FIGURE 60
Source: Original
NORTH SEA CASES: The German Sector Approach

FIGURE 61
Source: ICJ/Pleadings/1968(1), p.85 (adapted)
EQUIRATIO APPLIED TO OPPOSITE STATES, TO FAVOUR STATE B

FIGURE 62
Source: Original
EQUIRATIO APPLIED TO ADJACENT STATES, TO FAVOUR STATE A

FIGURE 63
Source: Original
EQUIRATIO BETWEEN "Z" AND "Y" (to which island Y1 belongs)

FIGURE 64

Source: Langeraar/1986b, p.15 (adapted)
FIGURE 65
Source: Original
FIGURE 66
Source: Langeraar/1986a, p.405 (adapted)
EQUIRATIO APPLIED TO OPPOSITE STATES

STATE A

STATE B

--- Equidistance

--- Equiratio = 0.70

(Favouring State A)

FIGURE 67

Source: Langeraar/1986a, p.399 (adapted)
FIGURE 68
Source: Original
FIGURE 69
Source: Langeraar/1986b, p.11 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

TUNISIA/LIBYA: AN EQUIRATIO APPROACH

FIGURE 70
Source: Langeraar/1986b, p.12 (adapted)
LIBYA / MALTA: AN EQUITARIATIO APPROACH

FIGURE 71
Source: Langeraar/1986b, p.17 (adapted)
FIGURE 72

Source: Beazley/1979, p.154 (adapted)
FIGURE 73
Source: Beazley/1979, p.156 (adapted)
FIGURE 74
Source: Beazley/1979, p.157 (adapted)
FIGURE 75
Source: Francalanci/1989, Figure 43 (adapted)
COASTAL LENGTH BETWEEN POINTS "A" AND "B":
Three Possible Interpretations

L1 - Coastal length measured by following closely the sinuosities of the coast
L1 = 146 M

L2 - Coastal length measured by adding the length of the segments joining selected basepoints along the coast
L2 = 71 M

L3 - Coastal length measured by considering only one single segment representative of the coastal façade
L3 = 63 M

FIGURE 76
Source: Original
FIGURE 77

Source: Original
EQUIDISTANCE STARTING FROM A HEADLAND
- THE RECOUSE TO A BISECTOR -

Equidistance 1 - approximate direction of the equidistance line when no account is taken of Island B1.
Equidistance 2 - approximate direction of the equidistance line when Island B1 is considered.

Bisector

STATE A
STATE B

General Direction of the Coast of State B
General Direction of the Coast of State A

FIGURE 78
Source: Original
U.K. / FRANCE ARBITRATION: The Delimitation Area

Source: Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.239 (adapted)
FIGURE 80
Source: Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255 (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

JAN MAYEN CASE: The Delimitation Area

![Map of JAN MAYEN CASE: The Delimitation Area]

Source: Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255 (adapted)

FIGURE 81
JAN MAYEN CASE: EXAMPLES OF DISTANCE RATIOS

FIGURE 82
Source: Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255 (adapted)
FIGURE 83
Source: Francalanci/Scovazzi/1994, p.255 (adapted)
THE EFFECT OF SCALE IN THE GENERAL DIRECTION OF THE COAST

Scale 1:100,000

General Direction of the Coast

Scale 1:200,000

General Direction of the Coast

FIGURE 84
Source: Original
FIGURE 85
Source: DJ Freeman, London (adapted)
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

THE EFFECT OF CONTROLLING BASEPOINTS

Example of the Effect of Controlling Basepoints in a Situation of Adjacency Caused by "Headland A1"

Example of the Effect of Controlling Basepoints in a Situation of Oppositeness Caused by "Headland A1" and "Island A2"

FIGURE 86
Source: Original
FIGURE 87
Source: Original
COASTAL LENGTH COMPARISON BETWEEN OPPOSITE STATES:
The Trapezium Question

STATE B

Short Coast

Area of Overlapping 200 M Entitlements

Trapezium

Zone 1

Zone 2

Equidistance

Trapezium mid-line

State A 200 M Limit

State B 200 M Limit

FIGURE 88

Source: Original
FIGURE 89

Source: Admiralty Chart 4010 (adapted)
TYPES OF CONTINENTAL SHELF ENTITLEMENT

SCENARIO 1

SCENARIO 2

SCENARIO 3

SCENARIO 4

FIGURE 90
Source: Original
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FIGURE 91
Source: Original
"200 M Opening"

SCENARIO 1

SCENARIO 2

FIGURE 92

Source: Original
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FIGURE 93
Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

GREY AREAS

(a) CASE A (e.g. Gulf of Maine case)

(b) CASE B (e.g. 1990 USA/USSR Agreement)

FIGURE 94

Source: Original
FIGURE 95

Source: Original
TOWARDS THE CONCEPTUALISATION OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

RESOURCE ALLOCATION BY DELIMITATION – 1

SCENARIO 1

SCENARIO 2

SCENARIO 3

SCENARIO 4

FIGURE 96
Source: Original
FIGURE 97

Source: Original
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FIGURE 98
Source: Original

TIMOR SEA: MACROGEOGRAPHICAL PERSPECTIVE
FIGURE 99
Source: Original
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FIGURE 100

Source: Original

TIMOR SEA: ASPECTS OF COASTAL GEOGRAPHY (2)
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FIGURE 101

Source: Original

TIMOR SEA: LIMITS AND BOUNDARIES

- 1989 Area A Limit
- 2001 JPDA Limit
- 200M Limit
- Maritime boundary

1972 SEABED BOUNDARY
1977 WATER COLUMN BOUNDARY

A18

1972 SEABED BOUNDARY
1997 WATER COLUMN BOUNDARY

A17

1997 WATER COLUMN BOUNDARY

A15

1972 SEABED BOUNDARY

A16

1989 AREA A

2001 JPDA

1989 AREA A

1997 WATER COLUMN BOUNDARY

200M LIMIT

EAST TIMOR 200M LIMIT

Western Australia

Northern Territory

AustraliA

C. van Diemen

C. Fourcroy

Melville I.

C. Londonderry

Holothuria Reefs

Ashmore Is.

Lomblen

Flores

Indonesia

Atauro

Moa

Babar

131° E

10° S

123° E

13° S

19° S
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FIGURE 103

Source: Original
FIGURE 104

Source: Original
Seabed profile along a line joining a point near the western end of the East Timorese façade, and a point west of the midpoint of the entrance of Joseph Bonaparte Gulf.

Seabed profile along a line joining a point near the middle of the East Timorese façade, and a point east of the midpoint of the entrance of Joseph Bonaparte Gulf.

Seabed profile along a line joining a point near the eastern end of the East Timorese façade, and a point west of Bathurst Island.

**FIGURE 105**

*Source: Original*
# STRUCTURAL MODELS FOR THE ISLAND OF TIMOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTH</th>
<th>SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volcanic Arc</td>
<td>Overthrust model (Audley-Charles 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Island</td>
<td>Timor = allochthonous units overthrust on Australian continental margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor Trough</td>
<td>Rebound model (Chamalaun and Grady 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor = uplifted Australian continental margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imbricate model (Hamilton 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor = accretionary prism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duplex model (e.g. Charlton et al. 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor = thrustbelt of Australian margin sediments and allochthonous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overthrusted margin model (Sawyer et al. 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timor = detached edge of the Australian continental margin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 106**

Source: Reed et al./1996, p.306 (adapted)
FIGURE 107

Source: Original
FIGURE 108

Source: Original

AUSTRALIA / EAST TIMOR MARITIME BOUNDARIES: PROPOSED SOLUTION

- Proposed CS Boundary
- Proposed Water Column Boundary

PETROLEUM FIELDS
1. Sunrise + Sunset
2. Troubadour
3. Bayu-Undan
4. Laminaria + Coralina + Buffalo
5. Elang + Kakatua
6. Jahal

Holothuria Reefs
C. Londonderry
Western Australia

C. van Diemen
Melville L.
Northern Territory

Source: Original
APPENDIX 2

STATE PRACTICE IN MARITIME DELIMITATION

•

CONTINENTAL SHELF,

EXCLUSIVE ECONOMIC ZONE

AND EXCLUSIVE FISHERIES ZONE

Notes on the scope of this Appendix:

(1) This Appendix deals with continental shelf and EEZ/EFZ delimitation only. In some cases, the agreements deal also with the delimitation of the TS and/or CZ. No reference is made to state practice that deals only with TS and/or CZ boundaries.

(2) Not all agreements mention explicitly the “criterion” of delimitation on the basis of which the dividing line was determined. The agreements where explicit reference is made are identified. The information presented in relation to the other agreements is obtained from analyses of the boundary lines, and indicates either the “criterion” of delimitation (whenever some conclusion is possible) or the “type of line” used in the delimitation.

(3) No reference is made to agreements or unilateral acts that do not establish a dividing line (exception made to the agreements relating to the Timor Sea, which in view of the contents of Chapter 10 are relevant for this study), or to agreements that are signed as a result of an adjudication of the boundary by international courts.

References used in the Tables:

(a) State party to the CS Convention
(b) State party to the LOSC
(c) Non-member State of the United Nations
(d) Includes the delimitation of maritime areas other than CS and EEZ
(e) This delimitation includes areas that may (potentially) be included in the TS of the states involved
(f) Agreement that makes explicit reference to the “criterion” of delimitation (even if sometimes that reference is indirect, e.g. indicating that the delimitation had due regard of the 1958 CS Convention)
(g) Agreement that does not make any explicit reference to a “criterion” of delimitation, and in relation to which no conclusion could be drawn as to the use of any “criterion”
### TABLE A

**Ante-1958 Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Criterion or Type of Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Proclamation of 10 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 23 (cf. C57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Proclamation of 5 June 1949</td>
<td>Just Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Proclamation of 14 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 25 (cf. C57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Act 19 June 1955</td>
<td>Rules of Equity</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968/Add.1, p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Proclamation of 12 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Declaration of Two Houses of Parliament 28 May 1949</td>
<td>On Basis of Equity</td>
<td>ICJ/Pleadings/1968(I), p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Proclamation of 8 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>Ras-al-Khaimah</td>
<td>Proclamation of 17 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 28 (cf. C57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Royal Pronouncement 28 May 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Sharjah</td>
<td>Proclamation of 16 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 29 (cf. C57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Umm-al-Qaiwain</td>
<td>Proclamation of 29 June 1949</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 29 (cf. C57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A13 | Chile                   | Bilateral Agreement 2
Maritime Boundary 18 August 1952 | Parallel (a)                   | IMB, pp. 793-800                      |
| A14 | Ecuador                 | Bilateral Agreement 2
Maritime Boundary 18 August 1952 | Parallel (a)                   | IMB, pp. 829-837                       |
| A15 | Norway                  | Bilateral Agreement 2
CS Boundary 15 February 1957 | Atypical Recourse to Equidistance | IMB, pp. 1781-1789                  |
| A16 | United Kingdom
Venezuela
(Gulf of Paria) | Bilateral Agreement 2
CS Boundary 26 February 1942 | Sui Generis Line; Pragmatic    | IMB, pp. 639-654                    |
### TABLE B

#### Period 1958-1969

Unilateral, Bilateral and Multilateral Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Criterion or Type of Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter 8 December 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Order 7 June 1963</td>
<td>Art. 6 of CS Convention</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Finland (a)</td>
<td>Law 5 March 1965</td>
<td>Art. 6 of CS Convention</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Germany, D.R. (a)</td>
<td>Proclamation 26 May 1964</td>
<td>Principle of Delimitation of CS Convention; Art. 6 of CS Convention; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, pp. 107-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Law 20 February 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Germany, F.R.</td>
<td>Declaration 20 January 1964</td>
<td>Agreements</td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Proclamation 10 April 1958</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Legislative Act 21 July 1967</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Malaysia (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act 28 July 1966</td>
<td>Art. 6 of CS Convention</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Malta (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act 1 December 1966</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/16, p. 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>Netherlands (k)</td>
<td>Law 23 September 1965</td>
<td>CS Convention</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Norway (a) (c)</td>
<td>Legislative Act 21 June 1963</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>South Africa (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act No. 87 of 1963</td>
<td>CS Convention</td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Sweden (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act 3 June 1966</td>
<td>CS Convention</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>United Kingdom (Sarawak, North Borneo and Brunei)</td>
<td>British Orders 11 September 1958 (d)</td>
<td>Equidistance; Perpendicular to the general direction of the Coast</td>
<td>IMB, pp.924-928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>United Kingdom (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Order 12 May 1964</td>
<td>Agreements; Designation of areas with limits falling just short of a potential equidistance</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>USSR (a)</td>
<td>Decree 6 February 1968</td>
<td>Median Line; Equidistance</td>
<td>UN/SNL/1968, p. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST/LEX/LEG.B/15, p. 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Offshore Boundary 18 February 1968</td>
<td>Straight Line (roughly perpendicular to the general direction of coast) (b)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1475-1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement 6</td>
<td>Median / Middle Line (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS Boundary (e)</td>
<td>JDZ (shared revenues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>Netherlands (e)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement 7</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>United Kingdom (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>Finland (a)</td>
<td>USSR (b) (Gulf of Finland) (Baltic Sea)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 May 1965 (d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>Germany, F.R. Denmark (a)</td>
<td>(coastal regions) 9</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary (e)</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 June 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>Germany, F.R. Netherlands (a)</td>
<td>(coastal regions) 9</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary (e)</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 December 1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Just Delimitation; (f) Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 October 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Yugoslavia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 January 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>Netherlands (a)</td>
<td>United Kingdom (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 October 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28</td>
<td>Norway (a)</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 December 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>Norway (a)</td>
<td>United Kingdom (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f) (with minor divergences for administrative convenience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 March 1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30</td>
<td>Norway (a)</td>
<td>Sweden (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f) (with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 July 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31</td>
<td>Poland (a)</td>
<td>Germany, D.R. (a) (Baltic Sea)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Art. 6 of CS Convention; Median Line Principle (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29 October 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32</td>
<td>Senegal (a)</td>
<td>Portugal (a) (on behalf of Guinea-Bissau)</td>
<td>Exchange of Notes CS Boundary</td>
<td>Loxodrome (a) (roughly perpendicular to the general direction of the coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 April 1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>Sharjah</td>
<td>Umm al Qaywayn</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Seabed Boundary (d)</td>
<td>Simplified Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>USSR (a)</td>
<td>Poland (a) Germany, D.R (a)</td>
<td>Joint Declaration Delimitation Rules</td>
<td>Art. 6 of CS Convention (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 October 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE C

**Period 1969-1982**

**Unilateral Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Criterion or Type of Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maritime Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 August 1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistant Line; or as determined by</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, pp. 26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisheries Resources</td>
<td>International Law</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 June 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine Boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 February 1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Median Line; Equidistance Principle</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 June 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>Decree Law</td>
<td>Bilateral Negotiations</td>
<td>Smith 1986, p. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 December 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Ordinance</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>ST/LEG/SER.B/19, p. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 June 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Cook Islands (c)</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement, Arbitral Award, Judgement; Median/</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS/EEZ</td>
<td>Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), pp. 54-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 November 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Legislative Decree</td>
<td>Bilateral Negotiations</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 February 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>Cyprus (a)</td>
<td>CS Law</td>
<td>Agreement; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 April 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing Territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 December 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>Law 52/AN/78 TS/CZ/EEZ</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Agreement; Equitable Principles</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TS/CZ/EEZ-EFZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 August 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>France (a)</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 February 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>Germany, D.R. (a)</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 December 1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>Germany, F.R.</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EFZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 December 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>Greece (a)</td>
<td>Decree-Law</td>
<td>Rules of International Law</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. 142/1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Act/Proclamation</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Agreement Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>1 November 1978</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>30 July 1980</td>
<td>Thalweg; Parallels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>Law Extension</td>
<td>19 May 1978</td>
<td>Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>30 June 1977</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>6 April 1977</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1 June 1979</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>25 August 1975</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>30 October 1973</td>
<td>Median Line (Assimilation of the CS limits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>22 December 1976</td>
<td>Equitable Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>17 November 1977</td>
<td>Agreement; Equitable Principles; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2 May 1977</td>
<td>Agreement; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Kampuchea</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>15 January 1978</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>10 March 1978</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>Korea, North</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td>22 June 1977</td>
<td>Half-Line; Bisecting Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Note Verbale</td>
<td>12 July 1971</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Constitutional Decree</td>
<td>26 January 1976</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>8 April 1981</td>
<td>Agreement; Equitable Principles; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>No.8/1978</td>
<td>Agreement, Arbitral Award; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Type of Act</td>
<td>Date of Act</td>
<td>Agreement Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>Netherlands (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EFZ</td>
<td>8 June 1977</td>
<td>Agreement (Assimilation of the CS limits in the North Sea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>New Zealand (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ</td>
<td>26 September 1977</td>
<td>Agreement, Arbitral Award, Judgement; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39</td>
<td>Nigeria (a)</td>
<td>Decree EEZ</td>
<td>5 October 1978</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C40</td>
<td>Niue (c)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41</td>
<td>Norway (a)</td>
<td>Royal Decree EZ</td>
<td>17 December 1976</td>
<td>Agreement; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C42</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Royal Decree TS/CS/EEZ</td>
<td>10 February 1981</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C43</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Zones</td>
<td>22 December 1976</td>
<td>Agreement; Equitable Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C44</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Proclamation Offshore Seas</td>
<td>28 March 1978</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C45</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Presidential Decree EEZ</td>
<td>11 June 1978</td>
<td>Agreement; Recognized Principles of International Law on Delimitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C46</td>
<td>Poland (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act CS</td>
<td>17 December 1977</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C47</td>
<td>Portugal (a)</td>
<td>Decree Law CS</td>
<td>11 November 1969</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistance-special circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ</td>
<td>28 May 1977</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Declaration</td>
<td>2 June 1974</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C49</td>
<td>S.Tomé e Principe</td>
<td>Decree Law</td>
<td>16 June 1978</td>
<td>Bilateral Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C50</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ</td>
<td>25 August 1977</td>
<td>Agreement, Arbitral Award, Judgement; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C51</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>Order EEZ</td>
<td>22 February 1978</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C52</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Legislative Act Marine Waters</td>
<td>21 December 1978</td>
<td>Agreement or Award; Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53</td>
<td>Spain (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EZ</td>
<td>20 February 1978</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Law/Declaration</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Maritime Zones/EEZ</td>
<td>Agreement/Median Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Maritime Zones</td>
<td>1 September 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>TS/EEZ</td>
<td>23 October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>Proclamation</td>
<td>Fishery Limits</td>
<td>26 October 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C58</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>FZ</td>
<td>22 December 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C59</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Decree</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 May 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 February 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C64</td>
<td>Yemen, Democratic</td>
<td>Legislative Act</td>
<td>Maritime Zones</td>
<td>17 December 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE D

**Period 1969-1982**

**Bilateral and Multilateral Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Criterion or Type of Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Argentina, Uruguay</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d) 19 November 1973</td>
<td>Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 757-776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Australia (a), France (a) (New Caledonia)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 4 January 1982</td>
<td>Rules and Principles of International Law; Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 905-913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia (a) (Heard, McDonald Islands), France (a) (Kerguelen Is.)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 4 January 1982</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1185-1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Australia (a), Indonesia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Seabed Boundary 18 May 1971</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1195-1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Australia (a), Indonesia</td>
<td>Seabed Boundary Timor and Arafura Seas 9 October 1972</td>
<td>Natural Prolongation; Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1207-1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Australia (a), Indonesia</td>
<td>MOU on Fisheries (Provisional line) 29 October 1981</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1229-1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Australia (a), Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundaries (d) 18 December 1978</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 929-975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Australia (a), Papua New Guinea, Indonesia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundaries (d) 12 February 1973</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1219-1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Bahrain, Iran</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Delimitation 17 June 1971</td>
<td>Just and Equitable Delimitation; Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1481-1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Brazil (Guiana) (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Limits (d) 30 January 1981</td>
<td>International Law; Equidistance (exchange of areas on both sides of a potential Equidistance)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 777-783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Brazil, Uruguay</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d) 21 July 1972</td>
<td>Loxodrome, nearly perpendicular to the general direction of the coast</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 785-792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Burma (Myanmar), Thailand (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d) 25 July 1980</td>
<td>Equidistance Line</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1341-1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Canada (a), Denmark (a) (Greenland)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary (d) 17 December 1973</td>
<td>Median Line (adjusted by mutual agreements - partial or no effect to some islands)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 371-385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participating States</td>
<td>Nature of Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary Delimitation Method</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Colombia (a) Costa Rica (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Marine and Submarine Areas Boundary Parallel, open-ended Meridian and loxodrome (g)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 463-476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Colombia (a) Dominican Republic (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Marine and Submarine Areas Boundary</td>
<td>Principle of the Median Line (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 477-486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>Colombia (a) Ecuador</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Parallel (g)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 809-817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16</td>
<td>Colombia (a) Haiti (6)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Median Line; (f) Equidistant Trijunction Point</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 491-502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17</td>
<td>Colombia (a) Panama</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Marine and Submarine Areas Boundaries</td>
<td>Median Line, Principle of Equidistance (f) Parallels and meridians</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 519-535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>Cook Islands (c) USA (6) (American Samoa)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 985-993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>Costa Rica (a) Panama</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Boundaries of Marine Areas</td>
<td>Median Line; (f) Equidistant Trijunction Point</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 537-549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>Cuba Haiti (6)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement E EZ/EZ Boundary</td>
<td>Principle of Equidistance or Equity (as required) (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 551-563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>Cuba Mexico (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Sea Space Boundary</td>
<td>Principle of Equidistance (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 565-576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22</td>
<td>Denmark (a) United Kingdom (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1825-1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23</td>
<td>Finland (a) Sweden (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Median Line Principle (f) (with modifications, to account for previously delimited boundaries, or expediency reasons)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1945-1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24</td>
<td>Finland (a) USSR (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement FZ Boundary</td>
<td>Median Line (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1979-1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D25</td>
<td>France (a) Spain (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance; (f) Proportionality; JDZ</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1719-1734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>France (a) United Kingdom (a) (Eastern Channel and Southern North Sea)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1735-1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>Gambia Senegal (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundaries</td>
<td>Parallels (g)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 849-855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>Germany, D.R. (6) Sweden (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance (f) (with simplifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2029-2038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>Greece (a) Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>Iceland (a) Norway (a) (Jan Mayen)</td>
<td>Median Line Principle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D31</td>
<td>India Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>India Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D33</td>
<td>India Indonesia Thailand (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>Maldives Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D36</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>Thailand (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>Indonesia Malaysia (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D39</td>
<td>Indonesia Malaysia (a) Thailand (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>Indonesia Thailand (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>Indonesia Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D42</td>
<td>Iran Oman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>Iran Qatar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D44</td>
<td>Italy Spain (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>Type of Agreement</td>
<td>Boundary Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D45</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>UAE (Dubai)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Offshore Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Korea, South</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D48</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>MOU CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>France (Reunion)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>EZ Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D53</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>USA (American Samoa)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D54</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D55</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Denmark (Faroe Islands)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>EZ/FZ/CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>UAE (Abu Dhabi)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D59</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>France (Wallis, Futuna)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>EZ Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D60</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>USSR (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D61</td>
<td>USA (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 December 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>(with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 417-425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D62</td>
<td>USA (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Mexico (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreements</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24 November 1976</td>
<td>4 May 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>(with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 427-445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D63</td>
<td>USSR (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Poland (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>CS Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 August 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equidistance (^{(f)})</td>
<td>(with &quot;slight variations&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2039-2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D64</td>
<td>Venezuela (^{(a)})</td>
<td>USA (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 March 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; (^{(f)})</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 691-703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D65</td>
<td>Venezuela (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Netherlands (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Maritime Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 March 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; (^{(f)})</td>
<td>Ares of Great Circle; Proportionality; Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 615-637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D66</td>
<td>Venezuela (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Dominican Republic (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>Marine and Submarine Areas Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 March 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable Principles (^{(f)})</td>
<td>(but with a disclaimer stating that it could not be used as precedent in relation to the Dominican Republic); Equidistance used as first approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 577-590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D67</td>
<td>Venezuela (^{(a)})</td>
<td>France (^{(a)})</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement</td>
<td>EZ Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 July 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rules and Principles of International Law on Delimitation; (^{(f)})</td>
<td>Meridian; Equidistant Trijuction Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IMB, pp. 603-614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE E

#### Period Post-1982

**Unilateral Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Type of Act</th>
<th>Criterion or Type of Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Angola (b)</td>
<td>Law No.21/92 IW/TS/CZ/EEZ 28 August 1992</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 40, p. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Bahamas (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/AW/IW/EEZ No. 37/1993</td>
<td>Agreement or Award Median Line;</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 31, p. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Belize (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act IW/TS/EEZ 24 January 1992</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law to achieve an equitable settlement; Equidistance Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Bulgaria (a) (b)</td>
<td>Decree EEZ 7 January 1987 Legislative Act Ocean Space 8 July 1987</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law to achieve an equitable solution</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 10, p. 10 UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ/CS 26 June 1998</td>
<td>Agreement on the basis of International Law, in accordance with the Principle of Equity</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 38, p. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Maritime Code 27 January 1994</td>
<td>International Law; Treaties already signed; Median line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 42, p. 26-167 (34-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Denmark (a)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ 22 May 1996</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistant/Median Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 33, pp. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ Act No.1/1999 TS/EEZ 12 November 1984 17 6 March 1999</td>
<td>Equidistant/Median Line Equidistant/Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 84 UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 79 LOS Bulletin No.40, p. 31-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Law Maritime Boundaries 10 March 1993</td>
<td>Coordination with neighbouring states</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 25, p. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Gabon (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ No. 9/1984 18</td>
<td>Agreement, applying recognized principles of international law on delimitation</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Iceland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Regulation CS Delimitation 9 May 1985 19</td>
<td>Median Line (segment vis-a-vis the Faroe Islands, in relation to which no agreement exists) Agreement in accordance with the general rules of international law</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, pp. 127-128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Act/Ordinance</td>
<td>Agreement Type and Notes</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Indonesia (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ 18 October 1983 20</td>
<td>Agreement; Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, pp. 150-151, UN/NLEEZ(2), pp. 141-142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Legislative Act Marine Areas 1993</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistant Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 24, p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>Jamaica (4)(6)</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Areas 1996</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law, to achieve an equitable solution ibid.</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 34, p. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ 31 December 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>Japan (b)</td>
<td>Law EEZ/CS No. 74/1996</td>
<td>Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 35, pp. 94-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>Kiribati (c)</td>
<td>Legislative Act IW/AW/TS/EEZ No. 7/1983</td>
<td>Agreement or Award; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>Korea, South (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EEZ 8 August 1996</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 33, p. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>Madagascar (c)</td>
<td>Ordinance Maritime Zones 16 September 1985</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, pp. 151, UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>Malaysia (4)(b)</td>
<td>Bill EEZ 1984</td>
<td>Agreement; International law and state practice Equidistance</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration made upon ratification EEZ/CS 14 October 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOALOS Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Act No. 6/96 Maritime Zones 1985</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 41, p. 16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>Malta (4)(b)</td>
<td>Declaration made upon ratification EEZ/CS 20 May 1993</td>
<td>Equitable solution; Equidistance</td>
<td>DOALOS Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22</td>
<td>Marshall Islands (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act IW/AW/TS/EEZ/CZ 13 September 1984</td>
<td>Agreement or Award; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23</td>
<td>Mexico (4)(b)</td>
<td>Federal Act Maritime Zones 9 January 1986</td>
<td>Agreement; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24</td>
<td>Namibia (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ 30 June 1990</td>
<td>Agreement; Unilateral decision</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E26</td>
<td>Niue (c)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ 1996</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 37, p. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E27</td>
<td>Norway (a) (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act CS Definition 22 March 1985 23</td>
<td>Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E30</td>
<td>Poland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Areas 21 March 1991 24</td>
<td>Agreement; Unilateral decision</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E31</td>
<td>Romania (a) (b)</td>
<td>Decree EEZ 25 April 1986 25</td>
<td>Agreement, through the application, according to specific circumstances, the principles and criteria recognized in international law and in state practice, to arrive at equitable solution</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E32</td>
<td>Saint Lucia (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Areas (EEZ/CS) 18 July 1984 26</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law, to achieve an equitable settlement</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 227 UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Areas 30 August 1984</td>
<td>Agreement on the basis of international law to achieve an equitable settlement; Equidistance Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E34</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act Maritime Areas (TS/CZ/EEZ/CS) 8 June 1983 27</td>
<td>Agreement; Equidistance Line</td>
<td>UN/NLCS, p. 233 UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E35</td>
<td>São Tomé e Príncipe (b)</td>
<td>Law TS/EEZ 11 March 1998</td>
<td>Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 37, p. 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E36</td>
<td>Spain (b)</td>
<td>Royal Decree FZ 1 August 1997</td>
<td>Definition of the points that delimit the FZ on the basis of equidistance 28</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 36, p. 48 LOS Bulletin No. 37, pp. 80-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37</td>
<td>Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act EZ 3 December 1992 29</td>
<td>Agreement; Midline (equal distance)</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 23, p. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E38</td>
<td>Tanzania (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act TS/EEZ 1989</td>
<td>Agreement; Median Line</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 13, p. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E39</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago (a) (b)</td>
<td>Legislative Act AW/EEZ 18 August 1986</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law to achieve an equitable solution</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E40</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Decree EEZ 17 December 1986</td>
<td>Agreement; Equitable principles in order to achieve equitable solutions</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E41</td>
<td>Tuvalu (c)</td>
<td>Ordinance Maritime Zones 1983</td>
<td>Agreement or Award; Median Line</td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E42</td>
<td>Ukraine (b) 30</td>
<td>Law EEZ 16 May 1995</td>
<td>Agreement on the basis of principles and criteria of international law, to achieve an equitable solution</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 30, p. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E43</td>
<td>United Kingdom (a) (b) (Falkland Islands)</td>
<td>Declaration Fisheries 29 October 1986 31</td>
<td>Rules of international law</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 9, p. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E44</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Act No.17.033 Maritime Zones 20 November 1998</td>
<td>Treaties already signed</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 41, p. 46-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E45</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Proclamation 10 March 1983</td>
<td>Equitable Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ(2), p. 392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E46</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Decree EZ 28 February 1984</td>
<td>Agreement, on the basis of international law, to achieve an equitable solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Law EEZ 2 December 1998</td>
<td>Agreements; Generally recognised principles and norms of international law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UN/NLEEZ, p. 314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 32, p. 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes/oceans/ntrvo125.html">http://www.state.gov/www/global/oes/oceans/ntrvo125.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E47</td>
<td>Yemen, Democratic</td>
<td>Declaration upon ratification 21 July 1987</td>
<td>Median/Equidistant Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 10, p. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>Type of Act</td>
<td>Criterion or Type of Line</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Albania (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Principle of Equidistance; (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2447-2456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy (b)</td>
<td>18 December 1992 33</td>
<td>Sui Generis Line; Loxodromes, Parallels, Meridians (g)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 719-755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Argentina (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d)</td>
<td>LOSC Art. 74 / 83; (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 107-122 (cf. D3, D4, D5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chile (b)</td>
<td>29 November 1984 34</td>
<td>CS: Geological aspects EEZ: Equidistance (with modifications, e.g. semi-enclave of islands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Australia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ Boundaries</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 977-984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indonesia (b)</td>
<td>14 March 1997</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Australia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>Equitable Solution; Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1891-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Islands (a) (b)</td>
<td>13 September 1988 36</td>
<td>Pragmatic Line (based on modifications of different equidistance-lines)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1901-1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Belgium (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement TS/CS Boundary</td>
<td>Median Line (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2279-2291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>8 October 1990 37</td>
<td>(with simplifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Belgium (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>Relevant Principles of International Law; Equidistance (with modifications) and JRA</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2179-2204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Kingdom (a) (b)</td>
<td>29 May 1991 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Burma (Myanmar) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1329-1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India (b)</td>
<td>23 December 1986 39</td>
<td>(with modifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Cape Verde (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>Parallel, Meridians, and Other Types of Lines; Equidistance (used to determine turning points)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 503-518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal (a)</td>
<td>17 February 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Colombia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 801-808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaica (a)</td>
<td>12 November 1993</td>
<td>(atypical use, with modifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Colombia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation – Equidistance (f) (with simplifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1175-1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honduras (b)</td>
<td>2 August 1986 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Colombia (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 819-828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costa Rica (a) (b)</td>
<td>6 April 1984 41</td>
<td>(with modifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Cook Islands (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation – Equidistance</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 3 August 1990 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(with simplifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Costa Rica (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>12 March 1985 41</td>
<td>(with modifications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Cuba (a) Jamaica (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 18 February 1994</td>
<td>Equitable Solution –  Equidistance (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2205-2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Denmark (a) Germany, D.R. (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary 14 September 1988</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2087-2096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>Denmark (a) (Greenland) Iceland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary 11 November 1997</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications)</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 39, pp. 35-36 (cf. F17, F37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>Denmark (a) (Greenland) Norway (a) (b) (Jan Mayen)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary 11 November 1997</td>
<td>Completion of boundary up to Trijunction point</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 39, pp. 37 (cf. Jan Mayen case, ICJ/Reports/1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>Denmark (a) Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary 9 November 1984 43</td>
<td>Median Line Principle (f) (with modification motivated by practical and other considerations)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 1931-1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F19</td>
<td>Dominica (b) France (Guadeloupe and Martinique) (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 7 September 1987 44</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation;  (f) Equidistance (used with simplifications) Corridor (avoiding the cut-off effect)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 705-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F20</td>
<td>Dominican Republic (a) United Kingdom (a) (b) (Turks, Caicos Is.)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 2 August 1996 16</td>
<td>Principles of International Law; (f) Pragmatic Line</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 2235-2243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F21</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea (b) São Tomé and Príncipe (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary 26 June 1999</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; Equidistance (f)</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 47, pp.39-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F22</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea (b) Nigeria (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundaries 2000</td>
<td>Broadly based on equidistance (pragmatic modifications due to the longer Nigerian coast)</td>
<td>DOALOS Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F24</td>
<td>Estonia Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ 2 November 1998</td>
<td>LOSC; Other Relevant Principles of International Law (f) Equidistance (with modifications; reaffirming previous agreements) JFA</td>
<td>IJMCL/14-2/1999, pp. 299-308 (cf. F25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>Estonia Latvia Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Multilateral Agreement Trijunction point 30 April 1997</td>
<td>Pragmatic point (taking account of previously agreed boundaries)</td>
<td>LOS Bulletin No. 39, pp. 25 (cf. F23, F24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F26</td>
<td>Estonia Finland (a) (b) Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Multilateral Agreement Trijunction point (and related segments) 16 January 2001</td>
<td>Pragmatic point (taking account of previously agreed boundaries)</td>
<td>IJMCL/16-4/2001, p.659 (cf. F28, F29, F30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F27</td>
<td>Fiji (a) (b) France (a) (b) (New Caledonia, Wallis, Futuna)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement EZ Boundary 19 January 1983 45</td>
<td>Principles of International Law – Equidistance (Fiji) – Equitable Principles (France) (f)</td>
<td>IMB, pp. 995-1001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F28</td>
<td>Finland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ/EZ Boundary</td>
<td>18 October 1996</td>
<td>LOSC; (f) Previous agreements; Equidistance (reaffirming previous agreements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F29</td>
<td>Finland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EZ/FZ Boundary</td>
<td>5 February 1985</td>
<td>LOSC Provisions; (f) Equidistance; (transforms previously agreed boundaries in an all purpose boundary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F30</td>
<td>Finland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ/EZ Boundary</td>
<td>2 June 1994</td>
<td>Sui Generis Line; (a) Historical elements (equidistance perhaps used as reference for area exchange);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F31</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>27 June 1996</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation – Principle of Equidistance (with simplifications) (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F32</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>27 June 1996</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation – Principle of Equidistance (with simplifications) (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F33</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement EZ/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>25 October 1983</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F34</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>16 February 1984</td>
<td>Corridor (g) (avoiding the cut-off effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F35</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>14 July 1997</td>
<td>Confirms the previous agreement between Turkey and the USSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F36</td>
<td>Germany, D.R. (a)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundaries</td>
<td>22 May 1989</td>
<td>Principles and Norms of International Law; (f) Sui Generis Line (reflects a trade-off approach) Trijunction equidistance point ‘Homologation’ of the previous agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F37</td>
<td>Iceland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary</td>
<td>11 November 1997</td>
<td>Completion of boundary up to Trijunction point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F38</td>
<td>India (b)</td>
<td>Multilateral Agreement Trijuction Point</td>
<td>27 October 1993</td>
<td>Equidistance (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F39</td>
<td>Ireland (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreements CS Boundary</td>
<td>7 November 1988</td>
<td>Equidistance, modified equidistance, and bisector of coastal fronts; Parallels and Meridians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F40</td>
<td>Korea, North</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>22 January 1986</td>
<td>LOSC Provisions; (f) Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country 1</td>
<td>Country 2</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F41</td>
<td>Kuwait (b)</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Offshore Neutral Zone Border</td>
<td>2 July 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F42</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement TS/EEZ/CS</td>
<td>9 July 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F43</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Russian Federation (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ</td>
<td>24 October 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F44</td>
<td>Mozambique (b)</td>
<td>Tanzania (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d)</td>
<td>28 December 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F45</td>
<td>Netherlands (a) (b)</td>
<td>Belgium (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary</td>
<td>18 December 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F46</td>
<td>Niue (c)</td>
<td>USA (a) (b) (American Samoa)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>13 May 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F47</td>
<td>Oman (b)</td>
<td>Pakistan (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>12 June 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F48</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea (b)</td>
<td>Solomon Islands (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary (d)</td>
<td>25 January 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F49</td>
<td>Poland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary</td>
<td>10 February 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F50</td>
<td>Poland (a) (b)</td>
<td>Sweden (a) (b)</td>
<td>Multilateral Agreement Trijunction Point</td>
<td>30 June 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F52</td>
<td>Seychelles (b)</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement EEZ/CS</td>
<td>19 February 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F53</td>
<td>Solomon Islands (a) (b) (New Caledonia)</td>
<td>France (a) (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>12 November 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F54</td>
<td>Sweden (a)</td>
<td>USSR (b)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreements CS/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>13 January 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>Agreement Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Solution Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F55</td>
<td>Tanzania, Seychelles</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>23 January 2002</td>
<td>Equitable Solution – Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F57</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago, Venezuela</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>4 August 1989</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; Rules of International Law; Pragmatic Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58</td>
<td>Turkey, Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>4 December 1997</td>
<td>Equitable Delimitation; Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F59</td>
<td>Turkey, USSR</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement EEZ Boundary</td>
<td>Notes 1986-1987</td>
<td>Adopts for the EEZ the agreed CS boundary; Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F60</td>
<td>United Kingdom, Denmark, (Faroe Islands)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS/FZ Boundary</td>
<td>18 May 1999</td>
<td>Equidistance (with modifications) JFA Equidistant Trijunction point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61</td>
<td>United Kingdom, (Caymans Islands), Honduras</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>4 December 2001</td>
<td>Equidistance (with simplifications and modifications) Includes an agreement on a special fishing area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F62</td>
<td>United Kingdom, USA, (Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>5 November 1993</td>
<td>Equidistance (with simplifications)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F63</td>
<td>United Kingdom, (Anguilla), USA, (Virgin Islands)</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>5 November 1993</td>
<td>Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F64</td>
<td>USA, Mexico</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement CS Boundary beyond 200M</td>
<td>9 June 2000</td>
<td>International Law; Equidistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F65</td>
<td>USA, USSR</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement Maritime Boundary</td>
<td>1 June 1990</td>
<td>Interprets and updates the line of the 1867 Convention; Exchange of areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F66</td>
<td>USSR, Poland</td>
<td>Bilateral Agreement TS/CS/EEZ/FZ Boundaries</td>
<td>17 July 1985</td>
<td>LOSC Provisions; Equidistance (with slight variations, reaffirming previously agreed boundaries)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

(1) In the Constitution of 1950, Nicaragua states that the boundaries "shall be fixed by treaties and by law" (UN/SNL/1968/Add.1, p. 15; ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 15). A similar general reference to "law" is made by Honduras (ST/LEG/SER.B/1, p. 11).

(2) It refers to a 200-mile zone that at the time was not accepted in international law.

(3) The boundary is composed by two segments defined in an atypical manner, considered as a "selective utilization of the equidistance principle" (LS/17/1970, p. 5). This boundary is quite peculiar insofar as in a total length of 24.35 nautical miles, it changes from a situation of strict adjacency to a situation of strict oppositeness. In the agreement, there are references to the breadth of the territorial sea of the two states, but they do not explain the location of the points. The first segment runs close to a potential perpendicular to the general direction along the Varangerfjord. The third and final point is the point equidistant from the two capes (Kibergnes-Nemetski) on each side of the entrance from the Barents Sea.

(4) The state practice included in this period is only the practice that might have been considered in the North Sea cases judgement.

(5) Norway only became a party to the CS Convention on 9 September 1971.

(6) Although finalised before the signature of the 1958 Conventions, it is very likely that the outcome of this agreement was influenced by the work of the ILC upon which the conventions were based, which justifies its inclusion in this group of agreements.

(7) Germany safeguarded its position in relation to the effects of this treaty by an Aide-Mémoire of 25 May 1966 (Annex 15A to the German Memorial, ICJ/Pleadings/1968/I, p. 140).

(8) Some segments in the Gulf of Finland were influenced by the 1947 Peace Treaty.

(9) Although using equidistance in this delimitation of the continental shelf, Germany made clear that it did not accept the same criterion for the boundary further seawards.

(10) Norway only became a party to the CS Convention on 9 September 1971.

(11) By 1960, neither Senegal, nor Portugal were parties to the Geneva Convention (these states only became parties to the CS Convention on 25 April 1961 and 8 January 1963 respectively). The boundary line seems to be, on a small scale chart, approximately a perpendicular to the general direction of the coast between Cape Vert and Cape Palmas. It must be observed that the Exchange of Notes makes explicit reference to the 1958 Geneva Conventions.

(12) Apparently, the reasoning of the ICJ in the North Sea cases was used here. The Timor Trough was seen as a major geological separation between the two shelves, and was thus taken into account in the delimitation (report by Prescott, IMB, pp. 1210-1211). It is interesting to note that this delimitation favoured a state that had ratified the CS Convention vis-à-vis a state that was not a party to that Convention. More accurately, in accordance with the international régime in force at that time the question seems to be one of entitlement of Indonesia to areas south of the Timor Trough, rather than a question of delimitation between an overlapping of potential entitlements.

(13) This agreement applied the recommendations made by a Conciliation Commission (Jan Mayen Conciliation) jointly appointed by the two states (Iceland/Norway, Recommendation of 19-20 May 1981, ILR/62/1982, pp.108-136). With this agreement it is necessary to consider the Additional Protocol of 11 November 1997, which determines a short segment that joins the 200-mile line from Iceland with the Trijunction point agreed with Denmark (Greenland).

(14) In 1978, Portugal defined the limits of its EEZ (Decree Law No. 119/78, of 1 June), and extended its jurisdiction up to the equidistance line between the two states. Spain protested on the grounds that the EEZ boundary did not follow the parallel and the meridian adopted for the CS boundary.

(15) This agreement become provisionally applicable since 1 January 1978 for successive periods while waiting ratification.

(16) Bulgaria ratified the LOSC on 15 May 1996.

(17) Equatorial Guinea ratified the LOSC on 21 July 1997.

(18) Gabon ratified the LOSC on 11 March 1998.

(19) Iceland ratified the LOSC on 21 June 1985.

(20) Indonesia ratified the LOSC on 3 February 1986.

(21) Japan ratified the LOSC on 20 June 1996.

(22) The Netherlands ratified the LOSC on 28 June 1996.

(23) Norway ratified the LOSC on 24 June 1996.

(24) Poland Federation ratified the LOSC on 13 November 1998.

(25) Romania ratified the LOSC on 17 December 1996.

(26) Saint Lucia ratified the LOSC on 27 March 1985.

(27) Saint Vincent and the Grenadines ratified the LOSC on 1 October 1993.

(28) France protested this legislation on the following grounds: first, it established unilaterally the boundary between the two states where an agreement was required by international law; secondly, it did so on the basis of equidistance which was not deemed by France to be an equitable solution in casu (LOS Bulletin No. 38, p. 54).

(29) Sweden Federation ratified the LOSC on 25 June 1996.

(30) Ukraine only became party to the LOSC on 26 July 1999.

(31) The United Kingdom ratified the LOSC on 25 July 1997.


(33) Italy was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.

(34) Argentina and Chile were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.

(35) This Treaty provides for different CS and EEZ boundaries.

(36) Australia and the Solomon Islands were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.

(37) Belgium and France were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.

(38) Belgium and the United Kingdom were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(39) Myanmar and India were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(40) Honduras was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(41) Costa Rica was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(42) Germany acceded the LOSC in 1994. When this agreement was signed, the Germany D.R. was not a party to the LOSC.
(43) Denmark and Sweden were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(44) Dominica and France were not parties to LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(45) France was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(46) The LOSC was ratified by Finland in June 1996, and by the Russian Federation in 1997. When this agreement was signed neither Finland, nor the USSR were parties to the LOSC.
(47) Finland and Sweden were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(48) France and the United Kingdom were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(49) When these agreements were signed neither Poland, nor Germany (Germany D.R.) were parties to the LOSC. This agreement was necessary due to the reunification of Germany.
(50) India and Myanmar (Burma) were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(51) Ireland and the United Kingdom were not parties to the LOSC when the agreements were finalised.
(52) The Russian Federation ratified the LOSC in 1997. When this agreement was signed, the USSR was not a party to the LOSC.
(53) The USSR was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(54) Mozambique was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(55) Article 2 of the Agreement prescribes that, if any of the two states decides to establish an EEZ, the same boundary line will be applicable. Belgium was not party to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(56) Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(57) Poland and Sweden were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(58) When this agreement was signed, Poland, Sweden and the USSR were not parties to the LOSC.
(59) France and the Solomon Islands were not parties to the LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(60) The Russian Federation ratified the LOSC in 1997. When this agreement was signed, the USSR was not a party to the LOSC.
(61) Cambodia protested this agreement on the grounds that it makes reference to a maritime boundary between Vietnam and Cambodia which this state argues “has never agreed to” and violates thus its EEZ and CS rights in the Gulf of Thailand. Reference is made to the need to effect delimitation by agreement and to arrive at an equitable solution (LOS Bulletin No. 37, p. 95).
(62) The Russian Federation ratified the LOSC in 1997. When this agreement was signed, the USSR was not a party to the LOSC.
(63) The United Kingdom was not party to LOSC when this agreement was finalised.
(64) When this agreement was signed, Poland and the USSR were not parties to the LOSC.
APPENDIX 3

ASPECTS OF CHART PROJECTIONS

Contents:
Summary of Features and Attributes of Five Different Projections
Practical Simplifications of Features and Attributes of Projections
Projections: Projection Surface and Graticule
Distortions in the Mercator Projection
Comparison between the Mercator Projection and the Lambert Conformal Projection
Summary of features and attributes of five different projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES AND ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>MERCATOR</th>
<th>TRANSVERSE MERCATOR</th>
<th>LAMBERT CONFORMAL</th>
<th>Gnomonic</th>
<th>STEREOGRAPHIC (POLAR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meridians (M)</td>
<td>Parallel straight lines, equally spaced</td>
<td>Curves, concave toward central meridian, with increasing curvature away from it</td>
<td>Straight lines, which converge at the vertex of the projecting cone</td>
<td>Straight lines, which converge toward the nearest pole</td>
<td>Straight lines, which converge to the point of tangency (pole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallels (P)</td>
<td>Parallel straight lines, not equally spaced</td>
<td>Curves, concave toward nearest pole</td>
<td>Concentric circles, arcs nearly equally spaced</td>
<td>Curves (conic sections) except the Equator</td>
<td>Concentric circles, not equally spaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-P Angle</td>
<td>90°</td>
<td>90°</td>
<td>90°</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxodromes</td>
<td>Straight lines</td>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>Curves</td>
<td>Curves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Circles</td>
<td>Curves, excepting the meridians</td>
<td>Curves, with increasing curvature away from central meridian</td>
<td>Curves, with increasing curvature away from standard parallels</td>
<td>Straight line</td>
<td>Curves, with increasing curvature away from point of tangency (pole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Scale</td>
<td>Middle latitude between the points considered</td>
<td>Similar to Mercator charts, with the central meridianassuming the place of the Equator</td>
<td>Variable, increasing away from standard parallels</td>
<td>Increases rapidly away from the centre of the projection</td>
<td>Variable, increasing away from the point of tangency (pole)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction (Azimuth)</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Grid direction (related to the “grid north”)</td>
<td>Grid direction (related to the “grid north”)</td>
<td>Grid direction (related to the “grid north”)</td>
<td>Grid direction (related to the “grid north”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distortion of Shapes and Areas</td>
<td>Increases away from Equator, with dramatic effects at high latitudes</td>
<td>Variable, noticeable especially away from central meridian</td>
<td>Variable, noticeable especially away from standard parallels</td>
<td>Increases greatly away from the centre of the projection</td>
<td>Increases away from the point of tangency (pole)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practical simplifications of some of the features and attributes of projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES AND ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>MAP PROJECTIONS / SOME PRACTICAL SIMPLIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANVERSE MERCATOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geodesics</td>
<td>On large-scale charts (using UTM grid), near the central meridian may be approximated to straight lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance scale</td>
<td>On large-scale charts, the chart-grid azimuth may be converted into a geodetic azimuth with a simple sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction (Azimuth)</td>
<td>On large-scale charts, covering areas near the point of tangency, may be approximated to geodetic azimuth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distortion of shapes and areas</td>
<td>On large-scale charts (using UTM grid), covering areas near the central meridian, it is almost negligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In technical-theoretical terms, these characteristics cannot be seen as an accurate general statement regarding the attributes of these projections. This table is an attempt to simplify cartographic aspects that are rather complex.
PROJECTIONS

"Projection Surface"  Graticule

MERCATOR

CONICAL LAMBERT

TRANSVERSE MERCATOR

STEREOGRAPHIC
DISTORTIONS IN THE MERCATOR PROJECTION
(Factor of distortion indicated in the scale at the centre of the map)
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AFDI – Annuaire Français de Droit International
AIDI – Annuaire de l’Institute de Droit International
AJIL – American Journal of International Law
AO – Advisory Opinions of the ICJ
ASIL – American Society of International Law
AW – Archipelagic Waters
AYIL – Australian Yearbook of International Law

bpd – barrels per day

CD – Chart Datum
CLCS – Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf
CLCS/Guidelines – Scientific and Technical Guidelines of the Commission on the Limits
of the Continental Shelf, United Nations (Doc.CLCS/11, 13 May 1999)
CLCS/RoP – Rules of Procedure of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental
Shelf, United Nations (Doc.CLCS/3/Rev.3, 6 February 2001)
CLJ – Cambridge Law Journal
COLP – Center for Oceans Law and Policy, University of Virginia
CS – Continental Shelf
CS Convention – 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf
CZ – Contiguous Zone

DOALOS – Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, United Nations

EEZ – Exclusive Economic Zone
Eritrea/Yemen-I – Arbitral Award of 9 October 1998, on Territorial Sovereignty and
Scope of the Dispute between Eritrea and Yemen
Eritrea/Yemen-II – Arbitral Award of 17 December 1999, on Maritime Delimitation
between Eritrea and Yemen
EZ – Economic Zone
EFZ – Exclusive Fisheries Zone
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FHS Convention – 1958 Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas
FZ – Fisheries Zone

GA Res. – Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations
GPS – Global Positioning System

HRLJ – Human Rights Law Journal
HJ – The Hydrographic Journal
HS Convention – 1958 Convention on the High Seas

IBRU – International Boundaries Research Unit (University of Durham, UK)
ICJ – International Court of Justice
ICJ/Pleadings – Pleadings, Oral Arguments, Documents, of the ICJ
ICJ/Reports – Reports of Judgements, Advisory Opinions and Orders, of the ICJ
ICJ/Statute – Statute of the International Court of Justice
ICNT – Informal Composite Negotiating Text of the LOSC
IHO – International Hydrographic Organisation
IHO/Dictionary – Hydrographic Dictionary, Monaco, International Hydrographic Bureau
IHO/Resolutions – Technical Resolutions of the International Hydrographic Organisation, Monaco, International Hydrographic Bureau
IHO/S-23 – IHO, Special Publication No. 23
IHO/S-44 – IHO, Special Publication No. 44
IHO/S-52 – IHO, Special Publication No. 52
IHO/S-60 – IHO, Special Publication No. 60
IHO/Specifications – Charts Specifications of the IHO and Regulations of the IHO for International (INT) Charts, Monaco, International Hydrographic Bureau
IHR – International Hydrographic Review
IJMCL – International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law
ILA – International Law Association
ILC – International Law Commission
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ILC/Yearbook – Yearbook of the International Law Commission
ILM – International Legal Materials
ILR – International Law Reports
IMB/Report – Report included in IMB
ISA – International Seabed Authority
ISNT – Informal Single Negotiating Text of the LOSC
ITLOS – International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
IW – Internal Waters

JDA – Joint Development Area
JDZ – Joint Development Zone
JFA – Joint Fisheries Area
JRA – Joint Régime Area
JRHW – Juridical Regime of Historic Waters (Study prepared by the UN Secretariat)

LOS – Law of the Sea
LS – Limits in the Seas, International Boundary Study, Series A, US Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research

M – International Nautical Mile; the international nautical mile, the value of which is 1852 metres, as approved by the 1929 International Hydrographic Conference
MOU – Memorandum of Understanding
MP – Marine Policy

NIEO – New International Economic Order
NYIL – Netherlands Yearbook of International Law
ODIL – Ocean Development and International Law


PCA – Permanent Court of Arbitration

PCIJ – Permanent Court of International Justice


Qatar/Bahrain-Merits – Judgment of 16 March 2001, concerning Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain

RBDI – Revue Belge de Droit International

RIAA – Reports of International Arbitral Awards

RSNT – Revised Single Negotiating Text of the LOSC

RSZ – Revenue Sharing Zone

SDLR – San Diego Law Review

SMB – Single Maritime Boundary

sq.km – square kilometre

sq.M – square nautical mile

ST/LEG/SER.B/1 – Laws and Regulations on the Regime of the High Seas, Volume I, United Nations Legislative Series, 1951

ST/LEG/SER.B/8 – Supplement to Laws and Regulations on the Regime of the High Seas (Volumes I and II)..., United Nations Legislative Series, 1959

ST/LEG/SER.B/15 – National Legislation and Treaties Relating to the Territorial Sea, the Contiguous Zone, the Continental Shelf ..., United Nations Legislative Series, 1970


tcf – trillion cubic feet (gas reserves)


TS – Territorial Sea

TS/CZ Convention – 1958 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone

UN – United Nations


UN Doc. – United Nations Document (followed by its identification)

UN/NLCS – National Legislation on the Continental Shelf, United Nations, 1989

UN/NLEEZ – National Legislation on the Exclusive Economic Zone, the Economic Zone and the Exclusive Fishery Zone, United Nations, 1986


UN/Yearbook – Yearbook of the United Nations

UNTS – United Nations Treaty Series

US – Cases Argued and Decided in the Supreme Court of the United States


VCSSRT – 1978 Vienna Convention on the Succession of States in Respect to Treaties

WCR – World Court Reports: A Collection of Judgments, Orders and Opinions of the Permanent Court of International Justice (edited by Manley O. Hudson)

WGS 84 – World Geodetic System 1984
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