



Predictability and Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation

— STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL LAW —

Yoshifumi Tanaka

2ND EDITION

Predictability and Flexibility
in the Law of Maritime
Delimitation

Second Edition

Yoshifumi Tanaka

• HART •

OXFORD • LONDON • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

HART PUBLISHING
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Kemp House, Chawley Park, Cumnor Hill, Oxford, OX2 9PH, UK

HART PUBLISHING, the Hart/Stag logo, BLOOMSBURY and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First edition published in 2006

This edition first published in Great Britain 2019

Copyright © Yoshifumi Tanaka, 2019

Yoshifumi Tanaka has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

While every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this work, no responsibility for loss or damage occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any statement in it can be accepted by the authors, editors or publishers.

All UK Government legislation and other public sector information used in the work is Crown Copyright ©. All House of Lords and House of Commons information used in the work is Parliamentary Copyright ©. This information is reused under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 (<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3>) except where otherwise stated.

All Eur-lex material used in the work is © European Union,
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/>, 1998–2019.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Names: Tanaka, Yoshifumi, author.

Title: Predictability and flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation / Yoshifumi Tanaka.

Description: Second edition. | Oxford ; Chicago, Illinois : Hart, an imprint of Bloomsbury, 2019. | Series: Studies in international law | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019021107 (print) | LCCN 2019022293 (ebook) | ISBN 9781509912117 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781509912094 (ePDF) | ISBN 9781509912100 (EPub)

Subjects: LCSH: Territorial waters. | Maritime boundaries.

Classification: LCC KZA1450 .T36 2019 (print) | LCC KZA1450 (ebook) | DDC 341.4/5—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019021107>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019022293>

ISBN: HB: 978-1-50991-211-7
ePDF: 978-1-50991-209-4
ePub: 978-1-50991-210-0

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon

Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.hartpublishing.co.uk.
Here you will find extracts, author information, details of forthcoming events
and the option to sign up for our newsletters.

Brief Contents

<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	v
<i>Foreword to the First Edition</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	ix
<i>Detailed Contents</i>	xiii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxv
<i>List of Illustrations</i>	xxvii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxix
<i>Table of Treaties and National Legislation</i>	xxxiii

1. Preliminary Considerations.....	1
------------------------------------	---

PART I

THE EVOLUTION OF THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION: OPPOSITION OF TWO BASIC APPROACHES

2. Law of Maritime Delimitation Prior to the 1958 Geneva Conventions: Emergence of Two Approaches	15
3. The 1958 Geneva Conventions and the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea	31
4. The Methodology of Maritime Delimitation in the Jurisprudence I: Continental Shelf Delimitation	47
5. The Methodology of Maritime Delimitation in the Jurisprudence II: Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	74

PART II

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN THE CASE LAW AND STATE PRACTICE

6. Predictability in the Law of Maritime Delimitation: The Applicability of the Equidistance Method at the First Stage of Delimitation	187
7. Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation I: Geographical Factors	204

8. Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation II:
Non-Geographical Factors 370

PART III

BALANCE BETWEEN PREDICTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY
IN THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

9. Legal Framework Reconciling Predictability and Flexibility
in the Law of Maritime Delimitation 441

10. General Conclusion 469

Appendix: State Practice Regarding Maritime Delimitation 473

Selected Bibliography 508

Index 537

Detailed Contents

<i>Preface to the Second Edition</i>	v
<i>Foreword to the First Edition</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	ix
<i>Brief Contents</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxv
<i>List of Illustrations</i>	xxvii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxix
<i>Table of Treaties and National Legislation</i>	xxxiii

1. Preliminary Considerations.....	1
I. Nature of the Problem	1
A. Importance of Maritime Delimitation in International Law of the Sea	1
B. Development of the Studies on Maritime Delimitation	2
C. Analytical Framework	4
II. Concept of Maritime Delimitation	6
A. Legal Nature of Maritime Delimitation.....	6
i. Definition	6
ii. Arguments on the Distinction between Delimitation and Apportionment	8
iii. Arguments on the Distinction between Declaratory and Constitutive Delimitation	9
B. Typology of Maritime Delimitations.....	11
i. Typology in the 1958 Geneva Conventions.....	11
ii. Typology in the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea	12

PART I

THE EVOLUTION OF THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION: OPPOSITION OF TWO BASIC APPROACHES

2. Law of Maritime Delimitation Prior to the 1958 Geneva Conventions: Emergence of Two Approaches	15
I. Five Principal Systems of Maritime Delimitation	15
A. Median-Line System	15
i. State Practice and Opinions of Writers	15
ii. Emergence of Two Prototypes	18

B.	The System of a Line Perpendicular to the General Direction of the Coast	20
i.	The Grisbadarna Case (Norway/Sweden, 1909)	20
ii.	Evaluation	21
C.	Prolongation of the Land Boundary	23
D.	<i>Thalweg</i> System	23
i.	State Practice and the Case Law	23
ii.	Evaluation	26
E.	Common-Zone System	27
II.	Discussion at the Hague Conference for the Codification of International Law in 1930	27
A.	Delimitation of Territorial Sea between States with Adjacent Coasts	27
B.	Delimitation of the Territorial Sea between States with Opposite Coasts	28
III.	Summary	29
3.	The 1958 Geneva Conventions and the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea	31
I.	The 1958 Geneva Conventions	31
A.	Rules Regarding Delimitation of Territorial Sea and the Continental Shelf	31
i.	Basic Structure of the Rules	31
ii.	Comments on the Triple Rule	34
B.	Rules on the Delimitation of Contiguous Zones and Internal Waters	36
II.	The 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea	36
A.	Analysis of Articles 74(1) and 83(1)	36
i.	Legislative History of Articles 74(1) and 83(1)	36
ii.	Problems with Articles 74(1) and 83(1)	40
B.	Analysis of Articles 74(3) and 83(3)	42
i.	Obligations under Articles 74(3) and 83(3)	42
ii.	The Lawfulness of Unilateral Exploration and Exploitation	43
4.	The Methodology of Maritime Delimitation in the Jurisprudence I: Continental Shelf Delimitation	47
I.	The <i>North Sea Continental Shelf</i> Cases (Federal Republic of Germany/Denmark, The Netherlands, ICJ, 1969)	47
A.	Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf Delimitation (1): Article 6 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf	48
i.	The Fundamental Aspects of Article 6	48
ii.	The Positive Law Aspects of Article 6	49

B.	Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf Delimitation (2):	
	Equitable Principles	52
	i. Legal Basis of Equitable Principles	52
	ii. Substance of Equitable Principles	54
II.	The <i>Anglo-French Continental Shelf</i> Case	
	(France/United Kingdom, Arbitration, 1977)	56
	A. Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf Delimitation	57
	i. Preliminary Considerations on Reservations	57
	ii. Relationship between Article 6 and Customary Law	57
	B. Application of the Law Identified.....	59
	i. Establishment of the Continental Shelf Boundary.....	59
	ii. Comparison between the 1969 and 1977 Decisions.....	61
III.	The <i>Tunisia/Libya</i> Case (ICJ, 1982).....	61
	A. Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf Delimitation	62
	i. Relationship between Equitable Principles	
	and Natural Prolongation	62
	ii. Approach to Equitable Principles.....	63
	B. Application of the Law Identified.....	65
	i. Establishment of an Illustrative Continental	
	Shelf Boundary	65
	ii. Problem of the Illustrative Boundary	67
IV.	The <i>Libya/Malta</i> Case (ICJ, 1985).....	68
	A. Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf Delimitation	69
	i. The Court's Approach to Equitable Principles.....	69
	ii. Contents of Equitable Principles.....	70
	B. Application of the Law Identified.....	71
	i. Establishment of the Illustrative Continental	
	Shelf Boundary	71
	ii. Evaluation	73
5.	The Methodology of Maritime Delimitation in the Jurisprudence II:	
	Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	74
	I. The <i>Gulf of Maine</i> Case (United States/Canada, ICJ, 1984)	74
	A. Law Applicable to the Single Maritime Boundary	75
	i. Three Levels of Structure in the Chamber's	
	Reasoning and its Problems	75
	ii. The Chamber's Approach to the Law Applicable	
	to Single Maritime Boundary	78
	B. Application of the Law Identified.....	79
	i. Operational Stage	79
	ii. Verification Stage	80
	II. The <i>Guinea/Guinea-Bissau</i> Case (Arbitration, 1985).....	80
	A. Law Applicable to the Single Maritime Boundary	81
	B. Application of the Law Identified.....	81

III.	The <i>St Pierre and Miquelon Case</i> (France/Canada, Arbitration, 1992)	82
	A. Law Applicable to the Single Maritime Boundary	83
	B. Application of the Law Identified	84
	i. Operational Stage	84
	ii. Verification Stage	85
IV.	The <i>Jan Mayen Case</i> (<i>Denmark v Norway</i> , ICJ, 1993)	86
	A. The Law Applicable to the Maritime Delimitation	87
	i. Law Applicable to the Continental Shelf	87
	ii. Law Applicable to the FZ	88
	B. Application of the Law Identified	89
	i. Consideration of the Special/Relevant Circumstances	89
	ii. Balancing the Special/Relevant Circumstances	90
V.	The <i>Eritreal/Yemen Case: The Second Stage</i> (Arbitration, 1999)	91
	A. Law Applicable to the Single Maritime Boundary	92
	B. Application of the Law Identified	93
VI.	The <i>Qatar v Bahrain Case</i> (Merits, ICJ, 2001)	96
	A. Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	97
	i. Law Applicable to Territorial Sea Delimitation	97
	ii. Law Applicable to a Single Maritime Boundary	97
	B. Application of the Law Identified	98
	i. Territorial Sea Delimitation	98
	ii. Single Maritime Boundary	101
VII.	The <i>Cameroon v Nigeria Case</i> (Merits, ICJ, 2002)	102
	A. Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	103
	B. Application of the Law Identified	105
	i. Identification of Relevant Coasts and Base Points	105
	ii. Considerations on Relevant Circumstances	106
VIII.	The <i>Barbados v Trinidad and Tobago Case</i> (Arbitration, 2006)	107
	A. Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	108
	B. Application of the Law Identified	108
	i. Delimitation in the West and Central Segment of the Line	108
	ii. Delimitation in the East	109
IX.	The <i>Guyana v Suriname Case</i> (Arbitration, 2007)	110
	A. Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	110
	i. Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	110
	ii. Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Continental Shelf and EEZ	111

B.	Application of the Law Identified	112
i.	Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	112
ii.	Delimitation of the Continental Shelf and EEZ	113
X.	The <i>Nicaragua v Honduras</i> Case (ICJ, 2007)	113
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation.....	114
i.	The Existence of the Traditional Maritime Boundary.....	114
ii.	The Methodology of the Court.....	116
B.	Application of the Law Identified	119
i.	Establishment of a Single Maritime Boundary	119
ii.	Starting-point and Endpoint of the Maritime Boundary.....	120
XI.	The <i>Black Sea Case</i> (Romania v Ukraine, ICJ, 2009)	121
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation.....	121
B.	Application of the Law Identified	123
i.	Construction of the Provisional Equidistance Line.....	123
ii.	Considerations on Relevant Circumstances and the Disproportionality Test.....	125
XII.	The <i>Bangladesh/Myanmar</i> Case (ITLOS, 2012)	126
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation.....	127
i.	Law Application to the Single Maritime Boundary.....	127
ii.	Law Applicable to the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Nautical Miles	129
B.	Application of the Law Identified	129
i.	Delimitation of the Territorial Sea Boundary.....	129
ii.	Delimitation of the EEZ and the Continental Shelf.....	130
XIII.	The <i>Nicaragua v Colombia</i> Case (Merits, ICJ, 2012)	135
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation.....	136
B.	Application of the Law Identified	138
i.	Construction of the Provisional Equidistance/ Median Line	138
ii.	Considerations of Relevant Circumstances and the Disproportionality Test.....	139
XIV.	The <i>Peru v Chile</i> Case (ICJ, 2014).....	141
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation.....	141
i.	The Existence of an Agreed Maritime Boundary	141
ii.	Maritime Delimitation from Point A	142
B.	Application of the Law Identified	143
i.	Construction of the Provisional Equidistance Line.....	143
ii.	Considerations of Relevant Circumstances and the Disproportionality Test.....	143

XV.	The <i>Bangladesh v India</i> Case (Arbitration, 2014)	144
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	144
i.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	144
ii.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Continental Shelf and EEZ	145
B.	Application of the Law Identified	147
i.	Establishment of the Territorial Sea Boundary	147
ii.	Establishment of the Boundary of the EEZ and Continental Shelf	147
XVI.	The <i>Croatia/Slovenia</i> Case (Arbitration, 2017)	150
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	151
i.	Law Applicable to the Delimitation of the Bay	151
ii.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	152
B.	Application of the Law Identified	153
i.	Establishment of the Boundary in the Bay	153
ii.	Establishment of the Territorial Sea Boundary	153
XVII.	The <i>Ghana/Côte d'Ivoire</i> Case (ITLOS, 2017)	155
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	155
i.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	155
ii.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the EEZ and the Continental Shelf	156
B.	Application of the Law Identified	158
i.	Construction of the Provisional Equidistance Line	158
ii.	Considerations of Relevant Circumstances and the Disproportionality Test	159
XVIII.	The <i>Costa Rica v Nicaragua</i> Case (ICJ, 2018)	160
A.	Law Applicable to Maritime Delimitation	160
i.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the Territorial Sea	160
ii.	Law Applicable to Delimitation of the EEZ and the Continental Shelf	161
B.	Application of the Law Identified	161
i.	Establishment of the Territorial Sea Boundary	161
ii.	Establishment of the Boundary of the EEZ and the Continental Shelf	163
XIX.	Analysis of Approaches to the Maritime Delimitation	164
A.	Evolution of the Methodology of Maritime Delimitation	164
i.	Toward the Unification of the Methodology of the Maritime Delimitation	164
ii.	Discussion	168

B. Delimitation of the Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Nautical Miles.....	171
i. Jurisdiction of an International Court or Tribunal to Delimit a Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Nautical Miles.....	171
ii. Methodology of the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf Beyond 200 Nautical Miles.....	181

PART II

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN
THE CASE LAW AND STATE PRACTICE

6. Predictability in the Law of Maritime Delimitation: The Applicability of the Equidistance Method at the First Stage of Delimitation.....	187
I. Method of Analysis.....	187
A. Importance of Comparative Analysis between the Case Law and State Practice.....	187
B. Concept of Predictability.....	188
II. Analysis of State Practice.....	189
A. The Equidistance Method in State Practice.....	189
i. Method of Analysis.....	189
ii. The Results.....	190
B. Evaluation.....	191
i. Extensive and Virtually Uniform State Practice.....	191
ii. Existence of <i>Opinio Juris</i>	192
III. Interlinkage between Legal Title and Method of Delimitation.....	194
A. Concept of Legal Title in Maritime Delimitation.....	194
B. Relationship between Legal Title and Delimitation Method in the Case Law.....	196
7. Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation I: Geographical Factors.....	204
I. Introduction.....	204
II. Configuration of the Coast.....	204
A. Opposite or Adjacent Coasts.....	205
i. Analysis of the Case Law.....	205
ii. Analysis of State Practice.....	206
B. Concave or Convex Coasts.....	207
i. Analysis of the Case Law.....	207
ii. Analysis of State Practice.....	211
C. General Direction of the Coast.....	212
i. Analysis of the Case Law.....	212
ii. Analysis of State Practice.....	215
D. Summary.....	215

III.	Proportionality.....	216
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	216
i.	The First Phase (1969–2007): Development of the Concept of Proportionality in the Jurisprudence Concerning Maritime Delimitation	216
ii.	The Second Phase (2009–Present): Disproportionality as an <i>Ex Post Facto</i> Test at the Third Stage of Maritime Delimitation.....	232
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	238
i.	Agreements Regarding Continental Shelf Boundaries	238
ii.	Agreements Regarding Single Maritime Boundaries	239
C.	Summary.....	241
IV.	Presence of Islands	242
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	243
i.	Islands in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	243
ii.	Islands in the Context of the Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	251
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	265
i.	Offshore Islands	266
ii.	Islands ‘on the Wrong Side’	270
iii.	Detached Islands (Islands as the Sole Unit of Entitlement)	271
iv.	Island States	274
C.	Summary.....	274
V.	Baselines and Base Points.....	275
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	276
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	276
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single Maritime Boundaries	278
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	286
i.	Straight Baselines Which Did Not Influence the Maritime Delimitation	286
ii.	Straight Baselines Which Did Influence the Maritime Delimitation	289
C.	Summary.....	291
VI.	Geological and Geomorphological Factors.....	292
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	293
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	293
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	294

B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	297
i.	Agreements Regarding Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	297
ii.	Agreements Regarding Single Maritime Boundaries	302
C.	Summary.....	304
VII.	The Presence of Third States	305
A.	Analysis of the Case Law.....	306
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	306
ii.	Arguments in the Judgments on Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	309
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	321
i.	Establishment of a Tri-Junction Point.....	321
ii.	Agreements Which Provide for Future Delimitation with Third States	322
C.	Summary	323
VIII.	Position of Land Boundary.....	325
A.	Analysis of the Case Law.....	325
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	325
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single Maritime Boundaries	326
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	330
i.	Starting Point of Maritime Boundaries	330
ii.	Prolongation of a Land Boundary	331
C.	Summary	332
IX.	Presence of Ice	333
A.	Analysis of the Case Law: The <i>Jan Mayen</i> Case.....	333
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	333
C.	Summary	333
X.	Conclusions	334
II.	Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation II:	
Non-Geographical Factors.....		370
I.	Economic Factors	370
A.	Analysis of the Case Law.....	371
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations.....	371
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	373
B.	Analysis of State Practice.....	380
i.	Agreements Regarding Delimitations of Continental Shelf	380

ii.	Agreements Regarding Single Maritime Boundaries	381
iii.	Three Flexible Solutions in State Practice	383
C.	Summary	392
II.	Conduct of the Parties	394
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	394
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations	394
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	396
B.	Analysis of State Practice	407
i.	Agreements Regarding Continental Shelf Delimitations	407
ii.	Agreements Regarding Single Maritime Boundaries	408
C.	Summary	408
III.	Historic Rights	409
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	409
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations	409
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	412
B.	Analysis of State Practice	415
C.	Summary	416
IV.	Security Interests	417
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	417
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations	417
ii.	Arguments in the Context of Single/Coincident Maritime Boundaries	419
B.	Analysis of State Practice	422
C.	Summary	424
V.	Navigational Interests	425
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	425
i.	Arguments in the Context of Continental Shelf Delimitations	425
ii.	Arguments in the Context of the Territorial Sea and Single Maritime Boundaries	427
B.	Analysis of State Practice	429
i.	Agreements Regarding Territorial Sea Delimitations	429
ii.	Agreements Regarding Continental Shelf Delimitations and Single Maritime Boundaries	430
C.	Summary	431
VI.	Environmental Factors	432
A.	Analysis of the Case Law	432
B.	Analysis of State Practice	433
C.	Summary	435

VII. Traditional Livelihood	436
A. Analysis of the Case Law	436
B. Analysis of State Practice	436
VIII. Conclusions	437

PART III

BALANCE BETWEEN PREDICTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY
IN THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION

9. Legal Framework Reconciling Predictability and Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation	441
I. Tension between Predictability and Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation	441
II. General Observation	443
A. General Trend of the Case Law	444
B. Formation of the Case Law of Maritime Delimitation	446
III. Assessment of Relevant Circumstances	450
A. Scope of Relevant Circumstances	450
i. Two Hypotheses	450
ii. The Attempt to Establish a Legal Framework of Relevant Circumstances	452
B. Balancing Relevant Circumstances	454
i. The Balancing of Relevant Circumstances in State Practice	454
ii. The Balancing Relevant Circumstances in the Case Law	456
IV. Problems with the Application of the Three-Stage Approach	458
A. Problems with the First Stage of Maritime Delimitation: Subjectivity in the Construction of a Provisional Equidistance Line	458
B. Problems with the Second Stage of Maritime Delimitation: The Manner of an Adjustment of the Provisional Equidistance Line	460
C. Problems with the Third Stage of Maritime Delimitations: Subjectivity in the Application of the Disproportionality Test	463
V. Conclusions	466
10. General Conclusion	469
Appendix: State Practice Regarding Maritime Delimitation	473
<i>Selected Bibliography</i>	508
<i>Index</i>	537