

**DECLARATIONS OF STATES PARTIES RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES IN
ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 287 (CHOICE OF PROCEDURE)**

Algeria

[Original: Arabic and French]

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 287, paragraph 1 (b), of the [said Convention] dealing with the submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that, in order to submit a dispute to the International Court of Justice, prior agreement between all the Parties concerned is necessary in each case.

Angola

“The Government of Angola declares, under paragraph 1 of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea done at Montego Bay on the tenth day of December one thousand nine hundred and eighty-two that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Argentina

[Original: Spanish]

In accordance with the provisions of article 287, the Argentine Government declares that it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

- (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea;
- (b) an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, in accordance with Annex VIII, article 1.

Australia

“The Government of Australia declares, under paragraph 1 of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea done at Montego Bay on the tenth day of December one thousand nine hundred and eighty-two that it chooses the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, without specifying that one has precedence over the other:

- (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention; and
- (b) the International Court of Justice.”

Austria

“In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it would give preference the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby chooses one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the [United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Agreement relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea] in accordance with article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the following order:

1. The international Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
2. A special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
3. The International Court of Justice.

Also in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.”

Bangladesh

Declaration made on 14 December 2009

“Pursuant to Article 287, paragraph 1 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh declares that it accepts the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of dispute between the People’s Republic of Bangladesh and the Union of Myanmar relating to the delimitation of their maritime boundary in the Bay of Bengal.”

Declaration made on 14 December 2009

“Pursuant to Article 287, paragraph 1 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh declares that it accepts the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of dispute between the People’s Republic of Bangladesh and the Republic of India relating to the delimitation of their maritime boundary in the Bay of Bengal.”

Belarus

Declaration made upon signature

[Original: Russian]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it accepts, as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in relation to questions of the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292.

Declaration made upon ratification

[Original: Russian]

In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus accepts as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the settlement of disputes concerning fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation,

including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Republic of Belarus will use a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Republic of Belarus recognizes the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea over questions concerning the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292 of the Convention.

Belgium

Declaration made upon signature

[Original: French]

In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it obviously gives priority, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium deems it expedient to choose alternatively, and in order of preference, as Article 287 of the Convention leaves it free to do, the following means of settling disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
2. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Still in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium wishes here and now to recognize the validity of the special arbitration procedure for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the provisions of the Convention in respect of fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

Declaration made upon ratification

[Original: French]

In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the Kingdom of Belgium hereby declares that it chooses, as a means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, in view of its preference for pre-established jurisdictions, either the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI (art. 287.1(a)) or the International Court of Justice (art. 287.1(b)), in the absence of any other means of peaceful settlement of disputes that it might prefer.

Canada

[Original: English and French]

“With regard to article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Canada hereby chooses the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention without specifying that one has precedence over the other:

- (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention; and
- (b) an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of the Convention.”

Cape Verde

“The Republic of Cape Verde declares that, in the absence of or failing any other peaceful means, it chooses, in order of preference and in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the following procedures for the settlement of disputes regarding the interpretation or

application of the said Convention:

- (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea;
- (b) the International Court of Justice.”

Chile

[Original: Spanish]

With regard to part XV of the Convention, the Republic of Chile declares that:

- (a) In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:
 - (i) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI;
 - (ii) A special arbitral tribunal, established in accordance with annex VIII, for the categories of disputes specified therein relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, and marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.
- (b) In accordance with articles 280 to 282 of the Convention, the choice of means for the settlement of disputes indicated in the preceding paragraph shall in no way affect the obligations deriving from the general, regional or bilateral agreements to which the Republic of Chile is a party concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes or containing provisions for the settlement of disputes.

Croatia

“In implementation of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Republic of Croatia has the honour to declare that, for the settlement of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention and of the Agreement adopted on 28 July 1994 relating to the Implementation of Part XI, it chooses, in order of preference, the following means:
1. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
2. The International Court of Justice.”

Cuba

[Original: Spanish]

With regard to article 287 on the choice of procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and, consequently, will not accept either the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the provisions of either article 297 or 298.

Denmark

“The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Egypt

[Original: Arabic]

[With reference to the provisions of article 287 of the Convention] the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it accepts the arbitral procedure the modalities of which are defined in Annex VII to the Convention as the procedure for the settlement of any dispute which might arise between Egypt and any

other State concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.
The Arab Republic of Egypt further declares that it excludes from the scope of application of this procedure those disputes considered to be exceptions under article 297 of the Convention.

Estonia

“Pursuant to Article 287, paragraph 1 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of Sea established in accordance with Annex VI and the International Court of Justice as means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention.”

Fiji

“The Government of the Republic of Fiji declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Finland

“In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, Finland chooses the International Court of Justice and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea as means for settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention as well as of the Agreement relating to the Implementation of its Part XI.”

Germany

[Original: German]

In the absence of any other peaceful means, which would be given preference by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, that Government considers it useful to choose one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the two Conventions, as it is free to do under article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the following order:

1. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
2. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Also in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

Greece

“Pursuant to article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Hellenic Republic hereby choose, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI of the Convention as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Guinea-Bissau

[Original: Portuguese]

As regards article 287 on the choice of a procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, [the Government of Guinea-Bissau] does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and consequently will not accept that jurisdiction with respect to articles 297 and 298.

Honduras

[Original: Spanish]

In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the State of Honduras chooses the International Court of Justice as the means for the settlement of disputes of any kind concerning the interpretation or application of the said Convention. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the State of Honduras reserves the possibility of considering any other means of peaceful settlement, including the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as agreed on a case-by-case basis.

Hungary

“In accordance with the Article 287 of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Hungary shall choose the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention in the following order:

1. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea,
2. The International Court of Justice,
3. A special tribunal constructed in accordance with Annex VIII for all of the categories of disputes specified therein.”

Italy

“In implementation of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Italy has the honour to declare that, for the settlement of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention and of the Agreement adopted on 28 July 1994 relating to the Implementation of Part XI, it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the International Court of Justice, without specifying that one has precedence over the other.

In making this declaration under article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Italy is reaffirming its confidence in the existing international judicial organs. In accordance with article 287, paragraph 4, Italy considers that it has chosen ‘the same procedure’ as any other State Party that has chosen the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea or the International Court of Justice.”

Latvia

“In accordance with paragraph 1 of the Article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea the Republic of Latvia declares that it chooses the following means for the settlement of dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention:

- 1) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention,
- 2) The International Court of Justice.”

Lithuania

“... in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 287 of the Convention, the Republic of Lithuania chooses the following means for the settlement of dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention:

- a) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
- b) The International Court of Justice.”

Mexico

[Original: Spanish]

In accordance with the terms of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Mexico declares that it chooses, in no order of preference, one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI;
2. The International Court of Justice;
3. A special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with annex VIII for one or more of the categories of disputes specified therein.

Montenegro

“Pursuant to paragraph 1 of Article 287 of the Convention, for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, Montenegro chooses, in order of preference, (i) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention and (ii) the International Court of Justice.”

Netherlands

“The Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, having regard to article 287 of the Convention, it accepts the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention with States Parties to the Convention which have likewise accepted the said jurisdiction.”

Nicaragua

[Original: Spanish]

In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Nicaragua hereby declares that it accepts only recourse to the International Court of Justice as a means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Norway

“The Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Oman

[Original: Arabic]

Pursuant to article 287 of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman declares its acceptance of the

jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as set forth in annex VI to the Convention, and the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, with a view to the settlement of any dispute that may arise between it and another State concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Portugal

[Original: Portuguese]

For the purposes of article 287 of the Convention, Portugal declares that, in the absence of nonjudicial means for the settlement of disputes arising out of the application of this Convention, it will choose one of the following means for the settlement of disputes:

- (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, established in pursuance of Annex VI;
- (b) the International Court of Justice;
- (c) an arbitral tribunal, constituted in accordance with Annex VII;
- (d) a special arbitral tribunal, constituted in accordance with Annex VIII.

In the absence of other peaceful means for the settlement of disputes Portugal will, in accordance with Annex VIII to the Convention, choose the recourse to a special arbitral tribunal in so far as the application of the provisions of this Convention, or the interpretation thereof, to the matters relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of marine living resources and marine environment, scientific research, navigation and marine pollution are concerned.

Russian Federation

Declaration made upon signature by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

[Original: Russian]

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, under article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. It opts for a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for the consideration of matters relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, including pollution from vessels and dumping. It recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as provided for in article 292, in matters relating to the prompt release of detained vessels and crews.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

“In accordance with Article 287, of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, ... the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI, as the means of settlement of disputes concerning the arrest or detention of its vessels.”

Slovenia

“The Government of the Republic of Slovenia declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Spain

Declaration made upon ratification

[Original: Spanish]

In accordance with the provisions of article 287, paragraph 1, Spain chooses the International Court of Justice as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration made on 19 July 2002

[Original: Spanish]

Pursuant to article 287, paragraph 1, the Government of Spain declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the International Court of Justice as means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Sweden

“The Government of the Kingdom of Sweden hereby chooses, in accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention and the Agreement Implementing Part XI of the Convention.”

Switzerland

[Original: French]

The Tribunal for the Law of the Sea has been designated as the only competent organ for disputes concerning law of the sea matters.

Trinidad and Tobago

“The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago ... declare[s] that in the absence of or failing any other peaceful means, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago chooses the following means in order of priority for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea:

- (a) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
- (b) The International Court of Justice.”

Tunisia

[Original: Arabic and French]

In accordance with the provisions of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Tunisia declares that it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or implementation of the above-mentioned Convention:

- a) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea
- b) An Arbitral Tribunal established in accordance with Annex VII.

Ukraine

Declaration made upon signature by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

[Original: Russian]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Ukrainian SSR chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the competence, as stipulated in article 292, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

Declaration made upon ratification

[Original: Ukrainian]

Ukraine declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention in respect of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, Ukraine chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. Ukraine recognises the competence, as stipulated in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

“In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the [said Convention], the Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea is a new institution, which the United Kingdom hopes will make an important contribution to the peaceful settlement of disputes concerning the law of the sea. In addition to those cases where the Convention itself provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom remains ready to consider the submission of disputes to the Tribunal as may be agreed on a case-by-case basis.”

United Republic of Tanzania

“The United Republic of Tanzania declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.”

Uruguay

[Original: Spanish]

Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement.