

ARBITRATION UNDER ANNEX VII OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

REPUBLIC OF GUYANA


v.

REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

COUNTER-MEMORIAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

VOLUME I

1 NOVEMBER 2005



ARBITRATION UNDER ANNEX VII OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

v.

REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

COUNTER-MEMORIAL OF THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME

VOLUME I

1 NOVEMBER 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Figures Appearing in Volume I of the Counter-Memorial of Suriname	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. Summary of Procedure	1
II. Contentions of Guyana	2
III. Overview of Suriname’s Position	3
IV. Organization of the Counter-Memorial	5
CHAPTER 2.....	6
POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT	6
I. Points of Agreement	6
A. The Tribunal Will Determine a Single Maritime Boundary	6
B. The Single Maritime Boundary Will Stop at a Point Where It First Reaches the 200-Nautical-Mile Limit Measured from the Baseline of One of the Parties	6
C. Geological Circumstances Are Not Relevant	7
D. The Relevant Coasts Are Adjacent, and They Meet at a Point at Which the General Direction of the Coast Changes	7
II. Points of Disagreement	7
A. Can the Land Boundary Terminus Be Determined by Establishing a Closing Line Across the Mouth of the Corantijn River?	7
B. Does the Absence of Agreement on the Land Boundary Terminus Preclude a Maritime Delimitation by the Tribunal?	9
C. Is the Territorial Sea Boundary Established?.....	10
D. What Is the Course of the Single Maritime Boundary?.....	10
E. Did the Colonial Powers Reach an Agreement Binding on the Parties Concerning the Boundary on the Continental Shelf?.....	10
F. Are the Parties Bound by the 1958 Geneva Conventions?.....	11

G. What Is the Role of the Conduct of the Parties as a Relevant Circumstance in the International Law of Maritime Boundary Delimitation?.....	11
H. Are the Maritime Boundary Positions of Suriname or Guyana Taken Against Third Countries Relevant in This Case?.....	12
I. Is There a <i>Modus Vivendi</i> with Respect to the 34° Line? Is There a <i>Modus Vivendi</i> with Respect to the Area of Overlapping Claims?	13
J. Did the 3 June 2000 Incident Occur in Disputed Waters?.....	13
K. Which Country Was Responsible for the 3 June 2000 Incident?	14
L. Which Country Was Responsible for the Parties' Failure to Enter into Provisional Measures of a Practical Nature Prior to Guyana's Institution of These Proceedings?	14
M. Should the Tribunal Uphold Suriname's Preliminary Objections?	14
CHAPTER 3.....	15
THE SINGLE MARITIME BOUNDARY LINES CLAIMED BY THE PARTIES	15
I. Suriname's Consistent 10° Line Position.....	15
A. The Genesis of the 10° Line and the Delimitation of the Territorial Waters	15
B. Suriname's Approach Regarding the Delimitation of the Continental Shelf and the Exclusive Economic Zone.....	19
II. The Evolution of Guyana's Position.....	24
A. Acceptance of the 10° Line for the Territorial Waters Boundary	24
B. The Combined 10° Line/Equidistance Line Position.....	24
C. Disavowal of the 10° Line for the Territorial Sea Boundary	25
D. Guyana's Adoption of the 34° Line for the Continental Shelf and an Equidistance Line for the Exclusive Economic Zone	28
E. The Various Purported Equidistance Lines Employed in Guyana's Memorial.....	30
F. Guyana's "Historical Equidistance Line" Is Neither Historical Nor Equidistant	34
III. A Comparison of the Evolution of the Positions of the Parties	36

A. Suriname’s Consistent Practice.....	36
B. Guyana’s Inconsistent Practice.....	37
CHAPTER 4.....	38
THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION APPLICABLE IN THIS CASE.....	38
I. The Single Maritime Boundary	38
A. The Parties’ Agreement That the Tribunal Will Establish a Single Maritime Boundary and Its Legal Implications	38
B. The History of the Single Maritime Boundary in the Judgments of the International Court of Justice and Arbitral Tribunals	39
II. The Legal Regime of the Single Maritime Boundary and the Entitlement of Adjacent Coastal States to the Maritime Areas in Front of Their Respective Coasts	44
A. The Entitlement of Adjacent Coastal States to the Maritime Area That Lies in Front of Their Respective Coasts	45
1. <i>Coastal Geography as the Essential Factor</i>	45
2. <i>The Natural Prolongation of the Coast</i>	46
B. The Requirement to Divide Any Area of Overlapping Coastal Front Entitlements Equitably	48
C. The Limited Legal Relevance of the Conduct of the Parties	51
D. The Procedural Role of the Equidistance Method	53
E. Conclusion	57
III. The Territorial Sea Boundary Has Been Established	57
CHAPTER 5.....	63
THERE IS NO <i>MODUS VIVENDI</i> PERTAINING TO A BOUNDARY LINE	63
I. The Limits of the Areas in Which the Parties Have Granted Oil Concessions Has Evidenced an Area of Overlapping Claims	64
A. The Establishment of the Western Limits of Suriname’s Oil Concessions.....	65
B. The Establishment of the Eastern Limits of Guyana’s Oil Concessions.....	65
C. The Overlapping Oil Concession Limits on a Year-by-Year Basis.....	66

1.	<i>The Status of Concessions in 1965 and 1966</i>	68
2.	<i>Period from 1967 to 1975</i>	69
3.	<i>Period from 1976 to 1979</i>	72
4.	<i>Period from 1980 to 1987</i>	73
5.	<i>Period from 1988 to 1996</i>	76
6.	<i>Period from 1997 to 2000</i>	78
II.	Comparison of the Suriname-Guyana Oil Concession History with the Oil Concession History in the <i>Tunisia/Libya</i> Case	81
III.	Staatsolie’s Award of an Operating Agreement in 1999 That Did Not Extend Throughout the Disputed Area Was Consistent with Suriname’s International Obligations Not to Jeopardize or Hamper a Final Maritime Boundary Settlement and Did Not Create a <i>Modus Vivendi</i>	83
	A. The Facts	83
	B. The Law	88
IV.	Although Legally Irrelevant, the Fishery and Other Law Enforcement Facts Support Suriname’s Position	90
	CHAPTER 6	93
	APPLICATION OF THE LAW TO THE FACTS	93
I.	The Relevant Geographic Circumstances	93
	A. The Coasts of Suriname and Guyana Are Adjacent Coasts.....	93
	B. The Coastlines of Suriname and Guyana Change Direction Where They Meet	93
	C. The Coast of Suriname and Its Concave Characteristics	94
	D. The Coast of Guyana and Its Convex Characteristics	95
II.	The Provisional Equidistance Line	95
	A. The Construction of the Provisional Equidistance Line	96
	B. Characteristics of the Provisional Equidistance Line	96
III.	The Inequitable Characteristics of the Provisional Equidistance Line	98
	A. The Provisional Equidistance Line Cuts Off the Extension of Suriname’s Coastal Front into the Sea.....	99

B.	The Cut-off of Suriname's Coastal Front Is Caused by the Effect of Minor Coastal Configurations on the Provisional Equidistance Line	99
1.	<i>Guyana's Convex Coastal Configuration Pushes the Provisional Equidistance Line Across the Coastal Front of Suriname</i>	100
2.	<i>The Relatively Recessed Nature of the Coast of Suriname Pulls the Provisional Equidistance Line Across the Coastal Front of Suriname</i>	100
3.	<i>Coastal Accretion and Erosion</i>	100
C.	If the Provisional Equidistance Line Is Inequitable, the Claim Line of Guyana Is Manifestly Inequitable.....	101
IV.	The 10° Line Respects the Extension of the Coastal Fronts of the Parties and Results in an Equitable Division of the Area of Overlapping Coastal Front Projections	101
A.	The Coastal Fronts	102
1.	<i>Suriname's Coastal Front</i>	102
2.	<i>Guyana's Coastal Front</i>	102
3.	<i>The Area of Overlapping Coastal Front Projections</i>	102
B.	The 10° Line Divides the Area of Overlapping Coastal Front Projections Equitably	102
1.	<i>The 10° Line as the Territorial Sea Boundary</i>	103
2.	<i>The Prolongation of the Suriname-Guyana Land Boundary Is a Relevant Circumstance in the Establishment of the Single Maritime Boundary Beyond the Territorial Sea</i>	104
3.	<i>The Relative Length of the Relevant Coasts Is a Relevant Circumstance in the Establishment of the Single Maritime Boundary Beyond the Territorial Sea</i>	105
	CHAPTER 7	107
	SURINAME'S RESPONSE TO GUYANA'S SUBMISSION 2	107
I.	The Relevant Facts.....	107
II.	Guyana's Joining of the Boundary Dispute with Questions of State Responsibility Is Inconsistent with State Practice and the Practice of Courts and Tribunals.....	111

III. The International Law of State Responsibility	112
IV. Guyana Has Suffered No Loss and Alone Bears the Consequences of Offering Contracts Concerning Areas for Which It Does Not Have Secure Title	113
V. Guyana Breached Its Duty Under Articles 74(3) and 83(3) of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention When It Authorized Drilling in a Disputed Area	116
CHAPTER 8	119
SURINAME’S RESPONSE TO GUYANA’S SUBMISSION 3	119
I. The Relevant Facts	119
II. The Law	122
III. Guyana, Not Suriname, Breached Its Duties Under Articles 74(3) and 83(3) of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention	123
CHAPTER 9	125
SUBMISSIONS	125
List of Documents Annexed to This Counter-Memorial	126

**LIST OF FIGURES APPEARING IN VOLUME I OF THE
COUNTER-MEMORIAL OF SURINAME**

	Following Page
The Area in Dispute (Figure 1).....	10
Location of 3 June 2000 Incident (Figure 2).....	14
Comparison of Line Constructed on Basis of 1977 Maritime Boundaries Act of Guyana to Guyana's 34° Claim Line (Figure 3).....	30
Comparison of Guyana's Fishery Zone "Eastern Boundary" to the 1977 Maritime Boundaries Act Line and Guyana's 34° Claim Line (Figure 4).....	30
Fishing Vessels Arrested by Guyana (Figure 5).....	30
1964 Colmar Map (Figure 6).....	66
Overlapping Concessions: 1965-1966 (Figure 7).....	66
Maps of Oil Concessions in Area of Overlapping Claims:	
1965-1966 (Figure 8).....	66
1967-1969 (Figure 9).....	66
1970 (Figure 10).....	66
1971 (Figure 11).....	70
1972-1974 (Figure 12).....	70
1975 (Figure 13).....	70
1976-1978 (Figure 14).....	70
1979 (Figure 15).....	70
1980 (Figure 16).....	70
1981 (Figure 17).....	70
1982-1983 (Figure 18).....	70
1984-1987 (Figure 19).....	76
1988-1991 (Figure 20).....	76
1992 (Figure 21).....	76
1993-1995 (Figure 22).....	76
1996 (Figure 23).....	76
1997 (Figure 24).....	76
1998 (Figure 25).....	76
1999-2000 (Figure 26).....	76
Tunisia/Libya Map No. 2 (Figure 27).....	82
Extract From Libyan Memorial Map No. 3 (Figure 28).....	82
Fisheries Inspections by Suriname in the Area of Overlapping Claims: 1994-2000 (Figure 29).....	92
The Relevant Geographic Circumstances in This Case (Figure 30).....	94
Provisional Equidistance Line and Relevant Basepoints (Figure 31).....	96
Three Sections of the Provisional Equidistance Line (Figure 32).....	98
Coastal Front Projections of Suriname and Guyana (Figure 33).....	98
Guyana's 34° Claim Line is More Inequitable than the Provisional Equidistance Line (Figure 34).....	102
1998 CGX Oil Concessions: Portion of Concessions in Disputed Area (Figure 35).....	108