

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> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>List of Figures Appearing in Volume I of the Counter-Memorial of Suriname .....</b>   | <b>vii</b>  |
| <b>CHAPTER 1 .....</b>   | <b>1</b>    |
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b>    |
| I. Summary of Procedure .....  | 1           |
| II. Contentions of Guyana .....  | 2           |
| III. Overview of Suriname’s Position .....   | 3           |
| IV. Organization of the Counter-Memorial .....   | 5           |
| <b>CHAPTER 2.....</b>  | <b>6</b>    |
| <b>POINTS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT .....</b>  | <b>6</b>    |
| 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<br>Reaches the 200-Nautical-Mile Limit Measured from the Baseline<br>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<br>Which the General Direction of the Coast Changes .....   | 7           |
| II. Points of Disagreement .....   | 7           |
| A. Can the Land Boundary Terminus Be Determined by Establishing<br>a Closing Line Across the Mouth of the Corantijn River? .....                                     | 7           |
| B. Does the Absence of Agreement on the Land Boundary Terminus<br>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<br>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        |
| <b>CHAPTER 3.....</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| <b>THE SINGLE MARITIME BOUNDARY LINES CLAIMED BY THE PARTIES .....</b>   | <b>15</b> |
| 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        |
| <b>CHAPTER 4.....</b>   | <b>38</b> |
| <b>THE LAW OF MARITIME DELIMITATION APPLICABLE IN THIS CASE.....</b>  | <b>38</b> |
| I. The Single Maritime Boundary .....   | 38        |
| A. The Parties’ Agreement That the Tribunal Will Establish a Single<br>Maritime Boundary and Its Legal Implications .....   | 38        |
| B. The History of the Single Maritime Boundary in the Judgments of<br>the International Court of Justice and Arbitral Tribunals .....                                     | 39        |
| II. The Legal Regime of the Single Maritime Boundary and the Entitlement<br>of Adjacent Coastal States to the Maritime Areas in Front of Their<br>Respective Coasts ..... | 44        |
| A. The Entitlement of Adjacent Coastal States to the Maritime Area<br>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<br>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        |
| <b>CHAPTER 5.....</b>   | <b>63</b> |
| <b>THERE IS NO <i>MODUS VIVENDI</i> PERTAINING TO A BOUNDARY LINE .....</b>   | <b>63</b> |
| I. The Limits of the Areas in Which the Parties Have Granted Oil<br>Concessions Has Evidenced an Area of Overlapping Claims .....   | 64        |
| A. The Establishment of the Western Limits of Suriname’s Oil<br>Concessions.....  | 65        |
| B. The Establishment of the Eastern Limits of Guyana’s Oil<br>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        |
|      | <b>CHAPTER 6</b> .....  | <b>93</b> |
|      | <b>APPLICATION OF THE LAW TO THE FACTS</b> .....  | <b>93</b> |
| 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<br>Minor Coastal Configurations on the Provisional Equidistance Line .....   | 99         |
| 1.  | <i>Guyana's Convex Coastal Configuration Pushes the<br/>Provisional Equidistance Line Across the Coastal Front<br/>of Suriname</i> .....  | 100        |
| 2.  | <i>The Relatively Recessed Nature of the Coast of<br/>Suriname Pulls the Provisional Equidistance Line<br/>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<br>of Guyana Is Manifestly Inequitable.....   | 101        |
| IV. | The 10° Line Respects the Extension of the Coastal Fronts of the Parties<br>and Results in an Equitable Division of the Area of Overlapping Coastal<br>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<br>Projections Equitably .....   | 102        |
| 1.  | <i>The 10° Line as the Territorial Sea Boundary</i> .....   | 103        |
| 2.  | <i>The Prolongation of the Suriname-Guyana Land<br/>Boundary Is a Relevant Circumstance in the<br/>Establishment of the Single Maritime Boundary Beyond<br/>the Territorial Sea</i> ..... | 104        |
| 3.  | <i>The Relative Length of the Relevant Coasts Is a<br/>Relevant Circumstance in the Establishment of the<br/>Single Maritime Boundary Beyond the Territorial Sea</i> .....                | 105        |
|     | <b>CHAPTER 7</b> .....  | <b>107</b> |
|     | <b>SURINAME'S RESPONSE TO GUYANA'S SUBMISSION 2</b> .....   | <b>107</b> |
| I.  | The Relevant Facts.....   | 107        |
| II. | Guyana's Joining of the Boundary Dispute with Questions of State<br>Responsibility Is Inconsistent with State Practice and the Practice of<br>Courts and Tribunals.....                   | 111        |

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



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

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