

**ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL ESTABLISHED UNDER ARTICLE 32(1) OF THE  
CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT  
OF THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC**

**IRELAND**

**v.**

**UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

**COUNTER-MEMORIAL OF THE UNITED KINGDOM**

**6 JUNE 2002**

**ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL ESTABLISHED UNDER ARTICLE 32(1) OF THE  
CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT  
OF THE NORTH-EAST ATLANTIC**

**IRELAND**

**v.**

**UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND**

**COUNTER-MEMORIAL OF THE UNITED KINGDOM**

**6 JUNE 2002**

# CONTENTS

<b>PART 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
A.	Overview of this Counter-Memorial.....	1
B.	The Subject of the Dispute.....	3
C.	Issues in Ireland’s Memorial Irrelevant to the Dispute as Formulated by Ireland.....	7
<b>PART 2</b>	<b>BACKGROUND FACTS .....</b>	<b>9</b>
A.	BNFL and the MOX Plant .....	9
B.	Principal Current Competitors and Customers .....	11
C.	The Process Followed in Redacting Information from the PA and ADL Reports .....	12
D.	The Excised Information .....	16
<b>PART 3</b>	<b>THE NATURE OF THE OBLIGATION UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE OSPAR CONVENTION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>PART 4</b>	<b>THE INFORMATION SOUGHT BY IRELAND IS ...NOT INFORMATION WITHIN ARTICLE 9(2) .....</b>	<b>24</b>
A.	The Interpretation of Article 9(2).....	24
B.	The Requested Information does not fall within Article 9(2) .....	25
C.	Consequences of the Requested Information Falling outside Article 9(2) .....	29
<b>PART 5</b>	<b>THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 9(3) OF THE OSPAR CONVENTION.....</b>	<b>32</b>
A.	English Law.....	33
1.	The Commercial Confidentiality Exemption under the 1992 Regulations.....	33
2.	The Commercial Confidentiality Exemption under Common Law.....	38
3.	Conclusions on English Law .....	40
4.	Applicable International Regulations.....	41
5.	Conclusions.....	42
B.	Commercial Confidentiality under International Instruments and Other National Laws .....	44
1.	International Instruments .....	44
2.	Other National La ws .....	47
3.	Conclusions.....	49
C.	Ireland’s Contentions on Public Interest.....	49
<b>PART 6</b>	<b>THE COMMERCIAL CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE REDACTED INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>50</b>
A.	The Confidentiality of the Information Redacted from the PA and ADL Reports.....	50
1.	The PA and ADL redaction exercises .....	50
2.	Information provided in confidence .....	51
3.	Commercial Confidentiality.....	52
4.	Conclusions.....	63
B.	The Alleged Failure to Give Reasons.....	63
<b>PART 7</b>	<b>CONCLUDING SUBMISSIONS .....</b>	<b>67</b>

<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>Survey of International Instruments concerned with Access to Information .....</b>	<b>68</b>
	A. Instruments concerned with Trade and Commercial Matters .....	68
	B. Instruments concerned with the Environment .....	72
	C. Conclusions.....	74
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>Survey of National Legislation concerned with Access to Information.....</b>	<b>75</b>
	A. France.....	75
	B. Ireland.....	76
	C. Australia .....	80
	D. United States of America.....	83
	<b>THE OSPAR CONVENTION (ENGLISH TEXT) .....</b>	<b>89</b>
	<b>THE OSPAR CONVENTION (FRENCH TEXT).....</b>	<b>101</b>

# LIST OF ANNEXES

## VOLUME I

1. Report of David Wadsworth, dated 5 June 2002.
2. Report of Dr Geoff Varley, *Commercial Confidentiality Concerning Excisions from the PA and ADL Reports on the Sellafield MOX Plant*, dated 5 June 2002.
3. Witness Statement of Jeremy Rycroft, dated 31 May 2002.

## VOLUME II

4. Council Directive 90/313/EEC of 7 June 1990, OJ No 1990 L 158/56.
5. Public domain version of the Arthur D. Little Report (July 2001).
6. Letter of 13 September 2001 from the Agent for the United Kingdom to the Agent for Ireland.
7. *R (Friends of the Earth Ltd. and Greenpeace Ltd.) v. Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Secretary of State for Health*, Judgment of 15 November 2001, [2001] EWHC Admin 914 (Mr Justice Collins).
8. *R (Friends of the Earth Ltd. and Greenpeace Ltd.) v. Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and Secretary of State for Health*, Judgment of 7 December 2001, [2001] EWCA Civ. 1847 (Court of Appeal).
9. European Commission Opinion under Article 37 Euratom, OJ 1997 No C/86/3.
10. Letter of 19 September 2001 from the Agent for the United Kingdom to the Agent for Ireland; Ireland's letter of 9 May 2002; United Kingdom's letter of 16 May 2002.
11. Extracts from the summary records of the OSPARREV Group, responsible for the preparatory work leading to the OSPAR Convention.
12. Environmental Information Regulations 1992 (S.I. 1992/3240), and the Environmental Information (Amendment) Regulations 1998 (S.I. 1998/1447).
13. DEFRA Public Access to Environmental Information: Guidance on the Implementation of the Environmental Information Regulations 1992.

## VOLUME III

14. *R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, ex parte Alliance against the Birmingham Northern Relief Road* [1999] JPL 231.
15. Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, Second Edition (1997).
16. Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration, *Case No A.1/95 – Refusal to provide full responses to information requests about the reprocessing of nuclear fuel at Dounreay*.
17. Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration, *Case No A.29/95 – Refusal to provide information about the economic viability of the Thermal Oxide Reprocessing Plant (THORP) at Sellafield*.

18. Hull, *Commercial Secrecy: Law and Practice* (1998), paragraphs 3.68 – 3.88.
19. *Arrêté du 23 fevrier 1983*, Journal Officiel, 17 avril 1983, p.3833.
20. *Arrêté du 20 septembre 1983*, Bulletin Officiel, No.58, 17 avril 1984.
21. (Irish) Access to Information on the Environment Regulations, 1996; S.I. No.185/1996.
22. (Australian) Freedom of Information (FOI) Memorandum No. 98, Exemption Sections in the FOI Act.
23. (United States) Freedom of Information Act, 1966 (5 U.S.C. § 552).
24. Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 2 (*Extracts*: § 2.101(a); § 2.118; § 2.201(e); § 2.208).
25. *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton* 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).
26. *Critical Mass Energy Project v. NRC* 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992).
27. *Public Citizen Health Research Group v. FDA*, 185 F. 3d 898 (D.C. Cir. 1999).