Africa's Deep-Seabed Resources Project

Third Workshop 1-3 June 2021

Project partners





Day 1 Presentations

Workshop co-host





IMPORTANT The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this presentation do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Provision of information concerning developments relating to the law of the sea emanating from actions and decisions taken by States does not imply recognition by the United Nations of the validity of the actions and decisions in question. Unless expressly stated otherwise, the findings, interpretations and conclusions, if any, expressed herein are those of the United Nations staff member who prepared it and/or deliver it and do not necessarily represent the views of the United Nations or its Member States.

UNCLOS at a glance

- 168 States Parties
- Known as the 'constitution for the ocean'
- Recognizes that problems concerning the ocean space are closely interrelated and should be considered as a whole











States Parties through the ISA



7

Protection and preservation of the marine environment (Part XII)

- General obligation to protect and preserve the marine environment in Part XII
- Qualified by the sovereign right of States to exploit their natural resources pursuant to their environmental policies and in accordance with their duty to protect and preserve the marine environment



Protection and preservation of the marine environment (Part XII)

- Prevent, reduce and control pollution from any source
- Measures to protect and preserve rare or fragile ecosystems and the habitat of depleted, threatened or endangered species and other forms of marine life
- Duty not to transfer damage or hazards or transform one type of pollution into another
- Measures to prevent harmful use of technologies or introduction of species





Protection and preservation of the marine environment in the Area (Part XI, Art. 145)

 Necessary measures must be taken in accordance with the Convention with respect to activities in the Area to ensure effective protection for the marine environment from harmful effects which may arise from activities in the Area









INTERNATIONAL SEABED AUTHORITY: STRUCTURE AND DECISION-MAKING

Yongsheng Cai Senior Legal Officer

Mauritius ADSR Workshop-1 June 2021



International Seabed Authority



isa.org.jm



Assembly

Overview

- 167 member States + EU
- Establish General Policy
- Functions
- · Elect members of the Council
- Elect Secretary-General
- Approve the budget
- Approve exploration & exploitation regulations
- Periodic review
- Strategic plan and high-level action plans

Mauritius ADSR Workshop-1 June 2021

Decision-Making

- Consensus
- Questions of procedure
- Questions of substance
- Two limitations by 1994 Agreement
- Based on the recommendations of the Council
- Based on the recommendations of the Finance Committee





Secretariat

- Secretary-General
- Annual report to the Assembly
- * International character of the secretariat
- Staff members
- Staff Regulations and Rules
- Offices
- EOSG, OLA, OEMMR, OAS

- Functions
- Provide support to SG in fulfilling his functions
- Convene annual session of the Authority
- Implement & coordinate to implement decisions made and policies set out by other organs
- Organize workshops and seminars to implement its work programme
- Others

Mauritius ADSR Workshop-1 June 2021





Legal & Technical Commission

Overview

- 30 members for a term of 5 years + 5 years, elected by the Council
- Functions
- Considering applications for approval of plans of work for exploration & exploitation
- Formulating rules, regulations and procedures relating to conduct of activities in the Area
- Issuing Recommendations for guidance
- · Supervising activities in the Area
- Making recommendations on protection of marine environment, including REMPs

Mauritius ADSR Workshop-1 June 2021

Decision-Making

- Consensus
- Voting: a majority



International Seabed Authority

14 - 20 Port Royal Street Kingston, Jamaica Phone: +1 (876) 922-9105 Fax: +1 (876) 922-0195

isa.org.jm





WORKSHOP

FOR THE PROMOTION OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA'S DEEP SEABED RESOURCES IN SUPPORT TO AFRICA'S BLUE ECONOMY

The Outer Limit of the Continental Shelf in Africa: Present Situation and Prospects

Prof. Maurice K. Kamga

Judge, International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (Hamburg)

Introduction

Maritime zones under national jurisdiction, including the continental shelf



Figure 1: Offshore extent of the maritime zones recognized under international law

Introduction

• For geologists, "continental shelf" is that part of the continental margin which is between the shoreline and the shelf break or, where there is no noticeable slope, between the shoreline and the point where the depth of the superjacent water is approximately between 100 and 200 metres.

• Legal caveat with its roots in the history of notion of the continental shelf, as it appeared in the 1958 Convention: either "the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the Territorial Sea to a depth of 200 metres," or, alternatively, "to a depth beyond that limit where exploitation of resources was possible."

♦ The 1982 Convention marked a distinct shift away from the unsatisfactorily open-ended definition

Introduction

Article 76 of the 1982 Convention offer a complex series of formulae for the establishment establish the outer limit of its continental shelf:

"1. The continental shelf of a coastal State comprises the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas that extend beyond its territorial sea throughout the natural prolongation of its land territory to the outer edge of the continental margin, or to a distance of 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured where the outer edge of the continental margin does not extend up to that distance.

2. The continental shelf of a coastal State shall not extend beyond the limits provided for in paragraphs 4 to 6.

3. The continental margin comprises the submerged prolongation of the land mass of the coastal State, and consists of the seabed and subsoil of the shelf, the slope and the rise. It does not include the deep ocean floor with its oceanic ridges or the subsoil thereof.

Introduction

4. (a) For the purposes of this Convention, the coastal State shall establish the outer edge of the continental margin wherever the margin extends beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, by either:

(i) a line delineated in accordance with paragraph 7 by reference to the outermost fixed points at each of which the thickness of sedimentary rocks is at least 1 per cent of the shortest distance from such point to the foot of the continental slope; or

(ii) a line delineated in accordance with paragraph 7 by reference to fixed points not more than 60 nautical miles from the foot of the continental slope.

(b) In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the foot of the continental slope shall be determined as the point of maximum change in the gradient at its base.

5. The fixed points comprising the line of the outer limits of the continental shelf on the seabed, drawn in accordance with paragraph 4 (a)(i) and (ii), either shall not exceed 350 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured or shall not exceed 100 nautical miles from the 2,500 metre isobath, which is a line connecting the depth of 2,500 metres.

Introduction

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 5, on submarine ridges, the outer limit of the continental shelf shall not exceed 350 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured. This paragraph does not apply to submarine elevations that are natural components of the continental margin, such as its plateaux, rises, caps, banks and spurs.

7. The coastal State shall delineate the outer limits of its continental shelf, where that shelf extends beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, by straight lines not exceeding 60 nautical miles in length, connecting fixed points, defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude.

8. Information on the limits of the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured shall be submitted by the coastal State to the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf set up under Annex II on the basis of equitable geographical representation. The Commission shall make recommendations to coastal States on matters related to the establishment of the outer limits of their continental shelf. The limits of the shelf established by a coastal State on the basis of these recommendations shall be final and binding.

9. The coastal State shall deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations charts and relevant information, including geodetic data, permanently describing the outer limits of its continental shelf. The Secretary-General shall give due publicity thereto.

10. The provisions of this article are without prejudice to the question of delimitation of the continental shelf between States with opposite or adjacent coasts."

Introduction

The notion of "outer limit of the continental shelf" refers then to a situation where a coastal claims an extended continental shelf in application of the provisions Article 76.

♦ In Africa, 53 States of the continent, only 15 are land locked states, this makes that many littoral states depend heavily on the maritime economy.

♦ In fact, any African coastal State that wishes to establish a extended continental shelf shall submit information before the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (the "Commission") to demonstrate that the natural prolongation of its submerged land territory to the outer edge of the continental margin extends beyond 200 miles.

♦ If the State is able to pass this test and demonstrate its entitlement to an extended continental shelf, it may proceed with the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf in accordance with the set of rules defined in the above-mentioned Article 76, paragraphs 4 to 10.



Part I – The progress and current situation of extended continental shelf delineation in Africa

In order to understand the progress of the delineation of extended continental shelf in Africa, necessity to analyse:

(A) the question of the deadline and the timing of the submissions of information on the proposed outer continental shelf limit to Commission;

(B) the first vague of Preliminary submissions in 2009, and

(C) the actual submissions some years later.

A – The question of the deadline and the timing of the submissions of information on the proposed outer continental shelf limit to Commission

 Original deadline: 10 years after its entry into force of the Convention for any State Party.

◆ As the Convention entered into force on 16 November 1994, the ten-year deadline, was set as 16 November 2004.

♦ However, many countries, struggled to meet the deadline.

◆ Moreover, the Commission established only in 1997, did not adopt its Scientific and Technical Guidelines until 13 May 1999 → New deadline: 13 May 2009

• States still struggled \rightarrow possibility to submit "preliminary information indicative of the outer limits of the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles and a description of the status of preparation and intended date of making a submission" on 13 May 2009

B – African Preliminary Submissions before the expiration of the deadline on 13 May 2009

• Between the 14 April and the 12 May 2009, 21 African Coastal States sent mainly preliminary submissions to the Commission.

• Either individually or in conjunction with another State.

◆ In an alphabetical order: Angola, Benin, Benin/Togo (joint submission), Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Togo.

C – African Actual submissions and some recommendations by the Commission

Around 25 African coastal States have made formal submissions to the Commission.

• Submissions made either individually or in conjunction with another State.

• The Commission has already made its recommendations on five submissions, while the rest are still pending.

1 – The recommendations of the Commission on five submissions

• While the full text of the recommendations is kept confidential, the summaries of recommendations are duly made available to the public.

• The summaries give a rough idea of the deliberation of the submissions.

◆The Commission chiefly examines : (i) whether it has the authority to consider the submission, (ii) the geological and geographical description of the region concerned, (iii) the natural prolongation of the land mass of the coastal State, and (iv) the determination of the location of the foot of the continental slope, the outer edge of the continental margin, and the outer limits of the continental shelf.



◆ Commission's recommendations on <u>30</u> March <u>2011</u>, by consensus.

◆ Commission agreed with the determination of the proposed points establishing the outer edge of the continental margin in the Mascarene Plateau region and recommended that the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf of the two coastal States be established in accordance with article 76, paragraph 7, of the Convention by straight lines not exceeding 60 M in length, connecting fixed points, defined by precise coordinates of latitude and longitude.

b) The Commission's recommendation on Ghana's submission

♦ Initial Submission on 28 April 2009, additional data and information in June 2013, and a revised executive summary of the submission on 12 September 2013.

Commission's recommendations on 5 September 2014.

◆ the Commission, inter alia, agreed with the determination of the proposed fixed points, establishing the outer edge of the continental margin of Ghana in the Gulf of Guinea, and then recommended that the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf be conducted in accordance with article 76, paragraph 7, of the Convention, by straight lines not exceeding 60 M in length, connecting fixed points, defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude.



◆ The Commission (i) agreed with the determination of the fixed points establishing the outer edge of the continental margin in the West Coast of the South African mainland, and recommended that the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf in the West Coast of the South African mainland be conducted in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 76 of the Convention by straight lines not exceeding 60 M in length, connecting fixed points, defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude;

(ii) with a precise exception, the Commission agreed with the principles applied in establishing the outer limits of the continental shelf for the West Coast region, including the determination of the fixed formula points, and the construction of the straight lines connecting those points, and recommended that South Africa proceeds to establish the outer limits of the continental shelf in the West Coast region accordingly;

(iii) the Commission agreed with the determination of the fixed points establishing the outer edge of the continental margin for the eastern margin of the Mozambique Ridge, and recommended that the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf for the Mozambique Ridge margin be conducted in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 76 of the Convention by straight lines not exceeding 60 M in length, connecting fixed points, defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude. d) The Commission's recommendation on the Seychelles' submission

Submission on 7 May 2009.

Recommendation on 27 August 2018.

◆ The Commission, inter alia, agreed with the determination of the proposed fixed points establishing the outer edge of the continental margin in the Northern Plateau Region, and then recommended that the delineation of the outer limits of the continental shelf in this region be conducted in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 76 of the Convention, by straight lines not exceeding 60 M in length, connecting fixed points, defined by coordinates of latitude and longitude.

e) The Commission's recommendation on Cote d'Ivoire submission

 Submission on 8 May 2009 and amended information on 24 March 2016.

Commission's recommendations on 5 February 2020.

♦ The Commission recommended that the proposed fixed points be used as the basis for delineating the outer limits of the continental shelf in this region, subject to the application of the relevant constraints.



 ♦ a) Joint Partial Submission by France and South Africa regarding the area of the Crozet Archipelago and the Prince Edward Islands on 6 May 2009.

 Its consideration was included in the agenda of August-September 2009.

◆ In March 2013, the two countries submitted an addendum to their initial Executive Summary.

b) Submission by the Republic of Kenya on 6 May 2009

 Its consideration was included in the agenda of August-September 2009.

♦ It should be noted that Sri Lanka and Somalia sent a Note verbale to the Commission in order to draw the latter attention on certain fact regarding their rights which might be affected by Kenya's claim.

2 – 15 African submissions are still pending before the Commission

 ♦ c) Partial Submission by the Republic of Mauritius on 6 May 2009, regarding on the outer limits of the continental shelf in the region of Rodrigues Island. On 8 October 2015, a revised executive summary of the partial submission. On 3 March 2020, an amendment to its partial submission.

• Its consideration was included in the agenda of August-September 2009.

• The area claimed appeared on the following maps





♦d) Submission by Nigeria on 7 May 2009. On 18 November 2016, an amendment to its submission.

◆ Its consideration was included in the agenda of August-September 2009.

• The area claimed appeared on the following maps.





♦ Its consideration was included in the agenda of March-April 2010.

• f) Submission by Mozambique on 7 July 2010

♦ Its consideration was included in the agenda of March-April 2010.

g) Submission by of Madagascar on 29 April 2011.

• Its consideration was included in the agenda of August-September 2011.

h) Submission by Tanzania on 18 January 2012

Its consideration was included in the agenda of July-August
2012.

The area claimed appeared on the following map.



i) Submission by Gabon on 10 April 2012.

◆ Its consideration was included in the agenda July-August 2012.

◆ Angola and Congo send Notes verbales to draw the attention of the Commission on their rights which might affected by the Gabon's claim.



♦ j) Submission by Angola on 6 December 2013.

◆ Its consideration was included in the agenda July-August 2014.

◆ DRC, Congo and Gabon send Notes verbales to draw the attention of the Commission on their rights which might affected by the Angola's claim

 k) Submission by Somalia on 21 July 2014; an amended executive summary of its submission transmitted on 16 July 2015

♦ Its consideration was included in the agenda in 2015.

◆ Tanzania, Yemen and Kenya send Notes verbales to draw the attention of the Commission on their rights which might affected by the Somalia's claim.

2 – 15 African submissions are still pending before the Commission

(*k) Submission by Somalia on 21 July 2014; an amended executive summary of its submission transmitted on 16 July 2015

♦ Its consideration was included in the agenda in 2015.

◆ Tanzania, Yemen and Kenya send Notes verbales to draw the attention of the Commission on their rights which might affected by the Somalia's claim.

The area claimed appeared on the following map.



♦ I) Joint Submission by Cabo Verde, The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Senegal and Sierra Leone, on 25 September 2014.

• Its consideration was included in the agenda in February-March 2015.

• Morocco sent a Note verbale by which it drew the Commission's attention on its rights which might be affected by the joint claim.

The area claimed appeared on the following maps.





m) Submission by Liberia on 23 October 2018.

• Its consideration was included in the agenda in January-March 2019.

 n) Submission by Mauritius concerning the Southern Chagos Archipelago region on 26 March 2019

Its consideration was included in the agenda in July-August
2019.

• The area claimed appeared on the following maps.





Before closing this first Part of our presentation, let's recall that after the recommendations of the Commission, the outer limits established by the coastal State on the basis of such recommendations shall be final and binding.

• The chart and other relevant information permanently describing the outer limits are then deposited with the UN Secretary-General, who is required to give such due publicity.

• After this brief exploration, what are the prospects and challenges facing African countries regarding the necessity to secure the resources of their extended continental shelf?

Part II – Securing the resources of the extended continental shelf: prospects and challenges

• Resources on the extensive extended continental shelf areas subject to submissions are of increasing interest from a marine resource development perspective.

• This is particularly the case as offshore exploration and exploitation technologies have advanced significantly in recent years.

• Key emerging seabed resource opportunities in extended continental shelf areas include energy resources such as oil, gas, and gas hydrates as well as seabed minerals and marine genetic resources.

Part II – Securing the resources of the extended continental shelf: prospects and challenges

 In order to secure those resources, African countries should first proceed to any potential maritime delimitation with any other relevant State(s) (A).

• They may also explore the possibility of joint exploitation of the overlapping extended continental shelves, especially when a joint submission has been made to the Commission (B).

◆ After securing their extended continental shelf and its resources, African States should be prepare to make some payments and contributions with respect to the exploitation of their continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles (C).

A – The issue of overlapping claims and the necessity of maritime delimitation on the extended continental shelf

• Maritime delimitation involves the establishment of a maritime boundary where the legal title of two or more adjacent and opposite States overlap.

• Maritime delimitation is beyond the competence of the Commission.

♦ There is a clear difference between the delineation of the outer limit of the continental shelf and the establishment of a maritime boundary in case of overlapping extended continental shelves.

A – The issue of overlapping claims and the necessity of maritime delimitation on the extended continental shelf

• 1) The difference between the delineation of the outer limit of the continental shelf and the establishment of a maritime boundary in case of overlapping extended continental shelves

◆ The above has been clarified by ITLOS in Bay of Bengal Judgment where it stated: "There is a clear distinction between the delimitation of the continental shelf under article 83 and the delineation of its outer limits under article 76. Under the latter article, the Commission is assigned the function of making recommendations to coastal States on matters relating to the establishment of the outer limits of the continental shelf, but it does so without prejudice to delimitation of maritime boundaries. The function of settling disputes with respect to delimitation of maritime boundaries is entrusted to dispute settlement procedures under article 83 and Part XV of the Convention, which include international courts and tribunals".

• The Commission is then only competent for recommendations on the validity of the national claims of extended continental shelf.

♦ Maritime delimitation can only be made by diplomatic or judicial means 35



A – The issue of overlapping claims and the necessity of maritime delimitation on the extended continental shelf

• States can follow the existing jurisprudence or State practice regarding maritime delimitation of the continental shelf within the distance of 200 nautical miles from the coastline.

• The applicable law in this regard can simply be transposed on the extended continental shelf, as the jurisprudence appear to suggest. The judgment in the case between Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire before a special Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea by can serve as an example : the Chamber indicated that the delimitation of the extended continental shelf would be in the continuity, by following the same direction, of the delimitation line within the 200 nautical miles, as it appear on this map.
B – The possibility of joint exploitation of the overlapping extended continental shelves

♦ In certain circumstances, if the States are not ready or are not willing to draw a maritime delimitation, they might choose to exploit jointly, in part or in total, the area where their extended continental shelf overlap.

◆ Africa has already some useful examples of joint exploitation before or after the determination of a maritime boundary.

• For the first instance, we have the Nigeria/Sao Tome and Principe Joint development Zone



Formation of gulf of Guinea EEZs



B – The possibility of joint exploitation of the overlapping extended continental shelves

◆ In 1974 Guinea-Bissau contested its boundary with Senegal. Although they attempted to resolve the matter through arbitration and a contest at the ICJ, they later settled for a more amicable process, by adopting a Join Development Zone across the maritime boundary.

◆ In fact, Guinea-Bissau and Senegal resolved to enter an agreement on 14th October 1998, both parties signed a "Management and Co-operation Agreement" in Dakar, aimed at providing among other things, the joint exploitation management and administration of both petroleum and fishing activities and seeks to provide a framework for cooperation and joint development between the two countries.

C – Payments and contributions with respect to the exploitation of extended continental shelf (Art.82)

"1. The coastal State shall make payments or contributions in kind in respect of the exploitation of the non-living resources of the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.

2. The payments and contributions shall be made annually with respect to all production at a site after the first five years of production at that site. For the sixth year, the rate of payment or contribution shall be 1 per cent of the value or volume of production at the site. The rate shall increase by 1 per cent for each subsequent year until the twelfth year and shall remain at 7 per cent thereafter. Production does not include resources used in connection with exploitation.

3. A developing State which is a net importer of a mineral resource produced from its continental shelf is exempt from making such payments or contributions in respect of that mineral resource.

4. The payments or contributions shall be made through the Authority, which shall distribute them to States Parties to this Convention, on the basis of equitable sharing criteria, taking into account the interests and needs of developing States, particularly the least developed and the land-locked among them."

C – Payments and contributions with respect to the exploitation of extended continental shelf (Art.82)

♦ This is a mechanism by which State with extended continental shelf make a sort of compensation because of the extension of their jurisdiction to what is normally the Area, the Common heritage of mankind.

Thank you very much for your kind attention!





























Contractors:	China Ocean Mineral Resources Research and Development Association (COMRA), China Minmetals Corporation, Beijing Pioneer Hi-Tech Development Corporation, People's Republic of China 2001, 2011, 2014, 2017, 2019;
2000	Deep Ocean Resources Development Company (DORD) and Japan Oil, Gas and Metals National Corporation (JOGMEC), Japan – 2011, 2014;
4000	Government of the Republic of Korea – 2001, 2014, 2018;
0.5 m	Yuzhmorgeologiya, Government of the Russia Federation and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Russian Federation – 2001, 2012, 2015;
5 S. 1989	Institut français de recherché pour l'exploitation de la mer (IFREMER), France – 2001, 2014;
2010	Interoceanmetal Joint Organization (IOM), a consortium formed by Bulgaria, Cuba, Czech Republic, Poland, Russian Federation and Slovakia - 2001;
STA STAN	Government of India – 2002, 2016;
PARAL CONSIST	Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources, Germany – 2006, 2015;
	Nauru Ocean Resources Inc., Nauru – 2011;
2012	Tonga Offshore Mining Limited, Kingdom of Tonga – 2012;
	G-TEC Sea Mineral Resources NV, Belgium – 2013;
P6-22	UK Seabed Resources Ltd, United Kingdom – 2013, 2016;
Asia-Pacific Group	Marawa Research and Exploration Ltd, Republic of Kiribati – 2015;
Eastern European Group	Ocean Mineral Singapore Pte Ltd., Singapore – 2015;
Latin American and	Companhia de Pesquisa de Recursos Minerais, Brazil – 2015;
Caribbean States Group 🗸	Cook Islands Investment Corporation, Cook Islands – 2016;
Western European and	Government of Poland – 2018;
Other States Group 🗸	Blue Minerals Jamaica Ltd., Jamaica - 2021













An Integrated, Prosperous and Peaceful Africa

Africa Mining Vision and contribution of deep-seabed exploration and exploitation to the development of Africa's Blue Economy

Mr. Frank Mugyenyi, Interim Coordinator, African Minerals Development Center, Africa Union Commission

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia June 01, 2021











African 🕥

AMV – Relevant Polices Instruments

The AMV Policy Instruments include:

- The Geological and Mineral Information Systems Strategy (GMIS) -to improve geological and geospatial information.
- African Minerals Governance Framework to improve the governance of minerals development for sustainable development
- African Mineral and Energy Resources Classification and Management System (AMREC) -African continental and national system for comprehensive resource management.
- Pan-African Reserves and Resources Reporting Code (PARC)- Pan-African Code for public disclosure
- AMV Private Sector Compact to ensure mutual and shared benefits











































6. Main functions of the Department- Seabed Minerals

 Develop strategies and policies to minimise and manage the impacts of seabed mineral activities on the marine environment;

- provide a regulatory regime for the conduct of seabed mineral activities;
- **facilitate the conduct of seabed mineral activities** to maximise benefits to Mauritius and the people of Mauritius;
- Build-up capacity in seabed mineral exploration; and
- Management of seabed mineral activities.



7. Development of a new legal framework for Seabed Minerals

The Government, in collaboration with the Commonwealth Secretariat, has developed **2 separate Seabed Minerals Bills** to provide for :

management of seabed mineral activities within the maritime zones of Mauritius-EEZ and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ).



7. Seabed Minerals Bill for the ABNJ

 The primary objective of the Seabed Mineral Bill for the ABNJ is to establish a legal framework for the sponsorship and the effective control of stakeholders involved in seabed mineral activities in the Area.

The Bill shall comply with all relevant standards of ISA and obligations under UNCLOS.



7. The precautionary principle

"the precautionary principle" means that, in order to protect the environment, where there are threats of serious and irreversible damage to the marine environment or threats to human health, lack of full scientific certainty regarding the extent of adverse effects shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent or minimise environmental degradation arising in any way from a matter or person or activity regulated;

17



7. Expression of Interest (EOI) for sponsorship

- In 2016, an EOI was launched for sponsorship by the Government of Mauritius, for seabed mineral exploration in areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.
- The exercise demonstrated some interest, but a comprehensive list of eligible companies need to identified and evaluated.






















































	S	eabed Jurisdiction a	areas		
	•	 Percentage of total world ocean seabed: 			
		The Area The Continental shelf (the EEZ 39 %)	53 % 46 %		
	3	01.06.2021	Mauritius ADSR Workshop	Source - http://www.grida.no/publications/shelf-last-zone/	
3					













































Slide 21

HB1 Harald Brekke, 25/5/2021



















End



Private entities can engage in mining activities in the Area provided *inter alia* that they are sponsored by a State Party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Sponsorship is the medium through which the sponsoring State exercises control over the contractor, by requiring it to comply with the provisions of UNCLOS. In light of the particular requirement for sponsorship, the following questions arose during discussions at the International Seabed Authority (ISA or the Authority): What are a state's responsibilities regarding the sponsored activity; what is the extent of a state's liability; and what measures must a state take to fulfil its obligations?

international relations & cooperation

These questions were put to the Seabed Disputes Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea by the Council of the Authority in the form of a Request for an advisory opinion. This case, which was prompted by the applications submitted to the Authority by two companies sponsored by two Small Island Developing States (Nauru and Tonga), also triggered a debate concerning the participation of developing States in activities in the Area and whether preferential treatment should be accorded to sponsoring States that are developing States.



3

Role and Responsibilities of Sponsoring States On 1 February 2011, the chamber of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS) unanimously adopted an advisory opinion on state responsibility in respect of private entities undertaking seabed mining activities in international waters. This was a historic international law ruling of the Seabed Disputes Chamber. This advisory opinion made a number of important statements, including that the precautionary principle, as formulated in the Rio Declaration, forms part of the corpus of customary international environmental law. The chamber's findings on state responsibility and the precautionary principle are significant additions to the opinio juris of international environmental law following on from the Pulp Mills decision of the ICJ. international relations & cooperation 4 International Relations and Cooperation REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA





Role and Responsibilities of Sponsoring States Another important statement within the advisory opinion is that responsibilities of sponsoring states are owed equally by all states. Nauru questioned whether a lesser standard should apply to it because it is a developing state. However, the chamber accepted the argument that there was no difference in the level of due diligence owed by a developing state as compared to developed states. As well as being owed equally by all states, the responsibility of due diligence is owed to all states. All states have an interest in international waters. In Pulp Mills, the ICJ found that a responsibility of due diligence exists between bordering states. nternational relations & cooperation 6 emational Relations and Cooperation PUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

The chamber extended the responsibility in respect of international waters to one that is owed to states per se. It took due diligence out of the trans-boundary context and applied it to the high seas, which are there for the benefit of all states. I think this influenced the chamber in its consideration of liability – the second question – where it found the principle of *erga omnes* applies, which means that any state can potentially make a claim against another state that fails to comply with the convention's provisions and regulations relating to seabed mining in international waters.



7

<section-header><text><text>

emational Relations and Cooperation PUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Furthermore, states that sponsor mining operations do not bear any residual liability for damages not compensated by a mining company responsible for any damage. If you have a Deepwater Horizon situation and the sponsored contractor doesn't have sufficient financial reserves to address the damage, there is no residual liability for the state to meet the gap. There is a liability gap. The chamber held that measures taken by a state to fulfil its responsibilities must include having laws in place to ensure environmental due diligence.



9

Role and Responsibilities of Sponsoring States

Contractual arrangements with the sponsored entity are not sufficient. Rather, states must ensure that there are appropriate laws for monitoring and enforcement to ensure that a sufficient level of due diligence is achieved. I am very happy with this opinion. I consider that this advisory opinion has a strong environmental flavour and sets a solid framework for the future management of mineral exploration and exploitation in the Area.



