Igor Vio
Rijeka College of Maritime Studies
Studentska 2, Rijeka

Technical papers
UDK 341.225.5:347.79(497.5)

CROATIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA: FIVE YEARS SINCE THE NOTIFICATION OF SUCCESSION

Five years ago the Republic of Croatia deposited the notification of succession with the UN Secretary General, on the basis of which it became a party to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (Montego Bay, 1982), while it acceded to the Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention (New York, 1994). The Croatian official translations of both international treaties were published in June 2000. The paper first deals with issues of succession of Croatia with respect to international conventions in general and then considers the same question related to the conventions on the law of the sea. The next chapter refers to some of the relevant provisions of the second part of the Maritime Code with the title "Marine and Submarine Areas of the Republic of Croatia", while problems regarding maritime delimitations between these Croatian areas and those of its neighbouring states in the Adriatic, as well as various means of dispute settlement, are discussed in the final part.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Parliaments of Croatia and Slovenia proclaimed their independence in June 1991, but political crisis escalated and after intensive negotiations these proclamations were suspended by the Brioni Declaration of 7 July 1991 for a period of three months. That period expired on 8 October 1991, and this is accepted as being the relevant date for the questions concerning the succession of states created by the dissolution of Yugoslavia.[1]

Since the the former Yugoslav Federation was a party to many international conventions, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, its disintegration, whose result were four new coastal states in the Adriatic Sea, caused certain legal questions. The polemic that ensued was based on establishing which of the international conventions were still to be binding for them, and which states necessitate prior notification in order to maintain their status of party to the treaty following the succession.

[1] The Arbitral Commission for the Succession of Yugoslavia (called the Badinter Commission) confirmed this opinion on 16 July 1993.

This dilemma was partially clarified by the Constitutional Resolution on the Sovereignty and Independence of the Republic of Croatia of June 25th 1991, which, in Art. 3 contains the following provision: "The international agreements which SFRJ has signed and ratified, will be applied in the Republic of Croatia unless they are contrary to its Constitution and legal order, on the basis of the provisions of the international law on the succession of states, regarding international agreements."[2] An identical provision is to be found in the Art. 33 of the Law on Concluding and Executing International Conventions.[3] On the other hand, the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia provides, in Art. 134, that the international agreements, which are signed, ratified and published, constitute an integral part of the national legal system, with the legal force below the Constitution but above all the other laws.[4] After gaining its independence, the Republic of Croatia, for the first time in its history, had an opportunity to create its own legislation related to maritime affairs. Thus, besides becoming a party through the notification of succession to the most important IMO conventions: Loadlines 1966, Tonnage 1969, COLREG 1972, MARPOL 1973/78, SOLAS 1974/78, STCW 1978,[5] the Republic of Croatia has implemented their provisions into its national maritime law: the Maritime Code and other laws and regulations. The Maritime Code of 1994 is the first legal act which encompassed both the law of the sea and the maritime law.

However, some of the issues, like the delimitation of maritime boundaries among the new states, have to be regulated by bilateral agreements. There are several situations in the Adriatic where the coastal states are in dispute concerning the boundary lines between their respective maritime areas, starting with disagreements as to which principles should be applied. None of the negotiations have resulted in an agreement so far. On the other hand, those agreements that the former Yugoslavia had negotiated with its neighbours, are binding for all parties involved.

The protection of marine environment in Croatia is regulated by the Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC) as a global treaty with general rules, but also by the Barcelona Convention and its Protocols as regional instruments for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea. Besides these international sources of law, there is the national legislation which contains provisions on marine pollution.

2. THE SUCCESSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

The disintegration of Yugoslavia raised various questions concerning the succession of the new states, but for the purpose of this analysis, a special importance should be given to the succession regarding the treaties. The dilemma concerning the binding rules of the international law is caused in the first place by the fact that the Vienna Convention on the Succession of States in Respect of Treaties (1978) has not entered into force,[6] and secondly, by the fact that state practice has not been continuous, general

---

[2] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia no. 31/1991.
[3] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia no. 53/1991.
[4] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia no. 56/1990.
[5] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia, International Agreements, no. 1/1992.
[6] 22 August 1978, 17 I.L.M. 1488.

and uniform enough to become customary law. However, some rules on succession are generally considered as customary law: one of these is the rule that international agreements determining boundaries and territorial regimes concluded by predecessor state remain binding between successor states and other parties.[7]

The Vienna Convention in its Article 36 contains special provisions for the treaties that are not in force. Thus, after the dissolution of a state which was a party of such a treaty, the successor state has an option to become its party by notifying its depositary. This means that the Vienna Convention, contrary to its rules regarding treaties in force, does not provide for *ipso jure* continuation and the successor states are not bound by multilateral treaties not in force at the moment of succession, unless their notification of succession is given to the depositary.[8]

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea belonged to this group of treaties at the time of the dissolution of Yugoslavia (8 October 1991), as well as during the following three years (until 16 November 1994). The former Yugoslavia ratified the Law of the Sea Convention in 1986 and became a party to it, but after its dissolution none of the successor states, including Serbia and Montenegro (The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), did not notify the depositary of the Convention (The United Nations) on their continuation in this respect.

Depending on one's interpretation of the international law, this could mean that the Yugoslav ratification would not be valid any more, and that the sixtieth instrument of the ratification should be the notification on succession of Bosnia-Herzegovina (12 January 1994) and not the ratification of Guyana (16 November 1993). Consequently this would change the date of entry into force of the Convention to 12 January 1995.

However, as of 22 May 1992 Croatia became a full member of the United Nations, and consequently a full member of all the other UN specialized organizations and bodies. Concerning the international conventions on the law of the sea, Croatia first became party to the three 1958 Geneva Conventions (on 14 November 1992),[9] at the same time following the developments related to the 1982 LOS Convention. After the conclusion of the Informal Consultations of the Secretary General which resulted in the adoption of the Agreement Relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the Convention on 28 July 1994 and the subsequent entry into force of the LOSC on 16 November 1994, Croatia decided to become a party to both treaties and deposited the related notification with the Secretary General of the United Nations on 5 April 1995. The Resolution of the Government of Croatia concerning the succession to the LOS Convention and the accession to the Agreement contains a peculiar provision stating its retroactive function - declaring that the Republic of Croatia has been a party to the LOS treaty since its independence (8 October 1991).[10] The Resolution also provided that the official Croatian translations of the Convention and the Agreement would be published within six months and three months respectively, after the entry into force

---

[7] The 1978 Vienna Convention confirms this rule in its articles 11 and 12.

[8] M.Seršić, The Crisis in the Eastern Adriatic and the Law of the Sea, Ocean Development and International law, Vol. 24, 1994, p. 293.

[9] The Croatian translations of the three Geneva Conventions (Convention on the High Seas, Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, and Convention on the Continental Shelf) were published on 2 December 1994 in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia, International Agreements, no. 12/1994.

[10] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia, International Agreements, no. 11/1995.

of the Resolution.[11] In the meantime, stated the Resolution, the translated text of the LOS Convention published in the Official Gazette of the predecessor state would be valid and applied as an official text in the Republic of Croatia.[12]

3. THE MARITIME CODE

The Maritime Code of the Republic of Croatia was adopted by the Parliament on 27 January 1994.[13] It is a comprehensive legal act consisting of 1056 Articles (divided into 13 chapters) dealing with: marine and submarine areas of the Republic of Croatia (the law of the sea), regime of the maritime public domain, safety of navigation, procedures concerning the registration of ships, property regime concerning vessels (ownership, liens and mortgages), limitation of shipowner's liability, contracts and other obligations relating to ships (carriage of goods by sea, carriage of passengers and their luggage), collisions at sea, salvage, general average, marine insurance, enforcement of maritime claims, and the conflict of laws.

As the scope of this article is the national implementation of the law of the sea, Chapter II of the Maritime Code, dealing with marine and submarine areas, is of a particular interest. The provisions of this chapter regulate the Croatian sovereignty, its sovereign rights and jurisdiction in internal waters, its territorial sea, continental shelf and exclusive economic zone. The analysis of these provisions leads to the conclusion that not only is the Croatian national legislation on the law of the sea based on 1958 Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea to which Croatia became a party through succession, but it is also based on all those provisions of the 1982 Convention which were considered customary international law in the period before its entry into force (i.e. the rules relating to the territorial sea and the continental shelf which are different from the 1958 Conventions, Part V of the UN Convention which deals with EEZ etc.).[14]

The former Yugoslavia used to pass the legislation regulating its law of the sea legislation in separate Coastal Sea and Continental Shelf Acts (1948, 1965 and 1987), whereas the maritime law was regulated in the Maritime and Inland Waters Navigation Act (1977), which entered into force on 1 January 1978. Having gained independence in 1991, Croatia passed a bill that enabled the application of this former federal law during the three-year period before the Croatian Parliament passed the Maritime Code.[15] This is the first time that Croatia has codified its maritime law and law of the sea in a single comprehensive legislative act.

The Maritime Code has abandoned the term "coastal sea" (comprising the internal waters and the territorial sea) which was used in previous legislation, because its wording was inadequate and unknown in the terminology of the international law of the sea. Article 7 of the Maritime Code regulating internal waters adopted the system of straight baselines from the previous legislation of the former Yugoslavia that had left the islands of Biševo, Jabuka, Svetac and Vis outside this system. Some com-

---

[11] It took five years to publish the translated texts.
[12] It was published in the Official Gazette of SFRY, International Agreements, no. 1/1986.
[13] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia no. 17/1994.
[14] Exclusive economic zone.
[15] The Official Gazette of the Republic of Croatia No. 53/1991.

mentators expressed the opinion that Croatia should have ceased this opportunity to extend its straight baselines to these islands in accordance with Article 7 of LOSC.[16] Although the Maritime Code contains no provisions to this effect, in those parts of the internal waters which used to be referred to as the territorial sea before the system of straight baselines "captured" them in internal waters, there is still the right of innocent passage according to the conventions.[17] However, the coastal state can avoid this duty to concede innocent passage to those ships that are crossing its waters without intention to enter its ports by creating a system of compulsory sea lanes and traffic separation schemes. Article 25 prescribes that such system shall be marked in the navigation map "Jadransko more" (The Adriatic Sea) and be gazetted in due time in the "Notice to Mariners".

Article 19(1) of the Maritime Code established a 12 mile territorial sea measured from the baselines. This is in accordance with the previous legislation as well as with the international law of the sea. On the other hand, the Maritime Code contains certain provisions which have been adopted by many coastal states, although they have not been generally accepted either in international conventions on the law of the sea or in the international customary law. An example of such a provision is Article 23 which requires notification of innocent passage of a foreign military vessel at least 24 hours in advance. Similarly, Article 27 puts a limit of a maximum of three military vessels of the same nationality entering the territorial sea. Naturally, the principle of sovereign immunity forbids any action of arrest or hot pursuit of foreign warships which, in case of violation of the national law, may only be required to leave the territorial sea. These provisions do not apply to the operations resulting from the Security Council decisions based on Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

Furthermore, a foreign fishing vessel at passage through the territorial sea of the Republic of Croatia shall not engage in fishing unless it has been issued a licence, and it shall sail at a speed of not less than six knots, without stopping or anchoring except if it is absolutely necessary as a consequence of force majeure or of an accident at sea, and carrying visible marks of a fishing vessel.[18]

Warships, tankers, nuclear ships, and ships carrying dangerous chemicals or noxious substances, while sailing in the internal waters and during innocent passage through the territorial sea of the Republic of Croatia shall sail following the prescribed routes for these ships, observe the systems of separated traffic in the areas where these traffic lanes or systems of separated traffic are prescribed, and satisfy any other prescribed conditions regarding the safety of navigation and the prevention of the pollution of the marine environment.[19]

Chapter VII of the Maritime Code (Articles 33-42) contains regulations on the EEZ.[20] However, coastal states do not have *ipso facto* an exclusive economic zone (unlike the territorial sea and continental shelf) without a special act of proclamation. Be-

---

[16] B. Vukas, Croatia and the Law of the Sea, Essays on the New Law of the Sea, Prinosi za poredbeno proučavanje prava, vol. 24, no. 26, Zagreb, 1996, p. 17.

[17] Article 5(2) of the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone, and Article 8(2) of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

[18] Article 26 of the Maritime Code.

[19] ibidem, Article 28

[20] The Maritime Code uses the term *gospodarski pojas* (economic zone).

cause of various political reasons, the former Yugoslavia, although actively contributing throughout UNCLOS III,[21] had never proclaimed its EEZ and neither has Croatia since gaining its independence. This means that provisions of Chapter VII will apply only after the Parliament of Croatia has decided to proclaim its EEZ.[22]

Though provisions on EEZ are in concordance with the LOSC, some authors criticized the lack of any reference to the rights and duties of other states in the Croatian exclusive economic zone. However, on the basis of Article 58 of the LOSC, the neighbouring states will have the right of fishing the surplus, with some restrictions. Perhaps more important than these sovereign rights on the resources in its EEZ, is the jurisdiction that Croatia will acquire concerning the protection of the marine environment.

The continental shelf of the Republic of Croatia is defined in Article 43 of the Maritime Code as "seabed and subsoil beyond the outer limit of the territorial sea of the Republic of Croatia seaward, up to the boundary lines of the continental shelf with the neighbouring states." These boundaries and others are described and discussed in the following chapter.

4. THE DELIMITATION OF MARITIME BOUNDARIES IN THE ADRIATIC

The dissolution of Yugoslavia and the creation of the new independent coastal states created the necessity of delimitation between their respective areas. Such situations exist concerning the delimitation of the territorial seas between Slovenia and Croatia, and concerning the territorial seas as well as the continental shelf between Croatia and Montenegro (FRY). Since the former Yugoslavia had never negotiated the lateral boundary of its continental shelf with Albania, this question will remain on the agenda of Montenegro or FRY. All these cases deal with delimitations between adjacent states. The possible delimitations between opposite coasts will arise when and if coastal states in the Adriatic Sea proclaim their EEZ. There are three such cases involving potential EEZ boundaries: Italy-Croatia, Italy-Montenegro (FRY), Italy-Albania.

Some of the maritime boundaries in the Adriatic which were negotiated between the former Yugoslavia and the neighbouring states are still in force between the successor states and their respective neighbours. The reason is the above mentioned rule of customary law on the binding effect of the boundary agreements in the case of succession.

The delimitation of the territorial seas between Italy and Yugoslavia in the Bay of Trieste was settled by the Osimo Treaty of 10 November 1975. Both states agreed to take into account "the principles resulting from the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone".[23] It means that the delimitation of the territorial sea between the two countries was made applying the median line corrected by one of the special circumstances, namely, the necessity to enable the navigation through the territorial waters of each state to the respective ports of Trieste and Koper. The Bay of

[21] The Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (1973-1982).
[22] Article 1042 of the Maritime Code contains such provision.
[23] The Official Gazette of SFRY, International Agreements, no. 1/1977. The treaty entered into force on 3 April 1977.

Trieste has roughly the shape of a rectangle, with an opening of about 12 miles - between the peninsula of Istria and Porto Grado - and a penetration of 13.5 miles. The Yugoslav (nowadays Slovenian) coast is indented by several small bays, whereas the Italian side is mostly straight (with the Muggia Bay as the only major indentation) and has extensive shallow waters along the shoreline. The deepest waters (20-30 m) are near the coast of Istria and are particularly rich with fish.

The boundary line of the continental shelf in the Adriatic was determined by the Rome Agreement of 8 January 1968 between Italy and the former Yugoslavia.[24] It entered into force on 21 January 1970. The above mentioned Article 43 of the Maritime Code in its second paragraph contains a reference to this Agreement. The delimitation was effectuated in accordance with the Article 6 of the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf which contains the combined rule of equidistance and special circumstances. Although the boundary line was basically the median line between the two opposite coasts, the presence and position of certain islands (Jabuka, Palagruža and Galijula) caused a compromise during the negotiations which resulted in the departure from the median line, conceding to Italy certain areas as a compensation. Jabuka was used as a basepoint but its full impact was offset by shifting the notional median line eastward, conceding to Italy an area of 1680 km^2. A special provision was made for natural deposits straddling the boundary, and both parties agreed to proceed, with regard to such deposits, by mutual agreement.[25]

As mentioned above, the dissolution of Yugoslavia caused the necessity of establishing new maritime boundaries between the new coastal states. Whenever states have to establish their boundaries, land or maritime, it causes a certain degree of disagreement because of the issues in question (the areas which will become their territory or "aquatory") are a vital, long-term interest. What made the maritime delimitation among the former Yugoslav Republics even more controversial, is the fact that there were no boundary lines between them set in the Adriatic Sea (whereas they had precise administrative land boundaries).

Its consequence is the inapplicability of the *uti possidetis* principle, which was a useful tool for establishing international land boundaries, and in some cases for resolving the problem of maritime delimitations.[26]

After gaining their independence in October 1991 and becoming the subjects of international law, Croatia and Slovenia declared the necessity of drawing a boundary line which would divide their territorial waters by mutual agreement. Whereas both states agreed to strictly apply the rules of customary and conventional international law - especially those rules contained in the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone and the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea - they could not agree on their interpretation and implementation. In its 7 April 1993 Memorandum,

---

[24] The Official Gazette of SFRY, International Agreements, no. 28/1970, p.231.

[25] Article 2 of the Agreement.

[26] This Latin term (meaning "as possessed") which has its roots in Roman Civil Law, became known in the international law in the period of disintegration of Spanish colonial domination in Central America and emergence of new states which caused the neccesity of establishing their frontiers. In this sense it means a legal effect of the *de facto* exercise of powers on certain territory at the moment of conclusion of a peace agreement or at the time of the settlement of a dispute. See in: V. Ibler, Rječnik međunarodnog javnog prava, Informator, Zagreb, 1972, p. 316.

Slovenia claimed its sovereignty over the entire Bay of Piran, and consequently, their jurisdictions arising thereof should be exercised by the Slovenian authorities.

Since the Republic of Croatia is also a coastal state in the Bay of Piran, the Slovenian claim is not only unacceptable to Croatia but moreover, it is a violation of Article 1 of the Geneva Convention and Article 2 of the UN Convention. Both provisions contain the rule that the sovereignty of a coastal state extends, beyond its land territory and its internal waters (and archipelagic waters in LOSC) to an adjacent belt of sea, described as the territorial sea, and to the airspace over the territorial sea as well as to its bed and subsoil. If accepted, the Slovenian request would put Croatia in a position unknown until now in the whole world: to have a foreign state's sovereignty in the territorial sea in front of the Croatian coast.

The second claim in the above mentioned Memorandum is the request that the territorial sea of Slovenia must have contact with the high seas. This claim would be realized only if a part of the Croatian territory (the Peninsula of Istria) were ceded and annexed to the state territory of the Republic of Slovenia. As these claims would be unacceptable for any sovereign state, Croatia declined them, but on the other hand, proposed a solution consisting in the establishment, by bilateral agreement, of a new very liberal *sui generis* regime in specified parts of the Croatian territorial sea. This regime, with some elements of the transit passage (created at UNCLOS III) for similar situations in international straits, should ensure the freedom of navigation beyond the regime of innocent passage. The Slovenian delegation has not accepted this proposal and so far has refused to submit the dispute to an international judicial forum (the International Court of Justice in the Hague, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in Hamburg or international arbitration).

While probable bilateral agreements will be negotiated in the forseeable future between Croatia and Slovenia, resolving their maritime boundary dispute together with several other controversial issues, more serious problems exist between Croatia and Montenegro (The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia). Since the dissolution of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Montenegro have been expressing territorial pretensions towards the most southern part of Croatia, before, during and after their military operations culminating in the occupation of Croatian territory and the siege of Dubrovnik. They have insisted on the total control of the entrance of the Bay of Boka Kotorska which became the base for the entire Navy of the former Yugoslavia.. After the end of the hostilities and the subsequent withdrawal of the Yugoslav Army from the southern part of Croatia, an interim arrangement created a demilitarized zone at Prevlaka, the peninsula belonging to Croatia at the entrance of the Bay. The UN peace-keepers stationed there were a separate unit independent from other peace-keeping forces (UNPROFOR, SFOR or IFOR).

Croatia should insist on the application of the *uti possidetis* principle, because the former boundaries between the ex-Yugoslav Republics "became frontiers protected by international law."[27] "According to a well-established principle of international law the alteration of existing frontiers or boundaries by force is not capable of producing any legal effect", so that "they may not be altered except by agreement freely arrived at."[28] Croatia

[27] The Opinion no. 3 of the Arbitration Commission of the Conference on Yugoslavia of 11 January 1992, International Legal Materials, 31, p. 1499.
[28] ibidem.

should not admit the existence of any territorial dispute with Montenegro (FRY). The only dispute to resolve is the one concerning maritime delimitation between Croatia and Montenegro (FRY). It involves the delimitation of territorial seas in the Bay of Boka Kotorska and outside it, up to the 12 miles from the nearest point on baselines. There are no special circumstances or historic titles in this case which could demand the delimitation in a way at variance with the median line. The second maritime delimitation is the one regarding the continental shelf. In this case the Maritime Code also provides for the median line: "Until the conclusion of an agreement concerning the delimitation of the continental shelf with Montenegro, or with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), the Republic of Croatia shall enjoy the sovereign rights in that zone up to the median line proceeding seaward from the outer limit of the territorial sea at the entrance of the Bay of Boka Kotorska". However, this third paragraph of Article 43 of the Maritime Code contains an obvious mistake since the starting point of the boundary line of the continental shelf may not be at the entrance of the Bay but 12 nm seaward. The future delimitation of possible exclusive economic zones of Croatia and Montenegro (FRY) should follow the same median line and starting from the seabed extend vertically in order to encompass the water column and the surface of the sea.

Considering the future relations between the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, it is essential to resolve the existing maritime boundary dispute as soon as possible because such diputes may represent a potential source of conflict. The negotiations conducted so far showed that the standpoints of the two parties were diametrically opposed. However, recent political developments in Montenegro and Serbia should promise a different attitude in the future efforts to resolve this maritime delimitation dispute.

5. CONCLUSION

Since becoming an independent state, Croatia has created its own national legislation on the law of the sea and has notified the Secretary General of the United Nations, as the depositary of the most important international treaties dealing with the law of the sea, on succession or accession of its status as a party to those conventions.

Regarding the 1958 Geneva Conventions, Croatia passed its legislative act and subsequent notification only one year after gaining independence in October 1991, whereas related to the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea it happened three years later, in April 1995.

In the meantime, the Maritime Code of 1994 codified not only the Croatian maritime law but also the law of the sea, incorporating many provisions from the mentioned international conventions. Although Croatia has not yet proclaimed its exclusive economic zone, the Maritime Code contains the necessary legal framework when such time comes. It will depend on various political, economic and social circumstances, but mostly on reaching a common standpoint with Italy and other neighbouring states in the Adriatic Sea, with the coastal states of the Mediterranean and with the European Union.

The most important issue on the Croatian agenda regarding law of the sea, besides the proclamation of its exclusive economic zone, is the resolution of the maritime boundary disputes with its neighbours, either through negotiating bilateral agreements, or through international judicial or arbitral settlements.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Andrassy, International Law and the Resources of the Sea, Columbia University Press, New York, 1970.
[2] V. Đ. Degan, Maritime Frontiers of the Republic of Croatia, Usporedno pomorsko pravo, vol. 37, no. 1-4, 1995.
[3] A. A. Faraj, The International Law of Maritime Boundaries and the Practice of States in the Mediterranean Sea, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.
[4] F. Florio, Sulla delimitazione del golfo di Trieste fra Italia e Jugoslavia, Studi in onore di Manlio Udina, I, Giuffre, Milano, 1975.
[5] G. P. Francalanci, F. Spanio, La Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sul Diritto del Mare, Aspetti Tecnici, Istituto Idrografico della Marina, Genova, 1989.
[6] V. Ibler, Isključiva gospodarska zona s posebnim osvrtom na Jadran, Pomorski zbornik, no. 21, 1983.
[7] V. Ibler, Rječnik međunarodnog javnog prava, Informator, Zagreb, 1972.
[8] V. Ibler, Državna granica na moru između Republike Hrvatske i Republike Slovenije, Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Zagrebu, vol. 44, no. 5-6, 1994.
[9] V. Ibler, Uz pitanje lateralnih granica Republike Hrvatske na moru, Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu, no. 51-52, 1998.
[10] U. Leanza, La delimitazione del mare territoriale nel Mediterraneo, Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Rijeci, vol. 16, no. 1, 1995.
[11] M. Seršić, The Crisis in the Eastern Adriatic and the Law of the Sea, Ocean Development and International law, Vol. 24, 1994.
[12] B. Vukas, Međunarodni sud za pravo mora, Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu, vol. 35, no. 51-52, 1998.
[13] B. Vukas, Croatia and the Law of the Sea, Essays on the New Law of the Sea, Prinosi za poredbeno proučavanje prava, vol. 24, no. 26, Zagreb, 1996.

Sažetak

HRVATSKA I KONVENCIJA UJEDINJENIH NARODA O PRAVU MORA: PET GODINA OD NOTIFIKACIJE O SUKCESIJI

Prije pet godina Republika Hrvatska položila je kod Glavnog tajnika UN-a notifikaciju o sukcesiji na temelju koje je postala strankom Konvencije UN-a o pravu mora (Montego Bay, 1982.), dok je na temelju pristupa ili akcesije stranka Sporazuma o primjeni XI. dijela Konvencije (New York, 1994.). Službeni prijevodi oba međunarodno-pravna instrumenta na hrvatski jezik objavljeni su uz izvornike na engleskom jeziku u lipnju 2000. U radu se razmatraju pitanja sukcesije Hrvatske u vezi s međunarodnim ugovorima općenito, te posebno glede međunarodnih konvencija koje uređuju pravo mora. Prikazane su značajnije odredbe drugog dijela Pomorskoga zakonika naslovljenog "Morski i podmorski prostori Republike Hrvatske", a zatim se iznose problemi vezani uz razgraničenje tih prostora sa susjednim državama na Jadranu i načini njihova rješavanja.