

**VESSEL-SOURCE POLLUTION
AND COASTAL STATE JURISDICTION**

Vessel-source Pollution and Coastal State Jurisdiction

**The Work of the ILA Committee on
Coastal State Jurisdiction Relating to Marine Pollution
(1991–2000)**

Edited by

Erik Franckx



Kluwer Law International

The Hague / London / Boston

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN 90-411-1630-3

Published by Kluwer Law International,
P.O. Box 85889, 2508 CN The Hague, The Netherlands.

Sold and distributed in North, Central and South America
by Kluwer Law International,
101 Philip Drive, Norwell, MA 02061, U.S.A.
kluwerlaw@wkap.com

In all other countries, sold and distributed
by Kluwer Law International, Distribution Centre,
P.O. Box 322, 3300 AH Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved
© 2001 Kluwer Law International
Kluwer Law International incorporates the publishing programmes of
Graham & Trotman Ltd, Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers,
and Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and
retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

Printed in the Netherlands.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD – <i>Kari Hakapää</i>	xxi
LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS	xxiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxv
1 GENERAL	xxv
2 SPECIFIC FOR EACH COMMITTEE REPORT	xxviii
2.1 First Report (Helsinki, 1996)	xxviii
2.2 Second Report (Taipei, 1998)	xxviii
2.3 Final Report (London, 2000)	xxviii
3 SPECIFIC FOR EACH COUNTRY REPORT	xxx
3.1 Australia	xxx
3.2 Belgium	xxx
3.3 Chile	xxx
3.4 China	xxx
3.5 Denmark	xxx
3.6 Finland	xxx
3.7 France	xxx
3.8 Germany	xxx
3.9 Greece	xxx
3.10 Italy	xxx
3.11 The Netherlands	xxx
3.12 Sweden	xxx
3.13 Taiwan	xxx
3.14 The United Kingdom	xxx
3.15 The United States of America	xxx
INTRODUCTION – <i>Erik Franckx</i>	xxxv
I FIRST REPORT (MAY 1996) - HELSINKI CONFERENCE (1996) .	1
1 INTRODUCTION	1

2 MANDATORY SHIP REPORTING	5
2.1 Developments until 1995	6
2.2 Developments since 1995	7
2.3 Conclusions	9
3 GENERALLY ACCEPTED INTERNATIONAL RULES AND STANDARDS	11
3.1 Use of terms	12
3.1.1 <i>Article 211</i>	13
3.1.2 <i>Article 226</i>	16
3.1.3 <i>Article 21 (2)</i>	17
3.1.4 <i>Conclusions</i>	18
3.2 Actual effect of reference	19
3.2.1 <i>Meaning of terms</i>	19
<i>i Competent international organization</i> ..	19
<i>ii Rules and standards</i>	21
<i>iii Generally accepted</i>	21
3.2.2 <i>Legal implications</i>	22
3.3 State practice	24
3.3.1 <i>Article 211 (2)</i>	24
3.3.2 <i>Article 211 (5)</i>	24
3.3.3 <i>Article 211 (6)</i>	25
3.3.4 <i>Article 226</i>	25
<i>i Analysis</i>	25
<i>ii Conclusions</i>	26
3.3.5 <i>Article 21 (2)</i>	26
<i>i Analysis</i>	26
<i>ii Conclusions</i>	27
3.4 Conclusions	27
3.4.1 <i>Theoretical foundations</i>	27
3.4.2 <i>Practical application</i>	30
4 CONCLUSIONS	31
WORKING SESSION	32
II SECOND REPORT - TAIPEI CONFERENCE (1998)	39
1 INTRODUCTION	39
2 APPLICABLE	40
2.1 Provisions in the LOSC	40
2.2 Meaning and purpose	40
2.3 Assessment	41

2.4 State practice	44
2.4.1 <i>General</i>	44
2.4.2 <i>The concept of 'generally accepted'</i>	45
2.4.3 <i>The status of the rule of reference</i>	52
3 WILFUL AND SERIOUS POLLUTION	55
3.1 As activity rendering passage non-innocent	55
3.2 Relation with penalties	59
3.3 State practice	60
3.3.1 <i>Innocent passage in national legislation</i>	60
3.3.2 <i>Penalty provisions in national legislation</i> ...	63
4 CONCLUSIONS	66
WORKING SESSION	68
III FINAL REPORT - LONDON CONFERENCE (2000)	75
1 INTRODUCTION	75
2 COASTAL-STATE ENFORCEMENT POWERS OVER VESSEL-SOURCE POLLUTION	80
2.1 Mandatory ship reporting and vessel traffic services	82
2.2 The distinction between enforcement powers over ships in innocent passage and ships in passage which is non-innocent	86
2.3 Coastal-state enforcement powers over foreign ships in non-transit passage	89
2.4 Coastal-state enforcement powers in archipelagic waters and archipelagic sea lanes	91
2.5 Coastal-state enforcement powers in the EEZ	94
2.6 Coastal-state enforcement powers in special areas under Art. 221 (6) of the 1982 Convention and ice-covered areas under Art. 234 of the 1982 Convention ...	96
2.6.1 <i>Special areas under Art. 211 (6) of the 1982 Convention</i>	97
2.6.2 <i>Special areas under Art. 234 of the 1982 Convention</i>	100
3 CONCLUSIONS	105
3.1 The purpose and meaning of the concept of 'generally accepted international rules and standards' ...	105
3.2 The purpose and meaning of the concept of 'applicable international rules and standards'	113

3.3 The pacta tertiis principle and the 1982 Convention regulatory approach concerning vessel-source pollution (status of the rule of reference)	117
3.4 The concept of 'wilful and serious pollution' in the 1982 Convention	125
3.5 Mandatory ship reporting and vessel traffic services . . .	128
3.6 Coastal-state enforcement powers over vessel-source pollution	129
WORKING SESSION	133
RESOLUTION	145
IV AUSTRALIA	147
<i>Michael White</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	147
1.1 General geographical context	147
1.1.1 Great Barrier reef	148
1.1.2 Torres strait	150
1.1.3 Australian/Indonesian sea boundary	150
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Australia and their delimitation	151
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	152
1.3.1 1982 Convention	153
1.3.2 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and Agenda 21	153
1.3.3 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973	154
1.3.4 The MARPOL 73/78 Convention	154
1.3.5 The International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 29 November 1969	155
1.3.6 The International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, 18 December 1971	156
1.3.7 Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, 22 March 1989	157

1.3.8	<i>International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation, 30 November 1990</i>	157
1.3.9	<i>Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 29 December 1972</i>	158
1.3.10	<i>International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea, 3 May 1996</i>	159
1.3.11	<i>Ballast Water</i>	159
2	PRESENT AUSTRALIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK	160
2.1	Commonwealth legislation	160
2.1.1	<i>Protection of the Sea (Powers of Intervention) Act 1981</i>	160
2.1.2	<i>Protection of the Sea (Prevention of Pollution from Ships) Act 1983</i>	161
2.1.3	<i>Protection of the Sea (Civil Liability) Act 1981</i>	162
2.1.4	<i>Protection of the Sea (Oil Pollution Compensation Fund) Act 1993</i>	163
2.1.5	<i>Hazardous Waste (Regulation of Exports and Imports) Act 1989</i>	164
2.1.6	<i>Environment Protection (Sea Dumping) Act 1981</i>	164
2.2	State and territory legislation	165
3	REGULATORY BODIES	166
3.1	Australian government departments	166
3.2	AMSA	166
3.3	National plan	166
4	AUSTRALIA'S OCEAN POLICY	167
5	CONCLUSIONS	167
V	BELGIUM	169
	<i>Tim De Bondt and Erik Franckx</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	169
1.1	General geographical context	169
1.2	Different maritime zones claimed by Belgium and their delimitation	170

1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	173
<i>1.3.1 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol to the Convention, 2 November 1973</i> ...	173
<i>1.3.2 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	173
<i>1.3.3 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	174
<i>1.3.4 1982 Convention</i>	174
2 PAST BELGIAN LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES	176
2.1 Implementation of the main international conventions ..	176
2.2 Other past Belgian legislative initiatives worth mentioning	178
<i>2.2.1 Examples of Belgium's recent adaptation of European directives</i>	178
<i>2.2.2 Examples of Belgium's recent adaptation of international treaties</i>	179
3 PRESENT BELGIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK	179
3.1 Situation prior to 1999	179
3.2 Situation since 1999	180
<i>3.2.1 General appraisal</i>	181
<i>3.2.2 Vessel-source pollution</i>	183
4 BELGIAN NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	185
5 CONCLUSIONS	188
VI CHILE	191
<i>Maria Teresa Infante</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	191
1.1 General geographical context	191
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Chile	192
<i>1.2.1 Internal waters</i>	192
<i>1.2.2 Territorial sea</i>	192
<i>1.2.3 Contiguous zone</i>	193
<i>1.2.4 EEZ</i>	193
<i>1.2.5 Continental shelf</i>	193

1.2.6 Straits	193
1.2.7 Charts	194
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	194
1.3.1 <i>International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	194
1.3.2 <i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	194
1.3.3 <i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	195
1.3.4 <i>1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea</i>	195
2 PRESENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK	195
2.1 Distinction between the different zones	196
2.2 Distinction based on the nature of maritime zones and the nationality of ships	196
2.3 Innocent and non-innocent passage	197
2.4 ‘Generally accepted international rules and standards’ ..	197
2.5 ‘Wilful and serious pollution’	197
2.6 Art. 234 of the 1982 Convention and ice-covered waters ..	197
2.7 Art. 218 of the 1982 Convention-type jurisdiction (port-state jurisdiction)	198
3 CHILEAN NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	199
4 CONCLUSIONS	199
 VII CHINA	 201
<i>Hui Yu</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	201
1.1 General geographical context	201
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by China and their delimitation	201
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	203
1.3.1 <i>International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	203

1.3.2	<i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	203
1.3.3	<i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	204
1.3.4	<i>1982 Convention</i>	204
2	PRESENT CHINESE LEGAL FRAMEWORK	205
2.1	Basic Chinese legislation relating to the oceans	205
2.2	Chinese regulations governing foreign vessels	207
2.3	China's emphasis on coastal-state jurisdiction	208
3	THE REVISED MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION LAW	209
4	CHINESE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	211
5	CONCLUSIONS	212
VIII	DENMARK	215
	<i>Kaare Bangert</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	215
1.1	The socio-legal context of the new marine environment regime	216
1.1.1	<i>Denmark</i>	216
1.1.2	<i>The Faroe islands</i>	217
1.1.3	<i>Greenland</i>	217
1.2	Policy context	217
1.3	Different maritime zones claimed by Denmark	218
2	PRESENT DANISH LEGAL FRAMEWORK	219
2.1	The framework of the maritime zones	220
2.1.1	<i>The Danish 12-n.m. territorial sea</i>	220
2.1.2	<i>The Danish 200-n.m. EEZ</i>	220
2.2	Vessel-source pollution in Danish law	221
2.2.1	<i>Overview</i>	221
2.2.2	<i>The new enforcement jurisdiction of the 1998 Marine Environmental Act</i>	224
2.2.3	<i>Inspection of foreign ships in the Danish territorial sea and EEZ</i>	225
2.2.4	<i>Intervention on the high seas outside the Danish territorial sea and EEZ</i>	226
2.2.5	<i>Supplementary principles of jurisdiction</i>	226

	2.2.6 <i>A drafting error: Foreign ships in the territorial sea excluded from intervention?</i>	226
	2.2.7 <i>Greenland</i>	227
	2.2.8 <i>The Faroe islands</i>	227
	2.2.9 <i>Shipping and the safety of ships</i>	228
	3 CONCLUSIONS	229
XI	FINLAND	231
	<i>Kari Hakapää</i>	
	1 INTRODUCTION	231
	1.1 General geographical context	231
	1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Finland and their delimitation	231
	1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	234
	1.3.1 <i>International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	234
	1.3.2 <i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	235
	1.3.3 <i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	235
	1.3.4 <i>1982 Convention</i>	235
	1.3.5 <i>Convention on the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area</i>	235
	2 PRESENT FINNISH LEGAL FRAMEWORK	236
	2.1 General	236
	2.2 Past developments	236
	2.3 Present legal framework	236
	3 FINNISH NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	239
	4 CONCLUSIONS	239

X	FRANCE	241
	<i>Patrick Daillier</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	241
	1.1 Contexte géographique	241
	1.2 Différentes zones maritimes françaises et leur délimitation	242
	1.3 Attitude vis-à-vis des principales conventions internationales	244
	<i>1.3.1 Conventions de portée universelle</i>	244
	<i>1.3.2 Conventions de portée régionale</i>	246
2	NORMES LÉGISLATIVES PASSÉES	246
3	NORMES LÉGISLATIVES EN VIGUEUR	247
	3.1 La liberté de navigation	247
	3.2 Le passage inoffensif des navires étrangers est-il distingué du passage non-inoffensif?	248
	3.3 Les pouvoirs d'intervention en mer	249
	<i>3.3.1 Les textes applicables</i>	249
	<i>3.3.2 Les navires concernés: ceux sous pavillon tiers ne peuvent-ils se voir imposer les normes nationales que s'ils sont dans un port national?</i>	250
	<i>3.3.3 Relation avec la CMB</i>	251
	<i>3.3.4 Les possibilités de sanction des contrevenants</i>	251
4	LES MOYENS OPÉRATIONNELS NATIONAUX	252
	4.1 Les institutions compétentes et les moyens dont elles disposent	252
	4.2 La responsabilité de l'Etat du fait des interventions autoritaires en mer	253
5	CONCLUSION	253
XI	GERMANY	255
	<i>Rainer Lagoni</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	255
	1.1 General geographical context	255
	1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Germany and their delimitation	255
	<i>1.2.1 Baselines</i>	255
	<i>1.2.2 Territorial sea</i>	256

	<i>1.2.3 Continental shelf</i>	257
	<i>1.2.4 Exclusive economic zone</i>	259
	1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	259
2	PRESENT GERMAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK	260
	2.1 Outline of the constitutional situation	260
	2.2 Intervention Convention and 1973 Intervention Protocol	261
	2.3 OILPOL Convention	261
	2.4 MARPOL 73/78 Convention	262
	2.5 1974 Helsinki Convention	263
	2.6 1982 Convention	264
	<i>2.6.1 Implementing laws</i>	264
	<i>2.6.2 Criminal law</i>	265
	<i>2.6.3 Supplementary ordinances</i>	265
3	GERMAN NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	266
	3.1 Competence relating to enforcement	266
	3.2 Practice of enforcement	267
4	CONCLUSIONS	268
XII	GREECE	269
	<i>Anastasia Strati</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	269
	1.1 General geographical context	269
	1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Greece and their delimitation	270
	1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	276
	<i>1.3.1 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	276
	<i>1.3.2 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	276
	<i>1.3.3 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	277
	<i>1.3.4 1982 Convention</i>	277

2	PRESENT GREEK LEGAL FRAMEWORK	278
2.1	General appraisal	278
2.2	Scope of application	279
2.3	General prohibition	279
2.4	Obligations for ships and tankers	280
2.5	Sanctions	281
2.6	Routeing systems	282
3	GREEK NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	282
4	CONCLUSIONS	285
XIII	ITALY	287
	<i>Angelo Merialdi</i>	
1	INTRODUCTION	287
1.1	General geographical context	287
1.2	Different maritime zones claimed by Italy and their delimitation	287
1.3	Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	290
1.3.1	<i>International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol to the Convention, 2 November 1973 ...</i>	290
1.3.2	<i>CLC and Fund Convention</i>	291
1.3.3	<i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	292
1.3.4	<i>1982 Convention</i>	292
1.3.5	<i>Participation in the Barcelona system</i>	293
2	PRESENT ITALIAN LEGAL FRAMEWORK	294
2.1	Problematic cases of implementation of international law	294
2.1.1	<i>The MARPOL 73/78 Convention and Law no. 979 of 31 December 1982</i>	294
2.1.2	<i>The CLC and Presidential Decree no. 504 of 27 May 1978</i>	296
2.1.3	<i>Port-state control: Implementation of the Paris Memorandum of Understanding and Directive 95/21/CE</i>	297

2.2 Regulation of navigation in international straits	297
2.2.1 Messina	298
2.2.2 Bonifacio	298
2.3 Other legislative initiatives worth mentioning	299
3 CONCLUSIONS	300
 XIV THE NETHERLANDS	303
<i>Erik Jaap Molenaar and Harm M. Dotinga</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	303
1.1 General geographical context	303
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by the Netherlands and their delimitation	304
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	306
2 PRESENT NETHERLANDS LEGAL FRAMEWORK	308
2.1 Overview	308
2.2 Innocent passage	311
2.3 Wilful and serious pollution	312
2.4 Transit passage	312
2.5 The concept of ‘generally accepted’	314
2.6 Enforcement	314
2.6.1 In-port enforcement	314
2.6.2 Enforcement at sea	315
2.6.3 Safeguards	316
3 NETHERLANDS NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	317
4 CONCLUSIONS	320
 XV SWEDEN	323
<i>Said Mahmoudi</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	323
1.1 General geographical context	323
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Sweden and their delimitation	323

1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	326
<i>1.3.1 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	326
<i>1.3.2 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	326
<i>1.3.3 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	327
<i>1.3.4 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 10 December 1982</i>	327
<i>1.3.5 International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation, 30 November 1990</i>	328
2 SWEDISH NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	328
2.1 The Intervention Convention	328
2.2 The MARPOL 73/78 Convention	328
2.3 The 1982 Convention	332
2.4 OPRC Convention	333
2.5 Recent developments	333
3 CONCLUSIONS	336
XVI TAIWAN	337
<i>Lawrence Kuen-chen Fu</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	337
1.1 General geographical context	337
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by Taiwan and their delimitation	337
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	339
<i>1.3.1 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 29 November 1969 and Protocol of 1973</i>	339
<i>1.3.2 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 12 May 1954</i>	339

1.3.3 <i>International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 2 November 1973, and Protocol to the Convention, 17 February 1978</i>	339
1.3.4 <i>1982 Convention</i>	339
2 PAST TAIWANESE LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES	340
2.1 Implementation of the main international conventions	340
2.2 Other past Taiwanese legislative initiatives worth mentioning	340
3 PRESENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK	341
3.1 Situation prior to 1999	341
3.2 Situation since 1999	341
3.2.1 <i>General appraisal</i>	342
3.2.2 <i>Vessel-source pollution</i>	342
4 TAIWANESE NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	343
5 CONCLUSIONS	343
XVII THE UNITED KINGDOM	345
<i>David Anderson</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	345
1.1 General geographical context	345
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by the United Kingdom and their delimitation	345
1.2.1 <i>The territorial sea</i>	345
1.2.2 <i>Beyond the territorial sea</i>	346
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	348
2 PAST UK LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES	349
3 PRESENT UK LEGAL FRAMEWORK	350
3.1 Merchant Shipping (Prevention of Oil Pollution) Regulations 1996	351
3.2 Merchant Shipping (Dangerous or Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk) Regulations 1996	353
3.3 Merchant Shipping (Prevention of Pollution by Garbage) Regulations 1998	353
3.4 Merchant Shipping (Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation Convention) Regulations 1998	353

4 UK NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	354
5 CONCLUSIONS	355
 XVIII THE UNITED STATES	 357
<i>John E. Noyes</i>	
1 INTRODUCTION	357
1.1 General geographical context	357
1.2 Different maritime zones claimed by the United States and their delimitation	357
1.3 Status iuris concerning the main international conventions relating to marine pollution	360
2 PAST US LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES	362
3 PRESENT US LEGAL FRAMEWORK	364
3.1 Overview	364
3.2 Federal constitutional authority supporting federal marine pollution laws	365
3.3 Federal marine pollution statutes	366
3.3.1 <i>Intervention on the High Seas Act</i>	366
3.3.2 <i>Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships</i>	367
3.3.3 <i>Port and Waterways Safety Act and Port and Tanker Safety Act</i>	369
3.3.4 <i>Clean Water Act</i>	370
3.3.5 <i>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act</i>	373
3.3.6 <i>Oil Pollution Act of 1990</i>	374
3.3.7 <i>Marine Sanctuaries Act</i>	376
3.3.8 <i>Deepwater Port Act</i>	377
3.3.9 <i>Other federal statutes relevant to the protection of the marine environment</i>	378
3.4 State law	381
4 US NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICE	384
5 CONCLUSIONS	388