 DOI: https://doij.org/10.10000/IJLMH.1110335

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 8 | Issue 4

2025

The Role of International Tribunals in Resolving Maritime Disputes

NAVODITA KAUSHIK[1] AND VIBHANSH SONI[2]

ABSTRACT

Maritime disputes persist as an ongoing diplomatic problem which combines various issues of sovereign powers with resource extraction freedoms and navigation guidelines as well as environmental preservation. The paper investigates how international tribunal courts manage complex international conflicts through law-based methods instead of political power struggles. The research examines institutional background along with jurisdictional boundaries as well as analytical methods and significant cases while examining tribunal efficiency and future possibilities to assess judicial bodies' influence on maritime dispute settlements. Maritime conflict resolution through international tribunals depends heavily on state recognition and combined diplomatic methods together with execution systems for their developed advanced methods of jurisdiction. The paper recommends strategic improvements for maritime dispute resolution in present day where oceanic areas and resources face growing competition.

Keywords: *Maritime Disputes, International Tribunals,Legal Adjudication, Sovereignty, Resource Rights*

I. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary maritime dispute resolution architecture accommodates sophisticated ways, of the kind of permanent judicial weapons, ad hoc arbitral tribunals and fored systems that have a limited territorial range of competence. UNCLOS Part XV brought about an original approach to dispute settlement that provided multiple forums to states while keeping the vast majority of disputes within compulsory procedures involving binding decisions. States, however, can choose an 'cafeteria approach' where they can choose between four mechanisms of dispute resolution, namely the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the Annex VII arbitration (under Article 287(2)(a)), or the Annex VIII special arbitration (for technical disputes, Article 287(2)(c)), with Annex VII arbitration being the default rule unless otherwise declared in Article 287(1), since 'the availability of these means of settlement other than Arbitration is an intrinsic part of [the

[1] Author is a Student at Christ University, India.
[2] Author is a Student at Christ University, India.

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

optional] regime' (Klein, 2018 In 1996 International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea was established while its headquarters was in Hamburg, Germany and operates as a specialized judicial body consisting of 21 judges elected in consideration of equitable geographical representation. ITLOS has particular expertise in maritime matters and has developed expeditious procedures particularly for urgent situations, namely provisional measures and prompt release applications. The International Seabed Area, as the 'common heritage of mankind,' is peculiarly subject of exclusive jurisdiction of the Tribunal's specialized Seabed Disputes Chamber (Treves, 2019). Over the course of its history, the Court of fifteen members - judges - has partly decided many maritime disputes, giving the court precedents on methods for delimitation, on the sovereignty over maritime features and on freedoms of navigation. Arbitral tribunals set up under UNCLOS Annex VII have become the go-to option for handling maritime disputes. They offer a lot of flexibility in procedures, let parties choose their arbitrators, and can keep things confidential if needed. Notable cases like the South China Sea dispute (Philippines v. China), the Bay of Bengal Maritime Boundary Arbitration (Bangladesh v. India), and the Chagos Marine Protected Area Arbitration (Mauritius v. United Kingdom) have tackled intricate issues related to maritime rights, historical claims, and environmental responsibilities. This variety in institutions showcases the diverse nature of maritime disputes and caters to different state preferences for expertise, transparency, and the level of formality in resolving conflicts. This whole system allows for a specialized approach to maritime issues while still sticking to UNCLOS as the main legal framework (Churchill & Lowe, 2022).

II. JURISDICTIONAL PARAMETERS AND STATE PARTICIPATION

The current jurisdictional framework for maritime dispute resolution strikes a modest balance between compulsory adjudication of a dispute and state sovereignty, which does not uniformly and succinctly address the desire to encourage, but not uniform outcome, third party settlement of a dispute. Article 286 of UNCLOS establishes the fundamental principle of the submission unilaterally, required for compulsory procedures resulting in binding judgments if approached by diplomatic methods are not successful. The express consent requirement for each dispute represented by this obligatory pathway is an important departure from the norm regarding the requirement of express consent for all maritime disputes, and it reflects a presumption in favor of a legal resolution of maritime conflicts. But these limitations and exceptions to the compulsory jurisdiction are designed as well to limit state autonomy in sensitive areas (Boyle, 2014). In particular, Article 298 of UNCLOS permits any state to exclude certain types of disputes from compulsory settlement through submission to

formal procedures by means of a reservation. They are optional exceptions to include maritime boundary delimitations, historic bays or titles, military activities, and law enforcement actions, very precisely, the categories of activities that most commonly overlap or cut through core sovereign interests. Notably, approximately 40 states have so far made declarations which significantly limit the jurisdiction of a tribunal over politically sensitive disputes, including major maritime powers China, France, Russia, and the United Kingdom. Other limitations include additional jurisdictional limits, as in the case of prior exhaustion of local remedies in some cases, as well as the principle that the rights of third states cannot be adjudicated without their consent and, finally, the lack of the tribunals' enforcement authority beyond the issuance of binding decisions (Crawford & Nevill, 2015).

This shows some rather complex attitudes to participation in maritime adjudication; many states happily submit some or all claims of a technical nature in adjudication but are not overly keen about giving consent for resolving sovereignty adjacent disputes. Generally, developed maritime powers have acquiesced in the adjudication of some issues, particularly in the area of fisheries management, vessel release, and environmental protection reserving that they do so while reserving more or less all for themselves the right to decide on military activities and historic claims. Whereas international tribunals have traditionally been classified as 'political' forums underutilized by developing coastal states, they have become a hot venue of choice in recent years for developing coastal states to assert their maritime rights against more powerful neighbours, illustrated by Somali ICJ case against Kenya and the Philippines arbitration against China, but with little or no compliance on the ground. There are also regional differences in acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction as European states are more likely to accept compulsory jurisdiction than are Asian (Beckman, 2017). China's refusal to participate in arbitration initiated by the Philippines for the South China Sea is a particularly challenging phenomenon because it is non-participation in adjudicatory proceedings. UNCLOS Article 9 of Annex VII explicitly states that a party's presence is not required for the proceedings to occur but to participate does not bode well with evidentiary challenges, legitimacy concerns, and implementation obstacles. In particular, tribunals have been able to devise non-participation methodologies through which they can address the absence of a state through painstaking review of all evidence available, exhausting the state's known positions, and rendering reasoned, albeit necessarily incomplete, conclusions in the light of the informational asymmetry. However, the adverse consequence of nonparticipation is significant in the context of adjudication, especially from the geopolitical powerful state capacity to prevent adverse enforcement of decisions (Arsana and Schofield, 2022).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

III. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO MARITIME DELIMITATION

In the case of maritime boundary delimitation, coupled with the high political emphasis involved, international tribunals have progressively developed sophisticated methodological approaches to maritime dispute resolution, both in the form of dispute settlement as well as in the determination of an agreed line of reasonable contiguity (he di a el th m arr). The development of delimitation methodology followed the equitable principles/relevant circumstances of the North Sea Continental Shelf Cases (which were more geographic and equitable) to the contemporary three stage procedure balancing geographic objectivity and equitable outcomes. This methodological refinement has been utilized to transform this exercise into a more structured analytical framework, which the actions both of judges and of negotiated agreements (Lathrop, 2022). The ICJ's exact formula of the contemporary "equidistance/relevant circumstances" method, as applied to maritime delimitation, is in the Unanimous judgment in the Maritime Delimitation in the Black Sea (Romania v. Ukraine). Ukraine, 2009), proceeds through three discrete stages. Tribunals then take its first step by constructing a provisional and equidistance or median line on the basis of the relevant coastal geography using precise cartographic techniques to identify appropriate base points. Second, they ask whether circumstances relevant to this provisional line should be adjusted, if at all, so as to obtain an equitable result. Typical circumstances of such kind are irregularities of coastal configuration, the existence of islands and other maritime features, existing agreements or arrangements, as well as consideration of proportionality of coastal length. Third, tribunals examine the question of whether the delimitation it has established does not result in a broad disproportion between maritime areas allocated and the length of the respective coasts of the parties (Fietta & Cleverly, 2021).

In addition, this clarity has been further strengthened by constantly using this methodological approach in different forums. More and more, the ICJ, ITLOS and arbitral tribunals have come closer together in their approaches, such as in the complementary decisions of the Bay of Bengal cases (Bangladesh v. Myanmar and Bangladesh v. However, even in India, these methods were used, although the same cases were judged by different institutions (India). Through the composition of their judgments on each methodological stage it has contributed to strengthening the formative power of their decisions and to offering useful advice for states at the time negotiating maritime boundaries. It has responded to previous worries of law of the sea fragmentation and better legal predictability in maritime relations (Kwiatkowska, 2023). Importantly, methodology of delimitation has included concerns beyond geographic than contemporary concerns. Particularly in enclosed or semi enclosed seas where ecosystem

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

integrity calls for a cooperative management of the seas across its boundaries, environmental factors are increasingly treated as relevant circumstances. Specific boundary adjustments may be affected by resource-related considerations, although resource-related considerations are not decisive. Maritime delimitation provides one of the highest methodological sophistication of maritime disputes under the jurisdiction of international tribunals, which has achieved so far one of its major contributions for peaceful settlement of maritime disputes once contentious, but increasingly governed by law with predictable parameters and outcomes (Freestone et al., 2019).

IV. LANDMARK CASES AND THEIR JURISPRUDENTIAL IMPACT

Several of which have established exacting principles regarding legalities of maritime cases, that have tremendously impacted maritime jurisprudence, and demonstrated that international tribunals can resolve these disputes in their most transformative form. The North Sea Continental Shelf Cases (Federal Republic of Germany v. Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany v. It established the basic principles of maritime delimitation for 1969, namely rejecting the automatic application of equidistance approach in favour of a more context and equitable approach to delimitation. This seminal judgment profoundly changed the practice of delimitation as well as implying the special role of the ICJ as the main creator of maritime boundary law. Similarly, the Gulf of Maine case (Canada v. This functional integration of the continental shelf and water column is in line with the articulation of a single maritime boundary as a delimitation methodology (United States, 1984), which contributed significantly to delimitation methodology and articulated the concept of a single maritime boundary between and for both continental shelf and water column (Tanaka, 2023). The Maritime Delimitation and Territorial Questions between Qatar and Bahrain case (2001) must also be considered a watershed in maritime jurisprudence in the ICJ and the Court evaluated in a comprehensive manner related interrelated questions of land sovereignty, maritime delimitation as well as historic rights. In fact, the Court's strictly delineating the legal status of various maritime features (as an island, a low tide elevation or a submerged bank) created authoritative criteria, used to date in the context of settlement of disputes of coastal geography, which can be very complex in some regions. Concioztively, the Court integrated historic pearl fishing rights in its treatment of the indigenous practice and wylshed the relationship between it and the modern law of the sea framework. This balanced approach in reconciling historic claims with the contemporary legal regimes were to be an influential as evidenced in the South China Sea Arbitration (Schofield, 2018).

The Southern Bluefin Tuna Cases (New Zealand v. Japan; Australia v. ITLOS had the ability to deal with urgent conservation concerns through provisional measures, as highlighted in Japan, 1999. Through its order to the Tribunal to suspend Japan's experimental fishing program pending further proceedings (although we might provide a different analysis of Art. 292, it is clear the Tribunal did not need to suspend Japan's experimental fishing program even pending further proceedings), the Tribunal demonstrated how international adjudication has the capacity to prevent irreparable harm to marine living resources during dispute resolution processes. As we can see, the cases involve scientific evidence being brought into the proceedings, with the Tribunal weighing in expert testimony concerning stock assessments and sustainable yields carefully. Over time, this scientifically informed approach has been so typified of maritime law, especially where the substance is renewable resources and the protection of the environment (Stephens & Rothwell, 2020). Most recently, the South China Sea Arbitration (Philippines v. The profound impact that maritime entitlements, historic claims and the status of maritime features have had on the contemporary understanding has been shaped significantly by China, 2016) In the light of China’s non-participation, the award of the tribunal was a complete one addressing the scope of historic rights under UNCLOS, legal classification of maritime features according to natural capacity to support human habitation and obligations in relation to environmental protection and aggravation of disputes. It made clear the relationship between historic claims and the conventional law of the sea by rejecting China's 'nine dash line' claim insofar as it extended beyond entitlements under UNCLOS. Similar to this, its in depth analysis of what an island is capable of generating extended maritime zones with will give definite direction to consider entitlements in areas of dispute at global perspective (Gao & Jia, 2021).

V. Effectiveness and Limitations of International Tribunals

International tribunals achieve maritime dispute resolution success by meeting distinct assessment measures which include both judicial clarity and Termination of problems and Decision compliance along with Regional stability support and Ocean governance advancement. International tribunals operate successfully under multiple evaluation metrics even though they encounter ongoing issues that limit their effectiveness when handling specific situations. Truthful judicial decisions are characterized by tribunal expertise which leads to predictable maritime relations through developed consistent doctrines and methodological approaches. The advancements made in delimitation theory and UNCLOS application and state environmental duties serve maritime law with substantial value (Cohen, 2021). The record regarding dispute termination shows mixed results according to empirical

evidence found in various studies. International tribunals successfully resolved multiple maritime disputes as documented in the defensible outcomes achieved between Romania and Ukraine in the Black Sea and Bangladesh and Myanmar in the Bay of Bengal as well as numerous fisheries disputes. Judicial intervention fails to resolve certain maritime disputes especially when states possess strong power or their core sovereignty interests face threat. China prevented effective implementation of the tribunal's award because Beijing rejected the tribunal's authority to rule and all of its determined findings during the South China Sea Arbitration case. International tribunals rely completely on state cooperation and consent for their execution because this is a basic limitation within the international legal framework (Whomersley, 2018).

The compliance patterns of both the tribunal system's advantages and shortcomings are reflected through statistical data. The compliance statistics of maritime decisions stand above those from other categories of international disputes because authorities execute about 60-70% of adjudicated decisions. The tribunal system achieves moderate success for several reasons such as technical maritime cases but also benefits from mutual party interests and negative consequences that stem from ignoring authoritative decisions. High-stakes disputes about core national interests along with major imbalances of power between disputing parties remain difficult to enforce. The situation leads to an alarming pattern because tribunals succeed with technical disputes but fail to manage politically sensitive conflicts which threaten regional stability and security (Mitchell & Owsiak, 2021).

Resource constraints and procedural complexity represent additional limitations on tribunal effectiveness. Seagoing disputes typically need extensive specialized knowledge and detailed preparation of evidence together with specialized legal representation thus becoming difficult for developing states with limited resources. ITLOS maintains financial assistance programs while the Permanent Court of Arbitration provides special fee reductions for developing nations yet such aid does not eliminate considerable differences in litigation capability between states. Comprehensive procedural demands combined with mandatory bilateral negotiations and jurisdiction-based challenges lead to long waiting times that enable the development of fait accompli conditions that harm less powerful states. Court structures present important barriers to fair resolution but the essential value of international tribunals requires them to operate as part of combined diplomatic mechanisms and institutional approaches for maritime conflict management (Rosenne, 2018).

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VI. FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND REFORM PROPOSALS

International tribunals operating within maritime dispute resolution need adapted strategies which combine resolution of modern challenges with their existing performance strengths. Building institutional capacity stands as the top priority because it focuses on gaining expertise about new topics including marine biodiversity preservation along with deep seabed mining management and climate change effects on maritime boundaries. Parallel to its current Seabed Disputes Chamber ITLOS should create specialized chambers to handle complex technical matters whereas arbitral tribunals should maintain lists of experts possessing appropriate scientific and technical qualifications. The ability to conduct fact-finding investigations using satellite imagery and marine scientific research and environmental monitoring enables stronger empirical support for difficult technical case adjudication (Barnes, 2018). Improved tribunal procedures should work to increase their reach to maritime disputes across different sectors. The implementation of streamlined procedures for pressing cases that exceed the scope of provisional measures would enable tribunals to stop adverse effects from becoming irreparable in both environmental and other matters. The power to issue advisory opinions should receive additional resources which would enable experts to deliver authoritative legal instruction on developing issues before they transform into contentious matters. The control mechanism for third-party involvement must be enhanced to handle maritime disputes with multiple stakeholders so all stakeholder interests receive thorough assessment. Tribunals should adopt the proposed procedural enhancements to maintain their consensual structure but also achieve modern maritime adaptation (Harrison, 2019).

Compliance certainly cannot be managed through only formal enforcement mechanisms. Mobilizing reputational incentives for compliance, measures of transparency, such as systematic monitoring and reporting on the implementation of decision, are possible. The certainty of maritime boundary could be factored in assessment across international financial institutions to help create economic incentive toward dispute resolution and compliance with judicial decisions. Third party diplomatic engagement could potentially do the same thing after judicial rulings, bringing the words of determinations into practice. Even with this, these strategic approaches recognise the political dimension of compliance while simultaneously preserving the purport of legal decisions (Noyes, 2020). Reconceptualizing tribunal role in broader ocean governance framework is most fundamentally necessary for enhancing tribunal effectiveness. Tribunals should be considered a source of support to a broader system of ocean governance, not just as a tool for binary dispute resolution, according to legal clarification,

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

normative development, stakeholder participation and adaptive management of maritime spaces. From this systemic perspective, judicial decisions would be focused more on the forward looking that the governance function inherent to them as opposed to withObject over focusing on each specific case underlying a judicial decision. Embracing this expanded conception of their role, international tribunals can achieve full potential in providing international ocean governance to a period of increasingly rife maritime competition and cooperation (Kraska & Pedrozo, 2023).

VII. CONCLUSION

International tribunals have become an indispensable body to denote the solution of maritime disputes, as it once was the domain of power politics, it became more and more a domain ruled by legal principles and judicial reasoning. This research finally shows that the existence of UNCLOS and its comprehensive dispute settlement system was a watershed moment in ocean governance, the existence of many forums with different combinations of applicable jurisdictional frameworks for various challenges of maritime competition and cooperation. To the extent these tribunals have developed jurisprudence—ITLOS, the ICJ, and arbitral tribunals under UNCLOS Annex VII—legal entitlements, methodology, and authoritative interpretations of treaty provisions have progressively clarified legal entitlements and become a predictable way of doing things concerning state behavior. International tribunals have advanced methodologically, achieving the most important contribution in the international field in maritime boundary delimitation. Tribunals have evolved from abstract equitable principles to a more structured, three stage, approach of provisional equidistance lines, relevant circumstances, and proportionality assessments so as to provide more legal predictability, and achieve adjudicated outcomes as well as negotiated settlements.. Likewise, Arctic disputes over fisheries, navigational zone disputes, and the environment have, in turn, also led to the emergence of a similar sophistication in methodological response in the international tribunals, evidence that international tribunals have an adaptive capacity for dealing with a range of maritime concerns. Landmark decisions of the international tribunals through the North Sea Continental Shelf Cases, the Maritime Delimitation in Black Sea, the South China Sea Arbitration, among others, show international tribunals are competent to address the complex cases of maritime disputes not based on political confrontation, but on the reasoned legal analysis. These decisions go decidedly beyond any particular dispute to have wider ramifications—of a state practice as a rule of customary law, for treaty interpretation, and in regional maritime arrangements around the world. Tribunals have helped in great measure to channel disputes to legal processes and thereby contribute to regional

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

stability and the peaceful management of ocean spaces. Although international tribunals remain ineffective, they are effectively limited by structural constraints of the international legal system. Implementation gaps exist because more than one jurisdiction has restrictions, lack enforcement challenges, suffer accessibility barriers, and face political resistance, all of which disallow the full implementation of judicial mechanisms. Most notably, however, these limitations are strongly demonstrated in difficult to manage disputes of potentially core national interests with highly asymmetric distribution of power between the parties. This challenge is apparent in the South China Sea Arbitration, where China has rejected the jurisdiction and substantive findings of the tribunal and has not implemented the award because of it.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]

VIII. REFERNCES

1. Arsana, I. M. A., & Schofield, C. (2022). The South China Sea Arbitration: Implications for Maritime Boundary Delimitation. *International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, 37(2), 241-270.

2. Barnes, R. (2018). The Continuing Vitality of UNCLOS. In J. Barrett & R. Barnes (Eds.), *Law of the Sea: UNCLOS as a Living Treaty* (pp. 459-489). British Institute of International and Comparative Law.

3. Beckman, R. (2017). Jurisdiction and Applicable Law in the South China Sea Arbitration: Implications for Maritime Disputes in the Region. *Ocean Development & International Law*, 48(3-4), 320-333.

4. Boyle, A. (2014). Dispute Settlement and the Law of the Sea Convention: Problems of Fragmentation and Jurisdiction. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, 46(1), 37-54.

5. Churchill, R. R., & Lowe, A. V. (2022). *The Law of the Sea* (4th ed.). Manchester University Press.

6. Cohen, H. G. (2021). Fragmentation and Institutional Design: The Evolving Practices of International Courts. *Georgetown Journal of International Law*, 52(1), 87-136.

7. Crawford, J., & Nevill, P. (2015). Relations between International Courts and Tribunals: The "Regime Problem". In M. Young (Ed.), *Regime Interaction in International Law: Facing Fragmentation* (pp. 235-260). Cambridge University Press.

8. Fietta, S., & Cleverly, R. (2021). *A Practitioner's Guide to Maritime Boundary Delimitation*. Oxford University Press.

9. Freestone, D., Barnes, R., & Ong, D. M. (Eds.). (2019). *The Law of the Sea: Progress and Prospects*. Oxford University Press.

10. Gao, Z., & Jia, B. B. (2021). The Nine-Dash Line in the South China Sea: History, Status, and Implications. *American Journal of International Law*, 107(1), 98-124.

11. Harrison, J. (2019). *Saving the Oceans Through Law: The International Legal Framework for the Protection of the Marine Environment*. Oxford University Press.

12. Klein, N. (2018). *Dispute Settlement in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea*. Cambridge University Press.

13. Kraska, J., & Pedrozo, R. (2023). *International Maritime Security Law* (2nd ed.). Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

14. Kwiatkowska, B. (2023). The Contribution of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea to the Progressive Development of International Law. *International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law*, 38(1), 45-78.

15. Lathrop, C. G. (2022). Maritime Delimitation as a Judicial Process. *British Yearbook of International Law*, 93(1), 65-118.

16. Mitchell, S. M., & Owsiak, A. P. (2021). Judicialization of the Sea: Bargaining in the Shadow of UNCLOS. *International Interactions*, 47(4), 648-676.

17. Noyes, J. E. (2020). The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 32(1), 109-182.

18. Rosenne, S. (2018). *Essays on International Law and Practice*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

19. Schofield, C. (2018). Islands or Rocks, Is that the Real Question? The Treatment of Islands in the Delimitation of Maritime Boundaries. In M. H. Nordquist, J. N. Moore, & R. Long (Eds.), *The Marine Environment and United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 14* (pp. 322-340). Brill Nijhoff.

20. Song, Y. H., & Tønnesson, S. (2022). The Impact of the Law of the Sea Convention on Conflict and Conflict Management in the South China Sea. *Ocean Development & International Law*, 44(3), 235-259.

21. Stephens, T., & Rothwell, D. R. (2020). *The International Law of the Sea* (2nd ed.). Hart Publishing.

22. Tanaka, Y. (2023). *Predictability and Flexibility in the Law of Maritime Delimitation* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

23. Treves, T. (2019). The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the Rule of Law. In A. Del Vecchio & R. Virzo (Eds.), *Interpretations of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea by International Courts and Tribunals* (pp. 37-58). Springer.

24. Whomersley, C. (2018). The South China Sea: The Award of the Tribunal in the Case Brought by Philippines against China—A Critique. *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 15(2), 239-264.

*****

 [ISSN 2581-5369]