APPENDIX I


General Reservations:
1 Repeat the text of article 36(2) "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation"
2 Refer explicitly to reciprocity
3 Specify that declarations are or acceptance is made in conformity with article 36(2)
4 Repeat or refer to the four categories of disputes in article 36(2)

Ratione Temporis:
1 Object of exclusion
2 Exclusion date

Ratione Materiae:
1 Recourse to other method of peaceful settlement
2 Territorial dispute
3 Rights and status of adjacent sea areas, islands, delimitation of maritime boundaries, sea resources
4 Adjacent airspace
5 Matters exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction as determined by international law
6 Matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction
7 Matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction as determined by the state itself
8 Disputes relating to multilateral treaties unless all parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the court
9 Relating to a treaty or treaties
10 Suspension of proceedings regarding a dispute under consideration by the council of the League of Nations or the United Nations Security
11 Subject to the right to submit the dispute to the council of the League of Nations
12 Excluding disputes arising out of events occurring at a time when the respective state was involved in hostilities
13 Excluding disputes relating to hostilities, armed conflict, individual and collective self-defense, resistance to aggression and occupation, fulfillment of obligations imposed by international bodies
14 National security reservation
15 Other reservations ratione materiae
Ratione Personae:
1 Excluding British Commonwealth countries
2 Excluding Arab states
3 Requiring recognition, diplomatic relations
4 Excluding non-sovereign states or territories
5 Only states party to the statute or members of the United Nations

Others:
1 Reserve the right to add, amend, withdraw reservations or declaration
2 The declaration of the other party should be deposited no less than 12 months prior to the filing of an application or the other party should not have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction exclusively for the purposes of the dispute
3 Declaration made for specific types of dispute
4 Modifications excluding disputes arising out of events occurring during WWII
APPENDIX 2
Domestic Legal System Types, 2002

Common Law Countries
United States of America, Canada, Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados,
Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Antigua & Barbuda, St. Kitts-
Nevis, Belize, Guyana, United Kingdom, Ireland, Cyprus, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Ghana,
Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Lesotho, India, Bhutan, Bangladesh,
Myanmar, Nepal, Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines, Australia, Papua New Guinea, New
Zealand, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu, Fiji, Tonga, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Palau,
Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa

Civil Law Countries
Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador,
Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Surinam, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil,
Bolivia, Paraguay, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg,
France, Monaco, Liechtenstein, Switzerland, Spain, Andorra, Portugal, Germany, Poland,
Austria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Italy, San Marino, Albania, Macedonia,
Croatia, Yugoslavia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovenia, Greece, Bulgaria, Moldova,
Romania, Russia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Georgia,
Azerbaijan, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Cape Verde, Sao Tome and
Principe, Guinea-Bissau, Equatorial Guinea, Mali, Benin, Ivory Coast, Guinea, Burkina
Faso, Togo, Gabon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the
Congo, Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, Swaziland, Madagascar,
Mauritius, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Republic, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan,
Mongolia, Taiwan, North Korea, South Korea, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, Indonesia,
East Timor

Islamic Law Countries
Gambia, Nigeria, Namibia, Comoros, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Sudan, Iran,
Iraq, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar,
United Arab Emirates, Oman, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Maldives

Countries with Mixed Legal Systems
Malta, Senegal, Niger, Cameroon, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, Eritrea, South Africa,
Botswana, Seychelles, Israel, China, Japan, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Brunei,
Vanuatu
## APPENDIX 3
Compliance with ICJ/PCIJ Decisions on Territorial, River, and Maritime Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Claimants, Subject</th>
<th>Complied?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Territorial Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2002</td>
<td>Indonesia / Malaysia, Pulau Ligitan &amp; Pulau Sipadan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2002</td>
<td>Nigeria / Cameroon, Bakassi Peninsula &amp; Maritime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/2001</td>
<td>Qatar / Bahrain, Maritime &amp; Territorial Questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1999</td>
<td>Botswana / Namibia, Kasikili / Sedudu Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/1994</td>
<td>Libya / Chad, Aozou Strip</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/1992</td>
<td>El Salvador / Honduras, Land-Island-Maritime Questions</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1986</td>
<td>Burkina Faso / Mali, Frontier</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1975</td>
<td>Mauritania / Morocco, Western Sahara</td>
<td>Advisory**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/1962</td>
<td>Cambodia / Thailand, Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1960</td>
<td>Honduras / Nicaragua, Border</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/1959</td>
<td>Belgium / Netherlands, Zondereygen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1953</td>
<td>UK / France, Minquiers &amp; Ecrehos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/1933</td>
<td>Norway / Denmark, Eastern Greenland</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1925</td>
<td>UK / Turkey, Mosul</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/1924</td>
<td>Yugoslavia / Albania, Saint-Naoum Monastery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1923</td>
<td>Poland / Czechoslovakia, Jaworzina / Spisz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>River Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/1997</td>
<td>Hungary / Slovakia, Gabcikovo-Nagymaros Project</td>
<td>No***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/1937</td>
<td>Belgium / Netherlands, Meuse Diversion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/1929</td>
<td>Germany et al. / Poland, Oder River Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maritime Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/1993</td>
<td>Denmark / Norway, Jan Mayen Delimitation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1991</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau / Senegal, Maritime Award</td>
<td>Yes****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/1985</td>
<td>Libya / Malta, Continental Shelf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1984</td>
<td>Canada / United States, Gulf of Maine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/1982</td>
<td>Tunisia / Libya, Continental Shelf</td>
<td>Yes*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1974</td>
<td>UK / Iceland, Fisheries Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/1974</td>
<td>West Germany / Iceland, Fisheries Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/1969</td>
<td>West Germany / Denmark, North Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/1969</td>
<td>West Germany / Netherlands, North Sea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1951</td>
<td>UK / Norway, Fisheries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 1992 ICJ decision in the El Salvador-Honduras case has generally been accepted and carried out by both sides. A decade after the award, El Salvador appealed to the ICJ on the basis of newly discovered documents that might have affected a small portion of the overall award, but the ICJ rejected this appeal in December 2003 and upheld the original award.
** The 1975 ICJ decision in the Western Sahara case did not award the territory to either Morocco or Mauritania. Instead, it was an advisory opinion, which indicated the Court's decision that before Spain occupied the territory its residents had ties to both Morocco and Mauritania. Thus, there is no award that the two sides could have complied with (although had the Court decided differently, there might have been such an award).
***The 1997 ICJ ruling in the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros case found both Hungary and Slovakia at fault, as both Hungary’s unilateral withdrawal from the 1977 agreement over the dam project and Slovakia’s unilateral decision to go ahead with Variant C of the project were ruled illegal. Compliance is coded as no rather than pending because it has been more than five years since the award was issued, although talks have occurred between the claimants over a mutually satisfactory way to execute the ICJ ruling.

****Guinea-Bissau initially pressed its case over the maritime question following the November 1991 ICJ decision, through both bilateral negotiations and a further ICJ case. Both sides are considered to have complied with this decision, though, as Guinea-Bissau withdrew its objections and successfully requested the discontinuance of further ICJ proceedings in 1985.

*****The 1982 ICJ decision in the Libya-Tunisia case is considered to be complied with by both sides. A Tunisian request for revision and interpretation was addressed by a follow-up ICJ ruling in December 1985, which rejected the request for revision and issued the requested interpretation and clarification, and the matter has subsequently been considered resolved.

Notes
• This table lists every ICJ (1947-present) and PCIJ (1920-1946) decision over territorial sovereignty issues, cross-border river issues, or maritime issues that would qualify as territorial, river, or maritime claims under ICOW coding rules. Qualifying cases are identified using the documents on the ICJ web site: <http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions.htm> for the ICJ and <http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/idecisions/icipij/> for the PCIJ.
• This table excludes cases over associated questions, such as minority rights or indemnities after the transfer of territory between states. It also excludes cases where the Court ruled that it did not have jurisdiction or otherwise could not hear the case, or where the Court granted a request for discontinuance, because such cases produced no award with which the claimant states could comply.
• Compliance with each decision is determined based on news sources such as the New York Times, Facts on File, Keesing’s Contemporary Archives, Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe, diplomatic histories of the involved countries or regions, and reference works such as the Encyclopedia of International Boundaries (Biger 1995) and Jane’s Exclusive Economic Zones of the World (Pratt 2000). The claimants are coded as complying with a decision when both sides accept and implement the terms of the decision, which typically involve the end of the territorial, river, or maritime claim in question. Coding of compliance is not based on
• Four relevant cases are currently pending: the Benin-Niger frontier dispute, the Malaysia-Singapore claim over Pedra Branca/Pulau Batu Puteh, and the Nicaragua-Honduras and Nicaragua-Colombia claims over the Caribbean Sea. Slovakia is also currently pressing for further action in the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros case with Hungary, which is coded here as noncompliance because it has been more than five years since the original award was made.