Chapter IV

Progress of work in the Preparatory Commission during the Geneva Meeting, 12 August - 4 September 1985

At Geneva Summer Meeting, the Preparatory Commission continued its work on the rules of procedures of the Assembly and Council of the International Sea-Bed Authority, studies concerning the problems that could be encountered by land-based producer states; the operational options of the Enterprise (the operational arm of the Authority); the draft mining code; and the rules of procedure of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. 49

As the work of the Preparatory Commission is divided between plenary and four Special Commissions in this part the progress of work in each body would be studied under a separate rubric, starting with the study of the progress on work in the Plenary.

(a) Plenary

During the Geneva meeting, in addition to the organization of work, the work of the plenary was divided into three parts:

49. United Nations Press Release, SEA/215, 4 September 1985, p.1. It may be mentioned that at the time of Geneva meeting a total of 159 States and entities were member of the Preparatory Commission. The total number of observers was 15 (grand total 174). However, the number of participants from among members was 103 and from among observers 9 (grand total 112). See: Law of the Sea Bulletin, No.6, October 1985, p.71.

An important development during the Geneva meeting was the adoption of a Declaration which asserted that the Convention regime was the only regime for deep sea-bed mining and that "any claims incompatible with it shall not be recognized". It rejected such claims and regarded them as illegal.

At the request of the Soviet Union and Pakistan and on the basis of a decision taken by General Committee on 29 August 1985 the above draft Resolution and Draft Declaration were considered by the Plenary on 30 August 1985.

The Plenary adopted the Declaration submitted by Pakistan on behalf of the "Group of 77" in which the preparatory commission has expressed deep concern that some States have undertaken certain actions which undermine "the Convention and which are contrary to the mandate of the Preparatory Commission."

The Declaration while referring to the letter dated 10 June 1985 addressed to the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission by the Acting Permanent Representative of the USSR to the United Nations regarding the licence granted by the United States of America for the exploration of part of the Area, declares that "Any

---

50. Doc.LOS/PCN/L.Rev.2. As it was pointed out earlier, this draft resolution declared that the "Provisional understanding regarding Deep-Sea-Bed Matters" concluded by a number of countries on 3 August 1985 was incompatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and was "wholly illegal".
claim, agreement or action regarding the Area and its resources undertaken outside the Preparatory Commission which is incompatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and its related resolutions shall not be recognized. It "rejects such claim, agreement or action as a basis for creating legal rights and regards it as wholly illegal." 51

The declaration was adopted without a vote 52 after the Chairman of the Commission read out the following statement:

"After consultation with delegations it is my understanding that Draft Declaration ... of 12 August 1985 commands a large majority in the Preparatory Commission. I, therefore, take it that consequently the Draft Declaration has been approved and has been adopted. I note that a number of delegations, while appreciating the pre-occupations of that majority, could not give support to the declaration because of their concern about some aspects of the substance and the effect of the declarations." 53

(ii) Preparation of the Rules, Regulations and Procedures relating to the various Organs of the Authority

At the Geneva Meeting the Plenary held 10 meetings on the Authority. The Plenary completed

51. See The text of the Declaration in Appendix III.
the second reading of the draft rules of procedures of the Assembly and started consideration of the draft rules of procedure of the Council, prepared by the Secretariat and circulated at the Third Session in Kingston.

The Plenary provisionally adopted several rules of the Assembly, namely, rules 76-77, 81-84, 86-87, 92-94, 98-101, 101-106 and rules 78-80 (as orally amended). It also examined more than two-thirds of the rules of procedures of the Council. A number of those rules, however, have been held in abeyance, pending the consideration of the rules of procedure for the Legal and Technical Commission of the Authority, as the latter will have a significant role in the examination of the applications for mine sites and the negotiation of mining contracts on behalf of the Authority, as well as in recommending their approval by the Council.

The following issues have remained outstanding. They were subject of private consultations by the Chairman: the question of subsidiary organs (whether main committees should be institutionalized in the rules of the Assembly); the status and extent of participation by States observers to the Authority; control over financial and budgetary matters (including a proposal by the six industrialized countries to have a key role in a Finance Committee whose membership will include the four largest contributions to the Authority); and the majority required for the election of the Secretary-General of the Authority.
During the discussion on the issue of whether the elections of officers under the Convention should be considered as a procedural matter requiring a simple majority, or a matter of substance which should be settled by a two-thirds majority, conflicting views were expressed, which prevented the Plenary from taking any decision on rule 85 on the elections.

On the rules of the Council, the issues of decision-making and financial matters were at the heart of discussions. In view of the inter-relations of financial aspects in the different rules of procedure of the organs of the Authority it was felt that these matters should be considered in their entirety at the appropriate stage.

However, the Plenary provisionally adopted several rules of the Council, namely, Rules 11-12, 15-17, 25, 27-28, 30, 33, 35-44, 46, 48, 51-52 and 56 without amendments and rules 1, 3, 7-8, 10, 13, 22-23, 26, 31, 34, 45, 47, 53, and 57 as amended.

It was decided that the sections carrying the rubric "sessions" and "agenda" should be redrafted. 54

(iii) The Implementation of Resolution II

Following the consultations at the Third Session of the PREPCOM in Jamaica in 1985, which were followed by inter-sessional consultations, the Chairman continued his efforts during the Geneva Meeting. However on September 3, the Chairman reporting on the results of consultations with prospective pioneer investors,
pointed out that he was not able to recommend specific measures with regard to the implementation of Resolution II which deals with the registration of pioneer investors.\(^\text{55}\)

The Chairman requested that the Preparatory Commission allow more time for "intensive" consultations. He said that it had been agreed that the parties to the consultations will meet together and with the Chairman before the beginning of the Fourth Regular Session to be held in Kingston in 1985 and "make very serious efforts to resolve the issue." \(^\text{56}\) The Chairman said:

"There is a period of over six months to find a solution and this should be utilized fully by all concerned to achieve a positive result." \(^\text{57}\)

He noted that once a resolution to the overlapping claims was arrived at, the preparatory commission could resume its elaboration of rules covering the registration of pioneer investors. However he added:

"If agreement has not been reached, the Chairman will report to the Plenary at the latest by the beginning of the second week of the next session and will request the Commission to take an appropriate Decision on how to go ahead with the matter." \(^\text{58}\)

\(\text{\textsuperscript{56}}\) United Nations Press Release, SEA/213, 3 September 1985, p.1
\(\text{\textsuperscript{57}}\) Report of the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission, n.52, p.4.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{58}}\) Ibid.
Special Commission 1

The Special Commission 1 in discharging its task has so far examined inter alia data and information on past and present production, consumption, trade and future production potential of copper, nickel, cobalt and manganese from land-based sources as well as basic data and information on recycling of copper, nickel, cobalt and manganese. During the Geneva Meeting the Special Commission concentrated its discussion on:

(a) The concrete formulation of the criteria for the identification of developing land-based producer States likely to be most seriously affected;

(b) Preparation of an outline for an in-depth study of possible effects of sea-bed production on such States and investigation of associated problems;

(c) The formulation of certain guidelines that will need to be taken into account by the Authority in devising any remedial or assistance measures. In addition to the data and information provided by the Secretariat, the Commission had before it responses from 19 international organizations on remedial measures, programmes and activities undertaken by them in different sectors.

59. See: Basic Data and Information of relevance to the work of Special Commission 1, Doc.LOS/PCN/SCN.1/WP.2/Add.3, 31 July 1985, See also: Doc.LOS/PCN/SCN.1/WP.2/Add.4, 6 August 1985.
At the Geneva Meeting some progress was made in the deliberation of criteria for identifying developing land-based producer states likely to be most seriously affected by sea-bed production.60

On 16 August 1985, the Chairman of the Special Commission in a statement, provisionally concluding the discussion on the issue of concrete formulation of appropriate criteria for identifying developing land-based producer States which would be adversely affected by the Sea-Bed production gave the following formulations:

A developing land-based producer State should be considered likely to be most seriously affected by sea-bed production if:

(i) it exports an average of US dollars 100 million of the four minerals a year during the last 5 years before production authorizations are issued to the sea-bed miners; or

(ii) it earns an average of 10 per cent of its total export earnings from these four minerals per year during the last 5 years before production authorizations are issued to the sea-bed miners; or

(iii) it produces an average of 100,000 tons of copper, or 50,000 tons of nickel, or 10,000 tons of cobalt, or 50,000 tons of manganese a year during the last 5 years before production authorizations are issued to the sea-bed miners; or

60. United Nations Press Release, SEA/214 3 September 1985, p.1
(iv) its average production of the four minerals per year during the last 5 years before production authorizations are issued to the sea-bed miners represents 10% of its GDP; or

(v) its exports of the four minerals account for 5% or more of its GDP per year during the last 5 years before production authorizations are issued to the sea-bed miners.\textsuperscript{61}

According to the said statement in the course of the extensive discussion in the Commission on the above matter there was a general agreement that a final identification of developing land-based producer States likely to be most seriously affected by a sea-bed production could be carried out by the Authority in due time. There was also a general agreement that this final identification would be done at a time rather close to the time of the earliest commercial production from the sea-bed in the Area.\textsuperscript{62}

In the future the Special Commission would continue its work in formulation the concerned criteria and preparing for a study of possible effects. It would also study in depth existing international or multilateral economic measures which could be of relevance to its work.

In addition to above studies, a number of delegations have suggested that two additional studies be carried out: one on the influence that various

\textsuperscript{61} See: Doc.LOS/PCN/SCN.1/1985 CRP.8, 16 August 1985, pp.3-4

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. p.1
factors such as population and geographic location might have on the level of dependence on one or more mineral involved in sea-bed mining, and another to examine the role of the mineral sectors concerned in the economies of particular developing land-based producer states and identify possible areas where multiplier effects would be felt of a decline in exports or production.\textsuperscript{63} There appears to be a realization in the Commission that its studies and recommendations cannot be definitive until actual sea-bed mineral production begins and its impact is experienced.\textsuperscript{64}

(c) \textit{Special Commission 2(Special Commission for Enterprise)}

As it was mentioned the Special Commission for the Enterprise (Special Commission 2) was mandated to consider the operational and structural requirements of the future Enterprise (the operational arm of the International Sea-Bed Authority). Another major area of concern for the Special Commission 2 is the availability of managerial skilled manpower to ensure that the Enterprise is able to carry out activities in deep sea-bed mining in such a manner as to keep pace with States and other entities. At the Geneva Meeting, the Special Commission had before it a working paper (document LOS/PCN/SCN.2/WP.6) outlining a project profile of a deep sea-bed mining operation by the Enterprise in order to examine basic requirements and variations according to different operational options.

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{United Nations Press Release, SEA/214, 3 September 1985, p.2}
\textsuperscript{64} See: \textit{Law of the Sea Bulletin}, No.6 October 1985, p.75
It held nine meetings, eight of which were held on operational options: six on the assumptions to be used in studying operational options under reference in the above working paper and Add.1 \(^{65}\) and two on the options themselves as set forth in the working paper. The final meeting was devoted to the question of training for which a new working paper was prepared by the Secretariat \(^{66}\) (Document LOS/PCN/SCN.2/WP.9 entitled "Implementation of paragraph 12 of Resolution II: Training").

(i) **Assumptions**

As it was mentioned earlier, a working paper which was placed before the Special Commission when it met in Kingston, Jamaica, in March 1985 outlined a project profile of a deep sea-bed mining operation by the Enterprise. \(^{67}\) The paper was based on a number of key assumptions to the availability of enough raw materials to sustain a 20-year operation, markets for copper, nickel, cobalt and manganese, on land facilities and services and requisite skilled manpower and financial resources. In addition to the earlier paper, the Secretariat had assembled additional information on metal prices and had made further calculations according to a number of selected variants to obtain the gross returns per unit of capital and the internal rates of return for the nine operational options examined in the original paper. \(^{68}\)

\(^{65}\) Project Profile of a Deep-Sea-Bed Mining Operation by the Enterprise, Addendum, LOS/PCN/SCN.2/WP.6/Add.1

\(^{66}\) Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 2 on the Progress of work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.25, 3 September 1985, p.1

\(^{67}\) Document LOS/PCN/SCN.2/WP.6.

\(^{68}\) United Nations Press Release, SEA/170, 14 August 1985, p.1
On the matter of assumptions, while a number of delegations were satisfied that the assumptions used were reasonable for the purpose of working paper 6 (the original paper), some delegations doubted the validity of assumptions. Their concerns stemmed from the extent to which the assumptions were at variance with present prospect for sea-bed mining and were reliant on parameters, particularly technological parameters, which have not yet been established for sea-bed mining. 69

The effort to reach an agreed set of assumptions on which to base further study of operational options will be pursued 70 and at the Fourth Session the Special Commission will address the problems of formulating a working hypotheses on such factors as the prospects for metal prices and markets in the short and medium-term, the Enterprise's access to markets and the costs of its marketing efforts; and the availability of facilities and services for leasing, particularly the availability of a procession plant.

By the end of the year, the "sensitivity analysis" of working paper 6 would be submitted by the Australian delegation, which along with the other documents, will provide the basic materials for discussions at the next session.

At the Fourth Session the Special Commission 2 will be concentrating on finding a set of assumptions and a methodology which might be said to present the

---

69. Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 2 on the Progress of work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.25, 3 September 1985, p.3.

70. Ibid. p.1.
middle ground as between a reflection of today's reality, and a projection of the many facilitating elements for Enterprise operations which will permit options to be studies in detail. 71

(ii) **Operational Options**

The operational arrangements available to the Enterprise could be:

(a) Both mining and processing by the Enterprise;
(b) Mining by the Enterprise and processing on lease;
(c) Mining on lease and processing by the Enterprise;
(d) Both mining and processing by lease;
(e) Mining by the Enterprise and processing by joint venture;
(f) Mining by joint venture and processing by the Enterprise;
(g) Mining on lease and processing by joint venture;
(h) Mining by joint venture and processing by lease;
(i) Both mining and processing by joint venture. 72

The Commission decided that it will begin to examine each of the operational options at the next session. It was agreed that the first option that should be studied in detail was that of the Enterprise as a sole operator of a fully-integrated project.

71. Ibid. p.4
However, considerable interest was expressed, from the point of view of practicality and minimization of risks, in favour of a joint venture as an initial operational option.

It may be stated here that at the Fourth Session, the delegation of Austria will submit a new, revised proposal for a joint enterprise for exploration, research and development in ocean mining (JEFERAD), an "executive summary" of which has already been circulated to delegations as LOS/PCN/SCN.2/L.2/Rev.2. At a special colloquium convened by the Bureau to give that delegation an opportunity to obtain some preliminary reaction, the representative of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee (AALCC)\(^\text{73}\) indicated that its secretariat will prepare another paper examining the new proposal.\(^\text{74}\) It may be added that the AALCC secretariat had presented its comments on the earlier proposal to the Special Commission.

(iii) Training

During the discussions on training a number of important points were made:

(a) The need to elaborate an inventory of the skills involved in all stages of sea-bed mining;

(b) The need to adopt a cost-effective approach to training under paragraph 12 of Resolution II.

\(^{73}\) The AALCC was represented by the researcher.

\(^{74}\) Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 2 on the progress of Work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.25, 3 September 1985, p.2.
(c) The need to investigate ways of improving access to information on relevant education and training available under existing bilateral and multilateral programmes.

However, it would appear that for the time being, there might be only a limited context for the provision of practical training directly concerning skills required for sea-bed mining. The question had been raised, however, as to whether there might not be additional or more immediate training needs that should be addressed, as, for example, those associated with ensuring expertise for the International Sea-Bed Authority itself. 75 It may be mentioned that it is generally recognised that any training programme to be undertaken prior to the entry into force of the Convention will depend largely on the obligations to be performed by pioneer investors after their registration.

(d) **Special Commission 3**
(Special Commission on Sea-Bed Mining)

During the Geneva Meeting the Special Commission 3 held 10 meetings and discussed Articles 12 to 15 inclusive and 24 to 32 inclusive of documents LOS/BCN/SCN.3/WP.6 (Draft regulations on prospecting, exploration and exploitation of polymetallic nodules in the Area) and some corresponding articles in the Annex to this Working Paper. Detailed discussions took place on, *inter alia*, The submission of an application for the approval of a plain of work, the form and content of

75. Ibid, pp.2-3
the application. 76 The financial and technical capabilities of the applicant, the total area covered by the application, data on estimated commercial value of the two sites submitted in the application under the parallel system and the different stages involved in the application for deep sea-bed mining.

With regard to the technical capabilities and technical information required for applicants, there was general agreement that an application should contain sufficient information to enable the Council to ascertain the technical capabilities of an applicant. 77 During the discussions the attention was also focussed on two provisions in the sea-bed mining code calling on prospective miners to provide data on the anticipated environmental impact of the mining operation; as well as on the commercial viability of the sea-bed area for which an application is submitted. 78

The majority of speakers maintained that it was important that the environmental impact of an operation be considered before a contract was granted. It was suggested that environmental issues involved here should be dealt with in a separate section of the mining code dealing with all environmental issues. With respect to the issue of one-stage or two-stage application procedure, i.e. the question whether an application

76. There was general agreement that applications should be submitted in a prescribed form. It was also suggested that the prescribed forms should be annexed to the regulations.

77. See: Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 3 on the Progress of Work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.26, 3 September 1985, p.4.

for deep sea-bed mining will be submitted in one or two stages, one point of view (Group of 77) favoured a one-stage procedure while a second opinion (Soviet Union and Federal Republic of Germany) supported a two-stage procedure. 79

The main reasons given for favouring a one-stage approach were that:

(i) The Convention does not allow a two-stage procedure;

(ii) The Authority should not be placed at a disadvantage in its knowledge of the particulars of the area for which applications were made. As the Authority is responsible for the selection of the reserved area, it was felt that it was necessary to have as much information as possible in order to make an informed decision about the selection. In the absence of a plan of work for the two areas, the Authority would have to rely solely on geologic data which would not be sufficient for an assessment of the equal commercial value of both areas. It was also stressed that one-stage approach would simplify administrative procedures.

The reasons given for favouring a two-stage approach were:

(i) that it had a legal basis in the Convention, therefore it was completely well-founded from a legal point of view;

(ii) that an applicant was not obliged to draw up a plan of work for the Enterprise since the Enterprise was an independent body;

(iii) that it was not practical to draw up two plans of work since it was costly and the plan of work for the Enterprise would probably be out of date by the time the Enterprise went into operation.

The Commission left in abeyance its discussion of whether the application should be submitted in one stage or whether it should be in two stages.

Regarding the work programme of the Special Commission for the future, it was suggested at the Geneva Meeting that at its next session the Special Commission continue discussion of the procedure for the designation of an area to an applicant and for the approval of a plan of work and conclude its deliberations on "Draft Regulations on prospecting, exploration and exploitation of polymetallic Nodules in the Area". 80

(e) Special Commission 4 (The Special Commission for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea)

At the Geneva Meeting the Special Commission 4 continued its consideration of the rules of procedure for the Tribunal and dealt with the procedures for proceedings in disputes. This included incidental proceedings which consist of preliminary objections, counter-claims, intervention by interested parties,

80. Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 3 on the progress of work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.26, 3 September 1985, p.7.
special reference and discontinuance of proceedings. It also dealt with proceedings before chambers and judgements, their interpretation or revision and a modification of the rules in particular cases. On the subject of revision of judgements, although the Convention and the Tribunal Statute do not expressly provide for it, agreement was reached that provision should be made in the draft rules of procedures by which decisions may be revised on the basis of discovery of a new fact of a decisive nature which comes to light after the decision.

In addition to the examination of Part III of the Draft Rules (proceeding in Disputes), the Commission also examined the Draft Rules for the prompt Release of vessels\(^1\) which was prepared by the Secretariat. However, there was insufficient time to discuss the question of access to the Tribunal by entities other than States.\(^2\)

The Special Commission concluded its first reading of a series of rules for proceedings in disputes which may be brought before the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Doc. LOS/PCN/SCN.4/WP.2/Add.1

\(^2\) Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 4 on the Progress of Work in that Commission, LOS/PCN/L.24, 3 September 1985, p.2

\(^3\) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea will have shared competence over all Law of Sea matters, but it is its specialized chamber, the Sea-Bed Dispute Chamber, that will have exclusive competence over all disputes involving the international sea-bed area, even as against the rest of the Tribunal. That is, the Sea-Bed Dispute chamber alone will have competence to the exclusion of all other fora over sea-bed mining and related activities. See: Bernardo Zuleta, "Introduction", *The Law of The Sea, United Nations Convention on the Law of Sea*, (New York: United Nations, 1983) pp.XXVII-XXVIII.
Several of the rules remain to be redrafted in the light of discussions held in the Commission. At the Geneva Meeting the Special Commission 4, among others, examined a proposed rule for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea dealing with cases which have been the subject of proceedings before another international court.

The rule had been redrafted in the light of comments made during earlier discussion and at the Geneva Meeting further suggestions were made, with special reference to the limits of the right of Tribunal to hear such cases.

(1) Rules on Release of Vessels and Crews

According to Article 292, para 1, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea:

"Where the authorities of a State party have detained a vessel flying the flag of another State Party and it is alleged that the detaining State has not complied with the provisions of this Convention for the prompt release of the vessel or its crew upon the posting of a reasonable bond or other financial security, the question of release from detention may be submitted to any court or tribunal agreed upon by the parties or, failing such agreement within 10 days from the time of detention, to a court or tribunal accepted by the detaining State under article 287 or to the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, unless the parties otherwise agree."


Paragraph 3 of the above Article provides that:

"The Court or tribunal shall deal without delay with the application for release and shall deal only with the question of release, without prejudice to the merits of any case before the appropriate domestic forum against the vessel, its owner or its crew. The authorities of the detaining State remain competent to release the vessel or its crew at any time".

At the Geneva Meeting, the Special Commission had before it the Draft Rules for the Prompt Release or Vessels. It may be pointed out that the procedure formulated in this connection are of significance especially to long-distance fishing States and merchant fleets.

The Draft rules, inter alia, provide that an application for release may be made to the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea by the flag State or by its authorized representative.

The Rules also provide that such an application shall be dealt with by the Tribunal without delay and shall have priority over all other cases.

The discussion in the Commission mainly focussed on whether the provision for the priority should be included in the rules or whether the matter should be left to the discretion of the Tribunal.

The Commission also turned its attention to the provisions dealing with the speedy handling of such cases by a subsidiary organ of the Tribunal and the implementation of the Tribunal's order while
considering the article which deals with what should happen when the Tribunal is not sitting at a time when an application for the release of a vessel is made and permit the Chamber of Summary procedures to act in the matter, if the parties so agree. 86

The Commission also discussed questions relating to the posting of a bond or other financial security for the protection of a coastal state in proceedings of the Tribunal dealing with the prompt release of a detained vessel or its crew.

The purpose of the bond would be to satisfy the judgment or award resulting from domestic proceedings in the detaining state against the vessel, its owner or its crew following the release of the vessel.

In the discussion of relevant rules of the Tribunal, questions arose as to how to handle the posting of the bond or other financial security.

One view held that the Tribunal was responsible for what happened to the bond and that the security should be posted with that body.

Another position was that as the Convention contained no provisions on the matter, it should be left to the Tribunal itself to decide. A third argument was that current practice was for bonds to be posted with the detaining State and that the rules for the Tribunal should either say that the posting must be with the national authority or it should say nothing at all. 87

87. United Nations Press Release, SEA/204, 29 August 1985
At the Geneva Meeting in his report to the Plenary, the Chairman of the Special Commission 4 noted that the Secretariat was continuing its endeavours to obtain detailed information on the planning and execution of facilities for international courts or tribunal that had recently been established which were not within the aegis of the United Nations, since there had been no recent experience of courts or tribunal being established under the aegis of the United Nations. 88

(ii) Future Programme of Work

In Kingston next Spring (1986) the Special Commission will first give its attention to the question of disputes between organizations, consortia or entities other than States. It will then proceed with the article-by-article examination of rules relating to the Sea-Bed Disputes Chamber and advisory proceedings, and thereafter re-examine revised drafts on the basis of suggestions made in the discussions. 89

Next Session of the Preparatory Commission

The Preparatory Commission has decided that its Fourth Session would be held in Kingston, Jamaica, from 17 March to 11 April 1986, preceded by a three-day meeting of the Group of 77 from 12 to 14 March 1986.

* * *

* * *

88. Statement to the Plenary by the Chairman of Special Commission 4 on the Progress of Work in that Commission, n.81, p.2