International Journal of Law
www.lawjournals.org
ISSN: 2455-2194
Received: 09-09-2023, Accepted: 25-09-2023, Published: 10-10-2023
Volume 9, Issue 5, 2023, Page No. 156-165

Determining the status of natural resources of the high seas: An analytical overview of the current international and regional framework

Debjyoti Sarkar[1], S M Hayat Mahmud[2]
[1] Lecturer, Department of Law, Rajshahi Science & Technology University, Bangladesh, Bangladesh
[2] Assistant Professor, Law Discipline, Khulna University, Bangladesh, Bangladesh

Abstract
This research provides a comprehensive analysis of the status of natural resources in the high seas, with a specific focus on the Bay of Bengal. It delves into the international legal framework, including key agreements like the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, scrutinizing provisions related to fisheries, environmental conservation, and the freedom of the high seas. Additionally, the study evaluates regional legal frameworks and initiatives influencing resource management in the Bay of Bengal, such as the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Program and the Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA). It conducts a comparative analysis of national laws in Bay of Bengal bordering countries to assess their alignment with international and regional conservation standards. Synthesizing findings from international, regional, and national dimensions, the research identifies challenges and opportunities in high seas resource management and proposes recommendations to fortify legal frameworks, foster regional cooperation, and promote sustainable practices, with a focus on effective natural resource conservation in the Bay of Bengal region.

Keywords: High seas, legal protection, regional initiative, loopholes

Introduction

In this age of increasing anthropogenic pressures, the high seas have emerged as the last uncharted territory of the world's commons, even though they are the least protected of all the world's commons. The chapter titled "Determining the Status of Natural Resources of the High Seas: An Analytical Overview of the Current International and Regional Framework" provides a comprehensive analysis of the legal frameworks that have been established on an international and regional level to protect and manage the natural resources that are present in the high seas. The chapter "Determining the Status of Natural Resources of the High Seas: An Analytical Overview of the Current International and Regional Framework has analyzed these legal frameworks." At the beginning of the chapter, several international, regional, and national instruments, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the Convention on Biological Diversity, and various other conventions and agreements, are all covered in great detail.

In contemporary international law, there is a growing recognition that a significant portion, potentially even the majority, of marine living resources that can be commercially exploited are subject to the exclusive sovereignty of coastal states. This concept will be further elaborated upon in the subsequent discussion. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) 1982 introduced the concept of Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) spanning up to 200 nautical miles from a country's coastline. This effectively extended a nation's jurisdiction over a significant portion of the previously unregulated international waters.

We continue by conducting a critical analysis of these regimes, which reveals their shortcomings, difficulties, and failures to accomplish the goals that they have set out for themselves. As we look into global precedents and the possibility of change, we investigate how to make the most of the laws that are currently in place while also leaving room for the creation of new ones. In its final section, the chapter offers some strategic recommendations for overcoming the political obstacles that stand in the way of protecting our nation's high seas.

The Current International Legal Regime of the High-Seas

The best way to describe the current system of international law is as a mosaic of various instruments (treaties, programs of action, etc.), both global and regional, whether they are "legally binding" documents or "soft law". This disjointed collection creates a legal system that establishes who can and should do what and where. The current international legal framework that governs the use of the high seas strongly promotes cooperation between States, allows the creation of MPAs, is adaptable, and could more explicitly support HSMPAs.

1. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)

The UNCLOS has been widely referred to as a comprehensive legal framework for the world's oceans, as it effectively outlines most of the rights and responsibilities of all participating nations. Of paramount significance, it delineates distinct zones of jurisdiction within the oceans, thereby allocating varying rights to different states.

1. The territorial sea is defined as the area that spans from the baseline to a distance of 12 nautical miles. In the area mentioned above, the coastal state maintains exclusive sovereignty and jurisdiction akin to that it exercises within its terrestrial boundaries. For instance, the exclusive rights of the coastal state in the territorial sea are limited by its duty to allow innocent passage by ships from other States.

2. The contiguous zone is a maritime zone that spans from 12 to 24 nautical miles. The coastal state is authorized to implement measures to prevent and penalize violations of its national legislation about customs, fiscal, immigration, and sanitary issues, provided such violations occur within its territorial sea or territory.
3. The coastal state is authorized to establish an exclusive economic zone (EEZ) that ranges from 12 to 200 nautical miles. Within this zone, the state is granted the authority to exercise sovereign rights over living and non-living marine resources and jurisdiction over marine scientific research and protecting and preserving the marine environment.
4. Beyond the 200 nautical miles, the high-seas regime is implemented, which allows all States to participate in fishing activities, subject to treaty obligations and the rights of other States. In contemporary times, most fishing activities conducted on the high seas are subject to regulation by regional fisheries management organizations to varying degrees. Distinct regulations will be in place for utilizing mineral reserves located on the profound ocean floor.

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) is a meticulously designed framework that aims to strike a delicate equilibrium between the concerns and priorities of all nations. The negotiation process spanned 15 years after two prior endeavors to attain a consensus. UNCLOS serves as the fundamental basis of international law about using oceans. Notably, despite being adopted in 1982, the Convention did not become effective until 1994, following the amendment of its deep seabed mining regulations through the 1994 Mining Agreement. Furthermore, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) was augmented in 1995 by ratifying the United Nations Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. The agreements mentioned above indicate that UNCLOS is a dynamic treaty amenable to revisions or expansions following the desires of its constituent Parties.

The current state of the Convention delineates that the provisions of UNCLOS that hold the utmost significance and pertinence for our objectives are categorized subsequently

1. The regulations governing fishing activities, resource conservation in the high-seas, as outlined in Articles 116-120, and
2. The regulations about safeguarding the marine ecosystem, particularly Articles 192 and 194, are essential.
3. Freedom of High Seas and Regulation Regarding Marine Environment

1.1 The Regulatory Framework Governing Fisheries and Resources Conservation

The Law of the Sea protects and manages open ocean biological resources. Articles 116 and 117 limit international fishing for resource equity and collaboration. State must protect fish populations, sovereignty, and marine resources from overexploitation. Article 116 promotes state marine environment and pollution control. Enforcement is difficult without central authority and monitoring. Precautionary measures require international cooperation, stricter regulations, and technological advances without complete scientific evidence. To protect high-seas resources, Article 118 emphasizes global cooperation. Assistance, conservation, and science require organizational cooperation. Effective conservation and long-term management require information and capacity building despite competing priorities and legal differences. Articles 117 and 118 discuss interstate resource preservation and cooperation. UNCLOS requires scientifically credible fisheries management organizations to sustainably restore harvested species. States should preserve and cooperate independently. Stock conditions and use are guided by science. If stocks have suffered significant damage, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) may require a no-take or closed Marine Protected Area (MPA) if the concerned States cooperate. Open ocean RFMOs have taken such measures. High-seas marine protected areas are not explicitly prohibited by UNCLOS. UNCLOS allows states to preserve marine resources as agreed. States must consider stock-species relationships when taking high seas measures under UNCLOS Article 119. Rather than protecting a stock, protect a region.

1.2 The Environment Regime

Part XII of UNCLOS is dedicated to marine environmental protection. Article 192 emphasizes states' responsibility to safeguard the marine environment, while Article 193 allows for resource use within environmental policies. Article 192 stresses states' obligation to take actions, individually or collectively, to prevent pollution and protect the marine environment. Implementing these measures can be challenging due to resource limitations and the international nature of pollution. Effective protection requires increased commitments, financial support, and international cooperation.

Article 194 elaborates:

1. States can establish marine protected areas.
2. States must ensure their activities don't cause pollution beyond their jurisdiction.
3. Measures to combat marine pollution must be implemented.
4. States must protect delicate ecosystems and habitats of endangered species.

Cooperation among states is crucial to avoid interference while exercising their rights and fulfilling their duties. Harmonizing fisheries management and environmental protection allows robust high seas conservation through inter-state collaboration, evidence-based measures, and open ocean marine protected areas, not prohibited by UNCLOS.

Various global environmental agreements, such as the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the Kyoto Protocol, the Paris Agreement, and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, indirectly contribute to the conservation of high seas natural resources. The Rio Declaration's principles of sustainable development guide global conservation efforts and responsible high-seas marine ecosystem management. Climate change effects on these ecosystems are addressed by the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement, indirectly protecting high seas natural resources by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Stockholm Convention aims to prevent the spread of persistent organic pollutants, benefiting marine ecosystems. Additionally, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and other treaties concerning fisheries,

biodiversity, pollution, and marine protected areas provide explicit and comprehensive plans for protecting and sustainably managing marine life in international waters.

1.3 Freedom of High Seas and Regulation Regarding Marine Environment

Article 87 of UNCLOS grants freedom of the high seas, allowing all nations unrestricted access for various purposes. However, this openness can lead to overexploitation and ecological harm. Finding a balance between freedom and accountability is crucial for sustaining high-seas resources. Article 89 emphasizes flag state jurisdiction over vessels, vital in combating illegal activities like IUU fishing, yet enforcement complexities persist due to the vastness of the high seas. Article 90 addresses stateless vessels, subjecting them to the jurisdiction of the state where they are found, but challenges in identifying and prosecuting offenders remain. Coastal and high-seas fishing states are responsible for fish stock conservation, but cooperation faces hurdles like limited resources and competing interests. In EEZs, coastal states have rights over resources, but collaborative efforts are essential for shared stocks. Practical international cooperation, management mechanisms, better enforcement, and increased funding for scientific research are crucial for the sustainable use of high-seas resources. Only by working together can we ensure that future generations can access the ocean's rich natural resources.

The Convention on Biological Diversity and its Jakarta Mandate

The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), established during the 1992 Earth Summit, aims to preserve biodiversity and responsibly use genetic resources. Parties are urged to implement measures like monitoring, controlling harmful activities, and integrating biodiversity considerations in decision-making. The CBD emphasizes both in-situ and ex-situ conservation.

A significant aspect is the mandate for Parties to establish protected areas for biodiversity preservation. The Jakarta Mandate, introduced in 1995, outlines specific marine and coastal biodiversity actions, including integrated coastal area management, sustainable resource utilization, and establishing marine protected areas (MPAs).

Article 4 covers biodiversity within national jurisdiction and activities with effects beyond, including the high seas. Article 5 encourages collaboration for areas beyond national jurisdiction.

Parties must ensure their nationals avoid harming high seas biodiversity. They are encouraged to create protected areas and are obliged to collaborate for biodiversity preservation. This calls for MPAs in the open ocean, with negotiation requirements in regions beyond national jurisdiction. Adhering to the CBD's principles ensures the conservation of valuable ocean biodiversity for future generations.

The UN Fish Stocks Agreement

The 1995 United Nations Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks addressed shortcomings in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. It aimed to manage fish stocks spanning EEZs and the high seas, balancing coastal and distant water fishing nations' interests through three years of negotiations. Emphasizing a precautionary approach in Article 6, the Agreement shifted from reactive to proactive conservation. It mandates action based on reliable scientific evidence, urging caution in the face of uncertainty. High-seas Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are a key tool for implementing precautionary measures, with regional fisheries management organizations responsible for their designation to protect fish stocks and biodiversity.

While not yet in force, Parties voluntarily implement the Agreement. Establishing MPAs in high-seas regions under the supervision of relevant Regional Fisheries Management Organizations is a feasible approach. Once adopted by an RFMO, all Agreement Parties must adhere to these conservation measures. By implementing the Fish Stocks Agreement and adopting a precautionary approach, nations can collaboratively ensure sustainable management of fish stocks. This approach promotes ecological balance, resource protection, and alignment of coastal and distant fishing nations' interests, securing a prosperous future for oceans and their dependent communities.

The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, 1946

The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) was established in 1946 to facilitate the appropriate preservation of whale populations and promote the systematic advancement of the whaling sector. Throughout its half-century existence, the Convention has undergone significant transformations, transitioning from a regulatory mechanism for whaling to a present-day prohibition on the practice. The evolution observed in the whaling industry can be attributed to the shifting political objectives of most affiliated Parties. These Parties have implemented stringent measures to prohibit most forms of whaling, with only a few exceptions, such as scientific and traditional whaling. Of particular significance is the provision within the Convention that allows for the implementation of regulations aimed at both the opening and closing of waters and the establishment of sanctuaries wherein whaling activities are strictly prohibited. It is possible to declare these sanctuaries in all waters where whaling activities occur, including those beyond national jurisdiction, such as areas of the high seas. The Convention stipulates a highly particularised form of marine protected area (MPA) designed to limit a singular activity, whaling, as a conservation measure. Notwithstanding, it presents a compelling precedent and is especially remarkable due to its early adoption in 1946, well in advance of the widespread utilization of MPAs to manage and conserve marine resources.

Agenda 21

The possibility of establishing marine protected areas (MPAs) in the open ocean is recognized by Agenda 21, a significant soft-law mechanism. Chapter 17 of Agenda 21 focuses on oceans and coastal regions to protect, rationalize, and develop living resources in these areas. It emphasizes integrated management and sustainable development, urging coastal states to preserve marine biodiversity and productivity, such as establishing MPAs.

Agenda 21 promotes cooperation in areas beyond national jurisdiction, particularly at sea. States are responsible for protecting marine resources, including endangered species and ecologically sensitive habitats. It is recognized as a valuable framework for achieving sustainable development, providing practical recommendations for specific measures.

MPAs are critical for protecting the coastal marine environment in this context. Implementing MPAs on the high seas is not out of the question, but it will necessitate negotiations among all relevant States. Agenda 21 is essential for nations striving for sustainable development and fostering cooperation for marine resource conservation.

Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas Designated under the IMO Regime

The International Maritime Organization (IMO) is the UN platform for global shipping matters and regulations. Within IMO, the concept of Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs) has emerged. PSSAs are designated in recognition of 16 areas with ecological, socio-economic, or scientific importance vulnerable to harm from maritime activities. Implementing PSSA measures signifies the international shipping community's commitment to mitigating shipping's ecological impact. IMO member states, individually or collectively, can propose a region for PSSA recognition, subject to evaluation by the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC).

Assessments aim to scrutinize the effectiveness of measures mitigating shipping's impact on the marine ecosystem. Recent guidelines outline ecological, social, cultural, economic, scientific, and cultural standards for PSSA classification. Upon designation as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA), specific protective measures become binding for vessels under any IMO member state's flag. These measures include traffic separation schemes, pilotage, vessel traffic services, and no discharge areas, all carrying legal weight.

PSSA implementation underscores the global community's commitment to limit specific activities, particularly shipping, to safeguard regions of ecological or cultural significance.

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) was established in 1975 to regulate and control the trade of endangered species and their products. CITES categorizes species into three appendices based on their level of endangerment, and trade in these species is governed by permits and certificates. The primary goal of CITES is to prevent the extinction of species threatened by international trade while promoting sustainable use and protection of endangered species within member countries. However, CITES primarily regulates trade and may not directly address other threats to marine ecosystems and species, such as habitat destruction, pollution, and climate change. The success of CITES relies on member countries' dedication and cooperation, and challenges like illegal trade and inadequate enforcement can weaken conservation efforts. Additionally, political and economic factors may influence decision-making and listing processes within CITES, leading to debates and controversies.

Antarctic Treaty System: A Journey of International Cooperation and Environmental Protection

The Antarctic continent's vast ice sheets, extreme climate, and unique ecosystem have long fascinated explorers, scientists, and policymakers. Despite geopolitical tensions and competing interests, the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS) promotes international cooperation, scientific collaboration, and environmental protection. Its complex agreements and protocols have helped maintain peace and promote responsible scientific research in Antarctica while addressing many challenges and legal issues. Late 19th- and early 20th-century exploration and expeditions led to the Antarctic Treaty System. The "Heroic Age of Antarctic Exploration", led by Robert Falcon Scott and Ernest Shackleton, piqued international interest in Antarctica's scientific and strategic potential. Geopolitical rivalries shaped Antarctic Treaty System negotiations during the Cold War. Twelve Antarctica-interested nations participated in the 1957–1958 IGY to prevent militarization. This collaborative scientific project promoted goodwill and cooperation, preparing Antarctica governance discussions.

This system is based on the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, which took effect on June 23, 1961. This landmark agreement has several key provisions and features that define its goals and principles:

1. Demilitarization and Peaceful Purposes: The treaty bans military, nuclear, and base construction in Antarctica. Peaceful Antarctic scientific research is promoted.
2. Unrestricted Antarctic Scientific Research: The treaty requires this. This promotes scientific collaboration and sharing.
3. Consultative and Non-Consultative Parties: The treaty classifies signatories as consultative or non-consultative. Scientific researchers and Antarctica administration officials consult.
4. Territory Claims Suspension: The treaty suspends sovereignty claims over Antarctica, encouraging shared management and stewardship.
5. Environmental Protection and Conservation: The 1991 Antarctic Treaty Protocol strengthens Antarctica's ecosystem preservation efforts. It makes Antarctica a natural reserve, restricts mineral extraction, and protects the environment.
6. Antarctica Nuclear Testing Prohibition: The treaty prohibits nuclear explosions and radioactive waste disposal.

Antarctic Treaty System agreements and protocols cover governance, environmental protection, and resource management. The 1982 The Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources Agreement aims to conserve marine life in the Southern Ocean and promote sustainable fisheries. It regulates species catch and protects marine areas. The Madrid Protocol 1991 makes Antarctica a natural reserve with strict environmental, waste, and conservation laws. Besides Liability Annex protocol establishes liability and compensation for hazardous materials and activities associated with Antarctic environmental damage and accidents.

The Antarctic Treaty System shares similarities with international law governing the high seas, focusing on principles like freedom of navigation, scientific research, and environmental protection. However, these frameworks differ significantly due to Antarctica's unique characteristics: The Antarctic Treaty System goes beyond promoting demilitarization; it suspends territorial sovereignty claims over Antarctica, prioritizing cooperation. In terms of environmental protection, both frameworks emphasize marine conservation, but the Antarctic Treaty's

Protocol on Environmental Protection specifically targets the fragile Antarctic ecosystem, imposing stricter restrictions on human activities. Moreover, while the Antarctic Treaty System enforces a mineral resource moratorium to preserve the environment, high seas law allows for the freedom of resource exploitation. These distinctions reflect Antarctica's special status as a natural reserve, highlighting the priority of environmental preservation in the region.

Challenges and Ongoing Concerns

Climate change poses significant threats to Antarctica, including ice melt, rising seas, and altered currents that disrupt its delicate ecosystem. The future management of mineral and oil resources remains contentious, requiring a balance between environmental protection and sustainable use. Indigenous communities, like the Indigenous peoples of the Arctic, express concerns about potential impacts on Antarctica. Their traditional knowledge should inform decision-making. Enforcing the Antarctic Treaty in this remote, harsh environment presents challenges, demanding robust monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. The ATS exemplifies international cooperation and diplomacy in addressing complex environmental and geopolitical issues. Its history, negotiation, and provisions prioritize research, peace, and environmental preservation in Antarctica. As global challenges like climate change and resource management persist, the ATS serves as an inspiring model for nations to collaborate in preserving a unique ecosystem while advancing our understanding of Earth's natural processes. It continues to shape Antarctica's future and contribute to global environmental governance discussions.

Existing Regional Legal Frameworks for the Protection of Natural Resources in the High Seas of the Bay of Bengal.

1. Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Program

The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Programme is a regional legal framework that was established under the auspices of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). The Bay of Bengal (BOB) sizeable marine ecosystem project addresses issues related to the overexploitation of marine living resources, the degradation and loss of critical habitats, and water pollution. The BOB countries have agreed to work together and collaborate in implementing the BOBLME Strategic Action Programme (SAP) through the collaboration of the project's Executing Agencies. The BOBLME is innovative with a strong focus on how fishery and management, habitats, and livelihoods interest. The project also focuses on traditional fishing stocks but brings innovation through the ecosystem approach to fishery management (EAFM) in Marine Managed Areas (MMAs) for rebuilding fish stocks to sustain livelihoods while achieving positive Biodiversity outcomes. It supports women in the fisheries sector, directly addressing their past exclusion from fisheries development programs. The project will also focus on marine pollution and reducing plastics from fishing. The BOBLME Project includes Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and Thailand. The project aims to improve the lives of the coastal populations through better regional management of the Bay of Bengal environment and its fisheries.

The project's objectives are as follows

1. Establish a Strategic Action Programme (SAP) to protect the health of the ecosystem and manage the BoB's living resources long-term to improve the food and livelihood security of the region's coastal population. SAP implementation will accrue global benefits, resulting in an environmentally healthy BOBLME over time.
2. Encourage developing and implementing demonstrative regional and subregional collaborative approaches to expected and shared natural resource issues affecting the BOBLME's health and status.
3. Participate in and share information with other regional and global environmental monitoring programs to improve understanding of the BOBLME ecological functions and processes.
4. Support activities lead to the development of an agreed-upon set of environmental indicators to measure the health of the BOBLME, as well as the development of a regional collaborative approach to identifying significant coastal water pollution issues and developing remedial strategies.

Critical viewpoint

The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem (BOBLME) Programme has faced criticism for its shortcomings in conserving natural resources in the open seas of the Bay of Bengal. The lack of binding mechanisms has undermined its effectiveness, as violations go largely unpunished. Insufficient enforcement measures create loopholes for exploitation. The program struggled to address complex socio-economic factors impacting marine conservation, failing to balance livelihood needs with sustainable fishing practices. Its standardized approach overlooked diverse cultural, political, and economic contexts, reducing its efficacy. Shared responsibility led to blame dispersion and reduced commitment from member countries. Efforts to mitigate marine pollution, mainly plastic pollution from fishing activities, were inadequate, posing significant risks to the ecosystem's health and biodiversity. The BOBLME Programme needs more vigorous enforcement, adaptability, and targeted strategies to achieve effective conservation in the Bay of Bengal.

1.1 Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA)

The Indian Ocean Rim Association, also known as IORA, is an international organization that facilitates cooperation between countries located along the rim of the Indian Ocean. This association also includes the nations located in the Bay of Bengal region. It is generally agreed that the natural resources of the Indian Ocean are significant, and because of this, the Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA) is an outspoken supporter of regional cooperation and the pursuit of sustainable development. In the context of this framework, various activities take place, including discussions, the exchange of knowledge, and collaborative efforts of various kinds. These activities aim to foster responsible utilization and consumption of the ocean's resources out in international waters. However, it is of the utmost importance to assess the effectiveness of the Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA) in preserving the ecological integrity of the Bay of Bengal's high seas. The degree to

which regional strategies have been put into action, the efficiency with which regulations are enforced, and the results of collaborative efforts to address environmental issues should all be evaluated as part of this study.

Bangladesh-India Joint Working Group on Fisheries

The Bangladesh-India Joint Working Group on Fisheries is a bilateral mechanism established between Bangladesh and India to deal with various fisheries-related matters in the Bay of Bengal. This mechanism was established to facilitate communication and cooperation between the two countries. This partnership will include the safeguarding of the natural resources that can be found on the high seas. The framework mentioned above makes it easier for the two countries to work together to promote environmentally responsible fisheries management and reduce the possibility of unsustainable fishing practices. Through collaborative patrols, scientific research, and data exchange, efforts are being made to address the problem of illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing activities, also known as "IUU" fishing. However, it is of the utmost importance to evaluate the effectiveness of this collaborative working group in preserving the natural resources found on the high seas in the Bay of Bengal. The evaluation needs to include a study of the regulatory enforcement, an analysis of the effects on fish stocks and biodiversity, and an examination of the degree to which sustainable fishing practices are advocated for and implemented.

Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security (CTI-CFF)

The Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security (CTI-CFF) is an intergovernmental collaboration among six nations, including Indonesia and Malaysia, located in the Bay of Bengal region. The initiative focuses on coral reefs, fisheries, and food security. The primary objective of this initiative is to prioritize the preservation and efficient stewardship of coral reefs and the interconnected marine resources they support, with a specific emphasis on promoting sustainable practices. Through the implementation of various strategies, such as the creation of marine protected areas, fishery management plans, and sustainable livelihood programs, the CTI-CFF works toward the goal of preserving the natural resources located on the high seas. Nevertheless, it is of the utmost importance to analyze how effective this framework is in preserving the natural resources found in the high seas of the Bay of Bengal. This evaluation should include an assessment of the current state of coral reefs and the ecosystems they support, the effects on fish populations, and the efficacy of conservation and management initiatives.

Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs)

Regional Fisheries Management Organizations, also known as RFMOs, are of the utmost importance in managing fisheries resources located on the high seas, including those found in the Bay of Bengal. These organizations are responsible for developing and implementing strategies to promote environmentally responsible fishing practices, reduce the risk of overfishing, and protect particularly vulnerable species. Two regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs) are actively engaged in fisheries management within the Bay of Bengal region. These organizations are the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organization (BOBP-IGO). Despite this, it is of the utmost importance to assess how successful Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) have been in preserving the ecological balance of the open ocean. This evaluation should include investigating how regulations are enforced, the effects on fish stocks and ecosystems, and the extent to which sustainable fishing practices are advocated for and implemented.

Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC)

Even though the Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre for the Mediterranean Sea (REMPEC) is not solely focused on the Bay of Bengal, it can still provide insightful perspectives on regional strategies that aim to reduce the amount of marine pollution in international waters. REMPEC is an organization that works under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and its mission is to encourage cooperation and synchronization between the countries that are located in the Mediterranean in order to reduce the occurrences of marine pollution and to find solutions to the problems that it causes. REMPEC aims to protect marine resources in international waters by putting response plans into action, organizing training exercises, and disseminating information regarding previously gained knowledge and experiences. Even though the geographical characteristics of the Mediterranean Sea and the Bay of Bengal are very different, and even though they face very different environmental challenges, the insights and knowledge gained from REMPEC can be beneficial in developing regional frameworks to protect natural resources in the open ocean.

International Maritim Organization (IMO)

The International Maritime Organization, or IMO, is an official agency of the United Nations that holds specific authorization and is tasked with promoting safety, security, and environmental protection within the maritime domain. Its name comes from the acronym for "international maritime organization." Even though the International Maritime Organization (IMO) does not solely focus on the Bay of Bengal, it is crucial in establishing global standards and regulations that effectively safeguard natural resources in open oceans. These standards and regulations can be found in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has enacted regulations regarding the management of ballast water, the prevention of marine debris, and ship pollution to reduce the detrimental effects that human activities have on marine ecosystems. To determine how effective the regulations of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) are in protecting natural resources in the high seas around the world, including in the Bay of Bengal, it is essential to evaluate both the efficacy of these regulations and the member states' level of compliance with them. Protecting the marine ecosystems and biodiversity of the high seas presents a formidable obstacle, and overcoming it will require the cooperation of many countries and international organizations. Several regional initiatives have been launched in the Bay of Bengal region to address this issue, and the degree to which they have been successful can vary. This study examines these programs' effectiveness in preserving the natural environment.

South Asia Cooperative Environment Programs (SACEP)

The South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP) is an intergovernmental organization with a prominent presence on the international stage. It plays a critical part in encouraging environmental cooperation among the countries of South Asia, which includes the nations that are located in the region surrounding the Bay of Bengal. The South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP), which focuses on addressing various environmental concerns, includes protecting natural resources on the high seas as one of its primary areas of focus. Through the facilitation of policy dialogue, the provision of technical assistance, and the enhancement of capacity building, SACEP is working toward its goal of promoting the conservation of marine resources. In this regard, creating and implementing regional strategies and action plans is the primary goal of this organization. However, it is essential to evaluate the degree to which the initiatives taken on by the South Asian Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP) effectively safeguard the natural resources located in the high seas of the Bay of Bengal, as well as to determine if there are any limitations or deficiencies in its approach.

Critical Analysis on The Failure of these Regional Framework

The regional efforts aimed at conserving marine life and ecosystems in the Bay of Bengal have encountered a series of challenges and shortcomings, prompting a critical analysis in this paper.

The South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme (SACEP) demonstrates the importance of regional cooperation but faces hurdles in implementation due to political obstacles, resource limitations, and diverse ecological and socioeconomic conditions among member countries. SACEP's shortcomings are particularly evident in its inability to address root causes of environmental degradation like poverty and overfishing, as well as its lack of effective compliance mechanisms. The Indian Ocean Rim Association (IORA) aspired to cooperative and environmentally responsible growth but has struggled to achieve these goals. Challenges include reconciling differing national interests, effectively sharing knowledge and best practices, and enforcing regional strategies. Furthermore, the IORA's difficulties in monitoring and evaluating collaborative environmental initiatives hinder the assessment of their success.

The Bangladesh-India Joint Working Group on Fisheries exemplifies bilateral cooperation but falls short in effectively curbing Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing. Resource constraints, inadequate surveillance technology, and lenient penalties contribute to its limited effectiveness. The Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries, and Food Security (CTI-CFF) emphasizes conservation and sustainable management, yet faces challenges due to global warming, environmentally harmful fishing practices, and population growth, which threaten marine protected areas.

Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) such as the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and the Bay of Bengal Programme Inter-Governmental Organisation (BOBP-IGO) grapple with reduced effectiveness stemming from member state noncompliance, data deficiencies for decision-making, and difficulties addressing transboundary issues. The Regional Marine Pollution Emergency Response Centre (REMPEC) in the Mediterranean boasts success but requires adjustments to suit the socio-economic and environmental disparities of the Bay of Bengal.

The International Maritime Organisation (IMO) faces challenges in enforcing its standards among member states, particularly those with extensive shipping industries or enforcement limitations. Nevertheless, IMO regulations inadvertently contribute to high seas conservation through reduced ship pollution and marine debris. This analysis highlights the complex nature of high seas conservation and the need for adaptive strategies, robust enforcement, and international cooperation to address the unique challenges faced in the Bay of Bengal and similar regions.

An Analytical Approach on the Enhancement of Legal and Conservation Mechanisms in Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction

In the Bay of Bengal, the legal framework for conserving marine biodiversity in "Areas beyond national jurisdiction" (ABNJ) is lacking. Regional organizations and agreements mainly focus on fisheries and coastal areas, neglecting ABNJ. Current legal mechanisms are failing due to limited national capabilities, public awareness, and political engagement. Overfishing and illegal, unreported, and unregulated (IUU) fishing persist, indicating non-compliance with Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC) and UNCLOS regulations. Governance flaws result from overlapping regional organizations, a lack of coordination, and competing national interests.

Scientific and technical barriers hinder ABNJ marine biodiversity management. This region lacks data on marine biodiversity, and many countries lack technical capacity for research and monitoring. Opportunities exist to enhance the legal framework in ABNJ. UNCLOS negotiations aim to establish a legally binding international instrument for marine biodiversity protection in ABNJ. Regional cooperation, expanded mandates, and advocacy for regional approaches within global frameworks can improve legal mechanisms. Strengthening scientific research, data sharing, and technical capacities is essential. Involving government bodies, industry, civil society, and local communities in decision-making processes can enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of legal mechanisms. To succeed, regional high-seas conservation initiatives must improve enforcement, build national capacities, and adapt to regional challenges, including poverty, overfishing, and climate change, to protect Bay of Bengal marine life.

Existing National Laws

Bangladesh has implemented a range of legislative measures and policy frameworks at the national level to safeguard the environment and preserve its natural resources. Although these laws provide a comprehensive framework, they encounter challenges and loopholes that frequently impede their efficient enforcement, especially on the high seas. Presented here is a critical evaluation of several national laws

1. The Environment Conservation Act (1995) serves as the fundamental legislation in Bangladesh about environmental matters, with the primary objective of regulating pollution and mitigating environmental deterioration. The legislation facilitates the

establishment of an environmental clearance certificate, an essential prerequisite for industrial activities. Nevertheless, enforcement measures have frequently been ineffective due to insufficient personnel and resources, instances of corruption, and a lack of commitment from political authorities. Furthermore, the prescribed penalties for environmental offenses as stipulated by the Act frequently exhibit inadequacy in deterring individuals or entities engaged in polluting activities. Additionally, there is a notable lack of clarity within the legislation about allocating responsibility for enforcing the law mentioned above.

2. The Environment Court Act of 2000 facilitated the creation of Environmental Courts to expedite the adjudication process for environmental violations. However, it is essential to note that there have been minimal instances in which legal action has been taken following this legislation. The primary contributing factor to this phenomenon can be attributed to the limited level of knowledge regarding the law among the general populace and a significant portion of law enforcement personnel. Moreover, the judiciary frequently lacks specialized knowledge and training to address intricate environmental cases effectively.
3. The Wildlife (Conservation and Security) Act of 2012 has not effectively addressed the persistent issues of illegal poaching and wildlife trade, despite its original purpose to do so. The primary contributing factors to this issue include inadequate law enforcement, insufficient penalties for infractions, limited public awareness regarding legislation, and pervasive poverty, which incentivizes specific individuals within the community to participate in illicit wildlife trafficking.
4. The Bangladesh Water Act of 2013 establishes the fundamental structure for managing water resources. However, its effectiveness in preventing water pollution has been largely compromised by insufficient enforcement measures, inadequate inter-agency coordination, and limited public engagement in water management.
5. The Bangladesh Biodiversity Act (2017) encompasses provisions for preserving biological diversity, the responsible utilization of its constituents, and the just and equitable distribution of advantages. However, the execution of these measures has been hindered by resource constraints, insufficient public knowledge, and overlapping mandates among various governmental entities.
6. The Bangladesh Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Guidelines, initially established in 1993 and subsequently revised in 2018, serve as a pivotal instrument for incorporating environmental factors into the planning and implementation of development initiatives. Nevertheless, implementing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process frequently encounters challenges such as insufficient technical proficiency, political intervention, corrupt practices, and a prevailing perception of it as a bureaucratic obstacle rather than a means for fostering sustainable development.
7. Initially enacted in 1927 and subsequently amended in 2019, the Bangladesh Forest Act has not effectively curbed the persistently high deforestation rates. The factors mentioned above contributing to this issue include inadequate enforcement measures, encroachments by impoverished local communities seeking alternative means of sustenance, illicit logging activities, and conflicting land-use policies prioritizing agricultural and infrastructure development at the expense of forest preservation.

Critical Evaluation of the Existing Laws

Bangladesh's high seas conservation is primarily governed by international and regional agreements like UNCLOS, CBD, and the BOBLME project. The country upholds the "common heritage of mankind" principle, establishing Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and fishing regulations.

Existing laws, such as the Environmental Conservation Act (1995), Marine Fisheries Ordinance (1983), and Territorial and Maritime Zones Act (1974), provide a basic framework but fail to address unique Bay of Bengal high seas challenges. The rapid decline in Hilsa shad catches highlights the need for stricter fishing regulations, especially in the face of increased ship traffic, exemplified by the 2014 oil spill in the Sundarbans. Climate change-induced cyclones further threaten marine ecosystems. There's a pressing need for a comprehensive marine conservation law that strengthens enforcement, promotes sustainability, encourages public engagement, and supports scientific research. The expanding blue economy requires balancing economic development and ecological preservation.

Existing frameworks have gaps and need improvement. Enforcement mechanisms lack resources and technology. Laws focus on terrestrial issues, resulting in regulatory overlap and conflict. Clear responsibilities and agency cooperation are lacking. More research on high seas and human activities is essential. Bangladesh should enhance legal frameworks, prioritize marine issues, and integrate them into broader environmental and economic strategies. Strengthened enforcement, inter-agency cooperation, technology, and capacity-building are crucial. Sustainable fishing practices, pollution regulation, and climate change mitigation must be emphasized. Regional cooperation in the Bay of Bengal should address shared challenges for sustainable high seas conservation.

Conclusion

Our investigation into natural resource availability in international waters, particularly the Bay of Bengal, reveals the complex and imperfect legal framework governing marine biodiversity conservation in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). Despite international laws like UNCLOS, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Fish Stocks Agreement, and the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, challenges persist on the high seas. Overfishing, illegal activities, and environmental degradation persist, indicating a gap between regulations and practice. We advocate for more flexible laws that can address local issues effectively. Furthermore, there's a pressing need for greater coordination and cooperation among initiatives like the BOBLME Program, IORA, and bilateral arrangements, eliminating inefficiencies stemming from competing mandates.

Our review of national laws underscores the necessity of updating them to align with evolving international conservation standards and local environmental conditions. We recognize that a one-size-fits-all approach is insufficient. Instead, a flexible, multifaceted marine

conservation strategy is required, considering both hard and soft laws, global and regional perspectives, and collaboration among international organizations, national governments, regional groups, and citizens. As we navigate these uncharted waters, may this chapter serve as a guiding light toward a future where our oceans are regulated and protected, ensuring the sustainable management of their invaluable natural resources.

References:

1. Aceves-Bueno E, Read AJ, Cisneros-Mata MA. 'Illegal Fisheries, Environmental Crime, and the Conservation of Marine Resources' Conservation Biology,2021:35:11-20.
2. Agenda 21 - Chapter 17' <https://www.un.org/depts/los/consultative_process/documents/A21-Ch17.htm> accessed 19 July 2023.
3. Baker MC, De Fontaubert AC. *The Status of Natural Resources on the High-Seas: An Independent Study Conducted by the Southampton Oceanography Centre & Charlotte de Fontaubert* WWF--World Wide Fund for Nature 2001.
4. Baross J, Hoffman S. 'Submarine Hydrothermal Vents and Associated Gradient Environments as Sites for the Origin and Evolution of Life', 1985, 15 Origins of Life and Evolution of Biospheres 327
5. Carpenter A, Donner P, Johansson T. 'The Role of REMPEC in Prevention of and Response to Pollution from Ships in the Mediterranean Sea' in Angela Carpenter and Andrey G Kostianoy (eds), *Oil Pollution in the Mediterranean Sea: Part I: The International Context* (Springer International Publishing 2018) <https://doi.org/10.1007/698_2017_169> accessed 15 July 2023
6. Conservancy (TNC) TN and others, Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security (CTI-CFF) : Case Study Summary Report. (EU: European Union 2017) <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/252973/coral-triangle-initiative-on-coral-reefs-fisheries-and-food-security-cti-cff/1011237/> accessed 15 July 2023
7. De Fontaubert C, 'Marine. Coastal Protected Areas: Institutional and Legal Framework', 2000.
8. Decade O. 'Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project II (BOBLME II)' (*Ocean Decade*, 23 March 2023) <https://oceandecade.org/actions/bay-of-bengal-large-marine-ecosystem-project-ii-boblme-ii/> accessed, 2023, 15.
9. Doyle T. 'Blue Economy and the Indian Ocean Rim' Journal of the Indian Ocean Region,2018:14:1.
10. Duan W. 'General Obligations and Principles in Relation to MPA s in ABNJ', *The International Legal Regime Relating to Marine Protected Areas in Areas beyond National Jurisdiction* Brill Nijhoff, 2022.
11. Hutton J, Dickson B. Endangered Species, Threatened Convention: The Past, Present and Future of CITES, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora Earthscan London, 2000.
12. Johnston DM. and others, The Law of the Sea : Priorities and Responsibilities in Implementing the Convention (IUCN 1995) <https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/6888> accessed 6 May 2023
13. Kasting JF, Holm NG. 'What Determines the Volume of the Oceans?' (1992) 109 Earth and Planetary Science Letters 507
14. Konn C. and others, 'A Method for Detection of Trace Concentrations of Underivatized Amino Acid in Hydrothermal Fluids by Ion-Pairing Reversed-Phase UPLC-ESI-QTOF-MS' (2015) 06 American Journal of Analytical Chemistry 313
15. Lodge MW. and others, 'Recommended Best Practices for Regional Fisheries Management Organizations: Report of an Independent Panel to Develop a Model for Improved Governance by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations.' (Chatham House 2007) Report <https://repository.oceanbestpractices.org/handle/11329/1456> accessed 15 July 2023
16. Maffei MC. 'The International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling' (1997) 12 The International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law 287
17. Mooney-Seus M, Rosenberg A. 'Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs): Progress in Adopting Precautionary Approach and Ecosystem-Based Management
18. Munro GR. 'The United Nations Fish Stocks Agreement of 1995: History and Problems of Implementation' (2000) 15 Marine Resource Economics 265
19. 'Overview – Indian Ocean Rim Association – IORA' <https://www.iora.int/en/structures-mechanisms/structures/overview> accessed 15 July 2023
20. 'Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas' <https://www.imo.org/en/ourwork/environment/pages/pssas.aspx> accessed 19 July 2023
21. Raustiala K, Victor DG. 'Biodiversity since Rio: The Future of the Convention on Biological Diversity' (1996) 38 Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development 16
22. *Regional Fisheries Management Organizations and Advisory Bodies* (FAO 2020) <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/ca7843en> accessed 15 July 2023
23. 'SACEP | South Asia Co-Operative Environment Programme' <http://www.sacep.org/> accessed 15 July 2023
24. Shihab H. 'South Asia Co-Operative Environment Programme' [1997] 1997), Harmonising Environment and Development in South Asia, Colombo: SACEP
25. Silber GK. and others, 'The Role of the International Maritime Organization in Reducing Vessel Threat to Whales: Process, Options, Action and Effectiveness' (2012) 36 Marine Policy 1221
26. Staples D. 'Ecosystem Approach to Fishery Management (EAFM) Visuals Gallery' [2019] Training Department, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center
27. Tanja GJ. 'The Law of the Sea. R.R. Churchill and A.V. Lowe; Manchester University Press, Second Edition, 1988; ISBN 0-7190-2634-2; Price: £ 17.95; Xxxviii + 370 Pp.' (1989) 2 Leiden Journal of International Law 136
28. 'The Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem Project - PROJECT OVERVIEW'

<https://www.boblme.org/project_overview.html> accessed 15 July 2023
29. 'The Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) at a Glance' <https://www.marineinsight.com/maritime-law/the-marine-environment-protection-committee-mepc-at-a-glance/> accessed 16 August 2023
30. 'The Wellington Convention for the Prevention of Fishing with Long Driftnets in the South Pacific.', in Charlotte De Fontaubert, *Encyclopedia of Global Change* (Oxford University Press 2001)
31. Van Beukering P, Cesar H. 'Economic Analysis of Marine Managed Areas in the Main Hawaiian Islands' [2004] University of Hawai'i, USA: HCRI Research Program.
32. Young S. 'Contemporary Issues of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Debate over Sustainable Use' (2003) 14 Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy 167