



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Shared obligations in international law

Nedeski, N.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Other version

License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Nedeski, N. (2017). *Shared obligations in international law*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The background of the cover is a watercolor-style map of the world. The colors are primarily various shades of blue, from light sky blue to deep navy, with some areas of purple and magenta, particularly in the southern regions. The map is centered on the Atlantic Ocean, showing the continents of North America, South America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australia. The text is overlaid on a semi-transparent horizontal band across the middle of the map.

SHARED OBLIGATIONS
IN INTERNATIONAL LAW
NATAŠA NEDESKI

SHARED OBLIGATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

Nataša Nedeski

Copyright 2017 by Nataša Nedeski

Cover image: Watercolor art by Lagartixa (www.lagartixashop.com)

Cover and layout: Arnoud Ens

Printing: Ipskamp Printing, Enschede

SHARED OBLIGATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus
prof. dr. ir. K.I.J. Maex
ten overstaan van een door het College voor Promoties ingestelde commissie,
in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Agnietenkapel
op donderdag 2 november 2017, te 12:00 uur

door Nataša Nedeski
geboren te Utrecht

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor:	prof. dr. P.A. Nollkaemper	Universiteit van Amsterdam
Copromotor:	dr. C.M. Brölmann	Universiteit van Amsterdam
Overige leden:	prof. dr. P.J. Kuijper	Universiteit van Amsterdam
	prof. dr. J. d'Aspremont	Universiteit van Amsterdam
	dr. R. van Alebeek	Universiteit van Amsterdam
	dr. S. Trevisanut	Universiteit Utrecht
	prof. dr. C.M.J. Ryngaert	Universiteit Utrecht
	prof. dr. P. Palchetti	Università di Macerata

Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid

The research leading to this thesis received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Program for Research (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement n° 249499, as part of the Research Project on Shared Responsibility in International Law (SHARES), carried out at the Amsterdam Center for International Law (ACIL) of the University of Amsterdam.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my promotor André Nollkaemper and co-promotor Kiki Brölmann. Being (in Kiki's words) somewhat of an 'introvert scholar' it has been wonderful to have had two supervisors who gave me the desired freedom to go through parts of the process of writing a PhD thesis on my own, but who were also there whenever I was in need of a discussion on the seemingly never-ending number of concepts and categorizations potentially relevant for this study. Both of you have succeeded in making me feel that you believe in me and my project, which has been particularly helpful during those times that I wasn't quite sure of either myself. I have truly enjoyed working with you both. André, your expert guidance as the initiator of the SHARES project has been invaluable. Thank you for your incessant curiosity, open mind and your faith in my ability to tackle this topic. Kiki, I have greatly benefited from your sharp and analytical mind and dedication, and deeply appreciated your continuous words of encouragement and sense of humour.

As is true for most people that have been in my position, there is a diverse group of people behind the scenes that have directly or indirectly contributed to the completion of this PhD. Without naming anyone (and thereby conveniently mitigating the risk of forgetting someone), I want to thank all that have inspired and encouraged me to pursue a doctorate degree, and all that have supported me throughout the process. (Former) professors, colleagues, friends and family: thank you. Thanks are due in particular to the members of the SHARES project. My own work has certainly benefited from all of our (official and unofficial) SHARES meetings and, what's more, being a part of this team of wonderful people has made the process of writing a PhD thesis a less solitary endeavour.

Other important contributors to my on-the-job support system have been my two 'roomies' Chris and Yu. Chris, when I joined the department of International and European Law you were the first to take me under your wing. Yu, you joined our office a couple of years later and perfectly fitted the dynamics of E4.10. Thank you both for your companionship. I thoroughly enjoyed our many conversations about anything but our research, and will always remember our times in E4.10 fondly. Finally, Jessica, I was excited when you joined the SHARES project and sad to see you relocate overseas. The distance notwithstanding, I was lucky to be the continued beneficiary of your kindness and support, which eventually culminated in you acting

as my paranymp. Thank you, and I hope to be a similar source of support while you embark upon your own PhD journey.

It is only appropriate to end these acknowledgements by mentioning my two favourite persons in the world.

Snežana, my sister and best friend, I admire you greatly. Even while going through challenging times yourself you have always been there for me. I find it difficult to identify the right words to express how much our connection means to me, but one of the (many) plus sides of that connection is that I don't necessarily need to: you most likely know what I mean.

Arnoud, my partner-in-life, you are unlike anyone I have ever met. Calm and caring, smart and creative, driven and adventurous: these are only a few of the traits you possess that, all combined, have proven to be a force for good in my life. There seem to be no limits to what you would do for me. It is impossible to do justice to the contribution you have made to my overall happiness and wellbeing with a simple paragraph in an acknowledgements section. Nonetheless, I want to express that you have undoubtedly been my biggest source of support, for which I owe you my most heartfelt gratitude.



ABBREVIATIONS

ARIO	Articles on the Responsibility of International Organizations
ASR	Articles on State Responsibility
CAT	Convention Against Torture
CPA	Coalition Provisional Authority
DCFR	Draft Common Frame of Reference
EC	European Community
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights
ECJ	European Court of Justice
EU	European Union
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
ICJ	International Court of Justice
IGC	Intergovernmental Commission
ILC	International Law Commission
IO	International Organization
IOM	InterOceanmetal Joint Organization
IWA	Internationally Wrongful Act
LOSC	Law of the Sea Convention
NPT	Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
PECL	Principles of European Contract Law
PETL	Principles of European Tort Law
PICC	Principles of International Commercial Contracts
PNG	Papua New Guinea
SR	Special Rapporteur
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
US	United States
VCDR	Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations
VCLT	Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties
WTO	World Trade Organization



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
ABBREVIATIONS	5
1. INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 <i>Scope of the research</i>	16
1.1.1 International obligations and international responsibility	16
1.1.2 The international law of obligations	17
1.1.3 Duty-bearers	18
i. States as duty-bearers	19
ii. International organizations as duty-bearers	19
iii. Duty-bearers when states act through a common organ	22
1.1.4 Shared obligations	24
1.1.5 Divisible and indivisible shared obligations	25
1.1.6 Shared responsibility	26
i. Legal responsibility	26
ii. A single harmful outcome	28
iii. Contributions: one or several internationally wrongful acts	30
1.2 <i>Research question and approach</i>	30
1.2.1 The conceptualization of shared obligations	31
i. The distinction between bilateral and multilateral legal relations	32
ii. Categories of obligations and multilateral legal relations in the international law of obligations	33
iii. An iterative process	35
1.2.2 An analysis on the basis of the positive law of international responsibility	35
i. The existing legal framework of international responsibility	36
ii. In the light of the present study's conceptualization of shared obligations	37
1.3 <i>Relevance of the research</i>	39
1.4 <i>Structure of the thesis</i>	41

PART I	45
2. THE MOVE BEYOND A BILATERAL VIEW OF LEGAL RELATIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL LAW OF OBLIGATIONS	47
2.1 <i>Common interests, multilateral treaties and multilateral legal relations</i>	50
2.1.1 The protection of common interests	51
2.1.2 The rise of multilateral treaties	52
2.1.3 The emergence of multilateral legal relations	53
2.2 <i>The distinction between bilateral and multilateral legal relations</i>	55
2.2.1 Hohfeld's analysis of legal relations	56
2.2.2 The correlation between obligations and rights in international law	59
2.2.3 Analysis: distinguishing between bilateral and multilateral legal relations	61
i. The perspective of the right-holders	64
ii. The perspective of the duty-bearers	66
2.3 <i>Multilateral legal relations and the law of treaties</i>	67
2.3.1 Reciprocal, interdependent and integral obligations	68
i. Reciprocal obligations	70
ii. Interdependent obligations	71
iii. Integral obligations	72
2.3.2 Peremptory norms	74
2.3.3 The approach to multilateral legal relations in the law of treaties	75
2.4 <i>Multilateral legal relations and the law of international responsibility</i>	77
2.4.1 Crimes and delicts: the first step away from an exclusively bilateral view of legal relations	78
2.4.2 Bilateral, multilateral and <i>erga omnes (partes)</i> obligations	82
i. Bilateral obligations	83
ii. Multilateral and <i>erga omnes (partes)</i> obligations	84
2.4.3 Serious breaches of obligations under peremptory norms	87
2.4.4 The approach to multilateral legal relations in the law of international responsibility	88
2.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	90
3. THE CONCEPT OF SHARED OBLIGATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	93
3.1 <i>Sources, rules, norms and obligations</i>	94
3.1.1 Sources of international law	94
3.1.2 International legal rules or norms	95
3.1.3 International legal obligations	96
i. International obligations in the law of treaties	97
ii. International obligations in the law of international responsibility	97
3.1.4 Relevance for the conceptualization of shared obligations	98
3.2 <i>Elements of a shared obligation</i>	99
3.2.1 Multiple duty-bearers	100

3.2.2	Bound to a similar international obligation	101
3.2.3	Pertaining to the same concrete case	107
	i. Multiple states and/or IOs agree to an obligation to work towards or achieve a common goal	109
	ii. Multiple states and/or IOs are factually linked to a common situation	110
3.3	<i>Conclusions</i>	116
4.	DIVISIBLE AND INDIVISIBLE SHARED OBLIGATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	119
4.1	<i>Introducing two types of shared obligations</i>	120
4.1.1	Indivisible shared obligations	121
4.1.2	Divisible shared obligations	125
4.2	<i>Indicators for qualifying a shared obligation as divisible or indivisible</i>	128
4.2.1	Positive obligations and negative obligations	129
4.2.2	Obligations of result and obligations of conduct	130
	i. The distinction between obligations of result and conduct in the 1996 Draft ASR	130
	ii. The civil law understanding of obligations of conduct and result	132
	iii. Difficulties encountered when applying the distinction in practice	135
4.2.3	Categories of obligations as indicators for qualifying a shared obligation as divisible or indivisible	141
4.3	<i>Some considerations in the choice between divisible and indivisible shared obligations</i>	148
4.4	<i>Conclusions</i>	150
	CONCLUSIONS TO PART I	153
	PART II	157
5.	BREACHES OF SHARED OBLIGATIONS AND THE DETERMINATION OF SHARED RESPONSIBILITY	159
5.1.	<i>Shared responsibility for one or several internationally wrongful acts</i>	162
5.1.1	Shared responsibility for one internationally wrongful act	163
5.1.2	Shared responsibility for several internationally wrongful acts	166
5.2	<i>Breaches of indivisible shared obligations and the determination of shared responsibility</i>	168
5.2.1	Breach of an indivisible shared obligation	168
5.2.2	Attribution of conduct in breach of an indivisible shared obligation	170
5.2.3	Summary	174
5.3	<i>Breaches of divisible shared obligations and the determination of shared responsibility</i>	174
5.3.1	Breach of a divisible shared obligation	175
5.3.2	Attribution of conduct in breach of a divisible shared obligation	177
	i. Divisible shared obligations of a positive character and attribution of conduct	178

ii. Divisible shared obligations of a negative character and attribution of conduct	180
5.3.3 Overview	181
5.4 <i>Applying the distinction between divisible and indivisible shared obligations</i>	183
5.4.1 The shared obligation to rehabilitate Nauru's worked out phosphate lands	183
5.4.2 The shared obligation to take appropriate steps to maintain security and public order in and around the Coquelles terminal	185
5.4.3 The shared obligation to take appropriate measures to prevent the looting, plundering and exploitation of natural resources in Iraq	188
5.4.4 The shared obligation to provide 12.000 million ECU in financial assistance to the ACP states	189
5.4.5 The shared obligation to strictly limit pollution from land-based sources in lake Etang de Berre	191
5.4.6 The shared obligation to achieve a 20 per cent reduction of aggregate greenhouse gas emissions	193
5.4.7 The shared obligation to take all measures within one's power to prevent the Srebrenica genocide	195
5.4.8 The shared obligation to ensure that activities in the Area are carried out in accordance with Part XI LOSC	197
5.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	197
6. BREACHES OF SHARED OBLIGATIONS AND THE CONTENT OF SHARED RESPONSIBILITY	201
6.1 <i>Breaches of shared obligations and the nature of the obligation of cessation</i>	203
6.1.1 Shared responsibility for one internationally wrongful act and cessation	205
6.1.2 Shared responsibility for several internationally wrongful acts and cessation	208
6.1.3 Summary	210
6.2 <i>Breaches of shared obligations and the nature of the obligation to make reparation</i>	210
6.2.1 The notion of joint and several liability	213
6.2.2 Shared responsibility for one internationally wrongful act and reparation	217
6.2.3 Shared responsibility for several internationally wrongful acts and reparation	221
6.2.4 Summary	225
6.3 <i>Conclusions</i>	225
7. MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	227
7.1 <i>Main findings</i>	228

7.1.1	<i>The conceptualization of shared obligations</i>	228
	i. The one-sided approach to multilateral legal relations in the international law of obligations	228
	ii. The distinction between shared obligations and obligations that are not shared	229
	iii. The distinction between two types of shared obligations: divisible and indivisible shared obligations	230
	iv. Indicators for qualifying a shared obligation as divisible or indivisible	231
7.1.2	The relationship between shared obligations and shared responsibility	232
	i. Breaches of indivisible shared obligations and shared responsibility	233
	ii. Breaches of divisible shared obligations and shared responsibility	234
7.2	<i>Shared obligations in international law: concluding remarks</i>	235
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	241
	SUMMARY	267
	SAMENVATTING	275