UN v7

GLOBAL CHOKEPOINT PROTECTION PRINCIPLE

A proposed doctrine for collective maritime stability, lawful access and civilian continuity

STRATEGIC POLICY FRAMEWORK | VERSION 2.0 | 22 OCTOBER 2026

STATUS: ATLAS PROTOCOL PROPOSAL — FOR INSTITUTIONAL DISCUSSION; NOT ADOPTED INTERNATIONAL LAW.

Original foundation: 18 April 2026. Substantive revision: 22 October 2026. UNv7 denotes the Atlas Protocol proposal for institutional reform; it is not an official UN programme or treaty.

Governing proposition

Critical maritime corridors are national and regional geographies with global human consequences. Their protection requires lawful navigation, coordinated risk reduction, verified information and shared responsibility—not the transfer of sovereignty to an unmandated actor.

Executive assessment

Maritime chokepoints carry energy, food, medical supplies and industrial inputs through geographically concentrated passages. Disruption can propagate into price shocks, transport delays, security incidents and humanitarian exposure. Existing law already regulates several forms of passage; the proposed UNv7 contribution is to strengthen prevention, coordination and civilian-impact assessment within competent legal and institutional mandates.

This document proposes ten principles. Its provisions should be read as recommendations for voluntary adoption, negotiated arrangements or future competent decisions; no Atlas body can issue binding orders, establish UN mechanisms or suspend national rights.

1 | Strategic rationale

The operational vulnerability

- Localized interruptions can produce disproportionate cross-border consequences.
- Civilian systems absorb secondary effects well beyond the geography of the original incident.
- Unverified reports, coercive signalling and fragmented maritime information can accelerate escalation.
- Coordination among coastal states, flag states, shipping operators, insurers and humanitarian actors can reduce uncertainty.

Relation to other STR 05 dossiers

MCP-5 analyses five priority chokepoints and their disruption pathways. D.E.F.E.N.D. addresses cross-domain resilience and escalation management. GFSM traces financial contagion. This UNv7 principle addresses proposed governance and coordination standards; it is not a substitute for operational data or legal authority.

2 | Legal and institutional boundary

The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) differentiates transit passage through certain straits, innocent passage and other navigational regimes. Article 44 provides that states bordering straits shall not hamper transit passage and that it shall not be suspended; Articles 38–43 detail scope, duties, coastal-state regulations and

cooperation. Other passages may be subject to different rules or specific treaty regimes. It would be inaccurate to declare every closure, restriction or security measure categorically unlawful in every waterway.

The UNv7 proposal therefore operates through: applicable international law; sovereign consent where required; competent national and international institutions; and independently documented procedures. A no-veto preference is a policy proposal, not a power to override the UN Charter or binding decision rules.

3 | Proposed Global Chokepoint Protection Principle

Article 1 — Definition and scope

For analytical and planning purposes, a global chokepoint is a maritime passage whose disruption could significantly affect international trade, energy supplies, food security or essential civilian services. Designation under this proposed framework has no automatic legal consequences.

Article 2 — Tiered strategic classification

Tier	Analytical threshold	Suggested response
Tier 1	Potential global system-wide civilian or economic consequences	Continuous risk review and priority coordination
Tier 2	Significant multi-state or regional consequences	Regional coordination and documented contingency plans
Tier 3	Emerging or episodic vulnerabilities	Periodic assessment and targeted monitoring

Classification requires documented indicators, dates and transparent methodology; no permanent ranking is presumed.

Article 3 — Continuity of lawful navigation

Participating states and institutions should seek to prevent coercive interruption of lawful navigation, consistent with the applicable navigational regime, legitimate coastal-state rights, maritime safety obligations and binding international rules.

Article 4 — Sovereignty and shared responsibility

The proposal does not transfer sovereignty or jurisdiction. Coastal states retain rights and duties under applicable law; flag states, port authorities, operators and affected states share responsibilities appropriate to their mandates. Cooperative safeguarding should be based on consent, proportionality and non-discrimination where the governing law requires it.

Article 5 — Proposed coordination mechanism (GCPM)

A Global Chokepoint Protection Mechanism (GCPM) is proposed as a possible coordination network—not an existing UN body. Subject to participating-state agreement it could aggregate maritime alerts, support independent evidence review, coordinate safety messaging and facilitate links between competent institutions. Its remit, funding, data safeguards and governance would require a separate constitutive instrument.

Article 6 — Graduated emergency coordination

When material disruption occurs, participating actors could: (1) verify and timestamp reports; (2) notify competent national and maritime authorities; (3) undertake humanitarian and shipping-impact assessment; (4) convene time-limited consultation; (5) consider lawful, consent-based safe-transit arrangements; and (6) review decisions and publish an attributable findings record. No automatic deployment or no-veto authority is claimed.

Article 7 — Conduct to be discouraged or prevented

The proposed framework opposes coercive restrictions, discriminatory denial of lawful access, threats against civilian shipping and exploitation of chokepoints for unlawful pressure. The legal character of any specific measure must be assessed case by case under UNCLOS, relevant treaties, UN Charter obligations, national law and applicable humanitarian law.

Article 8 — Compliance, evidence and accountability

Documented incidents should trigger a proportionate review, transparent reporting where safety permits, and referral through existing competent channels as appropriate. Sanctions, binding orders or adjudication require independent lawful authority; the Atlas Protocol itself has none.

Article 9 — Human-impact priority

Assessments should explicitly track effects on food, medicine, fuel, civilian livelihoods and vulnerable populations. Humanitarian needs should shape contingency planning, but the proposal does not override lawful safety, security or jurisdictional requirements.

Article 10 — Closing principle

Maritime geography cannot be detached from sovereignty; nor can its global consequences be managed by geography alone. Durable protection rests on lawful access, reciprocal responsibility, verifiable information and timely cooperation.

4 | Implementation pathway

Stage	Action	Governance condition
01 — Baseline	Map maritime regimes, legal instruments, stakeholders and existing incident data	Legal review and transparent sourcing
02 — Voluntary pilot	Test an information-sharing and civilian-impact assessment protocol	Consent of participating actors
03 — Independent review	Audit evidence quality, data access, fairness and escalation risks	Published terms of reference
04 — Institutional dialogue	Explore adoption through competent fora and agreements	No claim of prior recognition or mandate

5 | Strategic monitoring matrix

Indicator	Observation	Interpretation guardrail
Navigation disruption	AIS anomalies, notices, passage conditions	AIS gaps alone do not establish hostility
Security exposure	Verified threats, incidents and alerts	Distinguish claims from confirmed facts
Commercial transmission	Diversion, freight and insurance pressures	Separate cause from correlation
Civilian consequence	Availability and affordability of essential goods	Specify population and observation window
Institutional response	Notification latency, access to	Record mandates and participating

	verified information	actors

6 | Atlas analytical integration

PLN 01: geographic and physical constraints. SPE 02: species-wide exposure to essential supply disruption. CIV 03: institutional continuity. HUM 04: perception and decisions under uncertainty. STR 05: chokepoints as strategic pressure systems. GEO 06: sovereign and regional relations. OBS 07: evidence, interpretation and early warning.

7 | Publication and doctrine status

This is a new proposed UNv7-aligned Atlas Protocol framework, revising the April 2026 “UN 2.0” wording. The former version remains part of the research archive. “UNv7” refers only to Atlas Protocol terminology; no adoption, endorsement or delegation by the United Nations is implied.

Next review gates: (a) validate legal treatment route by route; (b) align with updated MCP-5 and proposed D.E.F.E.N.D.; (c) check the institutional naming across STR 05 and the UNv7 website; (d) approve external publication wording; (e) separately validate any future metric or live monitoring link.

Reference framework

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982), especially Parts II and III, Articles 24–25 and 37–45. Official text: https://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/part3.htm

Atlas Protocol source: “UN 2.0 — Global Chokepoint Protection Principle”, 18 April 2026; revised working copy supplied 22 October 2026. Related STR 05 work: MCP-5 — Maritime Choke Points Protocol v2.0 (22 October 2026).

ATLAS PROTOCOL • PEOPLE BEFORE POWER