

**S-23 WORKING GROUP**

**AREAS OF CONCERN**

Responses to IHB e-mail of 8 July 2009

# ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVY

## AUSTRALIAN HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICE



LOCKED BAG 8801  
WOLLONGONG NSW 2500 AUSTRALIA

AH 2003/2500009 (fAA63979)  
AA 431317  
HYDRO 0494/09

25 September 2009

**Vice-Admiral Alexandros Maratos**  
Chair of S-23 Working Group  
International Hydrographic Bureau  
Monaco

Dear Admiral Maratos,

### S-23 – Areas of Concern

1. I refer to IHB's email of 8 July 2009 addressed to the S-23 Working Group members seeking comments on the 'Areas of Concern' list.
2. Whilst Australia maintains its previously stated position that the Southern Ocean extends northward to wash the southern coast of Australia, we are satisfied with the way that the 2002 draft 4th edition of S-23 records the Australian reservation on the page relating to the limits of the Southern Ocean and clearly shows Australia's interpretation of the limits of the Southern Ocean in the Annex.  
Accordingly, Australia does not intend to raise the limits of the Southern Ocean as an "area of concern" during the current review of S-23 by the Working Group.
3. Australia does not intend to raise any other areas of concern.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

**R. NAIRN**  
Commodore, RAN  
Hydrographer of Australia

Tel: +61 2 422 36683  
Fax: +61 2 422 36599  
Email: [rod.nairn@defence.gov.au](mailto:rod.nairn@defence.gov.au)



# HYDROGRAPHIC and OCEANOGRAPHIC DEPARTMENT JAPAN COAST GUARD

3-1, Tsukiji 5-chome, Chuo-ku, TOKYO, 104-0045 JAPAN

Phone: +81-3-3541-3685

Fax: +81-3-3248-1250

Tlx: (0) 252 2222 (JAHYD)

E-mail: ico@jodc.go.jp

H.O.D. 26/09

30 September 2009

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS  
Chair of Working Group on the Revision S-23 (Limits of Oceans and Seas)  
President  
International Hydrographic Bureau  
4 quai Antoine 1er  
B.P. 445  
MC 98011 MONACO CEDEX  
MONACO

Reference: Circulated Email dated 8 July 2009

Dear VADM Maratos,

Thank you very much for circulating the email dated 8 July 2009. I would like to offer Japan's comment on the sent list of the possible areas of concern which have been identified at the International Hydrographic Bureau as follows:

The name of the sea area listed as No.1 in the list of "AREAS OF CONCERN" has been described as "Japan Sea" in the S-23 "Limits of Oceans and Seas". "Japan Sea" (or "Sea of Japan") is the only internationally and historically established name for the sea area concerned, which started to be used in the world maps of several countries in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, and has become overwhelmingly in use ever since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Japan is of the view that there is no need or evidence to change the name of "Japan Sea" (or "Sea of Japan") in the current S-23, and that this particular sea area should be deleted from the list of "AREAS OF CONCERN".

And yet, a few countries have been challenging the legitimacy of the name of "Japan Sea" (or "Sea of Japan") which has been internationally and historically established, and this has led to hampering the works to revise the S-23 and set bad precedents in the history of IHO. Japan strongly expresses its position that this name must be maintained as such and no other name should be added in the S-23 whenever it may be revised.

We hope that the comment will be well reflected. Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Hideo Nishida

Japan Representative to S-23WG

# Korea Hydrographic and Oceanographic Administration



1-17, 7-ga, Hang-dong, Jung-gu  
INCHEON 400-800, Republic of Korea  
Tel: (+82) 32 880-0461, Fax: (+82) 32 891-2233

30 September 2009

KHOA-

Vice Admiral Alexandros Maratos  
Chair of S-23 WG  
International Hydrographic Bureau  
4, Quai Antoine 1er  
BP 445, MC98011 Monaco Cedex  
Principality of Monaco

Dear Vice Admiral Alexandros Maratos

Thank you very much for the E-mail dated 8 July 2009.

Korea's comment on S-23 - Area of Concern is as follows;

We have no objections to the list of possible areas of concern provided by the International Hydrographic Bureau. As we can witness from the following, the sea area between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago remains a disputed portion.

- In the draft of the 4th edition of the S-23, the sea area remained without a name, reflecting that an international agreement had not been reached with regard to its name.
- During the 17th International Hydrographic Conference 2007, the President of the Conference suggested publishing the S-23 as a first volume, leaving the disputed portion to be published later as a second volume once the concerned parties (the ROK, the DPRK, and Japan) had agreed upon an appropriate name.
- In June 2008, the Directing Committee of the IHO proposed a meeting between the ROK, Japan and the Directing Committee of the IHO in order to solve the naming dispute over the sea area in question.

- Aside from the aforementioned, various documents, including the reports of Proceedings of the International Hydrographic Conference and the circulated letters of the International Hydrographic Bureau confirm that the sea area in question is a disputed portion.

Yours sincerely,

Joonho JIN

Joonho JIN

Korea Representative to S-23 WG

Hydrographic Department of  
D. P. R. K



조선민주주의인민공화국  
수로국

INTERNATIONAL HYDROGRAPHIC BUREAU  
4, quai Antoine 1<sup>er</sup>  
B.P.445  
MC 98011 MONACO CEDEX

Fax: +377 93 10 81 40

Ing en chef Michel HUET

IHB Professional Assistant (Cartography)

Secretary of the S-23WG

COMMENTS ON THE "LIST OF AREAS OF CONCERN" ON THE S-23

Dear sir,

I express my deep thanks for your quick answer in response to our requirement for the work of S-23WG.

Referring to the step 4 of ways of progressing the work of S-23WG, we inform our comments on the "List of areas of concern" for the S-23 as follows.

According to the draft 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, S-23 that was published in June, 2002, the following sea areas were designated in both names simultaneously in accordance with the IHO Technical Resolution, A. 4. 2. 6.

- ① Page 1-11, ENGLISH CHANNEL (LA MANCHE)
- ② Page 1-12, DOVER STRAIT (PAS DE CALAIS)  
BAY OF BISCAY (GOLFE DE GASCOGNE)

We wish you to inform us of the reason why the above mentioned areas were deleted from the list of areas of concern.

I will take this opportunity to remind you that the most reliable way through which we can contact each other is the way through Fax.

Yours sincerely

Captain O Myong Chol

Vice Director of Hydrographic Department

D P R K.

## **S-23 AREAS OF CONCERN**

*(IHB e-mail of 6 July 2009)*

### **Singapore Comments**

The Straits of Malacca and Singapore are commonly considered a single continuous waterway as recognised by the IMO for the purposes of hydrography and navigation. This fact is supported by the single, continuous Traffic Separation Scheme spanning the Straits as well as the numerous fora and projects which consider the Straits a continuous waterway e.g. the Co-operative Mechanism for the Straits of Malacca and Singapore and the Marine Electronic Highway Project for the Straits of Malacca and Singapore. In addition, the Straits of Malacca and Singapore as a whole fall under NAVAREA XI as shown in IHO Publication S-53 entitled "IMO IHO World-Wide Navigation Warning Services". Therefore the placement of the Malacca Strait under Chapter VI as part of the South China Sea Main Zone would more accurately reflect international understanding, as well as facilitate administration and provisions of services described in S-53 and ensure consistency between publications.

In the same manner, we note that the description of the limits on the west from Pedropunt to Lem (Cape) Phra Chao are aligned with the geographical area and limits of NAVAREA XI. It is therefore Singapore's position that the Western limit of the Malacca Strait be retained as per the 1953 3rd Edition/1986 draft 4th Edition of S-23.

**S-23 AREAS OF CONCERN**  
(IHB e-mail of 6 July 2009)

**South Africa Response**

South Africa is unable to comment on paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 under 'Areas of Concern' however, the attached table indicates the omission and correction of some page reference numbers (in red).

Original Spelling	On page	Standard spelling
Nanao	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8	Nan'ao Dao
(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Dongdun Jiao
(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Dongmu Jiao
(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Maobi Tou
San-tiao Chiao	7-4 7-6 7-10 7-11	Sandiao Jiao
Fu-kuei Chiao	7-8 7-9 7-10 7-11	Fugui Jiao
O'luan Pi	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-4 7-6 7-8 7-9	E'luan Bi
T'ai-wan	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-1 7-2 7-3 7-4 7-6 7-8 7-9 7-10 7-11	Taiwan Dao
Teng-lou Chiao	6-6 6-7 6-8 6-9 6-10	Denglou Jiao
Lei-chou Bandao	6-6 6-7 6-8 6-9 6-10	Leizhou Bandao
Ying-Ko Tsui	6-6 6-8 6-9	Yingge Zui
Hai-nan Tao	6-6 6-8 6-9 6-10	Hainan Dao
Lin-Kao Chiao	6-6 6-8 6-9 6-10	Lin'gao Jiao
Gulf of Tonkin	6-6 (delete)6-9 6-10	Beibu Gulf
Hainan Strait	6-10	Qiongzhou Haixia
T'ai-wan Strait	7-8 7-9 7-11	Taiwan Strait
(additive)	7-12 7-13	Dazhushan Dao
Penglai Xijiao	7-12 7-13	Penglai Tou



## S-23 – AREAS OF CONCERN (U.S. comments in blue)

### 1. Sea area between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago

Japan, on one side, and Republic of Korea and DPR of Korea, on the other side, have a different view on naming this area.

This issue pertains to the name of the feature and not its areal extents. The U.S. does not have a position on what name should be used in international contexts.

### 2. Malacca Strait

India's comments (July 2003) on the draft 4<sup>th</sup> edition of S-23 which was circulated to Member States with IHB Circular Letter 30/2002, are reproduced hereafter:

Issue	Recommendation
Shifting of Malacca Strait from Chapter V (Indian Ocean) to Chapter VI (South China Sea)	India recommends that status-quo should be maintained in this regard by retaining Malacca Strait with its existing limits under Chapter V.

The U.S. concurs that this feature should remain in Chapter V (Indian Ocean) and not be shifted to Chapter VI (South China Sea).

### 3. South China Sea – East China Sea

China's comments (January 2003) on the draft 4<sup>th</sup> edition of S-23 which was circulated to Member States with IHB Circular Letter 30/2002, are reproduced hereafter:

1. As the traditional geographical concept with a clear definition, "South China Sea" refers to the vast water area to the south of China mainland, the east of Indochina peninsula, the north of Lathu Jawa, and the west of Philippine archipelago. It would not match the traditional name, and also easily result in illegibility in the geographic concept, if the "South China Sea" is considered as the part of "South China Sea and Eastern Archipelagic Seas". So, we suggest, following the practice in the 3<sup>rd</sup> version of this publication in 1953, "South China Sea" be an absolute sub-division.

If "Lathu Jawa" is meant to mean the Java Sea (Laut Jawa in Bahasa Indonesia), then the U.S. broadly agrees with the spatial definition in the first section of this sentence. We do not agree with the recommendation to split the section currently titled "South China and Eastern Archipelagic Seas and its Subdivisions" and create a separate entity for the South China Sea.

2. To mark out "Natuna Sea" from "South China Sea" has no any basis and would also not match the traditional name of this water area. The "Natuna Sea" area also belongs to the

“South China Sea”. We suggest “Natuna Sea” be cancelled and the southern limits of “South China Sea” be maintained in accordance with the demarcation of 1953.

The body of water south of the Natuna and Anambas Islands and north of Bangka and Belitung Islands and the Java Sea has the characteristics of a distinct sea feature, and the name “Natuna Sea” would not be an inappropriate name for this sea body. The U.S. has found no evidence of usage of the name “Natuna Sea” other than by Indonesia or by Indonesian-influenced sources. Absent some sort of agreement with or evidence of use by its other littoral states (Malaysia and Singapore), we somewhat regretfully agree with the Chinese that this name should not be applied at this time.

3. Early in 1950s, “Gulf of Tonkin” was changed to “Beibu Gulf”, which means “The gulf in the north of South China Sea”. Both China and Vietnam have accepted the “Beibu Gulf”. We request this water area be named as “Beibu Gulf”. In addition, “Beibu Gulf” is a part of “South China Sea”, therefore, should not be juxtaposed with “South China Sea”.

The U.S. favors retaining “Gulf of Tonkin” over “Beibu Gulf.” However, if both China and Vietnam, as the littoral states, have agreed on the latter name, as the Chinese representative claims, then the U.S. doesn’t have any objections to a name change for use in an international context. However, the last sentence in this section seems to suggest that this feature be removed as a separate entity in S-23 and subsumed into the South China Sea. The U.S. disagrees with that suggested revision.

4. The northern limit of the “South China Sea” is suggested to be modified as: “From the mouth of Han Jiang (23° 28’N-116° 52’E), the coast of China, eastward to Changshan Jiao (23° 26’N-116° 56’E), the western extremity of Nao’ao Dao; from Changshan Jiao eastward, along the southern coast of this island, to Dongdun Jiao (23° 24’N-117° 07’E); from Dongdun Jiao southeastern, through Dongmu Jiao (23° 12.3’N-117°13.9’E) of NanPeng Liedao, to Maobi Tou (21° 55’N-120° 43’E), the northern<sup>1</sup> extremity of Taiwan Dao; thence eastward, along the southern coast of this island, to E’luan Bi (21° 54’N-120° 52’E); thence to Amianan (21° 07’N-121° 57’E)”.

The U.S. does not see any noticeable difference between what is proposed in this paragraph for the northern limits of the South China Sea and what is in the current draft standard.

Accordingly, the southern limits of Taiwan Strait” should be adjusted.

5. “Taiwan Strait” is a part of “East China Sea”, therefore, it should not be juxtaposed with “East China Sea”. Taiwan is the indivisible domain of China, so “Taiwan” cannot be labeled with the font used for the national name, but only be labeled as “Taiwan Dao”.

This section seems to suggest that Taiwan Strait, a well known and heavily referenced international sea lane, be removed as a separate entity and subsumed into the East China Sea. The U.S. disagrees with this suggested revision.

---

<sup>1</sup> IHB comment: we think it should read “southern”.

6. Some Pacific Ocean areas eastern to Taiwan Dao belong to the “East China Sea”. The limits of “East China Sea” should be adjusted to “the line joining Hateruma to Amianan, thence a line from Amianan to E’luan Bi, the southern extremity of Taiwan Dao”.

The western limits of “Phillippine Sea” should be adjusted accordingly.

The U.S. strongly disagrees with this proposal; concurrence to this proposal would lend credence to China’s depiction of its “tenth South China Sea dash” between Japan’s Yonaguni-jima and Taiwan’s East coast.

7. Both “Bo Hai” and “Liaodong Wan” are not the composition of “Yellow Sea”. According to the geographic character of Bo Hai, Bo Hai is Chinese internal water, but not the part of Yellow Sea, and Liaodong Wan is one of three Bo Hai’s gulfs. Our suggestions are:

- a) Cancelling the demarcation of “Liaodong Wan”, and merge this area into “Bo Hai”;

The U.S would prefer, but do not insist, that Liaodong Wan still be treated as a sub-sub-division under Bo Hai (i.e. 7.X.1 – see the next sentence).

- b) “Bo Hai” being marked off “Yellow Sea” and juxtaposed with “Yellow Sea” as an absolute sub-division;

The U.S does not object to Bo Hai having its own subdivision marking (i.e. 7.X vs. the current 7.4.1). The Chinese have a point: Bo Hai is generally recognized to be Chinese internal waters, and in other similar cases (i.e. Gulf of Suez, Gulf of California) the feature is treated as a subdivision in the current draft of S-23.

- c) The limits of “Yellow Sea” and “Bo Hai” are “from Laotieshan Xijiao (38° 44’N-121° 08’E), the southwestern extremity of Liadong Bandao, southward to Dazhushan Dao (38° 01’N-120° 57’E); thence to Penglai Tou (37° 50’N-120° 45’E), the northern extremity of Shandong Bandao”.

A line running from the southern extremity of the Liaodong Peninsula passing through Beihuangcheng Dao, the island about 22 nm south of it, then along the chain of islands that could also include Dazhushan Dao, represents a far more natural separation of the bay from the Yellow Sea.

8. Some Chinese geographical names in this publication should be labeled with the new spelling form of standard Chinese geographical name. The details are:

The U.S. defers to IHO on the spelling of these features, and whether the “additive” ones are necessary.

Original Spelling	On page	Standard spelling
Nanao	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8	Nan’ao Dao

(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Dongdun Jiao
(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Dongmu Jiao
(additive)	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-8 7-9	Maobi Tou
San-tiao Chiao	7-4 7-6 7-10 7-11	Sandiao Jiao
Fu-kuei Chiao	7-8 7-9 7-10 7-11	Fugui Jiao
O'luan Pi	6-1 6-2 6-3 6-6 6-7 7-4 7-6 7-8 7-9	E'luan Bi
T'ai-wan	6-3 6-7 7-1 7-2 7-3 7-4 7-6 7-8 7-9 7-10 7-11	Taiwan Dao
Teng-lou Chiao	6-6 6-7 6-8 6-10	Denglou Jiao
Lei-chou Bandao	6-6 6-7 6-8 6-10	Leizhou Bandao
Ying-Ko Tsui	6-6 6-8	Yingge Zui
Hai-nan Tao	6-6 6-8 6-10	Hainan Dao
Lin-Kao Chiao	6-6 6-8 6-10	Lin'gao Jiao
Gulf of Tonkin	6-6 6-9 6-10	Beibu Gulf
Hainan Strait	6-10	Qiongzhou Haixia
T'ai-wan Strait	7-8 7-9 7-11	Taiwan Strait
(additive)	7-12 7-13	Dazhushan Dao
Penglai Xijiao	7-12 7-13	Penglai Tou