4th CSPCWG MEETING Monaco, 13-15 November 2007

Paper for Consideration by CSPCWG

Sea Boundaries (especially EEZ between countries)

Submitted by: Executive Summary:	DE Remember and publish conclusions of CSPCWG2 about sea boundaries
Related Documents:	M4-B440, CSPCWG2 report Annex E
Related Projects:	None

Introduction / Background

Although we have M4 and had a conclusion how to chart sea boundaries at CSPCWG2, only the participants of this meeting seem to use this recommendation if they chart boundaries, especially EEZ between countries. The helpful Annex E of CSPCWG2 report is not known by the mayority of MS. DE has got a question from PL about how to chart sea boundaries, especially EEZ: Why do we use N41 and not N47 for a EEZ boundary between two countries? Different MS have different solutions. See following examples of the EEZ charting in the Baltic Sea:



Correct according M4



Correct according M4



EEZ shown as N47, should be N41 with country names Sverige and Suomi / Finland



PL 251 INT 1218: EEZ shown as N47, should be N41 with country names Polska and Rossija



LV 1014 INT 1275: EEZ shown as N47, should be N41 with country names Latvija and Eesti



EE 519 INT 1272: EEZ shown as N47, should be N41 with country names



LT 382001:

Correct according M4, country name for Russia not correct, should be Rossija

Analysis / Discussion

It is not necessary to expatiate this topic again, only the regulation and conclusion should be appealed to MS.

Conclusions

MS should be aware of the principles (see B-440 and Annex E below) in the charting that the chart user can understand the products (standarized sea boundary symbols for the same area).

B-440.9 Limits of exclusive economic zones (EEZs)

If EEZs of a defined width of 200 miles from territorial sea baselines are established by international agreement, it is recommended that their outer limits should be charted by an unbroken coloured line with a suitable legend, preferably EEZ, at appropriate intervals on the inner side of the line. N47

B-440.3 International maritime boundaries should be charted, where navigationally significant, by alternating crosses and dashes, in colour. State names should be shown at appropriate intervals. Disputed boundaries should not be charted.

N41*

* The current M4 v. 3.004 still shows incorrect country names in the examples.

Annex E to CSPCWG 2 Record

(the CSPCWG2 agreed to the definition)

UK Brief on Hierarchy of Territorial Limits

- 1. The following note provided by UK's 'Law of the Sea' officer (Chris Carleton):
 - a. The International Boundary always takes precedence.

Where several different types of maritime zones merge towards a boundary they will do so progressively and the jurisdiction for each of the zones applies up to the boundary until in the ultimate you could reach a boundary that separates internal waters. The hierarchy of jurisdiction is

progressive from EEZ - CZ - TS to Internal Waters. In other words Internal Waters jurisdiction will include all measures contained within the other outer zones as well as additional jurisdiction.

2. The following additional points were suggested by UK's CSPCWG officers, and approved by the WG:

a. The EEZ is denoted by the legend EEZ along an unbroken line. If it coincides with another boundary, the simple solution is to retain the legend against the International Boundary (probably preceded by the name of the state, as the EEZ limit in this case may be for two countries whose zones are each side of the line.

b. Where a fishery limit coincides with another limit, the fish symbol can still be inserted in the line at appropriate intervals.

Recommendations

Include the principles of Annex E in M4 (B440?) or at IHB internet pages. Publish it via CL.

Justification and Impacts

High priority, because user could interpret the lines wrong if different symbols are used.

Action required of CSPCWG

The CSPCWG is invited to agree to the recommendation.