



4, Quai Antoine 1er
B.P.445 - MC 98011 MONACO Cedex
PRINCIPAUTE DE MONACO

IHB File No. S3/7020

23 November 2010

S-23 WG Letter No. 05/2010

**Final Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the S-23 WG
(Singapore, 5-7 July 2010)**

Status of Actions Arising from the Meeting

To: Participants in the 2nd S-23 WG Meeting and Members of the S-23 WG

Reference: S-23 WG Letter 04/2010 dated 6 October 2010 *Minutes of the 2nd Meeting of the S-23 WG*

Dear participants in the 2nd S-23 WG meeting and members of the S-23 WG,

1. The Chair and the Secretary would like to thank those who provided their comments to the second draft of the minutes of the 2nd meeting of the S-23 WG that took place in Singapore in late July, i.e. China, Japan, Rep of Korea and Morocco. The comments provided have been taken into consideration in producing final minutes of the meeting. A clean copy of the minutes, as well as a copy showing all changes made, have been posted on the IHO website, along with all comments received (See http://www.iho-ohi.net/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-23WG/S-23WG2/Minutes/S-23WG2_Minutes.htm).

2. The status of all actions arising from the 2nd S-23 WG meeting is shown at Annex A. It is also on the IHO website (see http://www.iho-ohi.net/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-23WG/S-23WG2/Actions/Actions_from_S-23WG2_and_Status.pdf). This includes a tentative conclusion for each action, based on the comments or information received to date. In some cases, the action cannot be progressed as the requested information has not yet been received. Action no. 8 will be the subject of a separate correspondence.

Yours sincerely,

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS,
IHB President and Chairman of the S-23 WG

2nd Meeting of the S-23 WG, Singapore, 5-7 July 2010Actions arising from the Meeting

Agenda Item	Action No.	Details	Status (22 Nov 10)
11.2.a	1	<p><u>To consider the South China Sea an independent area</u> (Meeting participants to provide comments on China's proposal to make the <i>South China Sea</i> an independent area within S-23 as soon as possible in order to determine the way forward.)</p>	<p>USA opposed the proposal to make South China Sea an independent area. See Comment by USA (29 Sep 10)</p> <p>Comment by Oman (1 Oct 10): "Not clear how this area is going to be when forming South China Sea as an independent area. In principle, Oman has no objection of forming a separate administrative division in S-23 provided there is acceptance by littoral States of South China Sea". See also China's e-mail of 12 Aug 10, section 1.2.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Based on the responses received, it can be concluded that there is not enough support to make South China Sea an independent area.</p>
11.2.b	2	<p><u>To subsume Natuna Sea into South China Sea</u> China to re-consider its position on <i>Natuna Sea</i> and/or provide additional information to the Chair for circulation to meeting participants.</p>	<p>Information awaited from China.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> No change, as the requested information has not yet been received.</p>
11.2.c	3	<p><u>To rename Beibu Gulf the existing Gulf of Tonkin</u> China to provide the Chair with the official agreement with Vietnam about <i>Beibu Gulf</i> and information on actual technical usage of this name, for circulation to meeting participants. Based on the responses received, the Chair to propose a way forward.</p>	<p>China has provided the following website: http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/chn/pds/wjb/zzjg/bjhysw/s/bhfg/t556665.htm. See also China's e-mail of 12 Aug 10, section 1.3.</p> <p>Comment by Japan (5 Nov 10): "The requested agreement could not be found on the Eng version of the above website; only a reference to the agreement between China and Viet Nam on the delimitation of the Beibu Bay Territorial Sea. As a result, we cannot check if Vietnam also uses the term 'Beibu Gulf'. The press release provided by China does not answer this question either."</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> There is a need for an English translation of at least the part of the official agreement indicating that Beibu Gulf has been accepted by both China and Vietnam, before any further action can be taken.</p>
11.2.g	4	<p><u>To amend to Taiwan Dao the name of this island</u> Meeting participants to provide the Chair with their views on China's proposal to name the island "Taiwan Dao" instead of "TAIWAN" as soon as possible. Based on the responses received, the Chair to propose a way forward.</p>	<p>Japan and USA have not agreed with the proposed changes. See also China's e-mail of 12 Aug 10, section 1.4.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> Based on the responses received, it can be concluded that there is not enough support to make the proposed change.</p>

Agenda Item	Action No.	Details	Status (22 Nov 10)
11.2.j	5	<p><u>To consider Bo Hai a separate body from Yellow Sea</u> China to provide the Chair with written technical justification for separation of <i>Bo Hai</i> from the <i>Yellow Sea</i>. The Chair to circulate it to the meeting participants for final approval.</p>	<p>Information awaited from China. <u>Conclusion:</u> No change, as the requested information has not yet been received.</p>
11.2.k	6	<p><u>To amend the line of demarcation between Bo Hai and Yellow Sea</u> China and USA to provide the Chair with written technical justification for their respective proposals regarding the line of demarcation between <i>Bo Hai</i> and the <i>Yellow Sea</i>. These, together with IHB findings on the justification for the existing line dating back to 1986, to be circulated to meeting participants by the Chair for final approval.</p>	<p><u>Information supplied by USA</u>; awaited from China. <u>Investigation conducted at the IHB</u> on the origin of the 1986 line. <u>Conclusion:</u> Based on the responses it is proposed to keep the limit shown in the 2002 draft of S-23.</p>
11.2.l	7	<p><u>To amend the southeastern limit of the Yellow Sea</u> Discussions to take place between China and Rep of Korea regarding the changes proposed by China on the southeastern limit of the <i>Yellow Sea</i>. Outcome of these discussions to be sent to the Chair as soon as possible for circulation to the meeting participants.</p>	<p>Outcome of those discussions awaited from China and Rep of Korea. <u>Conclusion:</u> No change, as the outcome of the discussion has not yet been received.</p>
11.3	8	<p><u>Naming of sea area between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago</u> In connection with naming the sea area between the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago, Australia, France, Japan and Republic of Korea to provide the Chair with their proposals for circulation to the members of the WG. Meeting participants and WG members not attending the meeting to provide the Chair, as soon as possible, with their views on these proposals. Based on the responses received, the Chair to propose a way forward.</p>	<p>Proposals from Australia, Japan and Rep of Korea have been posted on the IHO website (France's proposal has been withdrawn). See http://www.iho-ohi.net/mtg_docs/com_wg/S-23WG/S-23WG2/Proposals/S-23_Proposals.htm. Japan, Rep of Korea, DPRK, Oman, UK, Italy, Turkey and South Africa have provided comments. <u>Conclusion:</u> The Chair will soon propose a way forward, considering the responses received.</p>
11.4	9	<p>IHB to provide Oman with historical information on the limits of the <i>Strait of Hormuz</i>.</p>	<p>Investigation conducted by IHB, in liaison with USA. <u>Conclusion:</u> Inclusion of the Strait of Hormuz was proposed by USA. No specific information on the limits has been identified.</p>