

Agenda Item 5(d): National and International Meetings and Conferences

Statement by Mr. YOU Ki-Jun

Director-General for International Legal Affairs,

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea

Head of Delegation of the Republic of Korea to the First United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names

April 29 2019, New York

[First intervention]

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Actually, this is my first time to take the floor. I would like to join the other delegations in congratulating you as the Chair for this session of the UNGEGN as well as the other members of the Bureau on their election as their respective positions on the Bureau. And also I would like to commend the Secretariat on excellent preparation and organization of this session of the UNGEGN.

I just would like to briefly comment on what the distinguished delegate from Japan just referred to.

First of all, a working paper entitled International Seminar on Sea Names has been submitted. And then, in my view, according to rule 43 of the Rules of Procedure of the UNGEGN provides that quote, “a consideration of a working paper by the Group is without political significance”, unquote. This provision speaks for itself. This is one thing.

This is the reason why I mentioned that the consideration itself is not at all political or whatever in character. But anyway, I do note the comment made by the distinguished delegate from Japan about the question under our consideration. I would like to touch upon the basic

position of our government about that question.

First of all, internationally, the “East Sea” is being used widely together with the other name. This is an undeniable fact. What matters is the application or the implementation of UNCSCGN Resolution III/20 and IHO Resolution 1/1972. I just would like to briefly quote OP 2 of the UNCSCGN Resolution III/20, which provides that the Conference, quote, “further recommends that countries sharing a given geographical feature do not succeed in agreeing on a common name, it should be a general rule of international cartography that the name used by each of the countries concerned will be accepted. A policy of accepting only one or some names would be inconsistent in principle as well as inexpedient in practice. Only technical reasons may sometimes make it necessary, especially in the case of small-scale maps to dispense with the use of such names”. Again, this OP speaks for itself.

And also, in the current practice as well as past practices of dual naming, we can find a lot of instances in the various editions of the S-23, IHO publication, Limits of Oceans and Seas. The first edition to the third edition of the S-23, including the final draft of the fourth edition of the S-23, illustrates such instances. There are very famous cases: English Channel/La Manche. In my view, that particular case is very much connected with the case for us, because it is roughly 350 nautical miles in length, as well as roughly slightly less than 150 nautical miles in breadth, largely consisting of territorial seas, as well as EEZs of UK and France. The East Sea, very similarly, consists of solely territorial seas and EEZs of the coastal states concerned including Korea and Japan. There is no reason why we can’t apply the resolutions which I referred to earlier. And also, quite a significant number of mapping agencies as well as publishing companies are using, adopting the name “East Sea” together with the other name.

I don’t want to prolong the discussion. I shall stop here.

[Second intervention]

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I shall be very brief, there is just only thing I want to mention.

IHO Resolution 1/1972, also known as Resolution A4.2, talks about “such as”, “for example”.

These expressions should be construed as meaning “including”, but not “limited to”, which means, they are illustrative.

I already mentioned there are cases which are very much relevant to our own case. I don't want to repeat this. I just want to leave it there.

Thank you very much, indeed.