

16 March 1988

Note

to the Members

of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor
the Supply and Shipping of Oil and
Petroleum Products to South Africa

There will be a meeting of the Intergovernmental Group at
3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, 22 March 1988, in Room 3560F.

The following attached documents will be considered at the
meeting:

1. The provisional agenda.
2. Summary of the decisions of the previous meeting.
3. Summary of cases of alleged violations with recommendations
for follow-up action.

Please bring with you your copy of the report of the Group
(A/42/45) and the notes received from Permanent Missions concerning
alleged cases of violations, which have been circulated since the
issuance of the report.

Amer Araim

Secretary

Intergovernmental Group to
Monitor the Supply and Shipping
of Oil and Petroleum Products
to South Africa
5429A

3:30 p.m.

Tuesday, 22 March 1988

Room 3560F

Intergovernmental Group to Monitor
the Supply and Shipping of Oil
and Petroleum Products to South Africa
Provisional Agenda

1. Adoption of the Agenda.
2. Summary of the decisions of the previous meeting of the Group.
3. Hearing on the oil embargo against South Africa.
4. Consideration of individual cases of alleged violation with recommendations.
5. Other matters.

5367A, 8 March 1988

Intergovernmental Group to Monitor
Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum
Products to South Africa

Summary of decisions taken at the meeting of the
Intergovernmental Group on 3 March 1988

Cases of alleged violations and responses of Governments thereon shall be
considered at informal meetings of the Group to be chaired by the
Chairman.

Replies received from Governments on the questionnaire shall be
considered at informal meetings to be chaired by the Vice-Chairman.

Letters to be sent to the United Nations Conference on Trade and
Development and the International Maritime Organization. The
co-operation of these two organizations should be sought to assist in
verifying information on the oil embargo against South Africa and, in
particular, the movements of ships carrying oil and petroleum products to
South Africa.

A letter to be sent by the Chairman to the Permanent Representative of
Zambia, in his capacity as the representative of the Chairman of the
Organization of African Unity (OAU), to seek the support and co-operation
of the OAU in the work of the Intergovernmental Group.

A letter to be sent to the Presidents of the International Federation of
Transport Unions, International Dock Workers Union, as well as other
relevant trade unions seeking their support to and co-operation with the
Intergovernmental Group.

The question of soliciting external expert guidance would be considered
at a later stage.

_ The Centre was requested to seek the assistance of other Departments and Offices in the Secretariat with respect to the analysis of the data on oil shipment to South Africa.

The Chairman informed the Members that he would discuss with the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid the holding of a joint hearing on the oil embargo against South Africa.

The Secretariat was requested to start initial contacts with Lloyds concerning obtaining Seadata and to install a computer in order to receive the data.

Summary of Cases of Alleged Violations
with recommendations for follow-up action.it

1. The case of the ships Thanassis and Manhattan Viscount (paragraph 2, p; 49): Information was sought from the Permanent Mission of Brunei Darussalam, which replied that the government's investigation did not enable it to establish that oil had reached South Africa. It is suggested that the Mission of Brunei be requested to inform the Group of where the oil was delivered and to provide documentation concerning the destinations. No other Government was approached in the first instance, and there is consequently no basis for follow-up action with regard to other Governments.
2. The case of the ship Actor (paragraphs 3-7, pp. 49-50): Information was sought regarding this case from the Permanent Missions of Liberia, the United States, Norway, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Saudi Arabia and Singapore. Replies were received from the Missions of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Norway. The Mission of Saudi Arabia, in addition to its initial reply of a general nature applicable to all subsequent cases concerning Saudi Arabia, stated that the cargo was unloaded in France and presented documents corroborating this statement. Members are invited to comment on the documentation presented to the Group. The Mission of the United Arab Emirates responded that the matter had been conveyed to the Government of the United Arab Emirates for investigation. It is suggested that the Group solicit the results of the investigation. The answer from Norway was of a general nature, acknowledging that some transport did take place before the new Act took effect. It is recommended that a letter be sent to the Mission of Norway seeking specific information regarding the shipments concerned, i.e. did they take place as indicated in the report and if not, to provide iThe cases are listed in the same order of Annex Iii of the report of the Group, pp. 49-58.

documentation. Reminders should also be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e. Liberia, the United States, Oman and Singapore.

The case of the ship Berge Prince (paragraphs 8-12, p. 51): Information was sought regarding this case from the Permanent Missions of Liberia, Norway, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Iran and the Principality of Liechtenstein. Replies were received from the Missions of Norway, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. The Mission of Saudi Arabia stated that the cargoes were unloaded in France and presented documents corroborating this statement. Members are invited to comment on the documentation presented to the Group. The Missions of Norway and the United Arab Emirates referred to the answers mentioned above, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. The Mission of Egypt stated that investigation was being conducted. It is suggested that the Group solicit the results of the investigation. The answer from the Mission of Iran stated that the cargo was discharged in Singapore on 29 March 1986, which was allegedly supported by discharge certificates. It is suggested that a letter be sent to the Mission of Iran soliciting the relevant documents. Reminders should be sent to the Governments that did not reply to the first query, i.e.: Liberia and the Principality of Liechtenstein.

The case of the ship Thorsholm (paragraph 13, p. 51): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Saudi Arabia, Norway and the United Arab Emirates. The Missions of Norway and the United Arab Emirates

referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. A reminder should be sent to the Mission of Saudi Arabia, which did not reply in the first instance.

5. The case of the ship Egita (paragraph 14, p. 51-2): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Norway and Saudi Arabia. The Mission of Saudi Arabia presented documentation indicating that the cargo was discharged in Rotterdam. Members are invited to comment on the documentation presented to the Group. Norway referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

6. The case of the ship Berge Pioneer (paragraph 15, p. 52): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Norway, the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia. The Missions of Norway and the United Arab Emirates referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. The Mission of Saudi Arabia did not answer to the first query. A reminder should be sent.

7. The case of the ship Berge Bragd (paragraph 16, p. 52): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Norway and the United Arab Emirates. Both referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

8. The case of the ship Negtune Pavo (paragraph 17, p. 52): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Singapore, Brunei and Japan as well as the Observer Mission of Switzerland. A reply from the Mission of

10.

Japan was received indicating that records did not show that South Africa was the destination for this oil shipment. A follow-up question should be sent to the Mission of Japan to indicate where the destination was and to solicit documentation on alleged destination. Reminders should be sent to the Missions which did not reply, i.e. Singapore, Brunei and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Liberator (paragraph 18, pp. 52-3): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Brunei, Greece, Liberia, the United Kingdom and Japan and the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. The Mission of Greece indicated that the representative of the tanker company would provide the Greek authorities with information in due time. A letter should be sent to the Mission of Greece inquiring about further information. A reminder should also be sent to the Missions of Liberia, the United Kingdom, Brunei and Switzerland, which did not answer to the first query.

The case of the ship Jahre Transgorter (paragraph 19, p. 53):

Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Brunei, Liberia, the United Kingdom (as the administering power of Hong Kong) and Japan as well as the Observer Mission of Switzerland. Only the Mission of Japan responded with a reference to the letter mentioned under paragraph 8 above, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. A reminder should also be sent to the other Missions, i.e. Brunei, Liberia, the United Kingdom and Switzerland.

- 11.
- 12.
- 13.

The case of the ship NeEtune Pegasus (paragraph 20, p. 53): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Brunei, Singapore, Japan and the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Japan included in its response mentioned under paragraph 8 above a reference to this case, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e. Brunei, Singapore and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Berge King (paragraphs 21 and 22, pp. 53-4): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Norway, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and Iran. The two latter Permanent Missions did not reply. Reminders should be sent to these Missions. The Mission of Norway referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is advised. The Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that it was not aware of any crude oil shipments by Marimpex to South Africa. The Mission of the FRG should be asked to provide information regarding the destinations of the shipments concerned, as well as relevant documentation.

The case of the ship Monemvasia (paragraphs 23 and 24, p. 54): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Greece, Liberia, Japan, Brunei and Singapore and the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Greece replied, indicating that the ship had unloaded its oil cargo in Mombasa, Kenya. A follow-up letter is needed to request documentation. The Mission of Japan referred to the answer under

\$J4.

15.

16.

paragraph 8, above and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. A reminder should be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e.: Liberia, Brunei, Singapore and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Lauberhorn (paragraph 25, p. 54): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Liberia, Greece, Brunei, the United States, Japan and the Observer Mission of Switzerland. Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. The Mission of Greece stated that the ship did not fly the Greek flag. The Chairman responded that information was sought from Greece, because the apparent beneficial owner of the ship was a Greek company (Trade and Transport Inc.). The Mission of Greece was consequently requested to look into the matter once more. Since no further information has been received, a reminder should be sent to the Mission of Greece. Reminders should also be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e. Liberia, Greece, the United States and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Mosggint (paragraph 26., p. 54): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Egypt and Norway. Both referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 respectively, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

The case of the ship Janniche (paragraph 27, p. 55): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of the United Arab Emirates and Norway. Both referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2

4-

and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

17.
18.
19.

The case of the ship Hawaiian Monarch (paragraph 28, p. 55): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Liberia, Brunei, the United States and Japan as well as the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e. Liberia, Brunei, the United States and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Negtune Subaru (paragraph 29, p. 55): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Singapore, Brunei and Japan as well as the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first query, i.e. Singapore, Brunei and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Elmina (paragraph 30, p. 55): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Brunei, Greece, Liberia and Japan as well as the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Greece informed the Group that the ship did not call on South African ports and that the shipping company "Thenamaris" had addressed a letter to this effect to the Shipping Research Bureau. It is suggested that the Group solicit information from Greece regarding the destination of the shipmeht concerned, as well as relevant documentation. Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up

20.
21.
22.

procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions of Brunei, Liberia and Switzerland, which did not reply in the first instance.

The case of the ship NeEtune Otome (paragraph 31, pp. 55-6): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Singapore, Brunei and Japan and the Observer Mission of Switzerland. The Mission of Japan referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 8, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions which did not reply in the first instance, i.e. Singapore, Brunei and Switzerland.

The case of the ship Fidius (paragraph 32, p. 56): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom. The former referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. A reminder should be sent to the Mission of the United Kingdom, which did not reply to the first query.

The case of the ship Berge Princess (paragraph 33, p. 56): Information was requested from the Permanent Missions of Iran, the United Arab Emirates, Liberia and Norway as well as the Principality of Liechtenstein. Norway referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised. Reminders should be sent to the Missions that did not reply to the first

query, i.e. Iran and Liberia as well as the Principality of Liechtenstein. It should be added that in the first report a reference was inadvertently made to a reply from the Mission of the United Arab Emirates.

23. The case of the ship Berge EnterErise (paragraphs 34-36, pp. 55-7): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Oman, Norway and Japan. The reply from the Mission of Japan indicated that the destination of the ship was Singapore. The Mission of Japan should be asked to provide documentation. The reply of Oman indicated that the matter would be investigated. It was furthermore stated that the ship might have been waiting in anchorage and that the Government had no jurisdiction over the control of destination of such tankers. It is suggested that the results of the investigation be solicited from the Mission of Oman. Like the Mission of Japan, the Mission of Saudi Arabia indicated that the shipment was unloaded in Singapore. The Mission of Saudi Arabia should be asked to provide documentation. The Missions of Norway and the United Arab Emirates referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

24. The case of the ship Berge Chief (paragraph 39, p. 57): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of Oman, Norway and the Netherlands. The latter did not reply, accordingly a reminder should be sent. The former two Missions referred to the answers mentioned above under paragraphs 23 and 2 respectively, and the same follow-up procedure is therefore advised.

C.

25.

-10-

The case of the ship Patriotic (paragraphs 40-44, pp. 57-8): Information was sought from the Permanent Missions of the United Arab Emirates, Greece and Panama. The Mission of Greece stated that the ship unloaded its cargo in Singapore, and that it would have been technically impossible for the vessel to have deviated its course in order to visit South Africa. It is suggested that the Mission of Greece be asked to provide documents to support the submission that the cargo in its entirety was unloaded in Singapore. The Mission of Singapore should be asked to provide relevant information in light of the answer from Greece. The Mission of the United Arab Emirates referred to the answer mentioned above under paragraph 2, and the same follow-up procedure is advised. A reminder should be sent to Panama, which did not answer in the first instance.