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***Executive Summary:*** This document reports on some of SCUFN evaluation criteria complementary to general Guidelines in B-6 for helping in reviewing proposals of undersea feature names. It is suggested that two out of four classification criteria need to be redefined for the consistent decision-making process and for matching with the common practice. Once agreed, these categories should be reflected in the Cookbook for Decision Making (under development).

***Related Documents:*** SCUFN32 Summary Report.

***Related Projects:*** N/A

**Introduction / Background**

1. In 2019, SCUFN32 summarized the classification “criteria” and composite definitions resulting from the evaluation of undersea naming proposals. They have been used over the years. Strictly speaking, these “criteria” reflect the outcome of decisions on naming proposals, mainly based on technical and scientific analysis in application of B-6 guidelines.
2. Some of the categories resulting from the evaluation for undersea feature naming proposals have been defined as follows;
* ACCEPTED: The proposed name, as approved, will be included in the GEBCO gazetteer.
* ADOPTED: The proposed name is mainly located in a territorial sea and has been approved by the relevant national naming authority. It is adopted for inclusion in the GEBCO gazetteer due to its significance for GEBCO. Or the name has been proposed under the fast-track procedure.
* NOT ACCEPTED: Both specific and generic terms are considered unsuitable. The proposed name will not be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO gazetteer. The proposer may however be invited to re-formulate his/her proposal.
* PENDING: Either the specific term or the generic term is considered unsuitable, or further clarification is needed. The proposed name will be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO gazetteer pending the provision of additional information, e.g. supporting bathymetry or biographic information.
1. The validity of these criteria has been proved through the evaluation of naming proposals since they have been reported in SCUFN Summary Reports.
2. However, the criteria for ‘NOT ACCEPT’ and ‘PENDING’ have not fully reflected the common practice of the evaluation of the undersea naming proposals even though the definitions themselves are reasonable and understandable.
3. Therefore, these criteria have not been applied always consistently and have applied differently depending on the circumstances, on the interpretation of some B-6 guidelines, which has the possibility of causing confusion to the proposer.

# Analysis/Discussion

# What SCUFN is actually doing during the meeting and factors having not been considered for evaluation as follows;

* If ‘generic name’ used in the naming proposal is wrong or not appropriate, SCUFN has commonly corrected the generic name during the meeting. The name, “as approved” by SCUFN in the meeting, is then ACCEPTED. Then, the proposer is informed of the final decision. The definition for ACCEPTED as given above is considered sufficient to comply with this situation.
* In case that ‘specific name’ is not appropriate, SCUFN has commonly asked the proposer for fixing the problem and put the proposal in the pending status for two years as a maximum unless the proposer requests to extend the pending period.
* Proposer sometimes submits undersea feature naming proposals using GEBCO gridded data without actual survey data. Even though there are no criteria for evaluating these proposals, however, these proposals are generally not accepted. Same with derived bathymetry from satellite remote sensing and/or gravity anomalies.
* If sparse single-beam data are used that is not enough to identify the whole geometry of the undersea feature, there are no criteria for evaluating these kinds of proposals. However, these proposals have not been accepted.
* If the proposer submits a single proposal for the clearly separate multi-features with a different generic property, there are no criteria to evaluate this proposal. However, SCUFN commonly asks the proposer to re-submit the proposal for each feature separately.

# Recommendations

Based on the common practice, it is recommended, that in addition to the current criteria above:

1. Redefine the criteria for NOT ACCEPTED
* If there are no actual survey data (multibeam preferably), the proposal will not be accepted. In that case, “actual” means effective (and not “recent” or “modern”) since data from an old dense survey using single beam echo-sounder compliant with the standards in force at the date of the survey can be accepted.
* If there are only single beam data with a wide line spacing, the proposal will not be accepted.
* The proposer submits a single proposal for multi-features, the proposal will not be accepted.
* If the feature is already named and registered in the GEBCO Gazetteer, the proposal will not be accepted.
* Both specific and generic terms are considered unsuitable, so the proposal will not be accepted. The proposed name will not be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO Gazetteer. The proposer may however be invited to re-formulate his/her proposal.
1. Redefine the criteria for PENDING

- Either the specific term or the generic term is considered unsuitable, or further clarification is needed, the proposed name will be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO Gazetteer pending the provision of additional information, e.g. supporting bathymetric or biographic information.

- If the data is not sufficient to cover and identify the whole undersea feature, the proposal puts in the PENDING status.

If the proposer fails to correct or supplement the part requested by SCUFN within 2 years, it will be automatically deleted from the pending list.

The consolidated list of criteria or definitions is given in Annex.

This list of consolidated criteria needs to be included in the Cookbook (under development).

# Justification and Impacts

1. Clear criteria for evaluating classification and justifying outcomes, based on the common practice will help to make a consistent decision-making process.
* It expects the number of PENDING proposals may be increased until proposers clearly understand the SCUFN’s decision making processes. To be known by proposers, one could argue that an option would be to include these composite classification definitions (criteria) in an Appendix of a future of B-6.
* NOT ACCEPTED proposals will be reduced.

# Actions required of SCUFN

1. SCUFN is invited to:
2. note this paper;
3. discuss and make a decision for the new complementary criteria of NOT ACCEPTED and PENDING. The general decision will be made together with the other criteria including the decision-tree, minor features, and other issues currently discussing. Until then, these criteria will be used for a test purpose and put in the SCUFN cookbook (to be developed).

**Annex**

New criteria definitions including proposed amendments to the current definitions available in all SCUFN Meetings Summary Reports:

Note. The status of proposed undersea feature names is classified as follows:

1. **ACCEPTED** (The proposed name, as approved, will be included in the GEBCO Gazetteer.)
2. **ADOPTED** (The proposed name is mainly located in a territorial sea and has been approved by the relevant national naming authority. It is adopted for inclusion in the GEBCO Gazetteer due to its significance for GEBCO. Or the name has been proposed under the fast-track procedure.)
3. **NOT ACCEPTED** (Both specific and generic terms are considered unsuitable. The proposed name will not be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO Gazetteer. The proposer may however be invited to re-formulate his/her proposal.). If there are no actual survey data (multibeam preferably), the proposal will not be accepted. In that case, “actual means effective (and not “recent” or “modern”) since data from an old dense survey using single beam echo-sounder compliant with the standards in force at the date of the survey can be accepted. Also, the proposer submits a single proposal for multi-features, the proposal will not be accepted, and all the other complementary criteria are given in section 7.
4. **PENDING** (Either the specific term or the generic term is considered unsuitable, or further clarification is needed. The proposed name will be put in the reserve section of the GEBCO Gazetteer pending the provision of additional information, e.g. supporting bathymetry or biographic information. Same with section 8.