

Paper for Consideration by SCUFN

Alternative specific terms to Indy Maru and McVay

Submitted by:	IHO Secretariat (as SCUFN Secretariat)
Executive Summary:	This document reports on the discussions involving the SCUFN Chair (Dr. H.W. Schenke) and Vice Chair (Dr. Y. Ohara), with the contactor acting as facilitator, in relation with new specific terms suggested by Mr. Leighton Rolley to replace Indy Maru and McVay, initially proposed by Mr. Rolley and which were not accepted at SCUFN29.
Related Documents:	Decisions SCUFN29/15 and SCUFN29/16
Related Projects:	Actions SCUFN29/13 and SCUFN29/117

Introduction / Background

1. Mr. Leighton Rolley, Schmidt Ocean Institute, USA, submitted proposals for Indy Maru Seamount and McVay Seamount to SCUFN29 in 2016, for two features located in international waters in the Philippine Sea. SCUFN29 report indicates: “*SCUFN Members considered these proposals very carefully and finally recommended the proposer to consider the possibility of re-submitting them with less sensitive specific terms.*” and includes two relevant actions as follows:

- SCUFN29/15: Proposal for [~~Indy Maru~~] Seamount is kept as PENDING with the specific term to be changed (**L. Rolley**) for the following reasons:
 - The specific term is not compliant with rule B-6-II-A.4.
 - The history of the ship is considered as sensitive.
- SCUFN29/16: Proposal for [~~McVay~~] Seamount is kept as PENDING for the same reasons given for the proposal for Indy Maru Seamount (**L. Rolley**).

2. As a result, Mr. Rolley was invited to propose alternative specific terms. He then suggested the following:

- **Cenotaph** to replace Indi Maru, with following text as reason for choice: “*Cenotaphs are commonly used as memorials to individuals and groups lost in conflict/disaster. In particular, both Japan and the United States use the term for memorials as an acknowledgement of all those effected by conflict - irrespective of nationality.*”
- **Nautilus** to replace McVay, with following text as reason for choice: “*Named after Captain Nemo's fictional submarine in Jules Verne's novel Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea (1870).*”

Note: The specific term Yabe was also proposed by Mr. Rolley as a possible replacement for McVay, after Dr. Hisakatsu Yabe of Tohoku University (1878-1969) who was a prominent pioneer Japanese geologist. However, Vice Chair suggested not to retain Yabe for such a small feature, further noting that Dr. Yabe had little relevance to the area of this feature.

Analysis/Discussion

3. The Chair and Vice Chair were invited by the contractor to express their views on the alternative specific terms proposed by Mr. Rolley. In summary, this exchange of views has resulted in the Chair supporting both Cenotaph and Nautilus while the Vice Chair disagreed with both terms.

4. Chair expressed his support for naming Cenotaph Seamount the first feature, as a memento for all the unnamed victims of wars and disasters. He further added “The newly proposed Cenotaph Seamount is from my point acceptable, because this international used term is absolutely neutral, it can only indirectly be related to that region where the disaster with the Indianapolis happened.”

5. Chair also supported naming Nautilus Seamount the second feature, saying “The newly proposed Nautilus Seamount, referring to Captain Nemo's ship Nautilus, is from my point ok. *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea: An Underwater Tour of the World* (In French, *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers: Tour du monde sous-marin*) is a classic science fiction novel by French writer Jules Verne published in 1870.

6. Vice Chair said he was reluctant to accept Cenotaph Seamount. While he agreed that Cenotaph is absolutely neutral, he considered that, technically, following the current rule in B-6, there is no way to use Cenotaph as specific term in this case. He sees Cenotaph as a spiritual specific term, adding “If the shape of the concerned seamount looks like a ‘cenotaph’, then we can use the name. However, the concerned seamount is just a conical shape. So, if we follow the rule in B-6 strictly, we cannot use the ‘spiritual’ cenotaph as a specific name. Another concern I would have if the ‘spiritual’ usage of Cenotaph is allowed, is that ‘cenotaph’ is a general and common word and I am therefore reluctant to use this term for such a relatively small undersea feature. There have been numerous marine disasters that were associated with sinking of ship, for example, the case for the Titanic. If there is a much bigger undersea feature that was associated with marine disaster, then that feature should be ideal for a ‘spiritual’ Cenotaph Seamount.”

7. Vice Chair was also reluctant to accept Nautilus Seamount, saying “If we follow the current rule of B-6 strictly, then there are no way to use Nautilus as the specific term in this case. Captain Nemo’s Nautilus was not relevant to the concerned seamount, in terms of discovering or verifying the feature. According to B-6, we can use the name of famous persons. Following this rule, we might be able to use ‘Jules Verne’ (or even ‘Captain Nemo’). As a derivative interpretation of this rule, we might be able to use Nautilus, but this is not a straight forward way.”

8. Referring to the location of these two features/seamounts, Vice Chair reminded the rule in B-6, p. 2-4, § III.D which states “There is significant benefit to be gained from mutual consultation by all interested parties in preparing and submitting proposals to SCUFN.” He said that the concerned seamounts are located within the potential extended continental shelf of Palau and Japan, but not in international waters; that it should be noted that once CLCS makes its recommendation about the limit of both countries’ extended continental shelves, then both countries will delimit the boundary between the extended continental shelves. In this sense, JCUFN, Palau and SOI need to have mutual consultation with each other. He said that if we rush into the conclusion that Cenotaph Seamount and Nautilus Seamount are accepted now, then we might be involved in complicated situation. He would be prepared to act as ‘mediator or middleman’ in the above consultation or, if this is not possible, he suggested SCUFN Secretary to play that role.

9. Chair considers that both features are located in international waters, where names can generally be proposed freely on the basis of B-6, under the neutral guidance and supervision of SCUFN; that a triangular negotiation/consultation, as mentioned above, could be embarrassing for other SCUFN members, and even by proposers as, in such situations, scientists could be reluctant to prepare name proposals if they know that they may have to discuss names with those authorities, beside all the other work on a proposal. He also questioned an earlier suggestion from Vice Chair to use names in Japanese dialect since there are already similar names in the concerned area, all in relation with the Southern Cross. This could lead to difficult situations where groups or clusters of features, named from one country (in dialect, heroic, ethnic, or mythic form), overlay several regions of the wide ocean. It is SCUFN's task to maintain the internationality of the undersea feature names on the High Seas.

10. It should be noted that Clause I.A of B-6 has been inherited from initial guidelines drafted in 1980. As a result, B-6 does not include any references to EEZ and continental shelves as described by UNCLOS.

11. Following subsequent discussion by correspondence, Vice Chair indicated that he was willing to accept Cenotaph and Nautilus as specific terms for the two seamounts, if they were supported by Chair and Secretary.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

12. SCUFN members take note of this paper, in particular the comments in sections 3 to 11, and be prepared to express their views when this topic is discussed at SCUFN30 under agenda item 4.1.

13. SCUFN members, if they so desire, provide comments on this paper in advance of SCUFN30.

Justification and Impacts

14. Following discussions on this matter at SCUFN30, there may be merit in clarifying in B-6:

- The possible choices for specific terms (p. 2-2, Clause II.A refers);
- The meaning of “mutual areas of interest” (p. 2-4, Clause III.D refers) and, as a general note, what should be the role of SCUFN, if any, with regard to Clause III.D?
- The area of competence of SCUFN and whether/how EEZ and continental shelves, as described by UNCLOS, should be taken into consideration.
- These clarifications could be included in the solutions proposed either in response to Action SCUFN29/13 (Appendix to TORs), or in a new edition of B-6.

Action required of SCUFN

15. SCUFN is invited to:

- a. note this paper;
- b. consider the recommendations made in sections 12, 13 and 14.