



Decision-making process in SCUFN

***Main outcome of SCUFN35.1 Session 1 -  
way forward***

**Agenda Item 03.2B**

SCUFN35.1, 14 – 18 March 2022



IHO

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- SCUFN is facing an increasing number of issues when reviewing naming proposals for features located in areas where multiple maritime jurisdiction claims exist.
- Ineffectiveness of B-6, Section III.D **encouraging mutual consultation** for features located in areas of *mutual* interest...
- ... leading to a significant back-log of pending names with almost no chance to be solved by interested parties
- ... then leading to some maritime areas where undersea feature naming recognized by SCUFN is becoming impossible
- These situations go against the spirit of GEBCO and even threaten the role of SCUFN in the future.



IHO

# IMPORTANT GUIDELINES AND SCUFN RULES OF PROCEDURES

- *“International concern for naming undersea features is limited to those features entirely or mainly (more than 50 %) **outside the external limits of the territorial sea, not exceeding 12 nautical miles from the baselines**, in agreement with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.” (B-6, Ed. 4.2.0, Section I.A).*
- *“....it should be the policy to use forms of names applied by national authorities **having responsibility for the pertinent area.**” (B-6, Ed. 4.2.0, Section I.G).*
- *“Appointed Members of the Sub-Committee represent their parent organization [IHO or IOC] as experts...” (SCUFN ROP 2.1.2) and The Sub-Committee will not consider undersea feature name proposals that are **politically sensitive.**” (SCUFN ROP 2.10).....*



IHO

## SCUFN35.1 SESSION 1 DISCUSSION OUTCOME

International  
Hydrographic  
Organization

- No consensus on the tentative development (2021) and experimentation for 2 years of a decision-tree based on the location of the feature .
- No consensus on the « mutual consultation » process to become a pre-condition for undersea feature names located in areas of mutual interest.
- No consensus to apply ROP 2.10 systematically every time there is a single objection as it is not in the spirit of GEBCO and marine knowledge for future generations...
- Agreement that it is not in SCUFN mandate, scope and capacity to conduct legal analysis in depth of every case.



IHO

**WAY FORWARD – *WHERE THERE IS A WILL, THERE IS A WAY***

International  
Hydrographic  
Organization

- General Principle: simply apply existing Guidelines (B-6) and SCUFN ROP in force...
  
- In SCUFN review phase (SCUFN Operational Webservices), if there is a single « red » objection based on the location of the feature:
  1. Chair calls for a vote (secret ballot) among SCUFN Members (ROP 2.9) on the question: « *should the naming proposal considered as politically sensitive or not? »*
    - a) if simple majority votes is YES, then proposal is not considered (ROP 2.10.
    - b) If simple majority is NO, SCUFN is entitled to review the proposal in application of Guidelines B-6, Section I.A



**IHO**

**WAY FORWARD – *WHERE THERE IS A WILL, THERE IS A WAY***

International  
Hydrographic  
Organization

2. The review goes on and the final decision is based on the simple majority of comments (green, yellow, red), including changes on generic term if appropriate.