

## Paper for Consideration by SCUFN-36

### Follow-up SCUFN35.2/227: Regulating intersessional SCUFN work

<b>Submitted by:</b>	Yasuhiko Ohara (SCUFN Acting Chair)
<b>Executive Summary:</b>	This proposal recommends revisions to the document “Intersessional Work by Correspondence” as appropriate.
<b>Related Documents:</b>	“Intersessional Work by Correspondence”
<b>Related Projects:</b>	N/A

### Introduction/Background

1. At SCUFN-35.2, a proposal for regulating the SCUFN work by correspondence was submitted by the Secretariat. The proposal modalities were agreed in general, including decisions to be made by voting procedure when no consensus is reached. The proposal modalities are now appeared in a document “Intersessional Work by Correspondence (December 2022)”.
2. In the last week of July 2023, this procedure was firstly applied to 9 revised pending proposals from Chinese Committee on Undersea Feature Names (CCUFN). During the review of these 9 proposals, I felt that the proposed way of “voting” defined in the current document “Intersessional Work by Correspondence (December 2022)” is needed to be upgraded.

### Analysis/Discussion

3. In the Rules of Procedure, the article 2.9 says “.... The Sub-Committee should strive to decide by consensus. .... This option (= voting) will be used exceptionally if no consensus can be reached and a decision has to be made”. Following this, I believe that we do need to have discussion to seek for consensus even during intersessional work. Voting should occur only after this discussion.
4. In the case for the 9 revised CCUFN proposals, some proposals included changing of specific names. I see that a proposal with revised specific name can be equal to a “new” proposal, depending of the nature of the specific name. In this case, SCUFN needs an in-depth discussion on the proposal, like we do in the SCUFN-Operational Web Services (OWS) review process for the newly-submitted proposals. In our current practice, if there is a single red-flag opinion for a proposal during the SCUFN-OWS review, then the proposal is deferred to the plenary session.
5. In the past SCUFN-OWS review process, we already experienced that a minor red-flag opinion sometimes can be very significant. Therefore, we do need to have discussion to seek for consensus, employing these minor opinions.

However, the proposed way of “voting” defined in the current document “Intersessional Work by Correspondence (December 2022)” will ignore these minor, potentially important red-flag opinions.

### **Recommendations**

6. My recommendation is therefore to employ a two-step procedure: (1) firstly, we will decide the proposal as Green-flagged or Red-flagged with comments, (2) secondly, we will make a vote based on the Red-flagged comments to approve or defer the proposal to the next plenary meeting.

### **Justifications and Impacts**

7. Implementation of the proposed recommendation would result in revision of the document “Intersessional Work by Correspondence (December 2022)”.

### **Action required of SCUFN**

8. SCUFN is invited to:
  - a. Note this proposal.
  - b. Consider the recommendations in section 6.