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**Introduction/Background**

1. Having completed my first term of SCUFN membership, I thought that it might be useful to compile a few thoughts about the proposal and proposal review/scoring process. It is understood that the committee may be transitioning to a new operational mode once a process for automated proposals is launched. As a result, some of these points may soon become irrelevant. A review and validation of the scoring guidelines may be useful. Please accept these comments as being offered in a respectful and non-critical manner. We are all serving as volunteers and trying to meet our responsibilities in a diligent and fair way. I believe that the recent years have been challenging for SCUFN members and proposers alike, as requirements and procedures mature.

**Discussion**

The following are some thoughts for consideration (listed in no particular order):

2. A single coordinate point (centroid) could always be identified for each proposed named feature. This single coordinate point attribute will align more closely with traditional feature name gazetteers and encourage interoperability with other data sets. If agreed, the 'List of Geometries' document would require an update.

3. Is there a need to list points defining a polygon in the proposal form if a shapefile is being provided? At present, the submission of shapefiles is recommended.[[1]](#footnote-1) Should the recommendation for a shapefile become a mandatory requirment? Should there be a consideration about moving to a file geodatabase format (or some other file type)?

4. I am interested in learning more about the online proposal development progress and testing (KHOA).Is a review of B-6 needed to succinctly differentiate what are the requirements and what are suggestions for proposers to follow?

5. The list of past SCUFN meeting reports posted at <https://www.gebco.net/about_us/committees_and_groups/scufn/#names_proposals> requires an update.

6. There was a discussion at SCUFN-36 about vagaries and challenges of ensuring consistent scoring of proposals. Some variation is unavoidable due to changes and experience levels in the membership and the fact that humans are challenged with inherent subjectivity. As I understand it, the current scoring procedures may be found in two documents: 1) a presentation from SCUFN-33 (SCUFN33-04.0B) and 2) a paper from SCUFN-34 (SCUFN34-03.2A ). The evaluation categories discussed in the second document were approved at SCUFN-34 and may be found in the Summary Report. I recognize that I have not always consistently applied the scoring consistently. Maintaining awareness can be challenging with the many documents and decisions that have been made up to this point in time. Perhaps one solution is to align or replace the three colors with the agreed evaluation categories?

7. If a proposal is reviewed at a SCUFN meeting and evaluated, but assigned a category of "Pending" there should be a way to distinguish it from first-time proposals in the next round. If the reason for leaving as pending is for more data, once that data is provided, a full review of all of the components of the proposal doesn’t need to occur. I would suggest that the proposal should not be reloaded in the KHOA review system, however, I understand that the portal provides a convenient place to complete the review. It would be optimal if there was a way to retain the comments and evaulation from the first review as part of the proposal entry.

8. In my opinion, an incorrect generic name and/or specific name may not be a critical issue. The current agreement is that if both of these exist, the proposal is "Not Accepted." However, these issues can usually, with certain exceptions, be resolved with the proposer through communications. I believe that the category of "Not Accepted" should be liberally applied to insufficent or incomplete proposal packages.

9. Once scoring has been done, any proposal with a "red flag" should not be addressed during the SCUFN meeting unless all other proposals have been handled. Note: this may be less of a concern now that the total number of proposals accepted has been limited.

10. I suggest that for features located within the territorial sea, these be placed at the end of the queue for review. At SCUFN-36, there was recognition that the treatment should be similar to that given to fast-track proposals, which I agree with. But this fact was not apparant prior to the meeting.

**Action required of SCUFN**

11. SCUFN is invited to:

a. note this report

b. share thoughts on these suggestions

1. An asterisked (\*) note found underneath the 'Geometry' block of the Undersea Feature Names Proposal form. A reference to shapefile is also found in section 2.2 of Appendix A. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)