



IHB File No. S3/2644/A

CIRCULAR LETTER 96/2008
24 November 2008

**IHO-IOC PUBLICATION B-6, ENGLISH/FRENCH VERSION, 4TH EDITION, NOVEMBER 2008
STANDARDIZATION OF UNDERSEA FEATURE NAMES**

Reference: IHB Circular Letter 63/2008 dated 24 July

Dear Hydrographer,

1 The IHB thanks the following Member States who have replied to the Circular Letter in reference: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Finland, France, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Spain and the United Kingdom. In general, comments received expressed support and acceptance of the draft 4th edition.

2 We would like to thank in particular Brazil, France and New Zealand for having offered a variety of suggestions/comments. Please find in annex a résumé of those comments which are not of editorial nature. The IHB has studied in detail each of these suggestions jointly with the Chairman of SCUFN and has taken action accordingly.

3 Member States are kindly invited to dispatch and make use of the 4th edition of B-6 (English/French) that has been posted on the IHO website under Standards and Publications > Bathymetric Publications.

4 English/Spanish, English/Russian, English/Japanese and English/Korean versions of the 4th edition of B-6 are in the process of being updated and will be released as soon as they are available.

On behalf of the Directing Committee
Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Hugo Gorziglia', written in a cursive style.

Captain Hugo GORZIGLIA
Director

Annex A: Comments received by Member States on B6.
Copy to: IOC Secretariat, Paris, France

COMMENTS RECEIVED BY MEMBER STATES

BRAZIL

1. In the Undersea Feature Name Proposal there is no longer any room for a space or title to include the supporting material like maps, profiles, survey area, etc.

IHB Comment: Agree. A line has been added to the Form:

“Supporting material should be submitted as Annex in analog or digital form”

2. Offers some editorial corrections.

IHB Comment: Agree. Text has been improved.

FRANCE:

1. Requests the proposition made by SCUFN to use terminology in line with UNCLOS and to avoid the use of the term “international waters” as being ambiguous.

IHB Comment: Agree. Text has been re-worded.

2. Highlights a translation error in the French version of the CL.

IHB Comment: Note has been taken to avoid this sort of error.

3. Also suggests that there should be no difference in the treatment of undersea features names located within the territorial sea and the internal waters.

IHB Comment: Agree.

4. Notes that the new ToR of SCUFN (Art. 1.3.3) stills make reference to international waters, recommending applying the outer limit of the territorial sea as the delimitation that shall be used in the definition of the two geographic areas incumbent to SCUFN:

a) If the undersea feature is located inside the external limit of the territorial sea.

b) If at least 50% of the undersea feature is located outside the external limit of the territorial sea.

IHB Comment: Agree. Text has been re-worded.

5. Suggests that the IHB DC should consider the need to adjust article 1.3.3 of SCUFN Terms of Reference accordingly.

IHB Comment: Agree. Text has been re-worded to read: “Provide advice to individuals and appropriate authorities on the selection of undersea feature names located outside the external limits of the territorial sea and, on request, inside the external limit of the territorial sea.”

6. Offers some editorial corrections.

IHB Comment: Agree. Text has been improved.

NEW ZEALAND:

1. Suggests adopting the date in which the publication is finally issued

IHB Comment: Agree.

2. Suggests some modifications on the content layout.

IHB Comment: Agree. Sections I, II and III, as well as List of Acronyms have been added.

3. Suggests adding under I A the word “nautical” before miles.

IHB Comment: Agree.

4. Suggests adding under I C the following sentence: “Existing names may be altered to avoid confusion, remove ambiguity or to correct spelling”.

IHB Comment: Agree

5. Suggests adding under I E a possible solution.

IHB comment: Does not agreed as there might exist various solutions, all required to be considered if eventual solutions are to be included.

6. Suggests under I H the inclusion of diacritical marks or special characters.

IHB comment: No need to add special characters as SCUFN follows the UN Publication Series M, No 87. "Technical Reference Manual for the Standardization of Geographical Names".

7. Suggests change of word "famous" by "significant"

IHB Comment: the term famous fits much better as attribute of a person which shall be memorized. No change.

8. Suggests the addition of two new paragraphs after 9, in II Principles for Naming Features.

First paragraph: "The use of acronyms or abbreviations is discouraged, but may be considered, if the suggested name is otherwise deemed appropriate".

Second paragraph: "Names generally not accepted and includes a list of cases".

IHB Comment: B-6 provides general guidance on what it is expected/accepted. In our opinion first paragraph suggested does not provide a clear guidance. On one side indicates that the use of acronyms or abbreviations is discouraged, but at the same time indicates that may be considered when appropriate. With regard to the second paragraph being proposed, its objective is to identify what it is generally not expected/accepted, and certainly that list could further be enlarged. Being the aim of B-6 to highlight what it is accepted, we do not think it is recommended at the same time to attempt to also highlight the opposite. We feel this is well covered by the exiting text (II , 1 to 5)

9. Suggests adding the following sentence under II B 1: "Existing names that use incorrect generic terms should be altered".

IHB Comment: While the sentence is absolutely valid, we do not see the relation with the objective of the guidelines. Section II refers to the principles recommended to use in naming features not in correcting existing errors in naming. This particular situation does not need to be regulated as it will be considered on its merit on a case by case basis.

10. Suggests replacing under Procedure for Naming Features E, "resolve the question" by "Agree on a solution".

IHB Comment: Agree. The text has been modified.

11. Under Sea Proposal Name Form, some suggestions were made in order to include new, altered or discontinued options. Also to improve the presentation of the geometry and coordinates sections, and to amplify examples. NZ also indicates that they have some difficulties with the wording of the Notes, as the NZGB's naming jurisdiction will extend over the continental shelves of both NZ and the Ross Dependency, but confirms that it is intended that those undersea feature names that are determined by the NZGB will then proceed to be submitted to SCUFN for Selection and Review.

IHB comment: it is the hope of SCUFN that the form would be as general and easy to complete as possible. Until now it has worked well and during its revision it was not felt necessary to introduce further details, nevertheless it has been Agreed to add an extra line to allocate space for "Remarks", if any. With regard to the text in the Note, following France's suggestion, a) and b) have been amended. We appreciate NZ's intention regarding submission of the names determined by NZGB.

12. Suggests to add "and/or the national naming authority" under Authorities

IHB comment: Agree. The text has been modified.

13. Suggests to add under Terminology.. NOTES the following: "This has sometimes lead to finding that historically named features, do not physically exist".

IHB comment: Agree. The text has been modified.

14. Suggests several minor editorial improvements.

IHB comment: Agree. The text has been modified as appropriate.