

## Paper for Consideration by SCUFN

**Re: Action SCUFN 28/88****Yasuhiko Ohara****March 30, 2016**

This is to reply to Action SCUFN 28/88, i.e., the use of dual names separated by “/”.

I understand the concept of the dual names proposed by NZGB, such as

- Dual names recognize the culture and history of each part of the name (in NZ, the Maori and non-Maori name).
- Dual naming aligns with UNGEGN’s principles in terms of using the geographic names of indigenous group.

I would therefore like to respect the concept, but if we see the real SCUFN world, my answer for the dual name issue is negative. The reasons for my negative answer are as follows:

1. In principle, SCUFN was established for “standardization” of undersea feature names (see the second paragraph of page 1-v, B-6, 2013). However, the dual name proposal by NZGB is obviously against for “standardization” of undersea feature names; instead, it proposes complication.
2. One of the major rules for naming specific terms is: “Short and simple specific terms are preferable” (page 2-2 of B-6, 2013). In contrast, dual naming will inevitably result in lengthy specific term.

The above two reasons comes from B-6 rules. In addition, I do have other concerns. Although I said that “I understand the concept of the dual names proposed by NZGB” in the beginning, I do not perfectly concur with their reasoning. Well, **I do respect indigenous on-land names, such as “Uluru” by Aborigine. Likewise, I do respect indigenous undersea feature names by Maori, if there is any.** However, I do not think that the Maori peoples had sounding technologies for off-shore undersea features long time ago. In other words, I can imagine that most of the proposed dual named undersea features were surveyed with modern technologies by the immigrated British peoples, and the “Maori names” were later given to some of these undersea features. In this regard, I assume that most of the proposed “Maori names” are not originated from the Maori themselves. If my assumption is correct, then I do not want to concur with the reasoning by NZGB.

When we apply the dual name principle to some of Japan’s proposals, here are two examples from SCUFN-28, 2015:

- Hangetsu Ridge → Hangetsu / Half Moon Ridge
- Kazahayahoshi Seamount → Kazahayahoshi / Southern Cross Seamount

“Hangetsu” is the Japanese, meaning “Half Moon” in English. “Kazahayahoshi” is the Japanese dialect, meaning “Southern Cross”. I think these examples perfectly match the dual name principle; i.e., “Japanese + English” name vs. “Maori + English” name. This simple test indicates that the concept of the dual names proposed by NZGB is not uniquely applicable to NZ, but universally applicable to any no-English speaking countries. However, in reality,

Japan proposed just Japanese names, not dual names; this is also the case for Korean, Chinese and Brazilian proposals. If we follow this manner, NZGB may just want to propose Maori names, not dual names.

If we make a compromise with the NZGB, then we may consider the proposed dual name as a single name. If we take an example from NZGB's PPT, here is "Manawatawhi /Three Kings Island". Note that this is not an undersea feature name, but anyway, we can use it as a test case. In this example, we may consider "Manawatawhi /Three Kings" as a single specific name, not a dual name. If this argument is OK, then I am willing to accept the NZGB's proposal. However, we should be very careful that this kind of specific name will be lengthy, obviously against for the B-6's basic rule: "Short and simple specific terms are preferable" (page 2-2 of B-6, 2013).

End