Paper for Consideration by SCUFN

Report of the work made during the inter-sessional period

Recommendations from the experimental use of the new interfaces:
www.scufnterm.org, www.scufnsubmission.org, www.scufnreview.org

Submitted by:	IHB (as SCUFN Secretary)
Executive Summary:	At SCUFN27, it was agreed to experiment the new interfaces www.scufnterm.org, www.scufn.submission.org, and www.scufnreview.org (Action SCUFN27/82 refers). The upgrade of the quality and the consistency of the Undersea Feature Names Database of the GEBCO Gazetteer made during the inter-sessional period, between SCUFN27 and SCUFN28, has been used to experiment these interfaces.
Related Documents:	N/A
Related Projects:	N/A

Introduction / Background

1. In 2014, following the SCUFN27 meeting and considering the limited resources available within its Sub-Committee, the Secretariat of the GEBCO Sub Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN) decided to contract several tasks in order to improve the content of the IHO-IOC online GEBCO Gazetteer of Undersea Feature Names Database and enhance the future SCUFN day-to-day operations. The following tasks were contracted to the former SCUFN Secretary.

Tasks	Objectives	Outcome reported in
1&2	*Major upgrade of the quality of the content of the database and consistency check by populating the fields ""Minimum depth", "Maximum depth", "Total relief", "Dimension/Size", "Associated meeting", "Proposal date" and "Discovery date"*	Doc. SCUFN28-07.2A
3	*Harmonization and standardization of the spelling of proposers and discoverers*	Doc. SCUFN28-07.2A
4	*Establishment of a wish-list of potential improvements to the interface of the on-line Gazetteer*	Doc. SCUFN28-07.1A
5	*Preparation of recommendations from the comprehensive use, in test mode, of the new interfaces www.scufnterm.org, www.scufnsubmission.org, and www.scufnreview.org*	Doc. SCUFN28-06C
6	*Preparation of proposals for improving the procedure when assessing feature names lists proposed by national geographical names bodies*	Doc. SCUFN28-05.2B
7	*Monitoring of the PENDING names and management of the reserved-specific-list names*	Doc. SCUFN28-07.2B

2. The objective of this submission paper is to report on Task 5.

Analysis/Discussion

3. It must be said first and foremost, and above all, that it will be necessary that SCUFN Members provide their own views on the functions, and use of these new interfaces and define the road map (actions, timelines, and responsibilities) for their implementation and integration within the existing set of documented procedures and GEBCO Gazetteer functions for Editors and Administrators. The SCUFN Secretary[1] is in the view that a global and basic project description for the development of these new interfaces, on which the SCUFN Members should agree, is a necessary and preliminary step to be achieved, before going too far in the refinement of these interfaces.

4. Notwithstanding the lack of availability of a global picture based on user requirements, a comprehensive experimentation was conducted. A full report including detailed recommendations is given in Annex.

5. The main outcomes and recommendations of the experimentation having a potential impact on SCUFN day-to-day operations and its programme of work can be summarized, in general terms, as follows:

www.scufnterm.org

5.a/ need to make available all generic terms that are used in the GEBCO Gazetteer, including those that are not anymore recommended by SCUFN for new feature names, but which are still used for harmonization with other gazetteers. Definitions of these generic terms should appear once only.

5.b/ need to prepare a new Edition of B-6 in order to include and align the new definitions in Section II – GENERIC TERMS USED FOR HARMONIZATION WITH OTHER GAZETTEERS AND DEFINITIONS.

www.scufnsubmission.org

5.c/ need to encourage proposers to provide details on the geometry of undersea features in geospatial vector data format (such as Shape files), as it is very helpful for quality control.

5.d/ need to adapt the general SCUFN user documentation in order to provide guidance on the different ways for making proposals (Name Proposal Form on one hand, on-line scufn.submission.org webservices on the other hand). Need to develop the SCUFN administrator documentation to integrate the different components (management of accounts, rights,…).

www.scufnreview.org

5.e/ need to define a streamlined workflow and to agree on the different responsibilities among the SCUFN members, Chair's decision role included.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

6. SCUFN considers the comment made in section 3 of this paper.

7. SCUFN considers the main recommendations in section 5 of this paper, and that the project leader, taking into account the guidance provided by SCUFN, considers the detailed recommendations given in Annex, together with any other technical input provided by users and SCUFN members.

---

[1] To his basic knowledge and experience in SCUFN matters due to his recent appointment.

Justification and Impacts

8. It is important to get a consensus on the benefits expected from the users when commissioning these new webservices against the costs and human resources necessary to pursue this development, then maintain the webservices, then transfer them to the IHO (SCUFN Secretariat), provided if it is the intention.

9. Resource implications: impact on KIGAM resources to be budgeted. Solutions through GEBCO funding to be considered.

Action required of SCUFN
10. SCUFN is invited to:

     a.   note this report
     b.   consider the recommendations made in sections 6 & 7 and propose a way forward.

List of recommendations from the experimental use of new interfaces

I.   **www.scufnterm.org – UNDERSEA FEATURE GENERIC TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

1.   **General**

In the banner at the top of the page, add under the IHO logo: "**International Hydrographic Organization**", as not everyone will be able to identify that it is the logo of the IHO. Use same font and colour as those of "**Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission**". Use as background the chart background which is shown for the banner at www.scufnreview.org.

The NOTE at the top of the page should be plural, that is, NOTES.

First list of generic terms: "Generic terms and definitions". At same horizontal level of this title, in the central column, add a note as follows:

"NOTE: Only the generic terms in this section should be used in any new Undersea Feature Name Proposal that is intended for submission to the GEBCO Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN)."

Second list of generic terms: "Generic terms used for harmonization with other gazetteers and definitions" (note that "Gazetteers" must be written with two "e"). At same horizontal level of this title, in the central column, add a note as follows:

"NOTE: The generic terms in this section are used for some features in the GEBCO Gazetteer and/or in other gazetteers. They are kept in this list to facilitate harmonization between gazetteers. However, they are considered obsolete and **their use is not recommended for new feature names**."

2.   **Generic terms**

Considering

- That, in addition to those appearing in B-6, all generic terms used in the GEBCO Gazetteer, but not included in B-6, should be listed and defined here;
- That any given definition should appears once only;

Recommendations are made as indicated below.

Bank. Use the following definition:

"An elevation of the seafloor, at depths generally less than 200 m, but sufficient for safe surface navigation, commonly found on the CONTINENTAL SHELF or near an island."

Cap. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See BANK. »

Continental Rise. Use the following definition:

"A gentle slope rising from the oceanic depths towards the foot of a CONTINENTAL SLOPE."

Continental Shelf. Use the following definition:

« See SHELF. »

Continental Slope. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See SLOPE. »

Discordance. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), as well as its definition when it has been developed and agreed by SCUFN.

Escarpment. Use the following definition:

« An elongated, characteristically linear, steep slope separating horizontal or gently sloping areas of the seafloor. »

Fracture Zone System*. Add this generic term followed with an asterisk (genetic implication) to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« An extensive linear zone of irregular topography, mountainous or faulted, characterized by steep-sided or asymmetrical RIDGES, clefts, TROUGHS or ESCARPMENTS. »

Ground. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See BANK(s). »

Mid-Oceanic Ridge. Should be written as such, not Mid-Ocean Ridge.

Pass. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See SADDLE. »

Passage. Use the following definition:

« See GAP. »

Plain. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See ABYSSAL PLAIN. »

Promontory. Use the following definition:

« A major SPUR-like protrusion of the CONTINENTAL SLOPE extending to the deep seafloor. Characteristically, the crest deepens seaward. »

Scarp. Use the following definition:

« See ESCARPMENT. »

Seabight. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See VALLEY. »

Seachannel. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See SEA CHANNEL. »

Seamount Group. Add this generic term to the 2nd list (harmonization with other gazetteers), with definition as follows:

« See SEAMOUNT(s). »

Sea Valley. Use the following definition:

« See VALLEY. »

Shelf Break. Use the following definition:

« See SHELF-EDGE. »

Shelf-Edge. Should be written with a hyphen between the two words.

Submarine Valley. Use the following definition:

« See VALLEY. »

Tablemont. Use the following definition:

« See GUYOT. »

Valley. Use the following definition:

« An elongated depression that generally widens and deepens down-slope. »

3.   Impact on B-6

It is suggested that the following generic terms, with their definitions as above, be included in B-6 (Section II – GENERIC TERMS USED FOR HARMONIZATION WITH OTHER GAZETTEERS AND DEFINITIONS) at its next edition:

- Cap
- Continental Slope
- Discordance
- Fracture Zone System
- Ground
- Pass
- Plain
- Seabight
- Seachannel
- Seamount Group

II.   www.scufnsubmission.org - UNDERSEA FEATURE NAME PROPOSAL

1. General

In the banner at the top of the page, add under the IHO logo: "**International Hydrographic Organization**", as not everyone will be able to identify that it is the logo of the IHO. Use same font and colour as those of "**Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission**". Use as background the chart background which is shown for the banner at www.scufnreview.org.

At the top of the page, replace "Submission" with "Submission to the GEBCO Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN)".

Below "Submission to …" add a line with following notes:

"NOTES: 1) For a proposal to be considered by SCUFN, at least 50 % of the undersea feature should be located **outside the external limits** of a territorial sea.

2) Acceptable generic terms, and their definitions, are provided at www.scufnterm.org.

3) Guidance for the preparation of a proposal is provided in IHO-IOC Publication B-6; also available are Name Proposal Forms in DOC and PDF formats.

4) Proposers are encouraged to provide details on the geometry of undersea features in the form of GIS geospatial vector data format, such as Shape files.

At the right end of the line "Submission to …" add the word "HELP" with a link to a text providing explanations on how to proceed (see Appendix A).

2. Option "FILE UPLOAD"

Entering a Proposed Name (Number 3 box). Clicking on that box generates the display of a sub-window, with two boxes for "Specific Term" and "Generic Term". When clicking on the box "Generic Term", then a list of the acceptable terms in the first section of www.scufnterm.org should be presented, from which the proposer can select an appropriate generic term. Also, it is suggested to replace the text "You can use the proposed name" with "The proposed name does not exist already in the GEBCO Gazetteer and can therefore be used". When a proposed name is considered valid, then it should appear with the initials of the specific and generic terms in capitals, and all other letters in lower cases so that any diacritical mark in the specific term, e.g. Ngātoro, can be clearly distinguished. The name should then be shown as such at all steps of the submission process.

Line 4 « Select a File". There is a 2nd box on the right side, where the selected file name is written, in fact duplicated as the name already appears on the 1st box. Unless the 2nd box is proved to be useful, I suggest removing it.

After clicking on "SUBMIT" and that the proposed name file has been accepted, the proposer is presented with two options: "GO SUBMIT" or "GO OVERVIEW". It is suggested to replace with "GO SUBMISSION" and "GO SEARCH", respectively, which better reflects the reality. In this connection, the message informing on the success of the submission should better read: "You have successfully submitted the proposal file."

3. Option "PROPOSAL FORM »

At the top of the form, remove "(See **NOTE** overleaf)", as well as the note itself at the end of the form, as it is now covered with the new NOTE 1 (see Section 1 above). The addresses and other details on the IHB and the IOC, at the end of the form, should also be removed as they are linked to that note. Remove also the Note: "The boxes will expand as you fill the form", as the boxes actually do not expand when typing (which is fine for this form).

Name proposed. Should be "Proposed Name" for consistency with the "FILE UPLOAD" option. Same remarks as in Section 2 regarding the selection of a generic term and the use of lower case letters.

Geometry. Remove "(Yes/No)" at the end of the title, as this choice is not relevant here. It should be possible to select several geometries, for example "Point" and "Polygon". At present, only one geometry can be chosen.

Table of coordinates. In the first line, include examples of coordinates after "Lat." and "Long.", for example "Lat. (e.g. 63°32.6'N)" and "Long. (e.g. 046°21.3'W)", so that the proposer can see what is expected and that decimal minutes are possible (but decimal degrees are not).

Entering of coordinates. There should be checks that:

- the "Lat. deg" value is an integer number between 0 and 90;
- the "Long. deg" value is an integer number between 0 and 180;
- the "Lat. min" and "Long. min" values are decimal numbers between 0 and 59.999…

Centroid Coordinates. Replace with "**Point Coordinates**", for consistency with the geometry table above. Add an icon ⊞ on the right side of the "Point Coordinates" box, to allow for Multiple Points. When clicking on that icon, an additional "Point Coordinates" line in the table should be presented to the proposer.

Line Coordinates. Add an icon ⊞ on the right side of the "Line Coordinates" box, to allow for Multiple Lines. When clicking on that icon, an additional "Line Coordinates" line in the table should be presented to the proposer.

Polygon Coordinates. Unless the usefulness of "Range", "(a)", "(b)", "(c)", "(d)" is recognized, I suggest removing these words. Add an icon ⊞ on the right side of the "Polygon Coordinates" box, to allow for Multiple Polygons. When clicking on that icon, an additional "Polygon Coordinates" line in the table should be presented to the proposer.

Feature Description. Add "(m)" after "Maximum Depth", "Minimum Depth" and "Total Relief", to read "Maximum Depth (m)", "Minimum Depth (m)" and "Total Relief (m)". Further, there should be checks that the values entered are positive and below a reasonable ceiling, e.g. 15000m. At present, one can enter, for example, -200000 for any of these fields. When two fields have been completed, for example Minimum Depth and Total Relief, the remaining third field, in this case Maximum Depth, should be filled automatically.

Supporting Survey Data, including Track Controls. Replace "Supporting material can be submitted as Annex in analog or digital form" with "Supporting material can be submitted as attached files (see below)".

Figures. It is suggested to remove the entire "Figure" row, as the requirement for attached images is the same for both options "FILE UPLOAD" and "PROPOSAL FORM" and that it can be satisfied in the "ATTACHMENT" section under the "Search for Proposals" functionality. It is further suggested to insert instead a note as follows:

"NOTE: Any supporting file (image, DOC, PDF or compressed) can be attached as part of the SEARCH functionality."

4. "SEARCH" Functionality

Option "MODIFY". In case of a Name Proposal file (PDF or DOC) selected through the option "FILE UPLOAD", it is not possible to replace that file with another PDF or DOC file, by means of the option "Modify". In effect, the proposer gets the message: "You are not supposed to access this page", even though the required password has been entered. Note also that during this process, an intermediate message should be "Are you sure you want to replace this proposal file?", and not "Are you sure you want to replacement this proposals file?".

Option "DOWNLOAD". In case of a Name Proposal entered through the option "PROPOSAL FORM", clicking on "DOWNLOAD" results in a window where it is proposed to either open or register a file "createdoc_download.php". This type of file, even after registering it, is not easily or cannot be opened.

Section "ATTACHMENT". It should be possible to attach compressed files, such as ZIP or RAR files, for example to include Shape files. In effect, these files are provided as a package including, in addition to SHP files, DBF, PRJ, SHP-RXL and SHX files. The package is conveniently supplied in a compressed form. Compressed files can also be used to convey other formats such as KMZ or PPT files. If this is accepted, it is suggested to amend the comment as follows: "*only image file (JPG, PNG, GIF, BNP), DOC file, PDF file or compressed file (ZIP, RAR)."

Section "RESULTS". Replace with "**STATUS**", which better reflects the reality. Also, in the case of a newly submitted Name Proposal, the status should be "WAITING" (for consideration by SCUFN at a next meeting), rather than "DEFER" which implies that the proposal has been on the agenda of a SCUFN meeting and postponed for whatever reason. As regards the other "STATUS" options, it is suggested using those mentioned in past SCUFN meeting reports, that is, "ACCEPTED", "ADOPTED", "NOT ACCEPTED" and "PENDING".

Table resulting from a "Search" action. When clicking on "Search for Proposals", a table providing an overview of all proposals is shown (before any "Search" action is undertaken). This table can then be reduced and adjusted as a result of a particular "Search" action. In the column "RESULTS" (to be changed to "STATUS"), replace "DEFER" with "WAITING" and, for those names which have been accepted or adopted, change to "ACCEPTED as (Name)" or "ADOPTED as (Name)". For example, if a name has been proposed as Barker Bank and accepted as Barker Plateau, write "ACCEPTED as Barker

Plateau" in the "STATUS" column. Add a column "MEETING" at the right of the column "STATUS", where the associated meeting, at which the decision indicated in the latter column has been taken. In the above case of Barker Plateau, the relevant meeting would be "SCUFN-26 (2013)". As long as the status of a proposal is "WAITING", no SCUFN meeting should be mentioned. In order to avoid that the table becomes too big in the long term, it is suggested that the names which have been accepted or adopted, be removed from the table after a reasonable time following the concerned meeting, say 6 months. This would give sufficient time to the proposer to check the outcome regarding his proposal(s).

5. "OVERVIEW" Functionality

The overview table is very similar to that presented through the "Search" functionality and the comments made above to improve the table presentation are therefore also valid here. Accordingly, the choice offered under "STATUS" should be: "ACCEPTED", "ADOPTED", "NOT ACCEPTED", "PENDING" and "WAITING".

III.   www.scufnreview.org - UNDERSEA FEATURE NAME PROPOSAL REVIEW

At the right end of the line "Overview of Proposals" add the word "HELP" with a link to a text providing explanations on how to proceed (see Appendix B).

Add a note below the title "Overview of Proposals", as follows:

"NOTE: This page is to be used exclusively by members of the GEBCO Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN), to assess Name Proposals in the period between the date of their posting (see www.scufn.submission.org) and the next SCUFN meeting."

Overview of Proposals. Suggest replacing with "**Overview of Proposals for Review by SCUFN Members**". Two mechanisms are presented to select the proposal(s) to review: on the left hand column, an accurate selection process combining year, country, status and/or name; and on the right hand column, a selection process based on a year or a country or a status. At first glance, this may appear confusing; however, this double choice provides more flexibility to select the proposal(s) to review and therefore it is suggested to keep it as it is. Regarding the selection mechanism on the right hand column, the tables shown after clicking on "Status" have the number 4 everywhere in the 1st column on the left. It should be 1, 2, 3, 4 etc.

"Status" options for selection of proposals to review. There is no point in reviewing "proposed names" with status "ACCEPTED" (or "ADOPTED") and "NOT ACCEPTED", as SCUFN has already taken a decision regarding those names. I therefore suggest keeping only the criteria "WAITING" (not "DEFER") and "PENDING" (in case, additional or new information has been received from the proposer). In the latter case (PENDING), the reason for pending and/or the associated action, taken from the relevant SCUFN meeting, should be mentioned in the row "STATUS" (to replace "RESULTS"). Any file containing additional or new information provided by the proposer can be identified by its

date of posting, as shown in the "FILES" row, that is, the date of posting is subsequent to that of the relevant meeting.

Historical Assessment Records. However, it may be useful for SCUFN members to be able to view past comments made on proposals for which a final decision has been taken by SCUFN, that is, "ACCEPTED", "ADOPTED" or "NOT ACCEPTED". It is therefore suggested to add below the "Overview of proposals …" window, a line "Historical Assessment Records". When clicking on that line, the SCUFN member will be presented with similar window, but entitled "Overview of proposals - Historical Assessment Records" and limited to those proposals which have been "ACCEPTED", "ADOPTED" or "NOT ACCEPTED".

Proposal Review, "FILES" section. Same remark as in section II.4 above, regarding the "DOWNLOAD" option. we have been unable to open the file when it has been created via "PROPOSAL FORM". Also, the usefulness of that "DOWNLOAD" option is not clearly understood.

Proposal Review, "COMMENTS" section. It is suggested to move this section before the current "FINAL DECISION" section.

Proposal Review, "FINAL DECISION" section. It was assumed that no decision will be taken intersessionally, that all decisions will be taken at SCUFN meetings. This assumption might be wrong but it seems difficult, with 12 SCUFN members, to reach a collective final decision through this tool. It is therefore suggested to replace the title with "CHAIR's RECOMMENDATION" and to add below: "is that the proposed name be:", leaving the choice between:

- ACCEPTED as (Name);
- ADOPTED as (Name);
- Kept PENDING;
- NOT ACCEPTED; and
- Further discussed at the next SCUFN meeting.

This means that this section will be active for the Chair only. We are aware that having to fill this section will place an additional burden on the Chair' shoulders, but this can be considered as one of the Chair's responsibility. In the end, this should facilitate and simplify SCUFN deliberations during meetings.

Annex A – How to proceed for submission of an Undersea Feature Name Proposal

(Text derived from Section 1 of SCUFN27-06A document)

There are two ways to submit a name proposal. If the proposal has been prepared from a Name Proposal Form (from the GEBCO web site) and is available as a DOC or PDF file, then the "FILE UPLOAD" option should be selected. If, alternatively, the proposer wishes to enter the information on the proposed undersea feature name online, then the "PROPOSAL FORM" option should be selected.

Guidance for the preparation of name proposals is provided in IHO-IOC Publication B-6 "Standardization of Undersea Feature Names". In particular, attention is drawn to its appendix "User's Guide for Preparation of Undersea Feature Name Proposals to the GEBCO Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names (SCUFN)".

In both cases, the proposer is required to enter a personal 4 digit password. This password will allow the proposer to access the details of his proposal through the "Search for Proposals" functionality and view/amend it, or attach additional supporting files, as necessary.

For any proposed name, the system will automatically check that this name does not already exist in the GEBCO Gazetteer and is therefore acceptable. Otherwise, the proposer will be invited to propose another specific name.

"FILE UPLOAD" option. Follow the menus and click on "SUBMIT" when the proposal file name is shown in no. 4 box. One important thing is that the proposed name should be the same as your file name without the extension. For instance, your file name is 'scufn canyon.pdf', the proposed file name should be 'scufn canyon.'

"PROPOSAL FORM" option. A popup window presents a proposal form, in a format replicating that shown in B-6 and on the GEBCO web site. Enter the relevant information for the proposed name and associated undersea feature, by filling the concerned boxes. When the form is complete, click on "SUBMIT".

After the proposal has been submitted, it can be retrieved by clicking on "Search - Search for Proposals". To include additional files in support of the proposal (image, DOC, PDF or compressed files), click on the icon beside the proposed name. An "Edit" window is then shown and the additional file(s) can be selected in the "ATTACHMENT" section. Click on "ATTACH" to validate the selected file(s). Image files will be displayed in the "FIGURES" section.

Commented [A1]: This is taken from Doc. SCUFN27-06A. However, it seems that when a different file name from the proposed name is entered, it works, e.g. Bob Fisher Canyon vs Ecuador_Trench.pdf. Anyway, it seems better to allow for flexibility. Unless there is a compelling need to keep it, it is suggested to delete this section.

Appendix B – How to proceed for assessing an Undersea Feature Name Proposal?

(Text derived from Section 2 of SCUFN27-06A document)

To enter this website, there is a need to get an account from the super user, which is IHO. There are two grades to access this website: SCUFN Chair and SCUFN Member.

When you enter this website, you can view the proposal(s) based on "year", "country", and "status". When you click on one of the menu items, you can see all proposals submitted and waiting for assessment. Click on the icon beside the proposal that you wish to review, and you will see the "proposal window" showing the file information.

If the proposal has been submitted as a file ("FILE UPLOAD" option), click on 'DOWNLOAD' on the 'FILES' row, so as to download the proposal file in your local directory. After reviewing the proposal, write your comments in the "COMMENTS" section and "SUBMIT" them.

If the proposal has been submitted in the format of the submission website ("PROPOSAL FORM" option), click on "VIEW" on the "FILES" row and you can see the proposal in the pop-up windows. After reviewing the proposal, write your comments in the "COMMENTS" section and "SUBMIT" them.

As can be guessed, the "Chair's Recommendation" section is accessible by the SCUFN Chair only. After reading all SCUFN Member's comments, for a given proposal, the Chair will make a recommendation to the next SCUFN meeting that the proposed name be "ACCEPTED as (Name)", "ADOPTED as (Name)", "kept PENDING", "NOT ACCEPTED", or "further discussed at the next SCUFN meeting". Then he will click on "CONFIRM".

Any past assessment information including Member's comments and Chair's recommendations will be stored in a "Historical Assessment Records Database". Therefore, when you want to look at comments made on previous proposals, select "Historical Assessment Records", then choose "YEAR", "COUNTRY", or "STATUS", as appropriate, in the main window and you can consult the proposals' historical background.