

SCAR GEOSCIENCES STANDING SCIENTIFIC GROUP (GSSG)

**REPORT OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES
ON THE
SCAR COMPOSITE GAZETTEER OF ANTARCTICA (CGA)
Freiburg (Germany)**

Prepared by Roberto Cervellati and Maria Chiara Ramorino c/o ENEA, Rome

When the SCAR WG-GGI met, as such, for the last time in Shanghai, in July 2002, a few goals were proposed for the CGA. They are recalled here in the following.

The compilation of the CGA should continue, thus collecting definitions and dates of approval for all the already recorded names; collecting at the same time all new names for those features not yet named. Countries should be urged once more to send their contributions.

The CGA web site would be periodically updated as in the past.

It was left for the discussion in the WG-GGI, or in the Standing Scientific Group to be tasked with the CGA, to decide whether sometime in the future:

- 1 - all data collected would be considered ready for a publication; alternatively, if data should remain, as they are now, only accessible on the web;
- 2 - a policy about existing multiple names should be exploited.

The Italian team entrusted with the compilation of existing geographical names of Antarctica tabled at Shanghai meeting the following contributes

a) **"What's new in the CGA"**. The document contained all the addenda or amendments intervened after August 2000 and before July 2002. It updated the first edition (March 1998) of the SCAR Composite Gazetteer of Antarctica (CGA) and the "Supplement to the First Edition" issued in year 2000 and circulated at the Tokyo's Meeting.

The document "What's new in the CGA" was meant to be used jointly with the Volume 1, Volume 2 and Supplement. It listed 242 names and features not existing in the CGA in August 2000 plus 235 names already existing in the CGA but adopted by new countries, plus several tens items somehow modified.

b) The second contribution was the **"Composite Gazetteer of Antarctica (CGA), Volume 2, Draft July 2002, Letter A only"**. The rationale of this contribution was the following. Since March 1998, it had been recognized that the CGA should incorporate, for each listed name, the description of the feature and the date of approval of the name. The additional information, which is not always present in the national Gazetteers, was felt necessary to allow the future work of comparison and, perhaps, choice of the names. All countries were requested to supply the additional information, an effort limited - as a first step - to names beginning with letter "A" only. The "Draft July 2002, Letter A only" was a preview of a possible future edition of Volume 2 of the CGA completed with **descriptions** and **dates of approval**.

c) The third contribution was called **"Analysis of the CGA"**. The analysis took into consideration a statistically significant set of features and classified them according to the number of names received, i.e. single or multiple naming. In the case of multiple naming, the features were further classified to separate conflicting situations from situations where identical and quasi-identical multiple names are in use. The main result of the analysis was that an estimated three quarter of the features in the CGA do not exhibit any true naming problem. Serious differences, which would require a discussion on a case-by-case base, affects about 10% of the features.

Twenty two Countries contribute in maintaining the CGA updated. It is well known that to those national contributions the GEBCO catalog for undersea features should be added.

The present situation with the Countries and GEBCO is summarized in the following.

Argentina. We are in touch with Maria Cristina Morandi and Silvina Bouzas. The last messages exchanged after the Shanghai Meeting, July 2002, were meant to obtain some refinements about letter A toponyms, which are already included in the CGA; and to encourage the Argentineans to further collaborate in view of the new CGA supplement to be prepared before Bremen Meeting, July 2004.

Australia. We have been in touch with Henk Brolsma and Suzanne Stallman. Unfortunately we just learned that Mrs Stallman is no more active in this field. Henk is working hard on several related items. One of them are the maps and geographical names at Grove Larseman Hills. Some order among Chinese, Australian, Russian and USA names used in the area is expected as a fallout of this activity. The CGA will be updated accordingly.

All Australian names have now a description.

For the all problems relating the CGA with the Australian gazetteer our correspondent is now Henk Brolsma. We have not exchanged many messages soon after the Shanghai Meeting but now we are in touch frequently. Henk, jointly with Dave Watts, has created a link on the web from the SCAR map catalogue and the SCAR/CGA and other gazetteers.

Belgium. We are in touch since many years (1966) with Hugo Declair. We met him once more at the Shanghai Meeting and he promised to send to our office in Rome descriptions and date of approval.

Bulgaria. The country has contributed a complete information for about one hundred names: Our correspondent is Ivanov Lyubomir.

Canada. The Geographical Names Board of Canada approved, already in November 2000, a single geographical name. Soon after Olav Loken, Secretary of the Canadian Committee for Antarctic Research, submitted the name for the inclusion in the CGA following the required procedure. No other news from Canada.

Chile. The only data we have in the CGA are still those printed on a publication, on paper, dated 1974. We are in touch since Shanghai meeting with Ten.Col. Rodrigo Barriga Vargas, at that time the member of the WG-GGI. We have received from him the CD "Listado de Nombres Geograficos" which contains only names of Chile, however, and not Antarctic names.

China. The last additions to the Chinese list are dated December 2001 (20 names). No reply until now to our request for obtaining descriptions and dates about the last 20 names. We meet in Shanghai with E Dongchen but we had no other news since then.

France. The last correspondence with Benoît Guiu is dated 20 September 2002 when he was near to retirement. We obtained from him the name of the person who was going to take his position. We have recently contacted this person, Delphine Delgagne, who confirms her availability. French data are nevertheless stuck at the point they were in 1997 when the WG-GGI member was Mr. Le Pape. France was not represented at the last WG-GGI meeting in Shanghai.

Germany. http://fwserver1.ifag.de/kartographie/geoname-antarctic/geo_nam_ant_p1.html is the web site where all German names are listed. We visit the site regularly and transfer new names from there to the CGA. The last German approved name (Weimar-Eishöcker) is dated 31 October 2001.

India. We hadn't any further contact with A. Mitra after the list of 28 names which were received in 1998 and are all we still have about India in the CGA.

Italy. Italy has an Antarctic Geographical Names Committee since 1997. The Committee has now 7 Members. In the Committee the Army's and the Navy's geographic expertise are represented as well as that of the University and the Italian Geographic Society. The Committee has approved until now 40 names: 39 of them apply to previously unnamed features while 1 (Enigma Lake) existed already in the New Zealand gazetteer. All forty names have been included in the SCAR CGA.

Japan. We are not in touch with any Japanese representative. We have been told that Kiichi Moriwaki, the author of the excellent "Gazetteer of eastern Dronning Maud Land" circulated at the Tokyo's Meeting, has now retired. No news about Japanese names at the Shanghai Meeting or after then.

New Zealand. A web site of the Geographic Board of New Zealand encompasses names of both New Zealand and Ross Dependency. We are not sure whether the NZ Antarctic Gazetteer is fully available there. We know however that there are a few names (49) that have been approved by NZ after Shanghai's Meeting but have not been notified to the CGA's team in Rome. The last NZ contribution to the CGA is "Wratt Peak" approved on 28.06.02.

Norway. We are in touch with Anne Urset since March 2002. At that time we received as a Norwegian contribution the letter "A" list with descriptions and some date of approval. This list, containing 63 names, is not yet included in the CGA because M.C. Ramorino urged A. Urset for sending the other letters (in order to simplify her own work). However no further exchange of mail intervened since then.

Poland. We are having fruitful and frequent contacts with Ian Cisak. After Shanghai's Meeting we received from him 13 new names plus two amended names (see table above).

Russia. The list of Russian names incorporated in the SCAR CGA is rather old and we feel it contains several errors. We are in contact with Alexander Yuskevitch who in January 2002 informed us that his enterprise Aerogeodeziya should start the revision of the Russian gazetteer. We have not got any updating about this point. However he sent us, just before Shanghai's Meeting, three names (one of them was Vostok Lake) which have been included in the CGA. The last e-mail to him was about a message from Roger Payne (US) who pointed out that Vostok Station is not at South Pole. The remark was forwarded to Alexander.

Spain. After 30 names received in 1997 from Jeronimo Lopez we have not exchanged any letter with him or any other Spanish partner. The 30 names were completed by short definitions. As to the dates of approval they were not present in the list but reference could be made to a published paper which contains them all.

South Africa. We had not any recent contact with South Africa. However this country doesn't pose any problem. The SCAR CGA contains only two S.A. names which we received in 1997.

U.K. We have good and frequent contacts with the UK's Janet Thomson. The last updating consisted in a list of 5 names, received in July 2001. The work of adding information to or revising the existing names has been completed for the letter "A" but we know from Janet that the letter "B" is in progress.

Uruguay. The list of Uruguayan names is frozen to the 5 names received in 1997. They are complete as to the descriptions and dates of approval. Our correspondent has been the President of the Instituto Antartico Uruguayo, C. Ruggero.

U.S.A. The last updating was acquired by the CGA in year 2000 and consisted in 284 new names. The USA maintains a site where to consult the geographic names database.

From an inspection of the NZ web site it appears that the US has recently approved 47 new names. We know the list of the new names but we will wait for an official communication from the US representative for them and for any other list which we are unaware of but could have been added recently.

GEBCO. No recent contacts with GEBCO for the undersea features. The SCUFN (Sub-Committee on Undersea Feature Names) meets any second year. The CGA has acquired the last updating after the 2001 meeting of SCUFN and we expect the next updating during the present year. Our contact person is Mr. Huet.

Conclusion

The discussion above shows that the compilation of the SCAR/CGA is progressing but we don't think that the speed is satisfactory. While the collection of the already existing name lists, i.e. national gazetteers, proved to be a relatively easy task, now that the countries are required to supply additional information about names, such as the feature description or the history of a particular naming process, it appears rather difficult to get around the world sufficiently available and motivated partners. The notification of obvious misspelling or co-ordinate errors receives in general a quick and grateful reply; however the request of supplying a sensible amount of information requiring a true effort is not producing an adequate response.

On the other hand the authority of SCAR and value of the CGA are widely recognized and the SCAR recommendations about avoiding double naming and reporting new names to the CGA are more or less followed.

To maintain a permanent link between the group responsible for the CGA (presently the Italian group, i.e. the authors) is felt as the essential ingredient to the vitality and usefulness of the CGA. However we feel at present a sense of disbandment connected to the disbanding of the former WG-GGI. While with a stable WG membership it would be a straightforward step to address the members and to renew the request of supplying their contribute (new names, corrections, descriptions etc.), at present is not clear who in the SSG Geoscience is in charge for that, if any.

We think that the latter point should be discussed in Freiburg. An action aimed at reassembling an Antarctic geographic names community should perhaps be taken with help the SSG Chairman.