representative of Australia, met and reported that the credentials of all the delegates had been found in order.

Adoption of the agenda

8. The Conference adopted as its agenda the provisional agenda prepared by the Secretariat. The agenda as adopted is given in annex II.

Establishment of technical committees

9. The Conference established four technical committees and referred several items of the agenda to them. Below is a list of the committees :

Committee I. National standardization. (item 9)
Chairman: Mr. B. P. Lambert (Australia);
Vice-Chairman: Mr. L. Ratajski (Poland);
Rapporteurs: Mr. E. F. Halvorsen (Norway) and Mr. E. J. Holmgren (Canada).[3]

Committee II. Geographical terms. (item 10)
Chairman: Mr. F. Gall (Guatemala);
Vice-Chairman: Mr. Y. M. Nawabi (Iran);
Rapporteur: Mr. A. Roşu (Romania).

Committee III. Writing systems. (item 11)
Chairman: Mr. H. A. G. Lewis (United Kingdom);
Vice-Chairman: Mr. B. Khamasundara (Thailand);
Rapporteur: Mr. A. Pégorier (France).

Committee IV. International co-operation. (item 12)
Chairman: Mr. J. K. Fraser (Canada);
Vice-Chairman: Mr. A. Matta (Lebanon);
Rapporteur: Mr. J. Loxton (Kenya).

[3] Mr. E. S. Holmgren was appointed by the Chairman of Committee I to replace Mr. E. F. Halvorsen upon his departure.

Work of the Conference

10. In addition to the many committee meetings which took place, the Conference also held nine plenary meetings. The work of the Conference is summarized in chapter II. The resolutions and recommendations adopted by the Conference are given in chapter III. A list of the documents submitted to the Conference may be found in annex IV.

Closing session

11. The President of the Conference congratulated the delegates on their excellent work and co-operation and expressed satisfaction at the useful exchange of ideas that had taken place. Many participants assured the President that the success of the Conference would be long remembered.

II. SUMMARY OF THE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference considered items 7 and 8 of the agenda in plenary session. Under item 7 each representative was given the opportunity to summarize briefly the work done in his country on the standardization of geographical names. Under item 8 the participants briefly discussed their experiences on problems of domestic standardization of geographical names which were listed in section II of the first report of the Group of Experts on Geographical Names.[4] The information introduced under items 7 and 8 proved most useful in the work of the four principal committees which were formed to cover the substantive work of the Conference. Each of these committees was responsible for an item of the agenda: Committee I, item 9 (National standardization); Committee II, item 10 (Geographical terms); Committee III, item 11 (Writing systems); and Committee IV, item 12 (International co-operation). At its 8th and 9th plenary meetings, the Conference considered and adopted the reports of the committees and the draft resolutions submitted. A brief summary of the discussions in these committees follows.

Committee I

Committee I accepted the definition of national standardization as "the fixing by each country of the writing of the geographical names of that country in the official administrative language or languages of that country" proposed by the Group of Experts in paragraph 12 of its report on the preparatory meeting for the Conference.[5] The Committee also unanimously agreed that the relevant recommendations in the first report of the Group of Experts would be used as a basis for its discussions. As a result of its deliberations, the Committee adopted a draft resolution containing several recommendations. The draft resolution was adopted by the Conference as resolution 4.

Questions discussed or touched upon in the discussion of national names authorities included: the size and composition of national committees; the necessity for having both linguists and cartographers and various authorities represented on committees; centralization as opposed to decentralization; local committees on nomenclature; permanent or *ad hoc* membership of administrative bodies dealing with geographical names; and the diversity of conditions and experience in the standardization of geographical names. The proposals and amendments submitted were referred to a working group. The Committee approved the draft recommendation prepared by the working group, which was adopted by the Conference as recommendation A of resolution 4.

During the consideration of sub-item 9 (*a*), "Field collection of names", several representatives reported on the work done and the progress made in this field in their countries. A general discussion followed during which various points were considered, such as the use of tape recorders in the field, the problems of air photography, and the importance of finding good informants. The use of linguistic experts in the field found support. It was also pointed out that aerial photographs were often better than maps for field work, since many informants could not read maps but could find things on photographs. A working group on this

[4] The report of the Group of Experts on Geographical Names on its meeting in June-July 1960 on the question of domestic standardization appears in *World Cartography,* vol. VII (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 62.I.25), pages 7-18; throughout this chapter it is referred to as the first report of the Group of Experts.

[5] See annex III.

question prepared a draft recommendation, which was approved by the Committee and adopted by the Conference as recommendation B of resolution 4.

In the discussion of sub-item 9 (*b*), "Office treatment of names", the representative of Norway called attention to the fact that names were part of a country's national heritage. The Committee unanimously agreed that both linguists and cartographers were needed in the office treatment of names; linguists decided on the spelling of names and topographers decided which names to include and their exact location on maps. The representative of Monaco referred to the interest of the International Federation of Tourist Centres in the standardization of geographical names. The representative of the United States of America drew attention to a document containing instructions to United States personnel on preparing geographic names reports (E/CONF.53/L.53) and said that a further document would be circulated by his delegation on instructions to field personnel on the collection and office treatment of names issued by the United States Geological Survey. The representative of the Netherlands wished to include a recommendation for the adaptation of spellings of place names to the orthographic system used in that country. The representatives of Austria and the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out difficulties in such a procedure. The representative of the Netherlands then proposed that a recommendation should be included providing for the adaptation of spellings of place names as far as possible to the existing spelling system of the language.

A working group on sub-item 9 (*b*) prepared a draft recommendation on the subject, which was adopted as recommendation C of resolution 4.

During the discussion of sub-item 9 (*c*), "Decisions relating to multilingual areas", the representative of Austria proposed the inclusion of a recommendation to all countries with minority languages that due regard should be paid on maps to names in the language of a minority population. The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America pointed out that it was difficult to define the term "minority language" and warned against too specific a recommendation. It was argued that recommendation VII in the first report of the Group of Experts covered the point raised by the representative of Austria. The Committee agreed to set up a special working group to formulate a recommendation on this point. A draft recommendation prepared by the working group was approved by the Committee and adopted by the Conference as recommendation D of resolution 4.

The Committee then considered sub-item 9 (*d*), "National gazetteers". The Chairman proposed the reformulation of the relevant recommendations in the first report of the Group of Experts. The Committee agreed and referred the matter to a working group. The working group's draft recommendation on the subject was approved by the Committee and adopted by the Conference as recommendation E of resolution 4.

Under sub-item 9 (*f*), "Automatic data processing", the representative of the United States of America summarized the work done in his country. The Committee then discussed various points, including the relative advantages of using punch cards as opposed to tape, difficulties in handling diacritical marks, and problems presented by long names. The representative of the United Kingdom stated that tape seemed to offer the greatest advantages. The representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also commented on their countries' experiences in automatic data processing. A working group composed of representatives of these five countries submitted a draft resolution, which was approved by the Committee. The draft resolution was adopted by the Conference as resolution 3.

The Committee agreed to the Chairman's suggestion that there be inserted in the definition of a national names authority appearing in the first report of the Group of Experts the words "or co-ordinated group of bodies", so that the definition would read: "A body or co-ordinated group of bodies having authority and instructions to standardize names within a country".

Committee II

Committee II undertook the review of the list of selected technical terms prepared by the Group of Experts on Geographical Names and annexed to its first report.

After a brief discussion, the Committee generally agreed with the definitions, in both English and French, of most of the terms listed. The definitions of "generic term" and "glossary" were not considered adequate and, in addition, several participants wanted a definition of "category". A working group was selected to review these matters and reported that "category" was considered to entail too many complications and that a suitable definition could not at that time be formulated. The working group presented new definitions for "generic term" and "glossary" for the Committee's consideration.

The Committee laid special emphasis on the study of the nature of geographical entities, and gave careful consideration to the list of technical terms. It submitted to the Conference a draft resolution containing several recommendations. This was adopted by the Conference as resolution 19.

The Committee also submitted a revised version of recommendation VII in the first report of the Group of Experts. The revised text was adopted by the Conference (see resolution 20).

Committee III

Committee III, upon reviewing the list of documents presented by the participants, agreed that the subject of the transference of names should be divided into four categories: transference from (i) ideograms, (ii) syllabic scripts, (iii) the Roman alphabet, (iv) non-Roman scripts.

The Chairman drew attention to the two reports of the Group of Experts, and specifically to recommendation VII in the first report. All the participants agreed that the Committee should co-ordinate its activities with Committees I and II on this recommendation, and a working group was organized.