UNITED NATIONS GROUP OF EXPERTS   **Working Paper**
ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES   **No. 60/7**

Twenty-ninth Session
Bangkok, Thailand, 25 to 29 April 2016

Item 7 of the provisional agenda

**Implementation of resolutions and activities relating to
the Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation**

Evaluation of the Twenty-eighth Session of the UNGEGN:
A Review of the Questionnaire Survey Results[*]

---

[*] Prepared by Sungjae Choo (Republic of Korea), Convenor of the Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation, and Yeon-Taek Ryu (Republic of Korea)

Evaluation of the Twenty-eighth Session of the UNGEGN:
A Review of the Questionnaire Survey Results[†]

SUMMARY

Fifty-three responses to the evaluation questionnaire were collected at the 28th Session of the UNGEGN. An analysis of the Likert scale evaluations on the programs, contents and logistics of the Session indicated an overall satisfaction with the Session. All respondents gave a positive evaluation (expectations were met for 52 out of 53; 49 out of 53 evaluated the meeting to be very successful or successful). Documents were evaluated to be the most useful, followed by networking opportunities with other delegates, workshops, and special presentations. With regard to the logistics of the meeting, such items as retaining Working Group activities as agenda items, allocation of time, and summarizing groups of documents were given positive ratings. For future sessions, it was suggested to allow longer breaks for networking, more social events, more discussion about topical issues, more special presentations, time limit on presenting documents, and so on. Toponymic training and the implementation of resolutions were ranked at the top of the to-do list before the 11th UNCGSN in 2017.

Overview

At the 28th Session of the UNGEGN in New York, 2014, evaluation questionnaire forms were circulated in three languages: English, French and Spanish (see Annex 1). A total of fifty-three responses were collected. For 12 respondents (24.5%), this was their first time participating in a UNGEGN Session, while for 14 respondents (28.6%), it was their second or third time attending, and 23 respondents (46.9%) had attended more than three times. The collection of responses and tabulation of basic statistics were conducted by the UNGEGN Secretariat.

Evaluations on the Programs and Contents

An overall assessment of the Session was very positive. Most of the respondents indicated that it had met their expectations (52 out of 53, 98.1%). Most of the respondents rated the success of the Session very highly or highly (49 out of 53, 92.5%).

When divided by each element of the Session, documents were evaluated to be the most useful. Talking and networking with other delegates, workshops, special presentations, Working Group meetings, Division meetings, and exhibition and displays also received very positive ratings.

With regard to the logistics of the Session, such items as retaining Working Group activities as agenda items, allocation of time, summarizing groups of documents, duration of the Session (five days), and distinguishing discussion papers from information papers were evaluated positively with over 80 percent giving 'positive' or 'very positive' ratings, while time for Working Group and Division meetings was evaluated less positively, receiving a few negative responses.

[†] This working paper pertains to the UNCSGN resolutions VI/4 (Working group on evaluation) and X/1 (11th UNCSGN and 28th Session of the UNGEGN).

Table 1. Evaluation of the usefulness of each program and content of the Session

	very high	high	moderate	low	very low	high and very high (%)
Usefulness of documents	22	29	1	0	0	98.1
Usefulness of special presentations	28	21	3	1	0	92.5
Usefulness of workshops	7	22	2	0	0	93.5
Usefulness of Working Group meetings	14	31	4	0	0	91.8
Usefulness of Division meetings	13	26	6	0	0	86.7
Usefulness of exhibition/displays	10	26	11	1	0	75.0
Usefulness of talking/networking with experts	28	21	3	0	0	94.2

Table 2. Evaluation of the logistics of the Session

	very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative	positive and very positive (%)
Duration of Conference: 5 days	19	22	7	2	0	82.0
Allocation of time	16	28	5	0	0	89.8
Discussion versus information papers	18	22	8	1	0	81.6
Summarizing groups of documents	17	25	5	2	0	85.7
Resolutions WG activities as agenda items	19	28	2	0	0	95.9
Time for WG and Division meetings	11	25	10	4	0	72.0

UNCSGN Resolutions

With regard to UNCSGN resolutions, most of the respondents indicated that the resolutions are very useful or useful for managers of geographical names in promoting the standardization of geographical names (44 out of 49, 89.8%). Most of the respondents rated the importance of the implementation of the resolutions in each country's work on geographical names very highly or highly (46 out of 48, 95.8%).

Table 3. Evaluation of the usefulness of UNCGSN resolutions for managers of geographical names in promoting geographical names standardization

	very useful	useful	moderate	seldom useful	never useful	useful and very useful (%)
Usefulness of UNCSGN resolutions	28	16	5	0	0	89.8

Table 4. Evaluation of the importance of the implementation of UNCSGN resolutions in each country's work on geographical names

	very useful	useful	moderate	seldom useful	never useful	useful and very useful (%)
Implementation of UNCSGN resolutions	34	12	2	0	0	95.8

Comments and Suggestions for the Next Session

Suggestions for special presentations and workshops for the next Session included:

- UNCSGN resolutions
- Asian-oriented theme in presentations
- presentation of geographical names as cultural heritage
- workshop covering a basic concept for less developed countries
- future relationship between UNGEGN and UNGGIM

The following groups of comments and suggestions were noted for the next Session:

- longer breaks for networking
- more social events
- more discussion about topical issues
- more special presentations
- time limit on presenting documents

Eight countries answered affirmatively to the question on the assistance need for establishing a geographical names standardization programme. Assistance was mostly required in training courses and expert visits. Toponymic training and the implementation of resolutions were ranked at the top of the to-do list before the 11th UNCSGN in 2017.

APPENDIX.

EVALUATION

28th Session of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names
New York, 28 April – 2 May 2014

Your information: Country _____

How many times have you attended UNGEGN sessions?   Once☐   2 or 3 times☐   More than 3 times☐

I.   Overall Assessment

Did the Session meet your expectations?   Yes ☐   No ☐

How would you rate the success of the Session? Very high☐ High☐ Moderate☐ Low☐ Very low☐

II.   Programs and Contents

1.   How useful was each of the following programs and contents for you?

	very high	high	moder-ate	low	very low
a. Documents – reading and discussion					
b. Special presentations					
c. Workshops					
d. Working Group meetings					
e. Division meetings					
f. Exhibition/displays					
g. Talking and networking with other delegates					

2.   What changes would you suggest for future UNGEGN sessions?   Please specify.

_____

_____

3. **Please make suggestions for special presentations and workshops for the next UNGEGN session (topics, presenters, organization, logistics, etc.).**

_____

_____

_____

4. **What is your reaction to each of the following in reference to the 28th Session?**

	very positive	positive	neutral	negative	very negative
a. Duration of UNGEGN Session: 5 days					
b. Allocation of time to agenda items and working papers					
c. Distinguishing "discussion" papers from "information" papers					
d. Summarizing groups of documents, rather than individual presentations					
e. Retaining Working Group activities as agenda items					
f. Time available for WG and Division meetings outside the Session					

III. **Resolutions and General Work of UNGEGN**

1. **How useful do you think it is for managers of geographical names, including yourself, to refer to UNCSGN resolutions in promoting geographical names standardization?**

   Very useful ☐   Useful ☐   Moderate ☐   Seldom useful ☐   Never useful ☐

2. **How important do you think it is to implement UNCSGN resolutions in each country's work on geographical names?**

   Very important ☐   Important ☐   Moderate ☐   Seldom important ☐   Never important ☐

3. **What do you think are the factors that hinder the implementation of resolutions?**

_____

4. **What are the most important items that you would like to see UNGEGN undertake before the 11th Conference in 2017?**

_____

5. **Does your country need assistance in establishing a geographical names standardization programme?   Yes ☐   No ☐**

    If yes, what type of help do you want? (e.g. training course, expert visit, manual publishing)

    _____

6. **Do you have any other comments you wish to make?**

    _____

    _____