

United Nations Group of Experts on  
Geographical Names

---

15th Session  
Geneva, Switzerland, 11-19 November 1991  
Agenda Item 8, Report of the Working Group on Evaluation

Prepared by Dr. Richard R. Randall, USA  
Convenor of the Working Group

This report is submitted by the convenor of the Working Group. It contains five annexes:

- ANNEX A. Summary Report and Recommendations, p. 1
- ANNEX B. Work Carried out by Working Group Members, p. 5  
and Others
- ANNEX C. Responses to UNGEGN Questionnaire, p.7.
- ANNEX D. Comments on Resolutions of Fifth UN Conference, p.13
- ANNEX E. National Names Agencies, p. 14

The convenor notes the annexes do not correspond precisely with topics on the agenda of the 15th session. Owing to information provided by respondents and because of a perceived requirement to modify the format of the findings, the original structure has not been followed. Nevertheless, the convenor believes the mode of presentation is useful.

Paragraph 3 of Annex A provides the principal recommendations developed by the convenor in reaction to many comments from respondents, and in close collaboration with Mr. Dorion, then-Chairman of the UNGEGN. As indicated, the recommendations call for a basic modification of UNGEGN efforts to overcome perceived inefficiencies and to promote more positive results.

The convenor thanks the many individuals who submitted materials and information. The convenor also recommends the 15th UNGEGN accept the report and act to prepare an appropriate resolution on the topics for the 6th UN Conference.

## ANNEX A. SUMMARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Submitted by Dr. Richard R. Randall, USA  
Convenor of Working Group

### 1. Introduction.

Resolution 4 of the 5th UN Conference on Geographical Names in 1987 created a Working Group to Evaluate the UNGEGN and Review UN Resolutions and to report to the 14th UNGEGN. The convenor circulated a questionnaire to national authorities to obtain information on UNGEGN programs and the application of resolutions. Working Paper 31 of UNGEGN 14 provided the responses to the questionnaire and recommended further actions.

During and after the session, the convenor met with members of the Working Group, the UNGEGN Chairman, and others to discuss further tasks. One action was to send the questionnaire to countries not responding to the first questionnaire. (NOTE: Responses coming after 1 August 1991 could not be incorporated into a report dealing with all responses, Annex C.)

### 2. Background

An analysis of the responses to questionnaires and of factors concerning the UNGEGN and UN resolutions led to various conclusions. One conclusion is that while UN programs have brought notable progress in national and international names programs, there are significant exceptions. Perhaps the chief one is that too many nations do not benefit from UN efforts. Basically, they are not able to establish names authorities. This justifies a review of several factors, including the principles which guide our work.

The UNGEGN principles should reflect the basic statements adopted by UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) resolutions cited in Annex V of the report of the Fifth UN Conference. The initial statement (1959) recognized the need for national names standardization bodies and requested the Secretary General (SG) create a small group to recommend appropriate procedures and consider holding an international conference. The initiatives proceeded from a report of the SG on international cooperation in cartography.

The second ECOSOC statement (1968): referred to a UN conference on names, noted conference recommendations, recommended the "Ad hoc" Group of Experts to coordinate national activities, approved terms of reference for the same group, and requested a second UN conference. The ECOSOC statement also referred to a report on international

cooperation in cartography. The third ECOSOC statement (1973) noted the third UN conference (in 1972) and agreed the "Ad hoc" Group of Experts should be the UN Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN).

Successive conferences and UNGEGN sessions made further modifications to aims, principles, and procedures. The "Statute and Rules of Procedures of the UNGEGN," Annex V of the report of the Fifth Conference, is the current statement of guidelines. (NOTE: Annex V of UNGEGN 14 modified certain of the guidelines.)

### 3. Recommendations.

#### A. Revision of Aims and Functions.

The Working Group reviewed the guidelines and concluded they may be overly passive with regard to the challenges facing national and international standardization. Based on this conclusion and a review of the questionnaire responses, the members agreed the UNGEGN needs to consider different tactics and become more action oriented if it is to meet those challenges. Accordingly, the Working Group recommends the present statement of Aims of the Statute and Rule of Procedures of the UNGEGN be revised as shown below.

#### I. AIMS

The basic aims of the Group of Experts are:

- a. To promote the benefits of standardization at the national and international levels.
- b. To study principles, policies, and procedures of standardization to assure adequate comprehension of how the field applies most effectively to recognized requirements.
- c. To collect, process, and disseminate information about standardization.
- d. To implement tasks assigned by UN conferences.
- e. To play an active role in creating national and international standardization bodies.

#### III. FUNCTIONS

Several statements of function, such as (i), may be passive and should be eliminated or revised.

In addition, it is recommended the following be added:

"To develop statements of procedures for names standardization applicable to, and in response to, individual national requirements.

"To discourage detailed discussions or studies of topics of a purely onomastic or theoretic nature

"To create mechanisms for establishing specific standardization procedures in response to requests by nations.

"To consider the formation of structures in addition or in place of divisions to deal with issues beyond the capability of divisions to manage.

"To work at highest national, international, and UN levels to bring cartography and names together under UN or other auspices.

"To recognize in-country training as a principle goal for countries lacking standardization capability and to develop appropriate training programs.

"To publish manuals of principal substantive resolutions, such as those related to creation of names standardization or other topics, to provide practical information to broadest possible sector of user community.

#### B. Creation of Supplemental Organization.

Recognizing that the divisions alone may not be the best system for delivering benefits to those nations unable to participate in UNGEGN or UN programs, a supplemental organizational structure may be helpful. Below is a functional structure which classifies nations according to their involvement with standardization. The structure can be helpful in developing plans to assist nations that either do not receive UN guidelines or do not apply them. The structure also recognizes the natural tie between cartography and toponymy and the fact that national cartographic agencies are logical patrons of national names standardization.

##### Structure of functionality levels

Category 1. Mapping program is low level; no names program.

Category 2. Mapping program is functional; no names program.

Category 3. Mapping program is functional; names program is low level.

Category 4. Mapping program and names program are functional.

This system can permit nations to assist others on a one-on-one basis. Nations in category 4 can individually or in collaboration with others assist those in category 1 and 2 who request assistance. Divisions also could assist. It would be desirable if the UN could provide resources for such efforts. Nations should classify themselves as to which category they belong.

It would be useful if a nation in category "4" agreed to assist a nation in category "1" as a test case.

C. The Working Group requests these recommendations be incorporated into a resolution to be presented to the 6th UN Conference on Geographical Names.

ANNEX B. WORK CARRIED OUT BY WORKING GROUP MEMBERS  
AND OTHERS

Compiled by Dr. Richard R. Randall, USA  
Convenor of Working Group

Resolution 4 of the 5th UN Conference on Geographical Names in 1987 created a Working Group to Evaluate the UNGEGN and UN Resolutions. The Convenor conferred with UNGEGN Chairman Dorion and others to establish an agenda of actions designed to obtain ideas for improving our work.

This report briefly identifies the actions and the results obtained. It also refers to annexes accompanying this report that provide more detailed information on specified topics. For various reasons, not all assignments could be completed. Yet the information provided is useful and deserves serious consideration. Some topics need further attention..

1. Circulate questionnaire to nations not responding to questionnaire in 1988 and in early 1989; and seek opinions from all nations on resolutions of the Fifth UN Conference.

ACTION: RANDALL (USA)

STATUS: SEE ANNEX A

CONCLUSIONS: Several broad conclusions are justified. Few resolutions can be--or have been--implemented by a majority of nations, and in general a number of resolutions require revision for clarity. A major hindrance to the application of resolutions is the lack of a national names authority. Coordination with cartographic organizations is supported. UNGEGN should make a greater effort to encourage the creation of national names bodies. A publication highlighting major resolutions would help in this regard. Training should be a new major initiative. A single UNGEGN session between conferences should be considered. Limiting the number of experts is recommended to avoid participation of individuals not familiar with names standardization. Avoiding discussion of non-practical topics is suggested. A supplemental structure of UNGEGN should be sought if the body is to accomplish its mission, the major part of which might be seen as enabling more countries to create functioning names authorities. These and perhaps other recommendations should be conveyed to the appropriate UN bodies for implementation.

2. Study resolutions The goal was to interpret the value and effect of resolutions, with emphasis on those of the Fifth Conference.

ACTION: RANDALL (USA) AND KERFOOT (CANADA)

STATUS: SEE ANNEX D

CONCLUSIONS: It is perhaps too soon to determine how most nations have responded to resolutions of the Fifth Conference. Nevertheless, some countries indicate they have applied them. The annex reflects comments of the reviewers.

3. Redefine the objectives of the UNGEGN.

ACTION: DORION (CANADA) AND MATTISSON (SWEDEN)  
STATUS: NO REPORT (But note ANNEX A)

4. Restructure the UNGEGN. There was agreement that the divisional pattern should be retained, but structural flexibility should be encouraged to deal with program shortcomings.

ACTION: DIVISIONS  
STATUS: NO REPORT (But note ANNEX A)

5. Report to UNGEGN 15 with recommendations for UNGEGN programs and related UN activities.

ACTION: RANDALL (USA)  
STATUS: SEE ANNEX A.

6. List of national names authorities. It was agreed to compile a list of persons in each country who could serve as a point of contact. A request for information was circulated at UNGEGN 14.

ACTION: RANDALL (USA)  
STATUS: SEE ANNEX E  
CONCLUSIONS: The list is useful but is incomplete and subject to periodic change. It is recommended the UNGEGN office compile and circulate lists annually.

7. Coordinate with other technical and professional groups.

ACTION: ORMELING, JR. (NETHERLANDS), RAPER (SOUTH AFRICA), NAHRI (FINLAND), AND MBIKA (GABON).  
STATUS: NO REPORT  
CONCLUSIONS: The International Cartographic Association (ICA) now includes names as a topic for discussion. An ICA meeting in England in 1991 had names on the agenda. Continuing efforts at the international and national level are needed if cartographic organizations are to recognize the significance of names.  
(NOTE: A REPORT BY ORMELING RECEIVED TOO LATE FOR THIS REPORT WILL BE CIRCULATED TO 15TH UNGEGN.)

8. Investigate possible sources of funding. It was agreed that lack of funds restricted programs in many countries and that efforts should be made to identify potential sources.

ACTION: MBIKA (GABON):  
STATUS: NO REPORT.

9. Publicity and promotion of UNGEGN work. At UNGEGN 14, it was agreed to establish a program to provide greater publicity to the mission of national and international standardization.

ACTION: PARK (REPUBLIC OF KOREA)  
STATUS: PARK ASSIGNED TO NEW POSITION; NEW CHAIRMAN NEEDED

ANNEX C. RESPONSES TO UNGEEN QUESTIONNAIRE

Submitted by Dr. Richard R. Randall, USA  
Convenor of the Working Group

Introduction. Working Paper 31 of UNGEEN 14 dealt with responses to a questionnaire circulated in 1988 concerning UNGEEN programs and UN resolutions. The Working Paper reflected responses received from 17 countries before UNGEEN 14. More responses were received later, and in 1991 the convenor circulated the questionnaire to get opinions of countries not responding earlier and to determine the views of all countries concerning resolutions of the 5th Conference.

This report provides information about those later responses to the questionnaire. Paragraph A is a list of countries responding to the questionnaire circulated in 1988 and in 1991. Paragraph B gives summaries of answers to all parts of the questionnaire provided by countries in 1991. Information received after August 1, 1991 is not included.

A. Countries responding to questionnaire

Those with \* responded only after WP 31 was issued.  
Those with \*\* responded before and after WP 31 was issued.  
Others responded only before WP 31 was issued.

Country Extent to which UN resolutions have  
promoted standardization in country  
(L=Little, S=Some, V=Very much  
(V/S=Between Very Much and Some;  
L/S= Between "Little" and "Some.")

Austria-----V  
Bulgaria-----S  
Canada\*\*-----S  
China\*\*-----S  
Cyprus\*-----S  
Czechoslovakia\*\*-----V/S  
Finland-----S  
France\*-----S  
Germany, East-----V  
Germany, West-----V  
Germany\*-----V  
Greece-----S  
Hungary-----S  
India\*-----V  
Israel\*\*-----L  
Italy\*-----L  
Japan-----L  
Kenya\*\*-----V  
Netherlands-----L  
Norway-----S



Pakistan-----S  
 Poland\*-----S  
 Portugal\*-----S  
 South Africa\*\*-----V  
 Sweden-----S  
 Switzerland\*\*-----L/S  
 Thailand-----L  
 United Kingdom\*\*-----L  
 United States\*\*-----L

Of 29 countries responding, 6 said "Very Much", 13 said "Some", and 7 said "Little," and 2 varied between "Very Much," "Some," and "Little."

B. Countries responding after WP 31 was published (which includes some countries whose responses were also covered in WP 31. Two countries answered in 2 categories, as per above)

1. Resolutions

a. Value of resolutions

<u>Little</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Very Much</u>
Italy	China	Czechoslovakia
Switzerland		Germany
UK	Poland	Kenya
US	Portugal	
	Cyprus	
	France	
	Norway	

b. Identify useful resolutions and how implemented

(Note: IV/12 indicates Fourth Conference, Resolution 12)

China: IV/12--Course at Nanjing University, Nov. 88

IV/14--Gazetteers of provinces in work or issued

Canada: V/14, V/17, V/21

Czechoslovakia: V(13, 16, 18)

Cyprus: I/4

France: I/18--proposal for African toponymy; II/28 and III/18--published list of exonyms for Europe; IV/10--published list of country names.

Germany: I(3, 4, 7, 8), II(16, 17, 21, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35), III(2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16-22), IV(2-5, 7, 8, 10, 22, 18, 19, 20, 24), V(2, 4-7, 11-19, 25)

India: IV/3--India starting national gazetteer; IV/5--India preparing toponymic guidelines; IV/12--state mapping authorities standarize names; IV/18--working on transliteration matters; IV/23--topographic surveying includes exonym reduction.

Italy: Referred to fact that without national authority, resolutions cannot be implemented.

Kenya: I/4, II(28, 29); V(18 (working with Tanzania), 10, 12).

Norway: I(3, 4); II(23, 28, 29, 31, 33); III/3; IV(2, 3, 4)

Poland: IV(7, 8, 11, 20, 24),  
Portugal: I/4  
Switzerland: I/1--Improved information on transcription  
IV/4--Prepared toponymic guidelines; V/11

2. Identify resolutions not of interest

Czechoslovakia: V/21  
France: IV/14  
Germany: I/16, II(12,21), III(12,23), IV(8,22) V(3,10)  
India: IV/14  
Kenya: V(1, 2, 4, 7)  
Poland: IV(4, 5, 6)  
Switzerland: IV/11  
Thailand: Res. on maritime, undersea, and  
extraterrestrial names.  
UK: II/11; III(10, 12, 25)  
US: None except V(4, 10, 17, 20, 25)

3. Some resolutions need cancellation or revision

Czechoslovakia: Resolutions need to be more emphatic;  
need to emphasize resolutions should be applied.  
Germany: None  
Italy: Supports value of revision  
Switzerland: Supports idea of revision; says it is task  
of UNGEGN bureau.  
UK: Cites numerous examples of resolutions needing  
revision  
US: Recommends full-scale revision.

4. Factors hindering the implementation of resolutions

Czechoslovakia: cites need for better resolutions  
France: Names standardization difficult because  
several languages are involved; and there is no central  
authority.  
Germany: None.  
India: Complex language picture hinders implementation.  
Italy: No national names authority.  
Kenya: Lack of trained people and funding.  
Norway: Lack of national communications, need to  
simplify and translate resolutions; need better internal  
legislation; need to stress benefits of standardization to  
international society.  
Portugal: No functioning names authority.  
Switzerland: No national authority.  
Thailand: Minor factors hinder implementation.  
UK: "Practical" resolutions have been applied.  
US: Applies resolutions that conform to national  
standards and requirements.

5. For regular UN participants, is enough time spent on topics of national interest?

Yes	To some degree	No
Canada	China	UK
Czechoslovakia	Cyprus	
India	France	
Kenya	Italy	
Switzerland	Portugal	
Norway	US	
Germany		
Poland		
Thailand		

6. For those unable to attend UN sessions, are national interests represented?

Yes	To some degree	No
Kenya	China	India
Germany	Cyprus	Italy
Thailand	Poland	

7. Are UNGEGN divisions the best mechanism for objectives?

Yes	No
China	Switzerland (Yes: permits language groups to collaborate; no: duplicates activities of national bodies.)
Czechoslovakia	
Germany	
Italy	UK
Kenya	US: Recommend building different or additional structure to bring more effective focus on nations lacking authoritative programs.
Poland	
Portugal	

8. What should UNGEGN do to assist national programs?

China: Organize activities to exchange national experiences.

Czechoslovakia: Improve exchange of toponymic concepts among countries.

Germany: More suggestions for public work, more discussions about national reports, more exchange of experience.

Italy: Encourage national bodies to create names office.

Kenya: Provide training (implement Res. V/21).

Norway: Establish national body (Norway to act in 1989).

Poland Promote application of Res. I/4 and IV/20

Portugal: Encourage national bodies to create names office.

Thailand: Promote training. .

Switzerland: Publish brochure of major resolutions as way of persuading national authorities to create names office.

UK: Concentrate on original goals, and stop considering standardization only for international maps.

US: Establish training as principal effort; work to persuade national authorities to create names bodies.

9. Value of collaborating with UN Cartographic meetings

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
China: Send names experts to UN meetings	Czechoslovakia
Germany: Put problems and reports on names on agenda.	Switzerland: "...there is no regional carto conference for area.."
India: UNGEGN should circulate UN carto reports and try to improve communications.	
Italy: Supports idea.	
Kenya: Have joint sessions as seminars, workshops.	
Poland	
Portugal	
Thailand: Have joint carto/names sessions at carto conferences.	
US: Request UN to add names to carto conferences.	

10. Comments on UNGEGN program and effectiveness of UN resolutions.

Czechoslovakia: Resolutions need to be better written and emphasize need for implementation.

Germany: Increase activity on romanization, exonyms, toponymic guidelines, and gazetteers.

Italy: Endorses UNGEGN program but believes resolutions are not particularly effective.

Kenya: Without national support of names programs, resolutions have little impact; UNGEGN should promote implementation of resolutions more effectively.

Norway: Publish UNGEGN handbook; request national authorities to implement resolutions.

Poland: Promote UN programs more effectively.

Switzerland: Recommends having a single UNGEGN session between conferences; recommends monitoring programs to avoid unfruitful actions which repeatedly cover same topics.

UK: Limit number of experts per nation; seek to restrict discussions and vote to countries actively involved with specific topics; avoid discussion of onomastics and toponymy as a subject; and concentrate on international standardization.

US: UNGEGN should seek to improve its structure and function to assure best possible results; UNGEGN programs have tended to overlook needs of many nations in favor of topics reflecting interests of countries with advanced names programs; UNGEGN should revise policies to assure assistance reaches countries unable to participate in meetings; UN resolutions need review and reorganization into more meaningful categories; new resolutions should be limited strictly to those addressing practical topics.

Conclusions. The results of the questionnaires provide useful insight about national views. It is, however, difficult to reach summary and statistically supported conclusions regarding possible alterations in UNEGN and UN programs. It appears that the variations in responses reflect how nations differ in their evaluation of names work and in their ability to pursue stated programs. Some recommendations in paragraph 10 are sound and should be seriously considered.

ANNEX D. COMMENTS ON RESOLUTIONS OF FIFTH UN CONFERENCE

Submitted by Richard R. Randall, USA and Helen Kerfoot, Canada

The US and Canada have studied the 17 resolutions of the Fifth Conference and provide the following comments.

1. The resolutions cover many topics, some of which are directly relevant to UN aims and others are less so. Further, by adding 17 resolutions to the 119 of the first four conferences, the total for the 22-year history of conferences is 136. Such a high number of resolutions tends to suggest their ineffectiveness. Responses to the questionnaire circulated in 1988 and 1991 also make this point.
2. The US and Canada support those resolutions calling for training courses, collaboration with other professional and technical bodies, development of publicity and communications programs, and efforts to evaluate UNEGN programs and UN resolutions for the purpose of improving UN efforts.
3. The US and Canada recommend that future resolutions be kept to a minimum. Other recommendations are to: delete resolutions that are obsolete; combine and rewrite those that overlap in subject; and identify the remaining as valid and important. The US also recommends reclassifying all resolutions as TOKEN (i.e., thanking individuals or host nations), ADMINISTRATIVE (i.e., UNEGN rules, regulations, procedures, classification of work, agenda considerations), or SUBSTANTIVE (i.e., dealing with methods of standardization, or providing guidance to nations needing assistance on standardization programs). Finally, the US recommends the publication of a manual on "substantive" resolutions. Such a manual could assist nations to decide to form standardization bodies or to improve and strengthen existing ones.

ANNEX E. NATIONAL NAMES AUTHORITIES

Submitted by Dr. Richard R. Randall, USA  
Convenor of Working Group

Information corresponds to data provided by listed countries during or after the 14th UNEGN. Further information is requested to update the annex or to eliminate possible errors or discrepancies.

COUNTRY	NAME/ADDRESS OF NAT'L NAMES AUTHORITY	DATE OF FOUNDING AND REFERENCE TO APPROPRIATE LAW OR DECREE	NAME, TITLE & AND ADDRESS OF PRINCIPAL POINT OF CONTACT
Algeria	Institut National de Cartographie Algeria		Mme Yahia-Cherif Harba Conseiller Mission Permanent d'Algeri a Geneve 308, Route de Lousanne, 1293 Bellorne Geneve Switzerland
Austria	Abteilung fur Kartografische Ortsna- menkunde, Osterreichische Statistisches Zentralamt Hintere Zollamtsstr. 2 b A-1033 Vienna, Austria	January 16, 1969, Law of Associations	Dr. Helmut Desoye, Osterreichisches Statistisches Zentralamt Hintere Zollamtsstr. 2 b A-1033 Vienna, Austria
Canada	Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names	Created in 1997 as Geographic Board of Canada currently operating under Order in Council PC 1969-1458 as CPOCN	Helen Kerfoot Exec. Sec. CPOCN 650-815 Booth St. Ottawa Canada K1S 039
Quebec (Canada)	Commission de Toponymie du Quebec 220 Grande Allee Est Quebec Canada G1K 7A6	La Commission de Toponymie existe depuis 75 ans. Son Mandat est specifie aux articles 122 a 128 de la Carte de la langue Francaise (Loi#101)	Reni Mayrand President de la Commission de Toponymie 220 Grande Allee Est Quebec Canada G1K 7A6
China	China Committee on Geographical Names	August 1977, Approved by State Council	Wang Jitong, Secretary General on Geographical names 9 Xihuangchenggen Nanlie Beijing 100032 People's Republic of China



Israel	Government Names Commission The Prime Minister's Office Qiyat Ben Gurion 9100 Jerusalem Israel	Founded by Decree of the Govt. of Israel on 18 April 51; published in Reshumot (Official Gazette of the Govt. of Israel), No. 162, 5/24/51	Nattali Kadmon, Professor of Cartography, The Hebrew University Geography Department Mount Scopus, 91905 Jerusalem Israel
India	Surveyor General of India, Survey of India Hathibarkala, Dehra Dun India	Nil, by traditional practice	Col. P. M. Lakshman, Director Survey of India, Bangalore Southern Circle
Italy			Direttore dell'Istituto Geografico Militare, Firenze, via C. Battisti 10 (Italy)
Japan			Mr. Akira Yaguchi Map Information officer Geographical Survey Institute Kitazato-1, Tsukuba-Shi, Ibaraki-Ken 305 Japan
Kenya	Standing Committee on Geographical Names c/o Director of Surveys, P.O. Box 30046, Nairobi Kenya	The survey act 1961 (Chapter 299 of Laws of Kenya)	Walter J. Absaloms Director of Surveys P.O.Box 30046 Nairobi-Kenya
Korea	National Geography Institute	Founded in November 1974 in accordance with the Decree on the Establishment and Organization of the National Geography Institute (Presidential Decree # 7273)	Mr. Jung Soon-Ho, General Director National Geography Institute (Cartography Division) 111 Wonchun-Dong Suwon-shi Kyonggi-do Republic of Korea

Libya	Survey Department of Libya (S.D.L.) National Geographic Names Committee P.O. Box 600 Tripoli Libya		Mohamed Waifa Chief of Cartographic Division and Head of National Geographic Names Committee P. O. Box 600 Tripoli Libya
Morocco	Commission Nationale de Toponymie Direction de la Conservation fonciere et des travaux Topographiques Rabat Morocco	Encours d' approbation	Aquede Lahoussine Chef de Service de Topographie Generale Division de la Cartographie D.C.F.T.T 31 Avenue Hassan 1er Rabat Chellah Morocco
Norway	State Office of Cartography (Statens Kartverk) N-3500 Honefoss Ministry of Scientific and Cultural Affairs, P. O. Box N-0132 Oslo Norway	New law on standardization scheduled for discussion soon (31 July 89)	Botolv Helleland, Department of Name Research, Univ. of Oslo, P. O. Box 1011 Blindern, N-0315 Oslo Norway
Portugal	The National Council of Portuguese Toponymy	Created by decision of the Council of Ministers of 16-1085	Maria da Graca Magalhaes Caldeira Instituto Geografico e Cadastral Praca de Estrela 1200 Lisboa Portugal
South Africa	National Place Names Committee Private Bag X41, Pretoria, 0001 South Africa	1940	Peter E. Raper Head, Onomastic Research Center Human Sciences Research Council Private Bag X41 Pretoria, 0001, South Africa

Sweden	National Land Survey of Sweden S-80182 Gavle Sweden	Government's so-called White Paper SOU 1982:45. The governmental instructions for National Land Survey (SFS) 1985:617 revised SFS1988: 1232	Ann Christian Mattisson Chief of Division of Geographical Names National Land Survey S-80182 Gavle, Sweden
Switzerland	Six ministries and 26 regional names authorities work are responsible for names	Decree of the Federal Council on Dec. 30, 1970 on place names and names of other features.	Prof. Ernst Spless, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology ETH-Honggerberg CH-8093 Zurich Switzerland
United Kingdom	Permanent Committee on the Standardization of Geographical Names for British Official Use	1917: Established by	Mr. H. A. G. Lewis, Chairman c/o Royal Geographical Society 1 Kensington Gore, London United Kingdom SW7 2AR
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Permanent Interdepartmental Commission on Geographical Names (PICGN) under Main Administration of Administration of Geodesy and Cartography (GUGK)	1967: Created by terms of the decree of Council of Ministers of November 1966	Zemeev A., Chairman of PICGN, USSR, Moscow, V-218, Krizanovskogo 14, Kor. 2 GUGK
United States of America	United States Board on Geographic Names	1890: Created by Presidential Decree 1947: Reestablished by Public Law 242-80	Dr. Richard R. Randall, Ex. Secretary US Board on Geographic Names c/o Defense Mapping Agency 8613 Lee Highway, Fairfax, Virginia USA 22031