Since the Athens Conference the United Kingdom has devoted considerable attention to the study of the implications of adopting Pin Yin in place of Wade-Giles for the romanization of Chinese. For many purposes Pin Yin has been adopted for use by the United Kingdom. Yet the question remains how to deal with conventional names, many of which were names different from Wade-Giles but used in conjunction with it. Such names will inevitably remain in use for the foreseeable future. Their suppression, assuming it were possible, would cause grave difficulties and provoke continuous misunderstanding.

Application of Pin Yin to mapping has been studied intensively and comparison of various sources for Pin Yin names has confirmed that the process of conversion to Pin Yin is far from straightforward. The identity of places, the methods of arriving at Pin Yin names where sources are lacking and the problems associated with areas where the national language is not Chinese are important aspects of this question.

Work on Arabic has continued and especially in connection with mapping projects in a number of Arab countries.