

Distr. LIMITED

E/CONF.74/L.74 23 August 1982 ENGLISH ONLY

Fourth United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names Geneva, 24 August to 14 September 1982 Item 4 of the provisional agenda*

> REPORTS BY DIVISIONS AND GOVERNMENTS ON THE SITUATION IN THEIR REGIONS AND COUNTRIES AND ON THE PROGRESS MADE IN THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES SINCE THE THIRD UNITED CONFERENCE ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

REPORT BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/CANADA DIVISION**

Abstract of the Paper Submitted by the United States of America**

During the five years since the Third Conference, the United States of America and Canada continued to cooperate fruitfully on common problems. While there were no official programs sponsored by this UNGEGN division, the national standardization bodies of both countries worked together, and their representatives participated in several programs concerning toponymy as a field and dealing with specific questions about geographic names.

* E/CONF.74/1.

** Prepared by Dr. Richard R. Randall, Executive Secretary, U.S. Board on Geographic Names and Chairman of the Division. By agreement, Dr. Randall and Mr. Rayburn, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographic Names, occupy this post on a rotating two-year basis.

GE.82-66037

FOURTH UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES Geneva, Switzerland, 23 August - 14 September 1982 Item 4 of the provisional agenda. Reports by divisions on the situations in their regions and on the progress made in the standardization of geographical names since the Third United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names.

REPORT BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/CANADA DIVISION *

Submitted by the United States of America

As previous reports have indicated, the work of this division is limited principally to the efforts of the two national standardization agencies, the U.S. Board on Geographic Names and the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names, to decide any problems concerning names of features common to both countries.

Apart from such toponymic questions, representatives of the two organizations have cooperated in several meetings established to review a wide range of matters of interest to one or both sides. Mr. Alan Rayburn, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographic Names, attended several meetings sponsored by U. S. state, federal, and professional organizations and presented papers or otherwise participated in the sessions. These meetings included the 4th Western Geographic Names Conference convened in Utah in 1980 by names authorities in several states in the western part of the United States. This and others held by the same authorities have included a regular monthly meeting of the Domestic Names Committee of the U. S. Board on Geographic Names. Mr. Rayburn also attended a meeting of toponymic experts held in Washington in May of 1982 that was sponsored by several organizations, including the Board on Geographic Names.

^{*} Prepared by Dr. Richard R. Randall, Executive Secretary, U. S. Board on Geographic Names and Chairman of the Division. By agreement, Dr. Randall and Mr. Rayburn, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographic Names, occupy this post on a rotating two-year basis.

Meetings held in Canada were also attended by representatives of the United States. A symposium in Ottawa in 1980 brought Mr. Donald Orth, Board on Geographic Names Executive Secretary for Domestic Names and Mr. William Opalski, representing the Board's foreign-names ADP programs, to discuss United States work in automation and names. In June of 1982, Canada sponsored a session on gazetteers which was attended by Mr. Orth and where a paper on the topic was presented on behalf of Dr. Randall, Executive Secretary of the Board, who could not atend.

Advisory committees on undersea features of both national organizations have exchanged communications concerning their work. It is the aim to keep each other fully informed as to their naming activities in order to prevent unintended duplication of effort in areas where both countries might be active.

As stated in the 1977 report, relations between the two naming authorities remains productive and professional. The goodwill existing between the countries has promoted a spirit of cooperation in the resolution of any differences that might characterize names of common features. From the practical point of view, therefore, there has been little requirement for divisional work.