

ESA/RT/C/GN/3
16 March 1973

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS GROUP OF EXPERTS
ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES AT ITS FIFTH SESSION

from 5-16 March 1973

Terms of reference

1. The United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names was invited by the Secretary-General in pursuance of Economic and Social Council resolution (XLIV) to convene at the United Nations in New York from 5 to 16 March 1973.

Attendance

2. The Session was attended by 32 experts from 20 countries representing 12 of the 14 geographical/linguistic divisions of the world. 1/ The Acting Chief of the Cartography Section served as the Secretary for the Group.

Opening of the Session

3. The Session was opened by the Chairman of the Group of Experts.
4. The Group agreed to follow the same rules of procedure as in the previous sessions.
5. The Group adopted the following agenda:
 1. Opening of the session
 2. Progress reports by the Chairman and the Divisions
 3. Reports by the Working Groups
 4. Review of "Aims, functions and modus operandi"
 5. Proposal for United Nations gazetteer

1/ See Annex VIII.

6. Names beyond a single sovereignty
7. Training Courses
8. Diacritical marks and exonyms
9. Co-operation with other international organizations
10. Plan of action before the sixth session
11. Report of the fifth session

Officers of the Session

6. The officers of the Session were:

Chairman: Dr. Meredith F. Burrill

Vice-Chairman: Mr. A. M. Komkov

Rapporteur: Dr. D. Blok

7. The Chairman reported that he had presented a paper on the achievements of the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names held in London, during May 1972, during the twenty-second International Geographical Congress held in Montreal in August 1972. He also sent a copy of this paper to the Secretary-General of the International Committee of Onomastic Science to be published quarterly in *Onoma*. The Chairman, reporting for the United States of America-Canada Division, mentioned that Canada and the United States of America approached the categorization of undersea features in different ways; whereas the United States of America based its categories on the size and shape of the feature, Canada proceeded from the genesis of the feature. The question was discussed during a meeting in Halifax, where the differences were clarified. The Chairman further drew attention to some new publications on names published in his Division. The report by Mr. Gall on the activities of the Latin America Division was published as Working Paper No. 4. 2/ Mr. Gall presented to the United Nations Map Collection the National Atlas of Guatemala and on his request Mr. Velásquez was asked to report on progress made in Cuba. Mr. Nédélec, reporting for the Romance Languages Division stated that so far only France and Spain were active in the Division and in anticipation of the second Conference in London in 1972 he informed Italy of the Division's progress through the Istituto Geografico Militare in Firenze, but had not received any answer to date. It was decided that a combined effort by the United Nations Secretariat and the International Cartographic Association would be made in order to obtain active co-operation from Italy in the work of the Division. The report made by Mr. Radó on the East Central and South East Europe Division was submitted as Working Paper No. 11. 3/ Mr. Breu reported on

2/ This document is available on request from the Cartography Section of the United Nations.

3/ Ibid.

the activities within the Dutch-German Speaking Division. Work had continued on Duden, Geographisches Wörterbuch, volume on "Non-European Countries", to be published by the Ständiger Ausschusz für Geographische Namen, the subdivisional names-body for the German-speaking countries. A Teponymic Committee for Upper Austria is now being constituted and a Gazetteer of Austria has been finished in manuscript form by the Abteilung für Kartographische Namenkunde in Vienna, the Austrian body for co-ordinating names policy. Mr. Breu reported further that it might be expected that the German Democratic Republic would become a member of the Dutch-German Speaking Division in the future. The report by Mr. Hovda on behalf of the Norden Division was distributed as Working Paper No. 3. 4/ Mr. Lewis, reporting for the United Kingdom Division, said that work on Welsh and Gaelic names was continuing. A report by Mr. Lambert of Australia on work being done in New Guinea would be made available in the near future. The report by Mr. Komkov on work done in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Division was published as Working Paper No. 7. 5/ Mr. Komkov stated that in 1972 a small national anniversary atlas with gazetteer names had been published. Messrs. Kattan (Saudi Arabia) and Bulugma (Libyan Arab Republic) of the Arabic Division reported that their countries adhered to the romanization system for Arabic adopted during the Beirut Conference in 1971 and amended during the 1972 London Conference. Mr. Vadiie, reporting on behalf of the Asia Southwest Division, commented on Working Paper 14. 6/ Mr. Banlang, reporting for the Asia Southeast Division, said that documentation from the London Conference had been distributed to all of the countries in his Division, together with a request to comment on a proposed divisional meeting, but that he had to date received no replies. Mr. Coker (Nigeria) of the Africa, South of the Sahara Division stated that by agreement he and Mr. Absaloms (Kenya) had divided this Division into two: Africa East and Africa West. 7/ Mr. Absaloms stressed the difficulties met by the former Africa, South of the Sahara Division and asked for assistance in building up an organization that might form the backbone of both Africa East and Africa West. The Chairman stated that he would contact the Ford Foundation for funds for this purpose.

8. The Group of Experts on Geographical Names took note of the tangible progress reflected in the reports of the Divisions and expressed the wish that in the future the divisional aspects of the work would be emphasized in the reports.

4/ Ibid.

5/ Ibid.

6/ Ibid.

7/ A workable membership of the two linguistic/geographic divisions would appear to be: Africa East - Botswana, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Rwanda, Somalia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaire and Zambia. Africa West - Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Dahomey, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Upper Volta.

/...

Working Groups

9. The Working Groups on Extraterrestrial Topographic Features, on a Single Romanization System for each Non-Roman Writing System, on Definitions and on Maritime and Undersea Features reported on their work done since the London Conference in May 1972 and the fifth session of the Group of Experts (see annexes I to IV). Two new working groups were set up to deal with Training Courses and with International Gazetteers. These two working groups also reported to the Group of Experts (see annexes V and VI). All the reports were accepted; tribute was paid to the report of Mr. Delaney, the convener of the Working Group on Maritime and Undersea Features, for its excellent presentation and hope was expressed that it might serve as a model for the other working group reports in the future.

Bibliography of Gazetteers 1945-1972

10. Mr. Meynen reported that since the London Conference the work had proceeded along the lines described in his report to that Conference. He mentioned specifically the help he had received from Mr. Abelson, Mr. Geelan and Mr. Lewis. Since five volumes of references have been compiled, he believed it was time to bring the work to conclusion and to prepare it for publication. The Group of Experts paid tribute to the tremendous work Mr. Meynen had accomplished and thanked him for his effort.

Aims, functions and modus operandi

11. It was felt that it was time to see if any modifications in the aims, functions and modus operandi of the Group of Experts were required. The list of major linguistic/geographical divisions was enlarged because of the division of the fourteenth Division into two new Divisions, Africa West and Africa East. The question of establishing a Greek linguistic/geographic division was discussed, but decision was deferred pending communication of intention by Cyprus and Greece.

12. It was agreed that the term Division would be applied to the name of each Division, the term group being removed. The names of the Divisions should be altered accordingly. It was underlined that the experts should realize that they represent their Divisions and not their countries. In this connexion, methods were discussed to increase the work within the Divisions between meetings of the Group of Experts. It was the general opinion that regional conferences, especially cartographic conferences, might be of the greatest value in this respect. Also the prospect of a United Nations information circular could be of great help. Problems of correspondence and addressing were discussed and some suggestions for better means of communication were made.

13. The following amendments to the aims, functions and modus operandi adopted in 1970, 8/ were made on the proposal of the Central East and South East Europe Division:

8/ See document ESA/RT/C/GN/1, Report of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Geographical Names on its Second Session from 10 to 20 March 1970, pages 3-5.

Paragraph 9 will read:

In order to carry out its work and to achieve the results required, on both the national and the international level, as specified in the resolutions adopted at United Nations conferences, the linguistic/geographical divisions as listed below:

1. United States of America-Canada Division
2. Latin America Division
3. United Kingdom Division
4. Dutch and German-Speaking Division
5. Norden Division
6. Romance Languages Division (other than Latin America)
7. East Central and South East Europe Division
8. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Division
9. Arabic Division
10. Asia, Southwest Division (other than Arabic)
11. Indian Division
12. Asia, Southeast Division
13. Asia, East Division
14. Africa East
15. Africa West

Paragraph 14 was enlarged as follows:

The Group of Experts would welcome participation by countries that have not yet participated in conferences or Group of Experts sessions to take part, especially when their language or script is to be taken under consideration.

The first sentence of paragraph 21 was changed to read:

Working groups of specialists may be formed under the chairmanship of one of the national experts referred to in paragraph 14, to study particular problems, between meetings of the Group of Experts.

International Gazetteers

14. The idea put forward by the expert of the United States of America-Canada Division during the fourth session to convert the United States Board on Geographical Names (BGN) Gazetteers under certain conditions into United Nations gazetteers was welcomed, but also gave rise to many questions. A working group was formed to study and report on the matter (see annex VI) at the sixth session.

Names beyond a single sovereignty

15. Mr. Komkov pointed to resolution 24^{9/} of the London Conference and asked if the Chairman and the Secretary of the Group of Experts (GEGN) had yet consulted officially or unofficially with the legal division of the United Nations. He stated that he himself had consulted lawyers and that the result was to be found in Working Paper No. 8. ^{10/} A convention as mentioned in resolution 24 seemed more and more necessary as name giving continued on the Moon, in the Antarctic and in underseas regions. The Chairman said that he had undertaken to see whether or not the resolution was acceptable to his Government and had heard at the beginning of this year that, in principle, it was. The Secretary pointed out that it was necessary to have legislative authority from the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) before undertaking any formal queries on the matter. He expected consultations on this matter could be initiated following the spring 1973 session of the ECOSOC.

16. Mr. Breu drew the attention of the Group of Experts to resolution 25^{11/} of the London Conference and to its implementation by Austrian-German and Swiss-Austrian committees which had standardized single names for mountains and water features on the borders of those countries.

Training courses

17. Mr. Ormeling, commenting on Working Paper No. 24, ^{12/} said that this working paper contained the document presented by the Dutch experts to their Government. The Dutch Government considered this a good opportunity to start a training programme and was willing to contribute financially to the plan proposed by the Dutch experts. However, the Government was of the opinion that this training course must not be an isolated affair. The Dutch Government stipulated as a

^{9/} See document E/CONF.61/3, Draft Report of the Conference, page 29.

^{10/} Copies may be obtained from the Cartography Section of the United Nations on request.

^{11/} See E/CONF.61/3, Draft Report of the Conference, page 29.

^{12/} Copies may be obtained from the Cartography Section of the United Nations on request.

condition for its assistance, that there must be follow-up training courses, i.e., that there must be a programme of a series of training courses, of which this one might constitute the beginning. Mr. Ormeling proposed the establishment of a working group with the specific task of studying the details of the programme of this first course and of examining the possibilities of a follow-up (see annex V).

18. Many experts paid tribute to this initiative. It was agreed that this was the appropriate time to do something in this field, and that all countries, not only the developing ones, could profit from this training. A serious lack of specialists in the field of geographical nomenclature existed. It was suggested that a more detailed programme ought to be worked out and that specifications must be prepared regarding the choice of lecturers, as well as the qualifications of the students. Two new items for the programme were proposed: (a) automatic data processing and (b) the names to be used on different kinds of maps. It was considered desirable that the lectures on field-collection be illustrated by means of films and sound-tracks. The minimum requirements to be met by the students must be made known at an early stage. Some additions to the list of countries, attached to Working Paper No. 24, to be invited were also proposed. It was felt necessary that subsequently a course in the French language would also be organized.

19. As to an eventual follow-up it was made clear that courses will be planned in various regions, e.g., a training course for the Arabic area and one for Latin America. These courses might profit much from the experience that would be acquired during the Dutch pilot course. Mr. Delaney stated that he would strongly recommend that the next course be held in Canada: he could not commit his country.

20. A Working Group was established to study the programme, to provide guidelines for nations sending students, and to consider prospective future developments. The Working Group met and reported to the session (see annex V). After some discussion, during which it became clear that the first course would be necessarily an experimental one, the report was adopted.

Diacritical marks, exonyms

21. Before the next session of the Group of Experts a paper on the financial consequences of the use of diacritical marks will be presented by Mr. Ormeling. Mr. Komkov, commenting on Working Paper No. 10, 13/ emphasized the need for these marks in the rendering of place names in most languages. It was the general feeling that the position of the Group was the same as that adopted in Geneva.

22. The problem of exonyms was considered on the basis of the Working Papers No. 9 and No. 21. 14/ It was acknowledged that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

13/ Ibid.

14/ Ibid.

United States of America, Hungary, Thailand and Norway had produced lists of exonyms as recommended in resolution 28 15/ of the London Conference. Other countries were also preparing such lists. Difficulties in the treatment of exonyms in various contexts were discussed, as was the relationship between exonyms and names converted from one writing system into another. Measures that could be taken to diminish the use of exonyms were proposed, such as inducing map publishers to increase the use of local names.

23. The following definitions were adopted:

An exonym is a written form of a geographical name used in a certain language for a geographical entity situated outside the area where the language has official status and differing in its form from the name used in the official language or languages of the area where the geographical entity is situated.

A conventional name is an exonym which is widely and currently used.

A traditional name is an exonym which is long established as well as being presently in use.

Co-operation with other international organizations

24. In pursuance of resolutions 31 and 33 16/ of the London Conference, the Group of Experts considered the subject of co-operation with those international organizations, both scientific and intergovernmental which deal with place names and publish reference works. It was felt that this co-operation was essential to the application of name standardization. In particular the Universal Postal Union, the International Telecommunication Union, the International Cartographic Association, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Union of Tourist Organizations and the International Geographical Union, who all in one way or another use and disseminate names, were thought to be of the utmost importance. It was agreed that a letter would be sent to each of these organizations to inform them of the task the United Nations referred to the Group of Experts, to inform them of the Group of Experts plans and to ask for their co-operation.

25. It was acknowledged that contacts with scientific organizations such as the International Astronomical Union and the International Committee of Onomastic Sciences might be improved. It was the general feeling that ultimate responsibility for the methods employed in name giving ought to lay with United Nations bodies because of their international standing. All organizations that are occupied in name giving should be aware of this.

15/ See E/CONF.61/3, Draft Report of the Conference, page 31.

16/ Ibid., pp. 32 and 33.

Plan of action before the sixth session

26. The Working Groups are to prepare specific papers for the next session either by correspondence or by separate Working Group meetings when these are possible.
27. Divisional meetings were envisaged in various areas; the work within the divisions will be stimulated by the experts.
28. As to the preparation of the sixth session, it was deemed desirable that more preparatory work be done by intensive correspondence so that during the session time might be employed more economically.
29. The sixth session was tentatively scheduled for March 1975 and the seventh session at the end of May or the beginning of June 1976. The latter session might be principally devoted to the preparation of the third conference.
30. It was agreed that the setting up of a complete list of country names in the five official languages of the United Nations and in the official languages of the particular countries belonged to the competence of the Group of Experts. A Working Group was established to prepare such a list to be presented to the sixth session. The convener of the Working Group is Mr. Nédélec; other members are Messrs. Breu, Coker, Lewis, Page, Radó and Vadiie. The Working Group would prepare its list by direct correspondence with the experts from all the Divisions. It will make use of existing documentation, in particular, the terminology bulletin of the United Nations giving the list of Member States, etc., as well as the Statistical Yearbook and will keep in close correspondence and co-operation with the Terminology Section of the United Nations.



Annex I

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON DEFINITIONS

1. Three meetings of the Working Group on Definitions took place during the Fifth Meeting of the GEGN. The convener was Mr. C. Page (U.S.A.), the rapporteur was Mr. Velázquez (Cuba), and the following members of the Working Group were present: Mr. Breu (Austria), Mr. Nédélec (France), Mr. Lewis (U.K.), Mr. Gall (Guatemala), Mr. Hovda (Norway), Mr. Meynen (Federal Republic of Germany); absent were Mr. Dahlstedt (Sweden), Mr. Radó (Hungary), Mr. Lapesa (Spain), Mr. Hakulineh (Finland), Mr. Sharma (India), and Mr. Földi (Hungary).

2. The Working Group decided to complete its work prior to the convening of the Sixth Meeting of the GEGN, so that a final report of its work might be presented to that Meeting.

3. The following resulted from discussion of the work assigned to the Working Group by the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names in London, May 1972, and of definitions of terms distributed throughout the Working Group since that time by Messrs. Page, Nédélec, and Gall:

A. Definitions for the following terms were decided:

1. alphabet, transcription

An alphabet which may be employed in the process of transcription, q.v.

2. alphabet, transliteration

An alphabet which may be employed in the process of transliteration, q.v.

3. grapheme

A graphic symbol or combination of graphic symbols, cited within the context of a particular language, which represents a particular phonological and/or morphological item or items with consistency.

4. key, romanization

A table which sets forth the graphic symbols of a non-Roman writing system together with corresponding graphic symbols of one or more Roman writing system(s).

5. reversibility

A characteristic of a conversion system which results in the convertibility of any written item from one writing system to another, and reconversion into the first system, the result being identical in every particular with the original item.

6. vocabulary
 - a. A list of the words of a language (synonym: lexicon);
 - b. A succinct dictionary giving the principal words of a language or citing a list of specialized terms (see glossary or lexicon);
 - c. The repertory of words of a particular individual for all his communication.
 7. Standardization, geographical name
The prescription or the recommendation of a particular graphic form or forms for application to a given feature, as well as the conditions of employment of that form or forms.
 8. Standardization, international geographical name
(See Resolution E/CONF.61/C.4/R.4 - London, 25 May 1972).
- B. Definitions for the following terms were discussed, and it was decided that these would be considered by correspondence so that definitions might be presented to the Sixth Meeting of the GEGN:
- a. diglossia
 - b. feature, hydrographic
 - c. form, graphic
 - d. term, descriptive
- C. It was decided to omit the following terms:
- a. syllable
 - b. nucleus, vocalic
 - c. vowel
 - d. consonant
 - e. cluster, consonant
 - f. diphthong
 - g. (a number of technical linguistic terms)
 - h. language, national
 - i. language, state
 - j. language, vernacular
 - k. toponymy, cartographic
- D. The terms exonym, conventional name, and traditional name were discussed in full session of the UN/GEGN, and recommended definitions will appear in another working paper of the Fifth Meeting of the UN/GEGN.

4. For the continuity of the work, the convener (Mr. Page) will draw together all definitions of terms presently pending, will make comment or suggestion with regard to each, and will distribute the resulting document to all members of the Working Group: Comment and suggestion will be solicited from all members of the Working Group, using this document as a base.

5. A paper on definitions by Mr. Lapesa (Spain), received by members of the Working Group during the course of the Fifth Meeting, as well as Working Papers 17 and 29 of the Fifth Meeting, presented by Mr. Gall (Guatemala), will be included.

Annex II

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON UNDERSEA AND MARITIME FEATURES

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. This Working Group was established by the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Geographical Names during the Second Session, March 1970. The Working Group was directed to "create guide lines for name applications, the definition of descriptive terminology, methods of recording and stabilizing undersea nomenclature, and the determination of the agency or agencies best suited to centralize and disseminate such information" (see document ESA/RT/C/GN/1, April 29, 1970). These terms were expanded by the London Conference to include consideration of maritime features.

PREAMBLE

2. In the discussions of this Working Group,^{1/} the work done at earlier sessions of the Group of Experts was reviewed and the outcome of this work as expressed in resolutions of the London Conference was examined.
3. It was considered that resolutions 22, 23 and 26B^{2/} were particularly significant for guidance of the Group in future activities. Attention was directed to the following paraphrases of the pertinent resolutions:
4. Working Paper No. 23^{3/} of the Fifth Session prepared by the Group co-ordinator suggested as starting points for consideration:
 - (a) an examination of the I.H.O. publication "Limits of Oceans and Seas";
 - (b) an examination of the Principles and the Reporting Form used in publication No. 111, the USBGN Gazetteer of Undersea Feature Names;
 - (c) an examination of the list of generic terms and their definitions issued by the International Hydrographic Organization.

^{1/} Members of the Working Group present at the meeting were as follows: Mr. Delaney (Canada); Mr. Komkov (USSR); Mr. Burrill (USA); Mr. Lewis (UK); Mr. Ormeling (Netherlands); Mr. Meynen (West Germany) and Mr. Hovda (Norway). Mr. Sharma, representing India, was absent.

^{2/} See Report of the Conference, document E/CONF. 61/3 of 30 May 1972, pages 28 and 30.

^{3/} Copies of the working paper are available, upon request, to the Cartography Section of the United Nations.

Discussion

5. There was general agreement that the resolutions indicated in Working Paper No. 23 4/ constituted those with which the Working Group should now be concerned. Dr. Burrill advanced the view that no attempt should be made, at least at this stage, to incorporate regulations regarding the treatment of undersea feature names in an international convention. Rather, he felt that agreement on names proposed should be worked out by obtaining a consensus among those nations concerned with such names by the interchange of information of intent.

It was also agreed that the extension of the Working Group's terms of reference to "maritime features", as indicated in resolutions 22 and 23 5/ of the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names should not be interpreted as embracing terrestrial feature names.

In consideration of the publication "Limits of Oceans and Seas" and its accompanying maps, it was agreed that the terms "delimitation" and "limits", and the use of the first term in resolution 22 should not be interpreted in a legal sense in the work of the Group, but only in relation to delimitation for the purpose of envisaging the extent of areas to which names might apply for general reference purposes. It was also observed that care should be taken to avoid overlapping the work of other agencies engaged in the same areas of activity, but rather that every effort should be made to inform national and international hydrographic organizations of what the United Nations concerns in this field are. Attention was drawn to Circular Letter No. 28 of July 1972, from the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), in which conformity to the principles advanced by the United Nations Committee on the Standardization of Geographical Names is urged on its members, and copies of the circular were provided to the Group of Experts.

6. It was evident from the discussion that the consideration of the revision of Limits of Oceans and Seas may be needed in terms of other possible uses by oceanographers and others, and the Working Group needs to examine the publication in these terms. Similarly, the exploration of the details of model forms and of undersea naming principles call for much close examination by the various countries having interests in this area, and that can only be done by subsequent exchange of views, and the evaluation of accumulated opinions.

4/ Ibid.

5/ See, Report of the Conference, document E/CONF.61/3 of 30 May 1972, page 28.

CONCLUSIONS

7. The Working Group concluded that:

1. Correspondence should be entered into with concerned countries respecting the suitability of the Limits of Oceans and Seas, as stated in the IHO publication, from the standpoint of less specific purposes than designed by the IHO,
2. That countries should be invited to comment on the Principles and Proposal Form used in the USBGN gazetteer on undersea feature names and Antarctic feature names with a view to constructing principles and forms acceptable for United Nations purposes in this context,
3. That organizations such as the International Hydrographic Bureau and the oceanographic scientific community generally should be fully informed of the activities of this Working Group,
4. That the group co-ordinator should initiate this correspondence with the object of enabling firm proposals respecting Naming Principles, Name Proposal Forms and Generic Term Definitions to be presented to the Sixth Session of the Group of Experts.

of the area in which they lie, e.g., Mariana Trench, Ninetyeast Ridge.

(1) In some cases, this can be accomplished simply by using the same specific term in the names of adjoining features, e.g., Aleutian Ridge, Aleutian Basin, Aleutian Trench, Mariana Ridge, and Mariana Trench, Bellona Plateau, Bellona Reefs, Bellona Shoal.

(2) In some cases, the specific term may indicate direction from a large well-known associated feature, e.g., South Honshu Ridge, West Caroline Basin.

(3) In cases where extent of a long linear feature needs to be identified and the extremities can be identified by named geographic features, the names of those features may be hyphenated as the specific terms, e.g., Azores-Gibraltar Ridge, Peru-Chile Trench.

(4) Canyons, since they usually extend close to the shore, are normally given as specific terms the names of rivers, points or other readily identifiable named land features, e.g., and Barrow Canyon, Scripps Canyon and Ascension Canyon.

C. Specific names for other features can be derived from ships or other vehicles utilized in the discovery of the feature, from expedition names, individuals associated with the discovery, organizations and institutions sponsoring the expedition or from individuals who have specifically been involved in the recognition of the uniqueness of the feature through the interpretation of the data.

(1) Names of ships may be applied to features such as seamounts, knolls, canyons, tablemounts, etc. The ship name to be used should be that of the discovering ship, or if that has been previously used for a similar feature, it should be the name of the ship verifying the feature, e.g., San Pablo Seamount, Atlantis II Seamounts.

Undersea name policies

BGN policies applied in the official standardization of the approved names in this gazetteer are as follows:

1. The Board will consider appropriate name proposals by United States nationals for undersea features in international waters.
2. The Board will consider name proposals for features under United States territorial waters on the same basis as other domestic names.
3. Prior to the naming of a feature, identification of its character, extent and position shall have been established sufficiently for identification. Positions shall be given in terms of geographic coordinates. If it is necessary to refer to a feature before such full identifiability has been established, it is suggested that the reference be by coordinates and generic term with the addition of (PA) after the coordinates if the position is not adequately established and (?) after the generic if the nature of the feature is in some doubt.
4. Undersea names in the immediate vicinity of the coast of another country will be treated as names in that country.
5. The Board will ordinarily approve names of undersea features beyond limits of the United States that are bestowed, or approved, by other countries or nationals of other countries unless there is some conflict or other question. Generics in English, if appropriate to the feature, will be accepted; those in other languages will be translated.
6. Guidelines for selection of specific terms.
 - A. It is long-established BGN policy to favor short and simple names as the most efficient, other things being equal.
 - B. Specific terms in the names of major undersea features should, wherever feasible, indicate the general location

(2) Specific names of vehicles utilized in the discovery of a feature may be used, as in the Kiwi Seamount from the geomagnetic survey plane "KIWI" under Project MAGNET which discovered its existence through a magnetic anomaly.

(3) Expedition names may be used, e.g., Northern Holiday Seamount.

(4) Names of individuals associated with the discovery of a feature may be used, including any of the following:

- a. The captain of the ship.
- b. Expedition leaders, or survey party chiefs.
- c. Individuals in charge at the time of discovery and recognition of the feature.

(5) Individuals involved in the interpretation of data leading to the recognition of the unique character of a feature, e.g., bathymetrists, oceanographers, geologists, hydrographers.

(6) Persons who have made important contributions to knowledge of the oceans, including the interpretation of oceanic data, or the preparation of charts of the oceans such as historical hydrographers, oceanographers, and scientists, e.g., Maury Channel, Ewing Seamount.

(7) Organizations and institutions involved in the study of the seas, such as Scripps Canyon.

(8) Names of persons prominent in the past history of the nation.

D. It is permissible to name groups of features after specific categories of historical personages, mythical figures, stars, and constellations, fish, birds, animals, etc. Such groups could be as follows:

Musicians Seamounts: Bach Seamount, Brahms Seamount, Schubert Seamount

Electricians Seamounts: Volta Seamount, Ampere Seamount, Galvani Seamount

Ursa Minor Ridge and Trough Province, Kochab Ridge, Polaris Trough, Suhail Ridge

E. Descriptive names will be acceptable if not duplicated, particularly when they refer to distinguishing characteristics, e.g., Hook Ridge, Horseshoe Seamounts.

F. Names considered inappropriate include:

- (1) Names applied to similar features elsewhere.
- (2) Full names or unwieldy titles of individuals, institutions or organizations.
- (3) Names of commercial products or their manufacturers.
- (4) Names of individuals proposed because of relationship or friendship with the proponent.

7. Existing names that have been applied for many years may be accepted even though they do not coincide with the above policy.

Name proposal form

Undersea name proposal forms are provided in this publication to facilitate submittal and expedite approval and promulgation of names. Anyone may propose a name for an unnamed undersea feature that has been adequately identified as to type and geographic location.

Use a separate form for each name proposed, copying the form if necessary, and filling in all the blanks that are pertinent. Give coordinates of latitude and longitude ordinarily taken at the approximate center of the feature and read fine enough to identify the feature, ordinarily the nearest degree for basins, or the nearest minute for smaller features such as canyons.

For "kind of feature," use the appropriate term from the list of designations and definitions in the current edition of the BGN Gazetteer of Undersea Features. This term will ordinarily be used also as the generic term in the name. If the feature is of a

kind not covered by these terms or definitions, explain in a supplementary note.

Although "reference to prior publication" is provided for, it is hoped that authors will refer not-yet-acted-upon names to the Board before publication, and every effort will be made to act on them in time to accommodate publication schedules.

Reporting of errors

It is requested that all who use this gazetteer aid in its correction for future editions by reporting errors to the Board on Geographic Names, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. A statement of the source of the correct information will be helpful.

Geographic names or their spellings do not necessarily reflect recognition of the political status of an area by the United States Government.

/...

BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

UNDERSEA FEATURE NAME PROPOSAL

Ocean or Sea _____ Name proposed _____
Lat. _____ (N) (S), Long. _____ (E) (W); _____ nautical miles in _____ direction
from _____

Description: Kind of feature: _____
Identifying or categorizing characteristics (size, shape, dimensions, least depth, steepness, etc.): _____

Associated features: _____

Chart reference:
Shown and named on chart (map) _____
Shown but not named on chart (map) _____
Not shown but within area covered by _____
Reason for choice of name: _____

If for a person, state how associated with the feature to be named _____

Discovery facts: Date _____; by (individuals or ship) _____

By means of (equipment): _____
Navigation used: _____

Estimated positional accuracy in nautical miles: _____
Description of survey (track spacing, line crossings, grid network, etc.): _____

TEAR OUT ALONG THIS LINE

(OVER)

Use other side
where necessary

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BOARD ON GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

No. 133
195

ANTARCTIC NAME PROPOSAL

NAME PROPOSED: _____

DESCRIPTION: Kind of feature _____ Lat. _____ S, Long. _____ E.
_____ W.

_____ nautical miles distant from _____

_____ in a _____ direction

Map Reference (air chart, H.O. chart, map title, etc.) _____

Identifying Characteristics (size, shape, length, width, height, etc.) _____

Photo Reference (vertical, oblique, other.) _____

Materials Submitted _____

SUPPORTING DATA: Reason for Choice _____

Date discovered, seen, recorded, mapped, etc. _____

By whom _____

Personal Information (of honoree) _____

Expedition _____

Supporting Data Submitted (surveys, charts, photos, other.) _____

to be returned
not to be returned

SUBMITTED BY: Name _____

Address _____

Rank or official duties _____ Date _____

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

CODE _____ DATE RECEIVED _____

CASE SECTION _____ PROMULGATION _____

Annex III

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON EXTRATERRESTRIAL TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES

Group Terms of Reference

1. The competence of the Group of Experts on Geographical Names to consider the field of extraterrestrial names was determined at its Second Session in 1970. The Working Group 1/ then established consequent upon this determination was charged with the examination of such toponyms without qualification as to scope or methods (United Nations document ESA/RT/C/GN/1 dated 29 April 1970).

Relevant Resolutions - London Conference

2. Resolutions by the Second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names which are specifically relevant to this Working Group are numbers 21, 24 and 34. 2/

3. The Chairman summarized action since the London Conference. The contemporary state of mapping of the Moon and the current mapping programmes for both the Moon and Mars emphasized the need to devise systems of reference for extraterrestrial features acceptable to all nations. These mapping programmes include the 1:250,000 lunar mapping programme now being undertaken in the United States and the mapping of Mars from Mariner photography.

4. A circular letter had been sent by the Chairman to the individual members of his Group, including Colonel Sharma, Dr. Radó and Dr. Lapes, who had requested to be associated with the work of the Group during the later stages of the London Conference. The letter reported on correspondence which had taken place between the Chairman (Professor A. M. Komkov) and Dr. A. Dollfus, President of both the Inter-Union Commission for Lunar Studies and Commission 17, "The Moon", of the International Astronomical Union (I.A.U.) and with Professor D. Menzel, Chairman of the I.A.U. Working Group on Lunar Nomenclature.

5. Dr. Burrill reported that at a meeting in Washington on 23 January 1973, attended by Dr. Menzel and representatives of the Department of State, NASA, the US National Committee of the I.A.U., the Smithsonian Institution, the National

1/ Members of the Working Group are: Chairman: A. M. Komkov; Rapporteur: H. A. G. Lewis; M. F. Burrill.

Dr. S. Radó did not take part in the discussion.

Colonel Sharma and Dr. Lapesa did not attend.

2/ See, Report of the Conference, document E/CONF.61/3 of 30 May 1972, pages 28, 29 and 34.

Academy of Science and the Board on Geographic Names, it was made clear that only 20 to 30 names are required for Moon maps soon to be produced for NASA, that these can be drawn from an existing bank of names, and that the matter of formal contact between NASA and Dr. Menzel's sub-committee remained to be discussed at a meeting in Houston, Texas, in March 1973.

Discussion

6. The naming of extraterrestrial features is a complex matter and one which properly falls within the orbit of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names. Nomenclature of extraterrestrial features must be acceptable to all nations and this fact together with the need to determine how best to render names in a standardized form in each of the various languages of the world places the matter firmly in the province of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names. The drawing-up of such systems of nomenclature was not appropriate to astronomers alone. Naming of features on the Near Side and the Far Side of the Moon had traditionally been commemorative. Because the number of names allocated by astronomers were relatively few in number, a subsidiary system had been employed for the Near Side which entailed the addition of alphabetic (Latin and Greek) suffixes and, for certain features numerical suffixes, to identify minor features located near named topographical features. This system was well established and widely used by astronomers both professional and amateur. There was a reluctance on the part of many of them to abandon the system. However, the topographic detail now shown on large-scale maps prepared from photographs taken by space vehicles was far in excess of what could be seen by telescopes from Earth. For such detailed maps the alpha-numeric suffix was of limited use, in many cases confusing, and not to be recommended.
7. Commemorative naming of major features on the Far Side of the Moon had taken place but so far no letter or number suffixes had been employed. It appeared most desirable to avoid using the latter method for designating features of secondary importance on that side of the Moon except possibly where they are located within the perimeter of a major feature.
8. Direct exploration of the Moon by manned and unmanned lunar missions has produced a truly immense amount of surface information. As a part of the Apollo programme new names had been allocated to many small features. Although those names were intended solely for the purpose of operational reference during the missions, they inevitably tend to gain currency in just the same way as Antarctic names have become established by continued usage.
9. In a properly conceived system of extraterrestrial nomenclature, the appropriateness of names from the toponymic point of view would receive special attention.
10. There is the further question of the legal standing of names allocated to extraterrestrial surface features by non-governmental bodies. It was agreed that the status of the Group of Experts as a United Nations body and the standing of

the experts as representatives of their own linguistic/geographic divisions made the Group of Experts the body best constituted to deal with this question.

11. The large-scale cartographic work now being undertaken and the increasing currency of Martian and Lunar names emphasized the urgency of devising adequate systems of nomenclature and uniform methods of rendering names in various linguistic systems compatible with the aims of international standardization of the names of terrestrial features. There is clearly a necessity to co-ordinate all naming activity and achieve uniformity in the processes employed.

Conclusions

12. The Working Group will consider the extent to which names should be allocated and on what basis. In this connexion, NASA and other agencies engaged in extraterrestrial mapping will be invited to furnish details of their programmes, both current and projected, with a view to assessing the magnitude of the task in the near future and in the longer term.

13. Guide-lines will be drawn up by the Group of Experts and various methods of naming will be studied. No system of naming will be rejected out of hand. Commemorative naming, using the names of learned men of all nationalities, will be considered. Bearing in mind the limited number of such commemorative names available, the Group of Experts will examine the feasibility of using terrestrial geographical names, geographical and other terms, and the use of ordinary words selected from the languages of the entire world. In this task the assistance of the United Nations Organization and its member nations is requested.

14. The Group of Experts will confer with astronomers and others on the extent to which retention of alpha-numeric suffixes is desirable, but the extension of this method of designating features on the Far Side of the Moon and on Mars will be discouraged.

15. Systems for identifying small features will be investigated and tested, including methods based on the use of co-ordinates.

16. The Working Group is charged with examining how best to achieve legal international status for names allocated to extraterrestrial features.

17. The Working Group, in accordance with resolution 21 of the London Conference, will continue its activity in drawing up a plan for international agreement on the standardization of the names of extraterrestrial topographical features in co-operation with the international organizations (ICSU, IAU, etc.).

18. In this connexion, the Chairman of the Group of Experts, Dr. M. Burrill, together with the co-ordinator of the Working Group on Extraterrestrial Topographical Features, Professor A. M. Komkov, will maintain contact with those organizations and will prepare a status report for the next General Assembly of the I.A.U.

/...

19. Members of the Working Group will inform each other of contacts with international organizations.

20. The Working Group will obtain and exchange information on extraterrestrial mapping programmes.

Annex IV

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON A SINGLE ROMANIZATION SYSTEM
FOR EACH NON-ROMAN WRITING SYSTEM

1. Dr. Breu, convenor of the Working Group, gave an account of activities since the London Conference and at this present session (Working Papers 26 and 28).
2. With regard to the amended Beirut system for the transliteration of Arabic recommended under Resolution 9 1/ of the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, the Working Group agreed on a finalized text of the table to be annexed to the resolution in the printed Report of the London Conference.
3. The Working Group noted the terms of Resolution 8^{2/} of the London Conference concerning the conditions of adoption of the amended Beirut system for the transliteration of Arabic, and noted also the appearance of four different systems for the transliteration of Arabic in Algeria, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia. While recognizing the ultimate desirability of having a single transliteration system applicable in all the countries of the Arab world, the Working Group recognized also the special character of the countries of the Maghreb and Mauritania. It recommended therefore that the system agreed under Resolution 8 3/ of the London Conference be modified to accommodate a limited number of essential variants (see Addendum A), if it should be impossible to agree on a single system. It recommended further that the Arab League arrange a regional meeting of the Arab countries for this purpose, preferably in the Maghreb, and also that representatives of the official cartographic agencies concerned be present at this meeting.
4. The Working Group considered the draft romanization system for the Greek alphabet (Addendum B) prepared, in collaboration with Cyprus, by a special commission within the Greek Ministry of Culture, acceptable as an international system for the transliteration of Greek.

1/ See, Report of the Conference, document E/CONF.61/3, page 24.

2/ Ibid.

3/ Ibid.

Addendum A

	Amended Beirut System letter:	Proposed	
		Variant A	Variant B
<u>Consonant</u>	8.	j	dj, j
	15.	s	s (ss)
	16.	sh	ch
	17.	s ,	ç
	20.	z ,	d, z ,
	24(b)	-	g (gu)
<u>Vowel</u>	3.	u	ou
	6.	ū	oū
	4, 5, 6 (long vowels)	- (macron)	ˆ (circumflex)
<u>Note</u>	For particular purposes, or in order to take account of local pronunciation, diacritics may be omitted and diagraphs may be reduced to the first principal letter.		- - - - -

Addendum B

ROMANIZATION SYSTEM OF THE GREEK ALPHABET

A α = a	Ἄρτα	'Arta
αι = ai	Ἀθήναι	Athínai
αυ = av au (see note 1)	Μαυροβούνι	Mavrovouni
<hr/>		
B β = v b (see note 2)	Βόλος	Vólos
<hr/>		
Γ γ = g	Γαράζον	Garázon
γγ = ng	Ἄγγελόκαστρον	Angelókastron
γκ = g (initially)	Γκοριτσά	Goritsá
γκ = nk (medially)	Λαγκάδα	Lankáda
γχ = nkh	Ἀγκίαλος	Ankhíalos
<hr/>		
Δ δ = d	Δάφνη-Δένδρα	Dáfni-Déndra
<hr/>		
Ε ε = e	Ἐρέτρια	Erétria
ει = i	Γύθειον	Gýthion
ευ = ev eu (see note 3)	Λευκάς	Levkás
<hr/>		
Ζ ζ = z	Ζεμενόν	Zemenón
<hr/>		
Η η = i (4)	Ἡράκλειον	Iráklion
ηυ = iv		
<hr/>		
Θ θ = th	Θεσπιαί	Thespiáí

I ι = i	Ίρῖα	Iría
K κ = k see also γκ	Καλαμάκι	Kalamáki
Λ λ = l	Λίμνη	Límni
M μ = m μπ = b (initially) = mp (medially)	Μαραθών Μπέχρος Τέμπη	Marathón Békhros Témpi
N ν = n ντ) = d (initially) = nt (medially) ντζ = ntz	Νεστάνη Ντία Παντάνασσα Βιντζέτζος	Nestáni Día Pantánassa Vintzétzos
Ξ ξ = x	Ξάνθη	Xánthi
O ο = o οι = oi ου = ou	Όθος Οίτη Βούναγρον	Óthos Oíti Voúnagron
Π π = p see also μπ	Παῦλος	Pávlos
P ρ = r	Μερόπη	Merópi
Σ σ = s	Άσσος	Ássos
T τ = t τζ = tz see also ντ	Τίρυνς	Tíryns

Υ υ = y Υλίκη-Μύλος Ylíki-Mýlos
see also αυ, ευ, ηυ, ου

Φ φ = f
ph (see note 5) Φιλοθέη Filothéi

Χ χ = kh
see also γχ Χαραυγή Kharavgí

Ψ ψ = ps Ψαρά Psará

Ω ω = o Ώρωπός Orópōs

-
1. In names of strongly established historical forms, the digraph αυ will be written as au in lieu of av.
 2. In names of strongly established historical forms, the letter β will be written as b in lieu of v.
 3. In names of strongly established historical forms, the digraph ευ will be written as eu in lieu of ev.
 4. In a small number of names of strongly established historical forms (to be decided by a special committee), the letter η will be written as e in lieu of i.
 5. In names of strongly established forms, the letter φ will be written as ph in lieu of f.
 6. The spiritus lenis and spiritus asper are omitted. In a small number of names of strongly established forms, the spiritus asper will be romanized as h.

7. The three Greek accents will be uniformly represented by the acute accent, except in monosyllabic words and words accented on the last syllable. In accented digraphs, the acute accent will be shown over the second vowel.
8. The diaeresis will be shown with " in names where two consecutive vowels appear as a diphthong.
9. Double consonantal letters in Greek will be doubled also in romanization.
10. Iota subscriptum and iota adscriptum are ignored in romanization.

Annex V

DRAFT REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON
TRAINING COURSES IN TOPONYMY

Terms of reference

1. The Working Group^{1/} was organized to investigate the possibility of organizing a training course in Toponymy on the basis of resolution 18 adopted by the London Conference^{2/} and of Working Paper No. 24^{3/} submitted by Dr. Blok and Dr. Ormeling to the fifth session of the Group of Experts.

Recommendation

2. The Working Group strongly recommended the organization of a Pilot Training Course in Toponymy of four weeks' duration in spring 1975 in accordance with the guidelines laid down in Working Paper No. 24.^{4/}

3. The Working Group authorized Messrs. Blok and Ormeling to act as a task force and to carry out the preparation of the first course in Toponymy. The task force was invited to keep the members of the Working Group regularly informed on the progress being made by correspondence.

General outline of programme of work

4. (a) The training course, which should be conducted in English, should be concentrated on national standardization, particularly on the Field Collection of Names and on the Office Treatment of Names. It should cover the following subjects:

- a. Toponymy Terminology
- b. Functions of Geographical Names
- c. Report of United Nations activities on Standardization of Geographical names

^{1/} Members of the Working Group: F. J. Ormeling (Netherlands) convenor; W. J. Absaloms (Kenya) Rapporteur; D. P. Blok (Netherlands); G. F. Delaney (Canada); Per Hovda (Norway); F. A. Kattan (Saudi Arabia); H. A. G. Lewis (U.K.); E. Meynen (F.R.G.); and K. Vadiie (Iran).

^{2/} See resolution 18, Training Courses, document E/CONF.61/3, page 27.

^{3/} A copy of this document is available on request to the Cartography Section of the United Nations.

^{4/} Ibid.

- d. Field collection of names (1. General Problems; 2. Specific problems encountered in the various language areas)
- e. Office treatment of names (1. General Problems; 2. Specific problems encountered in the various language areas; 3. Automatic Data Processing)
- f. New Names - Changing of names - Commemorative names - Repetition of names
- g. Treatment of names in multilingual areas
- h. Generics and glossaries
- i. National Gazetteers, designation of names
- j. Names on Maps

(b) The Working Group recommended the organization of practical exercises towards the end of the course under the guidance of lecturers to evaluate the quality of names on maps against available documents and to evaluate information collected by tape recorders.

Lecturers

5. The Working Group recommended to invite the various experts of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names according to their experience and capabilities to act as the lecturers of the course.

Requirements for participants of the course

6. Though in general students with higher educational standards should be preferred the Working Group proposed that the minimum requirements of the participants of the course should be the equivalent of secondary school education with some linguistic and field experience on geographical names.

7. The Working Group strongly recommended that guarantees should be sought for an adequate command of the English language of the students. The command of English should not only be the general English usage but also the technical field on toponymy. To ensure that the selected students will be familiar with the technical terminology in toponymy the Working Group recommended the circulation of introductory literature (including definitions of toponymical terms) to the selected students in advance.

Certificate of attendance

8. The Working Group recommended that some assessment will be made on the performance of the students and that a special certificate of attendance may be issued signed by the two Directors of the course (United Nations Director and Host Country Director).

/...

Follow-up Work

9. The Working Group noted the desirability that follow-up courses should be hosted by other countries or linguistic/geographic divisions.

It welcomed the intentions of Mr. Delaney to investigate the possibility of a second course in toponymy in Canada. This second course may be in both French and English, if possible.

It has further noted similar intentions of Dr. Hovda to propose to the Norden governments to host another follow-up course and of Dr. Vadiie to investigate similar possibilities in Iran.

Finally the Working Group particularly welcomed the intentions of Mr. Kattan (Saudi Arabia) and of Dr. Gall (Guatemala) to investigate the possibility of courses in toponymy in their respective linguistic/geographic divisions. Mr. Kattan also proposed to prepare a film on the practice of field collection of geographical names in Saudi Arabia.

Annex VI

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON GAZETTEERS

1. The Working Group on Gazetteers^{1/} was established by the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names at its fifth session held in New York, 5-16 March 1973.

Tasks

2. Tasks to be undertaken are:

(a) to establish the requirements for United Nations gazetteers and to define the categories;

(b) to consider the possibilities of adapting the United States Board on Geographic Names (USBGN) Gazetteers as United Nations Gazetteers of the World as set out in the fourth session of the Group of Experts in London on 1 June 1972;

(c) to work out through correspondence the specifications for the different types of gazetteers reflecting applicability of United Nations recommendations in this field.

Discussions

3. It was agreed that there should be three categories of gazetteers, namely:

(a) National Gazetteers, as specified in resolution 4 of the United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, held in Geneva, Switzerland in 1967; ^{2/}

(b) A series of United Nations Gazetteers of the World;

(c) A concise United Nations Gazetteer of the World in one or two volumes.

4. It was unanimously accepted that the concise United Nations Gazetteer of the World would be a desirable project and might be based on the national interim lists as recommended during the second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, held in London in 1972. Further consideration of this matter was deferred and it was agreed to concentrate on the second category of gazetteers. Detailed discussions took place on type (b) above, during which the

^{1/} This is a Working Group of the whole.

^{2/} See United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names, Vol. I - Report of the Conference, page 11 (Sales No. E.68.I.9).

subject of map scales was introduced. It was decided that no single map scale or series would suit the requirements of all individual countries. Prevailing, but not unanimous, opinion was that maps at scales of 1:1,000,000 or larger would alone serve as a basis for the compilation of the series. For many countries maps at much larger scales would be required.

5. Dr. Breu presented for consideration Working Paper No. 34,^{3/} defining the three types of gazetteers, which was discussed together with Working Paper No. 6^{4/} previously presented by Mr. Komkov. The categories and titles set in Working Paper No. 34^{5/} were accepted by the Working Group.

6. The Working Group agreed on the following basic principles: that primary responsibility for gazetteers rests with the nation whose territory is covered; that gazetteers based on the BGN gazetteers will be produced with the consent of the country covered and maintenance will be carried out jointly by the country covered and the USBGN; that in special circumstances the preparation of certain volumes of the United Nations Gazetteer of the World may have to be deferred until a solution acceptable to the parties concerned can be found.

7. A small study group was then instructed to work out specific recommendations on how to adapt the USBGN gazetteers to comply with the specifications of one of the categories of United Nations Gazetteers of the World as laid down in Working Paper No. 34.^{6/} Basic documents for this study group were to be Working Papers Nos. 6, 20 and 34.^{7/}

8. The Working Group accepted the following detailed recommendations worked out by the study group:

(a) Title page should be along the following lines:

Emblem of the United Nations
United Nations Gazetteer of the World
Provisional Series
Volume: KENYA
Official Standard Names

^{3/} Copies of this document are available on request to the Cartography Section of the United Nations.

^{4/} Ibid.

^{5/} Ibid.

^{6/} Ibid.

^{7/} Ibid.

approved by the Standing Committee on Geographical Names of Kenya published by the Board on Geographic Names distributed only by the Defense Mapping Agency, Washington, D.C. 20305

May 1973

adopted by BGN for official use in the United States (the exact wording and location of this phrase to be resolved by USBGN and the country covered).

(A statement should be added that "this volume supersedes USBGN Gazetteer of Kenya 1964.)

(b) An outline map of the country covered will be included, if feasible.

(c) In addition to the main body of information, the foreword should contain: information on the genesis of the publication and its status as a United Nations Gazetteer; reference to the UNGEGN; composition of the USBGN; statement on the official language(s) of the country covered.

(d) A suitable disclaimer note will be worked out by the publishers and the United Nations.

9. The Working Group agreed that the first three USBGN Gazetteers to be provided for study should be those for Kenya, Undersea Features and one Latin-American country.

10. The United States would welcome the temporary attachment of names experts to the USBGN to work on problems connected with the production of gazetteers.

Annex VII

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

- Working Paper No. 1: Provisional Agenda
- Working Paper No. 2: Letter from A. M. Komkov, Vice-Chairman of the Group of Experts
- Working Paper No. 3: Report on the Standardization of Geographical Names in Norway since the London Conference
- Working Paper No. 4: Report by the expert for Latin America of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (Prof. Francis Gall)
- Working Paper No. 5: A Projected United Nations Gazetteer Series by M. F. Burrill
- Working Paper No. 6: On the most acceptable form and contents of the gazetteers published under the auspices of the United Nations by A. M. Komkov (item 4)
- Working Paper No. 7: On the work on the national standardization of geographical names carried out within the period after the Second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names held in May 1972, by A. M. Komkov (item 2)
- Working Paper No. 8: Problems of the Standardization of the Names beyond a single sovereignty (item 5)
- Working Paper No. 9: On the Russian Conventional Names of Geographical Entities of Foreign Countries, by A. M. Komkov (item 5)
- Working Paper No. 10: On the Usage of Diacritical Marks in Geographical Names Romanization, by A. M. Komkov (item 8)
- Working Paper No. 11: Progress Report of the Division East Central and South East Europe (item 2)
- Working Paper No. 12: Acceptability of Romanizations - comment on Paper L 106 Romanization of Geographic Names for International Use, by the U.S.A. (item 8)
- Working Paper No. 13: Greek draft - Romanization System of the Greek Alphabet (and Rev.1) (item 8)
- Working Paper No. 14: The minutes of Iran-Afghanistan's regional meetings on transliteration of geographical names - Teheran, Iran, 10-17/2/1973

- Working Paper No. 15: Arabic Glossary - Written in the Unified Arabic System
- Working Paper No. 16: The Translation of Generics in Geographical Names -
M. B. Smart (Canada) and E. Kalinin (U.S.S.R.)
- Working Paper No. 17: Glosario de terminología técnica usada en la normalización
de nombres geograficos
- Working Paper No. 18: Draft Report of the Working Group on Names of
(Rev.1) Extraterrestrial Topographical Features
- Working Paper No. 19: Problems of Nomination of extraterrestrial topographic
features
- Working Paper No. 20: List of Gazetteers (Defense Mapping Agency Topographic
Center)
- Working Paper No. 21: Exonym as an International Term (C. R. Page)
- Working Paper No. 22: Standardization in the Treatment of Generic Elements in
Toponyms
- Working Paper No. 23: Proposed areas of discussion - Working Group on Undersea
and Maritime Feature Names
- Working Paper No. 24: Pilot Training Course in Toponymy (Dr. D. Ormeling)
- Working Paper No. 25: Comparative Table
- Working Paper No. 26: Working Group on a Single Romanization System for each
non-Roman Writing System - minutes of first meeting 6/3/1973
- Working Paper No. 27: The Category "Minority Language" (C. Page)
- Working Paper No. 28: Working Group on a Single Romanization System for each
non-Roman Writing System - minutes of second meeting
8 March 1973
- Working Paper No. 29: Spanish language renditions of selected definitions of
technical terminology submitted by the Working Group on
Definitions by Messrs. Nédélec, Page and Gall
- Working Paper No. 30: Working Group on Gazetteers
- Working Paper No. 31: Thai exonyms (Colonel B. Khamasundara)
- Working Paper No. 32: Sobre transliteración de Nombres Propios Extranjeros

- Working Paper No. 33: Report of the Working Group on Definitions of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (C. Page)
- Working Paper No. 34: UN Gazetteers (Mr. Breu, Austria)
- Working Paper No. 35: Antarctic Name Proposal (No. 183)
- Working Paper No. 36: Report of the Working Group on Undersea and Maritime Features - Fifth session, Group of Experts, 1973
- Working Paper No. 37: Report of the Working Group on a Single Romanization System (Rev.1) for each non-Roman Writing System
- Working Paper No. 38: Report of the Chairman of the Group of Experts
- Working Paper No. 39: Automatic Data Processing (Canada)
- Working Paper No. 40: Draft Report of the Fifth Session
- Working Paper No. 41: Draft Report of the Working Group on Training Courses
- Working Paper No. 42: Draft Report of the Working Group on Gazetteers

Annex VIII

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

United States of America and Canada

Division Chairman M. F. Burrill
(United States of America) 5503 Grove Street
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015

G. F. Delaney
(Canada) Canadian Permanent Committee
on Geographical Names
615 Booth Street
Ottawa KIA OE 4, Ontario

M. R. Brown
(United States of America) Defense Mapping Agency
att: PRR-2
Building 56, U.S. Naval
Observatory
Washington D.C. 20305

Carl R. Page
(United States of America) Geographic Names Division
Topographic Center
Defense Mapping Agency
6500 Brooks Lane
Washington D.C. 20315

R. R. Randall
(United States of America) Defense Mapping Agency
Building 56, U.S. Naval
Observatory
Washington D.C. 20305

Latin America

Division Chairman F. Gall
(Guatemala) 13 Avenida "A" 14-23
Colonia Loma Linda
Ciudad de Guatemala

Y. R. Velázquez García
(Cuba) Director Técnico de Cartografía
Instituto Cubano de Geodesia y
Cartografía
Loma y 39
Nuevo Vedado
Havana

United Kingdom

Division Chairman H. A. G. Lewis
(United Kingdom)

P. J. M. Geelan
(United Kingdom)

Permanent Committee on
Geographical Names
c/o Royal Geographical Society
Kensington Gore
London S.W.

Permanent Committee on
Geographical Names
c/o Royal Geographical Society
Kensington Gore
London S.W.

Dutch and German-speaking Division

Division Chairman F. J. Ormeling
(Netherlands)

D. P. Blok
(Netherlands)

J. Breu
(Austria)

E. Meynen
(Federal Republic
of Germany)

Head of the Cartography
Department
International Institute for
Aerial Survey and Earth Science
144 Boulevard 1945
Enschede

Director, Institute for
Dialectology, Folklore and
Onomastics of the Royal Dutch
Academy of Science and Letters
Keizersgracht 569-571
Amsterdam

Head, Geographical Department
Austrian Institute for Eastern
and Southeastern Europe
Josefsplatz 6
A-1010 Vienna I

Langenbergweg 82
53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg

Norden

Per Hovda
(Norway)

Chief, Place-Names Archives
University of Oslo
Blindern, Oslo 3

Romance languages Division other than Latin America

F. Nédélec
(France)

Ingénieur-en-Chef Géographe
Institut Géographique National
136 bis rue de Grenelle
75 Paris (7ème)

East Central and South East Europe

Division Chairman S. Radó
(Hungary)

Director, Department of
Cartography
National Office of Lands and
Mapping
V. Kossuth Lajos Tér 11
1860 Budapest

E. Kofos
(Greece)

Special Adviser
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Athens

D. Vayacacos
(Greece)

Académie d'Athènes
Anagnostopoulou 14
Athens 136

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

A. M. Komkov
(Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics)

Vice-Chairman of the Permanent
Joint Committee on Geographical
Names
Cartographic Scientific
Information Centre
Novoshchukinskaya 11
123098 Moscow D-98

Arabic

Division Chairman F. A. Kattan
(Saudi Arabia)

Aerial Survey Department
Ministry of Petroleum and
Mineral Resources
P.O. Box 247
Riyadh

M. Al-Fayez
(Saudi Arabia)

Central Department of Statistics
Ministry of Finance
Riyadh

A. N. Al-Wohaibi
(Saudi Arabia)

The University of Riyadh
Riyadh

S. Bawazeer
(Saudi Arabia)

c/o Saudi Arabian Educational
Mission
880 Third Avenue (17th Floor)
New York, New York 10022

H. Bulugma
(Libya)

Libyan University
Benghazi

R. B. Seid
(Libya)

Ministry of Education
Tripoli

Asia South-West, other than Arabic

Division Chairman Y. M. Nawabi
(Iran)

Department of Linguistics
Faculty of Arts and Literature
University of Tehran
Tehran

K. Vadiie
(Iran)

Department of Geography
Faculty of Letters and Human
Science
University of Tehran
Tehran

H. Eren
(Turkey)

Dil ve Tarih-Cografya
Facültesi
Ankara

Asia South-East

Division Chairman Col. B. Khamasundara
(Thailand)

The Royal Thai Survey Department
Bangkok 2

Lt. Col. B. Thipphayathat
(Thailand)

The Royal Thai Survey Department
Bangkok 2

Africa East

W. J. Absaloms
(Kenya)

Secretary
Standing Committee on Geographical
Names
Survey of Kenya
P.O. Box 30046
Nairobi

Africa West

R. O. Coker
(Nigeria)

Federal Survey Department
Lagos
