<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number: 6a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item Name:</strong> National and international standardization of geographical names: Names collection, office treatment, national authorities, features beyond a single sovereignty and international cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement/intervention provided by:</strong> Austria (Peter Jordan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement/intervention:</strong> Addressing “Basis and principles of the standardization of geographical names in Finland”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Referring to the very clear and relevant paper “Basis and principles of the standardization of geographical names in Finland” I would like to mention that Austria faces the same problem of lacking national legislation for the standardization of geographical names, but that we have – also very similar to Finland – a well-established and in general well-functioning practice with a prevailingly bottom-up, subsidiary character. Critical items in Austria are the naming of natural features and traffic areas. Names of natural features are recorded by the Austrian Federal Office of Metrology and Surveying according to local use, but it may easily happen that a commercial name (e.g., for a mountain peak) is propagated and finally used by the majority of the local population and has thus to be accepted. For the naming of new traffic areas (e.g., streets in new developments) the Austrian Board on Geographical Names (AKO) has passed recommendations not to use commemorative or neutral names, but descriptive names reminding of former features at and functions of the place, e.g., field names. In practice, however, neutral (after birds, flowers etc.) and commemorative naming prevails.
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