4 March 2025

English

United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names
2025 session
New York, 28 April – 2 May 2025
Item 10 of the provisional agenda*
Other geographic names issues

Example laws on geographical names standardization and cultural heritage protection

Submitted by Norway

Summary **

Two complementary legislative frameworks have been developed to address the complex challenges of geographical names standardization while protecting cultural heritage and Indigenous rights across governmental structures. These comprehensive approaches establish robust mechanisms for both technical standardization and cultural preservation, providing evidence-based and culturally informed models for both centralized and federal jurisdictions.

The cornerstone of the frameworks is their governance structure, which can be implemented either through a single independent national names authority in centralized systems or through coordinated federal and state names authorities in federal systems. Both models operate with dedicated funding and technical infrastructure, implementing dual oversight systems that combine scientific committees of technical experts with cultural advisory boards. That ensures representation of Indigenous and minority communities, guaranteeing that standardization decisions reflect both scientific rigor and cultural sensitivity, regardless of governmental structure.

At the technical level, both frameworks mandate evidence-based standardization through rigorous research protocols that give equal weight to scientific evidence and traditional knowledge. The legislation requires comprehensive digital database systems that enable sophisticated analysis while maintaining strict documentation standards. In federal systems, that is achieved through coordinated federal-state technical infrastructure, while centralized systems maintain a unified national database. Those technical requirements ensure interoperability and data preservation, facilitating both domestic and international cooperation in toponymic research.

Both frameworks place particular emphasis on cultural heritage protection, establishing equal legal status for Indigenous and minority language toponyms. That is reinforced by mandatory cultural impact assessments for naming decisions and explicit protection for traditional geographical names as living heritage. Those provisions are supported by clear consent requirements for Indigenous naming decisions and protected status for traditional knowledge systems, with implementation mechanisms adapted to local contexts and governmental structures.

* GEGN.2/2025/1
** Prepared by Peder Gammeltoft, Norway, Norwegian Language Collections

Implementation in both models follows a structured five-year plan, with dedicated funding streams supporting core operations and special cultural projects. The frameworks include comprehensive professional development programmes, ensuring that technical staff maintain expertise in both scientific and cultural aspects of toponymic work. That is supplemented by knowledge transfer protocols and regular review procedures that guarantee long-term sustainability. Quality assurance is maintained through regular monitoring and evaluation requirements, clear enforcement mechanisms, and transparent appeal processes. The international dimension is addressed through mandatory research-sharing protocols and technical cooperation frameworks that are aligned with global best practices, whether managed centrally or at the federal level.

Those legislative models address current societal requirements for geographical names standardization, offering blueprints for jurisdictions seeking to modernize their toponymic practices while protecting cultural heritage. Their innovative integration of traditional knowledge with modern technical standards provides frameworks for balanced and sustainable toponymic governance in the twenty-first century.

Introduction

This paper presents two example laws on geographical names standardization that can serve as inspiration for Member States considering legislative frameworks in this domain, see *Appendices* at the end of this report. These comprehensive models represent idealized frameworks that incorporate international best practices developed through UNGEGN's work over several decades. It should be emphasized that the level of detail and complexity presented in these models exceeds what is typically necessary for effective implementation. Most existing geographical names laws and departmental orders are significantly less detailed, with operational complexity instead embedded in internal systems, administrative guidelines, and rules of procedure developed by implementing authorities. The value of the example law models lies in their articulation of key principles and institutional arrangements that support well-balanced, evidence-based standardization. Member States are encouraged to adapt the content of these laws selectively according to their specific legal traditions, administrative capabilities, and toponymic challenges.

1. Scope

The increasing complexity of modern toponymic management necessitates comprehensive legal frameworks that address multiple dimensions of standardization practice. The two example laws presented in this report – one for centralized governance systems (see Appendix 1) and one for federal structures (see Appendix 2) – represent a synthesis of best practices developed through international collaboration within UNGEGN. The example laws serve multiple purposes for Member States. They provide adaptable templates that can be customized to national legal traditions while maintaining consistency with international standards. They also establish benchmarks against which existing national legislation can be evaluated and potentially reformed. Implementation of frameworks based on these models offers several benefits: enhanced cultural heritage protection, improved consistency in geographical information systems, reduced conflicts over contested names, more efficient public administration, and strengthened national identity through respect for diverse naming traditions. Investment in proper toponymic infrastructure typically yields substantial returns through improved spatial data management and reduced administrative costs.

These example laws respond to several evolving challenges in toponymic governance. Digital transformation has fundamentally altered how geographical names are documented, disseminated, and utilized. Increasing recognition of indigenous and minority rights has necessitated more inclusive

approaches to naming authorities. Environmental changes and population movements have accelerated changes to the cultural landscapes that toponyms describe. The example laws align with established international frameworks including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, UNESCO conventions on tangible and intangible heritage protection, and the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Specifically, the laws support SDG 4 (Quality Education) through promoting cultural knowledge and linguistic diversity; SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities) by ensuring equal representation of minority and indigenous names; SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) through preserving cultural heritage in urban and rural planning; SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) by establishing transparent, participatory naming authorities; and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) through encouraging multi-stakeholder collaboration in toponymic governance. This alignment ensures that national toponymic governance contributes to broader international objectives regarding cultural diversity, scientific advancement of knowledge, and heritage preservation.

2. Ensure Inclusion, Representation and Transparency

Inclusion, representation, and transparency form the essential foundations of legitimate naming authority. When these principles are compromised, naming systems face challenges to their legitimacy, utility, and sustainability. The example laws incorporate these principles as central organizing concepts rather than peripheral considerations. In addition, historical practices have frequently marginalized indigenous and minority naming traditions, leading to cultural erasure and undermining the authenticity of geographical information systems. Both example laws address this historical imbalance through specific provisions guaranteeing equal status for indigenous toponyms, mandatory consultation protocols, consent mechanisms for traditional territories, and dedicated resources for documentation of endangered naming traditions.

The institutional frameworks established in both models ensure diverse representation through carefully designed decision-making bodies. The Cultural Advisory Boards mandated in both systems provide formal channels for community voices. Decision procedures incorporate community consultation as mandatory rather than discretionary elements. Appeal mechanisms ensure communities can challenge decisions that fail to adequately address their concerns. Transparency provisions are integrated throughout both legal frameworks. All standardization decisions require documented rationales accessible to the public. Research methodologies must be explicit and replicable. Database systems must support public access with appropriate privacy safeguards. Regular reporting requirements ensure ongoing accountability to both technical standards and cultural considerations.

Transparent processes for balancing competing naming interests represent a critical component of these models. Both frameworks establish clear criteria for evaluating competing claims, emphasize evidence-based adjudication, and require thorough documentation of decision rationales. These provisions reduce the potential for politically motivated naming decisions while enhancing the perceived legitimacy of outcomes.

3. Evidence-Based Approach to Geographical Names Standardization

Scientific rigor is not merely a technical concern but a fundamental requirement for legitimate standardization. Both example laws establish frameworks for ensuring that standardization decisions are grounded in verifiable evidence, methodological rigor, and systematic documentation. The scientific frameworks established in these models require multidisciplinary approaches to toponymic research. Linguistic analysis provides insights into name origins and evolution. Historical research establishes naming chronologies and contextual factors. Geographic documentation ensures spatial precision. Cultural studies illuminate community associations and usage patterns. This multidisciplinary approach prevents methodological biases that can emerge from over-reliance on single disciplinary perspectives.

Both models establish explicit standards for evidence evaluation that represent advances over traditional approaches. Requirements for multiple source verification reduce reliance on potentially flawed single sources. Uncertainty assessment provisions ensure transparent communication about confidence levels. Alternative analysis requirements ensure that competing interpretations receive fair consideration. These standards align toponymic research with broader scientific best practices. The technical infrastructure outlined in these models supports scientific rigor through comprehensive data management systems. Version control requirements ensure changes are tracked and reversible. Metadata standards facilitate evaluation of source reliability. Interoperability requirements enable cross-verification with related datasets. These technical provisions transform traditional toponymic archives into dynamic research environments capable of supporting ongoing scientific inquiry. A notable innovation in these models is their approach to integrating traditional knowledge with scientific methodologies. Rather than treating these as competing systems, the frameworks establish protocols for respectful integration that preserves the integrity of traditional knowledge while enabling systematic documentation. This approach represents a significant advance in resolving tensions between scientific and traditional approaches to geographical names standardization.

4. Legal Context and Administrative Requirements for Implementation

Implementation of these example laws requires careful consideration of existing constitutional frameworks and administrative law traditions. The federal model provides detailed guidance on constitutional division of powers, an essential consideration for Member States with multi-level governance structures. Successful implementation demands specific administrative capabilities that must be developed within implementing agencies. Both models require technical expertise in linguistics, geography, and information technology; administrative capabilities for community consultation and stakeholder engagement; and legal expertise for proper interpretation and application of standardization criteria. Phased implementation allows for gradual capacity building where resource constraints exist.

The example laws are designed to integrate with existing legislation governing cartography, cultural heritage, indigenous rights, and administrative procedures. However, assessment is required to identify potential conflicts with existing statutes. Areas requiring particular attention include existing authorities for name approval, established cartographic standards, heritage protection regimes, and administrative review procedures. Resolution of potential conflicts should precede implementation to avoid jurisdictional confusion.

Both models include transitional provisions addressing the legal status of existing names during implementation. These provisions balance respect for established usage with the need for comprehensive standardization. The phased implementation approach provides mechanisms for gradual review of existing names according to the new standards without creating administrative disruption or legal uncertainty regarding established toponyms. Effective enforcement mechanisms represent a critical component of successful implementation. Both models provide monitoring systems,[1] compliance requirements, and remediation procedures (cf. GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9). These provisions require adaptation to national administrative law traditions regarding appeals, and administrative discretion. The models emphasize positive incentives for compliance rather than punitive measures wherever possible.

5. Digital Transformation of Toponymic Management

Global toponymic management has undergone a profound transformation from analog, paper-based systems to integrated digital environments. Both example laws reflect this transformation by establishing comprehensive requirements for digital data management, interoperability standards, and

[1] This is an important mechanism to establish, as even comprehensive laws and administrative systems will over time be prone to inconsistencies in implementation that may even go against the intent of standardization, as exemplified in e.g. GEGN.2/2025/60/CRP.60.

system architecture. This transition creates opportunities for enhanced analytical capabilities, broader public access, and more efficient administration.

The technical requirements specified in both models need advanced database architecture standards appropriate for modern toponymic management. Key provisions include requirements for comprehensive metadata, version control systems, spatial referencing, temporal tracking, and relationship mapping. These technical standards enable sophisticated analysis capabilities required for evidence-based decision making while ensuring long-term data integrity and accessibility. Digital transformation enables unprecedented public engagement with toponymic information. Both models require public-facing interfaces providing access to standardized names, documentation of standardization decisions, historical naming information, and cultural context. These provisions enhance transparency while creating opportunities for public education regarding cultural heritage. Technical specifications ensure accessibility for users with disabilities in accordance with international standards.

The example laws establish requirements for data security and long-term preservation. Digital preservation standards must include provisions for format migration, redundant storage, disaster recovery, and technological obsolescence. Security provisions have to address access controls, encryption standards, and protection of sensitive cultural information. These measures ensure that digital toponymic information remains accessible for future generations while protecting integrity and cultural sensitivities. Both models position toponymic databases as core components of national spatial data infrastructure. Thorough reviews of technical specifications ensure interoperability with geographic information systems, cartographic production systems, and location-based services. These integration requirements will maximize the utility of standardized names across government operations, scientific research, and commercial applications while reducing duplication of effort in spatial data management.

6. Comparative Analysis of the Example Laws

The examination of legislative frameworks for geographical names standardization across Member States reveals two distinct yet complementary approaches. These models – one for centralized state structures and another for federal systems – represent alternative pathways toward shared objectives. This analysis reveals how each framework adapts standardization principles to different constitutional arrangements while maintaining alignment with international standards. Both legislative frameworks demonstrate remarkable consistency in their foundational principles. They share identical core objectives: safeguarding geographical names as living cultural heritage, implementing scientific standardization, protecting indigenous toponyms, promoting evidence-based decision making, enabling scientific toponymic research, as well as ensuring sustainable management, and a culturally sensitive administration.

This consistency across governance models indicates growing international consensus on toponymic protection essentials. Such convergence represents significant progress since the first United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names in 1967. The primary distinction between these approaches lies in their institutional architecture. The centralized model establishes a single National Names Authority with nationwide jurisdiction. This approach offers administrative efficiency and consistency throughout the national territory. The federal model creates a more locally responsive system with parallel federal and state institutions. It carefully delineates spheres of authority, assigning federal jurisdiction to interstate features while reserving state authority for intrastate features. Specific coordination mechanisms ensure cooperation between governmental levels.

Both models demonstrate strong commitment to evidence-based decision making. The centralized approach benefits from consolidated research capabilities, while the federal approach can facilitate more responsive regional research on local naming traditions. Importantly, both frameworks establish identical research standards regarding methodological requirements, evidence standards, and data requirements. A critical component of both frameworks is their robust approach to documentation

and knowledge preservation. The technical specifications for national names registers are virtually identical, requiring comprehensive databases with historical records, scientific documentation, and cultural information. Implementation differs significantly, however. The centralized model maintains a single national register, while the federal approach requires coordinated database management with clear protocols for data exchange between institutions – a technical challenge that centralized systems largely avoid.

Both models demonstrate similarity in their provisions for the protection of indigenous and minority rights, reflecting the emphasis in Resolution VIII/1 on indigenous geographical names. Equal status provisions, decision-making rights, and protection measures for traditional knowledge appear nearly identical across frameworks. This consistency suggests that commitment to cultural heritage protection transcends governance structures, representing a fundamental shift in toponymic management practices worldwide. The practical implementation of these frameworks presents distinct challenges. The centralized model offers advantages in administrative efficiency but may struggle to respond to regional variations. The federal approach offers greater local responsiveness but faces more complex coordination requirements and potential inconsistencies in standard application.

7. Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that effective geographical names standardization can be achieved through multiple governance models. The remarkable consistency in core principles across these diverse approaches suggests growing international consensus on best practices in toponymic management.

The convergence of scientific standards, cultural protection mechanisms, and institutional safeguards across both centralized and federal models reflects the maturation of toponymic governance as a distinct field. This evolution has been driven by increased recognition of names as cultural assets, technological advances in spatial data management, and heightened awareness of indigenous rights.

While the example laws presented in this report are more detailed than typically necessary for implementation, they provide a comprehensive reference from which Member States can selectively adopt elements appropriate to their context. The core principles of scientific rigor, cultural inclusion, and transparency can be implemented through simpler legislative frameworks supported by well-developed administrative procedures and technical systems.

The future development of toponymic governance will likely see further refinement of these approaches through practical implementation experience and ongoing international dialogue. UNGEGN remains committed to facilitating this exchange of knowledge and promoting continuous improvement in geographical names standardization worldwide.

Relevant resolutions and referenced reports:

GEGN I/4. (1967). National Standardization.

GEGN VI/2. (1982). Acceleration of Work on Standardization of Geographical Names.

GEGN VII/9: Standardization of geographical names utilizing the Internet (1998).

GEGN VIII/1. (200). Promotion of Minority Group and Indigenous Geographical Names.

GEGN IX/4. (2007). Geographical Names as Intangible Cultural Heritage.

GEGN IX/5. (2007). Promotion of the Recording and Use of Indigenous, Minority and Regional Language Group Geographical Names.

GEGN X/3. (2012). Criteria for establishing and evaluating the nature of geographical names as cultural heritage

GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9. (2025). Example laws on geographical names standardization and cultural heritage protection.

GEGN.2/2025/60/CRP.60. (2025). Documentary evidence in geographical names management: pitfalls of circular reference and institutional self-documentation.

Points for discussion

The Group of Experts is invited to:

(1) Consider how Member States might adapt the example legal frameworks to their specific governance structures in geographical names standardization.

(2) Discuss implementation strategies for digital transformation in toponymic management, including database architecture, public interfaces, and integration with national spatial data infrastructure.

(3) Explore mechanisms for balancing standardization requirements with protection of indigenous and minority naming traditions, particularly consent processes and equal status provisions for cultural heritage preservation.

(4) Examine approaches for ensuring evidence-based decision making through multidisciplinary research protocols that integrate traditional knowledge with scientific methodologies in geographical names standardization.

APPENDICIES

NOTE: The example laws below are not meant to be complete legal texts but rather templates showing potential components that Member States might consider including when developing their own geographical names legislation. They only show possible content to include under the various parts (chapters) and elements (paragraphs) in bullet point form for inspiration of what can be included in a law text. The laws are organized hierarchically to illustrate how comprehensive legal frameworks might be structured, but implementation would require adaptation to national legal traditions and administrative capabilities.

APPENDIX 1

Comprehensive Law on Geographical Names Standardization and Cultural Heritage Protection, Centralized State Structure

Chapter 1: General Provisions and Principles

§ 1. Purpose

1. This Law aims to: a) Protect geographical names as living cultural heritage, b) Ensure scientific, evidence-based standardization, c) Protect indigenous and minority language toponyms, d) Promote research-based knowledge and active use, e) Enable sustainable names management, f) Ensure culturally sensitive administration
2. This Law shall be interpreted to: a) Preserve cultural heritage, b) Promote scientific understanding, c) Protect minority rights, d) Support sustainable development, e) Enable evidence-based decision making

§ 2. Scope

1. This Law applies to: a) All public authorities, b) State-owned enterprises, c) Educational institutions, d) Research institutions, e) Public mapping services, f) Cultural heritage institutions
2. Geographic scope includes: a) All territorial lands, b) Territorial waters, c) Traditional indigenous territories, d) Cultural landscapes, e) Historical sites

§ 3. Definitions

1. "Geographical name" means any name designating a geographical feature, including: a) Natural features, b) Settlements, c) Administrative areas, d) Cultural sites, e) Historical locations
2. "Scientific evidence" means: a) Documented research findings, b) Verified historical sources, c) Linguistic analysis, d) Geographic documentation, e) Cultural research
3. "Traditional knowledge" includes: a) Oral histories, b) Cultural practices, c) Indigenous knowledge systems, d) Community memory, e) Local usage patterns

Chapter 2: Institutional Framework

§ 4. National Names Authority

1. Establishment and Independence: a) Independent statutory body, b) Professional administration, c) Dedicated funding, d) Technical infrastructure, e) Research capacity
2. Core Functions: a) National standardization coordination, b) Research oversight, c) Database management, d) Scientific methodology development, e) Quality assurance, f) International cooperation
3. Structure: a) Executive Board, b) Scientific Committee, c) Cultural Advisory Board, d) Research Division, e) Technical Division, f) Administrative Secretariat

§ 5. Scientific Committee

1. Composition: a) Toponymists, b) Historical linguists, c) Cultural geographers, d) Digital humanities experts, e) Indigenous knowledge experts, f) Archival specialists, g) Sociolinguists
2. Functions: a) Research methodology development, b) Evidence evaluation standards, c) Scientific review of decisions, d) Research program oversight, e) Quality assurance protocols, f) Technical standards development

§ 6. Cultural Advisory Board

1. Composition: a) Indigenous representatives, b) Minority community leaders, c) Cultural heritage experts, d) Local community representatives, e) Traditional knowledge holders
2. Functions: a) Cultural impact assessment, b) Community consultation oversight, c) Traditional knowledge integration, d) Rights protection monitoring, e) Cultural preservation guidance

Chapter 3: Scientific and Research Framework

§ 7. Research Standards

1. Methodological Requirements: a) Clear research protocols, b) Verifiable methods, c) Documented procedures, d) Peer review processes, e) Quality control measures
2. Evidence Standards: a) Multiple source verification, b) Primary source documentation, c) Chain of evidence, d) Uncertainty assessment, e) Alternative analysis
3. Data Requirements: a) Comprehensive collection, b) Systematic documentation, c) Quality assurance, d) Accessibility, e) Long-term preservation

§ 8. Names Research Database

1. Content Requirements: a) Historical documentation, b) Linguistic analysis, c) Geographic data, d) Cultural context, e) Usage patterns, f) Change documentation
2. Technical Standards: a) Digital preservation, b) Version control, c) Data protection, d) Interoperability, e) Public accessibility, f) Research functionality
3. Analysis Capabilities: a) Pattern recognition, b) Temporal analysis, c) Geographic distribution, d) Linguistic evolution, e) Cultural patterns, f) Usage trends

Chapter 4: Standardization Procedures

§ 9. Name Cases

1. Initiation Rights: a) Public authorities, b) Research institutions, c) Indigenous groups, d) Local communities, e) Cultural organizations
2. Required Documentation: a) Scientific evidence, b) Historical records, c) Cultural significance, d) Community input, e) Expert analysis
3. Process Requirements: a) Transparent procedures, b) Scientific review, c) Cultural assessment, d) Community consultation, e) Expert evaluation

§ 10. Evidence-Based Decision Making

1. Required Evidence: a) Historical documentation, b) Linguistic analysis, c) Geographic context, d) Cultural documentation, e) Usage patterns, f) Scientific research
2. Evaluation Criteria: a) Scientific validity, b) Cultural significance, c) Community impact, d) Practical considerations, e) Sustainability factors
3. Documentation Requirements: a) Decision rationale, b) Evidence assessment, c) Methodology description, d) Alternative considerations, e) Impact evaluation

Chapter 5: Rights Protection and Inclusion

§ 11. Indigenous and Minority Rights

1. Equal Status: a) Legal recognition, b) Documentation priority, c) Public visibility, d) Research support, e) Resource allocation
2. Decision-Making Rights: a) Consultation requirements, b) Consent protocols, c) Appeal processes, d) Review rights, e) Implementation oversight
3. Protection Measures: a) Cultural preservation, b) Knowledge protection, c) Research protocols, d) Documentation standards, e) Usage rights

Chapter 6: Documentation and Preservation

§ 12. Documentation Systems

1. National Names Register: a) Comprehensive database, b) Historical records, c) Scientific documentation, d) Cultural information, e) Geographic references, f) Usage patterns
2. Documentation Requirements: a) Primary sources, b) Research findings, c) Cultural context, d) Linguistic analysis, e) Geographic data, f) Community input
3. Technical Standards: a) Digital preservation, b) Data security, c) Accessibility, d) Interoperability, e) Quality control

§ 13. Research Archives

1. Content Requirements: a) Raw research data, b) Methodology documentation, c) Analysis records, d) Decision rationales, e) Cultural assessments, f) Community input
2. Preservation Standards: a) Long-term storage, b) Format sustainability, c) Migration protocols, d) Access controls, e) Security measures
3. Access Provisions: a) Research access, b) Community access, c) Public access, d) Security protocols, e) Privacy protection

Chapter 7: Sustainable Management

§ 14. Resource Allocation

1. Core Funding: a) Administrative operations, b) Research programs, c) Documentation systems, d) Technical infrastructure, e) Community engagement
2. Special Funding: a) Indigenous names projects, b) Minority language documentation, c) Cultural preservation, d) Research initiatives, e) Technology development
3. Resource Distribution: a) Equitable allocation, b) Priority setting, c) Efficiency measures, d) Accountability, e) Impact assessment

§ 15. Knowledge Management

1. Professional Development: a) Staff training, b) Research capacity, c) Technical skills, d) Cultural competency, e) Community engagement
2. Knowledge Transfer: a) Documentation protocols, b) Training programs, c) Succession planning, d) Institutional memory, e) Community education
3. Research Support: a) Academic partnerships, b) Research funding, c) Publication support, d) Conference hosting, e) International collaboration

Chapter 8: Implementation and Enforcement

§ 16. Implementation

1. Phased Implementation: a) Foundation phase (Year 1), b) Development phase (Years 2-3), c) Enhancement phase (Years 4-5), d) Optimization phase (Ongoing)
2. Implementation Requirements: a) Clear timelines, b) Resource allocation, c) Progress monitoring, d) Quality assurance, e) Impact assessment
3. Review Mechanisms: a) Regular evaluation, b) Performance metrics, c) Adjustment protocols, d) Stakeholder feedback, e) Scientific assessment

§ 17. Compliance and Enforcement

1. Monitoring: a) Regular audits, b) Performance review, c) Quality assessment, d) Impact evaluation, e) Community feedback
2. Enforcement Measures: a) Compliance requirements, b) Correction procedures, c) Appeal processes, d) Penalty provisions, e) Remediation protocols
3. Reporting Requirements: a) Annual reports, b) Scientific evaluations, c) Cultural impact assessments, d) Community feedback, e) International reporting

§ 18. International Cooperation

1. Collaboration Requirements: a) Research sharing, b) Best practices exchange, c) Technical cooperation, d) Cultural preservation, e) Standards alignment
2. International Obligations: a) Treaty compliance, b) Convention adherence, c) Standard adoption, d) Reporting requirements, e) Cooperation protocols

§ 19. Amendment Procedures

1. Review Requirements: a) Regular assessment, b) Scientific evaluation, c) Cultural impact, d) Stakeholder consultation, e) Implementation feedback
2. Amendment Process: a) Evidence-based proposals, b) Stakeholder consultation, c) Scientific review, d) Impact assessment, e) Implementation planning

§ 20. Entry into Force

1. This Law enters into force on [date]
2. Transitional Provisions: a) Existing names protection, b) Ongoing case handling, c) Database migration, d) System adaptation, e) Staff training

APPENDIX 2

Example Law on Geographical Names Standardization and Cultural Heritage Protection, Federal State Structure

Chapter 1: General Provisions and Principles

§ 1. Purpose and Federal Framework

1. This Law aims to: a) Protect geographical names as living cultural heritage, b) Ensure scientific, evidence-based standardization, c) Protect indigenous and minority language toponyms, d) Promote research-based knowledge and active use, e) Enable sustainable names management, f) Ensure culturally sensitive administration
2. This Law shall be interpreted to: a) Preserve cultural heritage, b) Promote scientific understanding, c) Protect minority rights, d) Support sustainable development, e) Enable evidence-based decision making
3. This Law establishes: a) Federal-state cooperation in names standardization, b) Division of naming authority responsibilities, c) Interstate coordination mechanisms, d) National standards framework, e) Resource sharing protocols
4. Federal-State Relationship: a) Federal oversight of interstate features, b) State authority over intrastate features, c) Cooperative management of shared features, d) Joint database maintenance, e) Coordinated research programs

§ 2. Jurisdictional Scope

1. This Law applies to: a) All public authorities, b) State-owned enterprises, c) Educational institutions, d) Research institutions, e) Public mapping services, f) Cultural heritage institutions
2. Geographic scope includes: a) All territorial lands, b) Territorial waters, c) Traditional indigenous territories, d) Cultural landscapes, e) Historical sites
3. Federal Authority Extends to: a) Interstate geographical features, b) International borders, c) Federal lands and waters, d) National monuments, e) Maritime zones, f) Cross-border indigenous territories
4. State Authority Extends to: a) Intrastate geographical features, b) Local cultural sites, c) Urban areas, d) State parks and reserves, e) Local historical sites

§ 3. Definitions and Standards

1. "Geographical name" means any name designating a geographical feature, including: a) Natural features, b) Settlements, c) Administrative areas, d) Cultural sites, e) Historical locations
2. "Scientific evidence" means: a) Documented research findings, b) Verified historical sources, c) Linguistic analysis, d) Geographic documentation, e) Cultural research

3. "Traditional knowledge" includes: a) Oral histories, b) Cultural practices, c) Indigenous knowledge systems, d) Community memory, e) Local usage patterns
4. "Interstate feature" means: a) Geographic features crossing state borders, b) Shared cultural landscapes, c) Joint water bodies, d) Cross-border indigenous territories
5. "Federal standardization" means: a) National naming standards, b) Interstate coordination, c) International alignment, d) Federal database management

Chapter 2: Institutional Framework

§ 4. Federal and State Level Names Authorities

1. Core Functions: a) Standardization coordination, b) Research oversight, c) Database management, d) Scientific methodology development, e) Quality assurance
2. Federal Functions: a) National policy development, b) Interstate coordination, c) International representation, d) National research center, e) Technical and database management, e) Research program oversight, f) International cooperation
3. State level establishment and Independence: a) Independent Federal and State Names Boards, b) Professional administration, c) Dedicated funding, d) Technical infrastructure, e) Research capacity

§ 5. Scientific Committees

1. Structure, Federal and State Level: a) Names Board, b) Research Unit, c) Documentation Division, d) Community Liaison Office
2. Composition, Federal and State Level: a) Toponymists, b) Historical linguists, c) Cultural geographers, d) Digital humanities experts, e) Indigenous knowledge experts, f) Archival specialists, g) Sociolinguists
3. Federal Level Functions: a) Research methodology development, b) Evidence evaluation standards, c) Scientific review of decisions, d) Research program oversight, e) Quality assurance protocols, f) Technical standards development
4. State Level Functions: a) Local standardization, b) Community consultation, c) Regional documentation, d) Implementation oversight

§ 6. Cultural Advisory Board

1. Composition, federal and state level: a) Indigenous representatives, b) Minority community leaders, c) Cultural heritage experts, d) Local community representatives, e) Traditional knowledge holders
2. Functions: a) Cultural impact assessment, b) Community consultation oversight, c) Traditional knowledge integration, d) Rights protection monitoring, e) Cultural preservation guidance

§ 7. Coordination Mechanisms [New paragraph]

1. Federal-State Coordination: a) Joint naming committee, b) Resource sharing protocols, c) Data exchange standards, d) Research cooperation
2. Interstate Coordination: a) Cross-border feature management, b) Shared database access, c) Joint research projects, d) Dispute resolution

Chapter 3: Scientific and Research Framework

§ 8. Research Standards

1. Methodological Requirements: a) Clear research protocols, b) Verifiable methods, c) Documented procedures, d) Peer review processes, e) Quality control measures
2. Evidence Standards: a) Multiple source verification, b) Primary source documentation, c) Chain of evidence, d) Uncertainty assessment, e) Alternative analysis
3. Data Requirements: a) Comprehensive collection, b) Systematic documentation, c) Quality assurance, d) Accessibility, e) Long-term preservation

§ 9. Names Research Database

1. Content Requirements: a) Historical documentation, b) Linguistic analysis, c) Geographic data, d) Cultural context, e) Usage patterns, f) Change documentation
2. Technical Standards: a) Digital preservation, b) Version control, c) Data protection, d) Interoperability, e) Public accessibility, f) Research functionality
3. Analysis Capabilities: a) Pattern recognition, b) Temporal analysis, c) Geographic distribution, d) Linguistic evolution, e) Cultural patterns, f) Usage trends

§ 10. Federal-State Research Cooperation

1. Joint Research Programs: a) Shared methodology development, b) Cross-border studies, c) Resource pooling, d) Technology sharing
2. Coordinated Documentation: a) Standard protocols, b) Shared databases, c) Joint preservation, d) Combined analysis

Chapter 4: Standardization Procedures

§ 11. Name Cases

1. Initiation Rights: a) Public authorities, b) Research institutions, c) Indigenous groups, d) Local communities, e) Cultural organizations
2. Required Documentation: a) Scientific evidence, b) Historical records, c) Cultural significance, d) Community input, e) Expert analysis
3. Process Requirements: a) Transparent procedures, b) Scientific review, c) Cultural assessment, d) Community consultation, e) Expert evaluation

§ 12. Evidence-Based Decision Making

1. Required Evidence: a) Historical documentation, b) Linguistic analysis, c) Geographic context, d) Cultural documentation, e) Usage patterns, f) Scientific research
2. Evaluation Criteria: a) Scientific validity, b) Cultural significance, c) Community impact, d) Practical considerations, e) Sustainability factors
3. Documentation Requirements: a) Decision rationale, b) Evidence assessment, c) Methodology description, d) Alternative considerations, e) Impact evaluation

§ 13. Jurisdictional Procedures

1. Federal Level Procedures: a) Interstate feature standardization, b) Cross-border consultation, c) International coordination, d) Federal land naming
2. State Level Procedures: a) Local feature standardization, b) Community consultation, c) Regional coordination, d) Local implementation

§ 14. Cross-Jurisdictional Names

1. Joint Management: a) Shared decision protocols, b) Coordinated research, c) Joint documentation, d) Combined resources

Chapter 5: Rights Protection and Inclusion

§ 15. Indigenous and Minority Rights

1. Equal Status: a) Legal recognition, b) Documentation priority, c) Public visibility, d) Research support, e) Resource allocation
2. Decision-Making Rights: a) Consultation requirements, b) Consent protocols, c) Appeal processes, d) Review rights, e) Implementation oversight
3. Protection Measures: a) Cultural preservation, b) Knowledge protection, c) Research protocols, d) Documentation standards, e) Usage rights

Chapter 6: Documentation and Preservation

§ 16. Documentation Systems

1. National Names Register: a) Comprehensive database, b) Historical records, c) Scientific documentation, d) Cultural information, e) Geographic references, f) Usage patterns
2. Documentation Requirements: a) Primary sources, b) Research findings, c) Cultural context, d) Linguistic analysis, e) Geographic data, f) Community input
3. Technical Standards: a) Digital preservation, b) Data security, c) Accessibility, d) Interoperability, e) Quality control

§ 17. Research Archives

1. Content Requirements: a) Raw research data, b) Methodology documentation, c) Analysis records, d) Decision rationales, e) Cultural assessments, f) Community input
2. Preservation Standards: a) Long-term storage, b) Format sustainability, c) Migration protocols, d) Access controls, e) Security measures
3. Access Provisions: a) Research access, b) Community access, c) Public access, d) Security protocols, e) Privacy protection

Chapter 7: Sustainable Management

§ 18. Resource Allocation

1. Core Funding: a) Administrative operations, b) Research programs, c) Documentation systems, d) Technical infrastructure, e) Community engagement
2. Special Funding: a) Indigenous names projects, b) Minority language documentation, c) Cultural preservation, d) Research initiatives, e) Technology development
3. Resource Distribution: a) Equitable allocation, b) Priority setting, c) Efficiency measures, d) Accountability, e) Impact assessment

§ 19. Knowledge Management

1. Professional Development: a) Staff training, b) Research capacity, c) Technical skills, d) Cultural competency, e) Community engagement
2. Knowledge Transfer: a) Documentation protocols, b) Training programs, c) Succession planning, d) Institutional memory, e) Community education
3. Research Support: a) Academic partnerships, b) Research funding, c) Publication support, d) Conference hosting, e) International collaboration

Chapter 8: Implementation and Enforcement

§ 20. Implementation

1. Phased Implementation: a) Foundation phase (Year 1), b) Development phase (Years 2-3), c) Enhancement phase (Years 4-5), d) Optimization phase (Ongoing)
2. Implementation Requirements: a) Clear timelines, b) Resource allocation, c) Progress monitoring, d) Quality assurance, e) Impact assessment
3. Review Mechanisms: a) Regular evaluation, b) Performance metrics, c) Adjustment protocols, d) Stakeholder feedback, e) Scientific assessment

§ 21. Compliance and Enforcement

1. Monitoring: a) Regular audits, b) Performance review, c) Quality assessment, d) Impact evaluation, e) Community feedback
2. Enforcement Measures: a) Compliance requirements, b) Correction procedures, c) Appeal processes, d) Penalty provisions, e) Remediation protocols
3. Reporting Requirements: a) Annual reports, b) Scientific evaluations, c) Cultural impact assessments, d) Community feedback, e) International reporting

§ 22. International Cooperation

1. Collaboration Requirements: a) Research sharing, b) Best practices exchange, c) Technical cooperation, d) Cultural preservation, e) Standards alignment
2. International Obligations: a) Treaty compliance, b) Convention adherence, c) Standard adoption, d) Reporting requirements, e) Cooperation protocols

§ 23. Amendment Procedures

1. Review Requirements: a) Regular assessment, b) Scientific evaluation, c) Cultural impact, d) Stakeholder consultation, e) Implementation feedback
2. Amendment Process: a) Evidence-based proposals, b) Stakeholder consultation, c) Scientific review, d) Impact assessment, e) Implementation planning

Chapter 9: Federal-State Relations [New Chapter]

§ 24. Resource Sharing

1. Federal Support: a) Technical infrastructure, b) Research funding, c) Training programs, d) Database management
2. State Contributions: a) Local expertise, b) Community engagement, c) Implementation resources, d) Regional documentation

§ 25. Dispute Resolution

1. Interstate Disputes: a) Federal mediation, b) Joint committees, c) Appeal procedures, d) Binding resolution
2. Federal-State Disputes: a) Consultation requirements, b) Mediation processes, c) Legal remedies, d) Implementation agreements

§ 26. Implementation Coordination

1. Federal Oversight: a) National standards, b) Progress monitoring, c) Quality assurance, d) Resource allocation
2. State Implementation: a) Local adaptation, b) Community engagement, c) Regional coordination, d) Resource management

Chapter 10: Entry Into Force [New Chapter]

§ 27. Entry into Force

1. This Law enters into force on [date]
2. Transitional Provisions: a) Existing names protection, b) Ongoing case handling, c) Database migration, d) System adaptation, e) Staff training
3. Federal-State Implementation: a) Phased jurisdiction transfer, b) Resource allocation timeline, c) System integration schedule, d) Training implementation