

## Minutes

*Joint Meeting of Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation and Working Group on Publicity and Funding*

*10-12 September 2015, Room 27.2.23, Department of Nordic Research, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark*

*13:00-17:21, 10 September 2015 (day one)*

*9:05-11:40, 10 September 2015 (day two)*

## Participants

Mr Sungjae Choo, Convenor, WG on Evaluation and Implementation, UNGEEN (Convenor, WG on Evaluation and Implementation, Republic of Korea)

Ms Naima Friha

Mr Brahim Atoui (Coordinator, Task Team for Africa, Algeria)

Ms Helen Kerfoot (Honorary Chairperson, Canada)

Mr Jinyoung Kim Geographical Information Institute (Republic of Korea)

Mr Yeon-Taek Ryu (Chungbuk National University, Republic of Korea)

Mr Sun-Bae Kim (Republic of Korea)

Mr Young-Hoon Kim (Korea National University of Education, Republic of Korea)

Ms Élisabeth Calvarin (France) appears at 13:13

Mr Peder Gammeltoft (Convenor, WG on Publicity and Funding, Denmark)

Mr Gerhard Rampl (University of Innsbruck, Austria)

Mr Ferian Ormeling (Netherlands)

Mr Botolv Helleland (Norway)

Ms Ulla Onkamo (Finland)

Ms Sirkka Paikkala (Finland)

Mr William Watt (Australia)

Mr Teemu Leskinen (Finland)

Ms Berrit Sandnes (Norway) – leaves at 14:00

Ms Leila Mattfolk (Sweden) – only day two

Mr Leif Nilsson (Sweden) – only day two

Ms Annette Torensjö (Sweden) – only day two

Ms Lisa Monica Aslaksen – only day two

Excused

Mr Staffan Nyström

Side events before, during and after the meeting

The joint working group meeting was accompanied by the meeting of the Working Group on Geographical Names as Cultural Heritage (9.-10.09.2015) and the meeting of the Norden Division (12.09.2015). Holding adjacent meetings was considered positive by all participants.

On Friday, 12.09.2015, the host institution organized a guided visit to the UN City Copenhagen. There a special lecture was given on the tasks and responsibilities of the UNFPA - United Nations Population Fund.

Coffee and lunches had been sponsored by the Swedish Institute for Language and Folklore, the National Geographic Information Institute (NGII) of the Republic of Korea and The Danish Place-Name Commission. Evening meals had been sponsored by Lantmäteriet, Sweden and by the National Geographic Information Institute (NGII) of the Republic of Korea.

## **1. Welcome**

Mr Choo welcomed the participants in the joint Working Group meeting of the Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation (WG-EvaImp) and the Working Group on Publicity and Funding (WG-PubFun). In his opening remarks Mr Choo stressed out the important task of defining a new focus for the Working Group. Mr Gammeltoft welcomed the participants and put the topic of operational modalities as main focus. Mr Choo and Mr Gammeltoft both emphasized the success of joint meetings with the WG on Names as Cultural heritage.

Choo welcomed Mr Helleland as a special guest and former longtime rapporteur of the WG. He also welcomed Mr Rampl as the new rapporteur of both WGs.

Mr Choo pointed out that the group has no formal membership and welcomed all participants as contributors for a good outcome of the meeting.

Logistical remarks:

- Following meeting materials were circulated before the meeting: agenda, minutes of the New York 2014 meeting, notes from the teleconference, excel files with about WP referring to resolutions and evaluation results, (summary of) comments regarding operation modalities (previously circulated by Ms Blake)
- Mr Choo had been provided with a draft report of GGIM5
- The meeting was scheduled for Th 13:00-17:30 and Fr 9:00-11:30 with a wrap up session at 7:30 at Neptun Hotel. At 15:00 a conference-call with the UN-office would take place. Due to the tight timeframe Mr Choo urges an efficient use of time and proposes to pre-discuss important issues for the upcoming teleconference.

## **2. Adoption of agenda and administrative matters (chairs, rapporteur, times, etc.)**

Minor amendments were made to the provisional meeting agenda circulated through e-mail beforehand (see annex 1 for the agenda). Mr Watt and Mr Choo proposed the addition of point 7.b. "UNGEKN Statute". The agenda was accepted.

Mr Choo chaired Meeting Agenda items 1-5 and Mr Gammeltoft chaired Meeting Agenda items 6-12. The teleconference with the UN-Secretariat was conducted by William Mr Watt.

## **3. Mandate, objectives, responsibilities, etc. of the two Working Groups**

Mr Choo showed the UNGEGN site of the WG-EvaImp. He mentions that no bigger revision of the work plan was needed. The website was now in English, French and Spanish, a fourth language would be added when translation was finished. Mr Choo proposed to accept the mandate for the WG-EvaImp as is.

Mr Gammeltoft added that the mandate of the WG-PubFun was generally coherent as well but some minor updates of the site would be necessary.

No further comments.

#### **4. Report from the UNGEGN Secretariat**

In preparation for the following teleconference with the UN-Secretariat Mr Watt summarized background information on the proposed topic of the call. He referred to the last convenor-secretariat telephone-conference and Mr Schweinfests remarks on the time-cycle Session-Session-Conference. Mr Watt then he referred to the UNGGIM-report, that raised some questions about the relationship UNGEGN-UNGGIM. He reported that since then he had some discussion with Mr Schweinfest and Mr Scott and he has assurance that UNGGIM would not have interest in absorbing UNGEGN and the main goal was streamlining ECOSOC and avoiding redundant activities. He informed that back to back meetings UNGEGN-UNGGIM were considered. Mr Watt was asking the Secretariat to send a list of people who take part in both meetings to evaluate overlapping attendance. He explained not to be wanting for UNGEGN to rely on UNGGIM attendance. He further explained that at this point it was not clear if UNGEGN should come up with ideas on these topics or if UNGGIM would make suggestions on its own – this would be one of his questions for the teleconference. The teleconference would inform about the Secretariat's point of view on these issues but also would give the opportunity to ask specific questions and report back. He stressed out the importance to find effective ways to work with UNGGIM.

Changes within UNGEGN could be proposed in the upcoming 2016 Session and then acknowledged at the 2017 Conference. Mr Watt estimated for UNGEGN not to feel threatened nor comfortable but he urged to give best value for the money ECOSOC spends.

Mr Choo proposed to collect/summarize questions and comments for the upcoming teleconference and opened the floor.

Ms Kerfoot asks if the upcoming Session in Bangkok would also be part of the telephone conference. Mr Watt affirmed.

Ms Kerfoot wanted UNGGIM to explain their process/timeframe.

Ms Friha asked for a deadline to submit ideas to secretariat. Mr Watt answered that a UNGGIM report came to ECOSOC to give an overall view. For UNGEGN this would mean that up to the 2017 Conference only a working plan could be submitted to ECOSOC because decisions outside meeting cycle were not possible.

Ms Kerfoot showed concerns about the plans for France in 2019 and the problems that could arise with changes in 2017. In response to Ms Kerfoot's concerns about problems that could arise with the planned session in France 2019 Ms Calvarin said France would also like to host the Conference in 2017, maybe even back to back with the GGIM-Europe meeting. There would be the necessary infrastructure from UNESCO to host the conference. The proposed date (availability of the conference center) would be in the second half of September. Mr Watt said he would welcome the meeting in France but he urged to make a fast decision. Ms Calvarin further explained the facilities and possibilities of the UNESCO properties in Paris. Ms Kerfoot told about the experiences in Canada and proposes the same procedures for France.

In regard to the upcoming Session in Bangkok Ms Kerfoot asked about the facilities and the program and what to do in between (maps exhibitions, posters, workshops before and after sessions, etc.) She also asked about sponsorship for individuals

Ms Friha responded that the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie would sponsor some participants.

Mr Leskinen asked if there were plans to use an interactive web session format. It would give people a chance to participate actively without having to travel. Mr Watt reported about bad experience with interactive teleconferences. Ms Kerfoot responded that the Secretariat would be concerned about the assurance of the identity of people on the other side of the line. Mr Watt added that the webcast worked fine at UNGGIM.

Mr Atoui asked about how to represent UNGEGN at UNGGIM. Who could, for example, represent UNGEGN at UNGGIM-Africa? He proposed that the chair of task team could be the representative – but how would he get invitation from UNGEGN or UNGGIM? Ms Friha responded she had an invitation. Mr Watt threw in there would still be the question of funding to make the representation of UNGEGN efficient. Ms Friha reported she didn't get funding for UNGGIM in Tunisia (and did not need it). The problem was that she did not have a topic what exactly to represent.

Mr Watt added that it would be necessary to also have an exact spot in the agenda to discuss about the papers.

Ms Friha reported from her experience in Beijing that there was no discussion or talk about the standardization of names in layers – there was no awareness for standardization.

Mr Choo emphasized the necessity of a formal relationship between UNGEGN and UNGGIM. Ms Kerfoot noted that one of the main problems would be funding. Mr Watt added that UNGGIM would be at the UNGEGN meetings.

Mr Choo expressed the hope that the Conference in France might be an opportunity to save money and connect to UNGGIM.

#### Conference-call

New York: Mr Stefan Schweinfest, Ms Cecile Blake, Mr Amor Laaribi, Mr Greg Scott (UNGGIM)

Copenhagen: Mr Watt for the participants

Begin 15:05

#### Information on Bangkok 2016: process, procedure, time frame

- 1) Mr Schweinfest informed about the conference center, side events should be possible when given specific dates and times. The center in town should make logistics easier.
- 2) Funding for individuals should be possible but would depend on the new budget year 2016.
- 3) Exhibition display of posters should be possible if arranged.

On the French proposal to host the 11<sup>th</sup> Conference in Paris (back to back with GGIM-Europe)

- 1) Mr Schweinfest was aware of the proposal. The back to back proposal was new to him but he was interested in the idea.
- 2) Mr Schweinfest agreed that Ms Calvarin should get in touch with the Secretariat. The length of the Conference would mainly be a problem if it was outside UNESCO premises but he also pointed out that meetings tended to be shortened in general.
- 3) The Conference in Paris was welcomed but it would need to be adopted by ECOSOC in any case.

#### Concerning eventual changes in UNGEGN

- 1) Mr Watt asked if it would be ok for ECOSOC if the adoption of changes could only be made at the Conference in 2017. Mr Schweinfest responded that in general this would be ok, but timing would be a problem. He reported that UNGGIM had taken place with positive mention of UNGEGN. Now there was a mandate for UNGGIM to start a joint reflection, meaning that UNGEGN would receive a letter from UNGGIM with the request to make a formal report. This would be forwarded to ECOSOC in the midst of January 2016. Mr. Schweinfest said that the UNGGIM process would be more advanced and the mode of cooperation would not be obvious. It should be made clear before the report to ECOSOC. He also said the question of costs would come up. At this time calculation shows more payed conference days for UNGEGN than for all UNGGIM together. A final decision would be made in 2017 but what in his opinion would be necessary was a committed signal until January,
- 2) To accomplish that Mr Watt suggested a special edition of the bulletin to get feedback. Mr Schweinfest agreed.
- 3) Mr Watt asked for the concept of future connection to UNGGIM. How would representation be handled. Mr Schweinfest answered a formal relationship would begin with the letter from UNGGIM then the two were formally linked. Mr Schweinfest deemed it useful and practical to have coordination on a national level. Mr Watt did not disagree with that.
- 4) Mr Watt asked when to expect the formal letter? Mr Schweinfest replied very soon, within the next 10 days.
- 5) Mr Watt asked if maintaining the status quo would be considered as an option. Mr Schweinfest answered that it would be an option – the important thing would be a strong vision statement/program, the structure would come on second place.

On web-based interaction

- 6) Mr Watt asked about possibilities of web-based interaction during the session in Bangkok. Mr Schweinfest answered that UN Web TV was be a new feature and available now. He would check availability in Bangkok. Ms Blake asked for a wish list for Bangkok until 26<sup>th</sup> of September.

Mr Watt thanked all participants and ended the conference-call.

Mr Watt summarized that Mr Schweinfest was obviously expecting some clear considerations for the future. As soon as he (Watt) would receive the letter from UNGGIM he would disseminate the letter together with some ideas.

Mr Choo asked who would compile the list for Bangkok.

- Compile an e-mail for Mr. Schweinfest before 9/26/2015 with questions concerning infrastructure, side events and individual sponsoring for the next UNGEGN Session in Bangkok. (*Mr. William Watt, Mr. Sungjae Choo*)

Ms Kerfoot highlighted difficulties of UNGEGN-UNGGIM contacts on the national level because the corresponding people would work on different administrative levels. Mr Watt expressed the opinion that contacts only could be possible on a strategic level. Ms Kerfoot added that a list with points to guide the communication between the individual people would be helpful. This could be included in the special issue of the Bulletin. Mr Ormeling stated that it might be best for chair and vice chairs to connect. He agreed to make contact with Mr Tim Trainor (known to him for 30 years).

- Get in touch with UN-GGIM to prepare future formal relationship. UNGEGN Vice-Chair Mr. Ferjan Ormeling agreed to contact UN-GGIM Co-Chair Mr. Timothy Trainor (*Mr. Ferjan Ormeling*)

- a. **Completed items since the 28<sup>th</sup> Session**  
See above
- b. **Status quo regarding arrangements for the 29<sup>th</sup> Session**  
See above
- c. **Bureau meetings, operational improvements**  
See above
- d. **A look ahead (UNGE GN works, link to UNGGIM, priorities, etc.)**  
See above

## 5. Progress Report of Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation

An overview on the papers submitted to UNGEGN 28, 11 papers on E/I was given.

- a. **Completed items since last WG meeting**  
Mr Choo went through the minutes of the last meeting and discusses briefly the points:
  - The upload of the meeting 2014 was completed.
  - Mr Zaccheddu's proposal of questionnaire input was completed.
  - Concerning the Resolutions Database: the problem with diacritics were fixed. Ms. Rodriguez Ramos provided the base for a Spanish version. It was working and would be published after some minor revisions. Mr Choo asked which language version could be next. He was informed that the expert of Egypt was working on an Arabic version and Ms Friha and Mr Atoui agreed to also collaborate on this version.
  - On the topic of an online questionnaire: Mr Choo would try to initiate that after the meeting. Mr Watt added that this could be very important to assess the feedback on the webcasts from countries not participating directly.
    - Ask the Secretariat for technical support (survey tool) to do an online evaluation and subsequent follow-ups. (*Mr. Sungjae Choo*)
- b. **Resolutions database (English, French, Spanish and others)**  
Mr Choo showed the now very well working resolutions databases (discussion was postponed to item 7).
- c. **Evaluation questionnaire: some basics**  
Mr Choo gave the floor to Mr Ryu who had prepared the paper *28th UNGEGN Evaluation\_resolution part 2*. Mr Ryu summarized the basic results of the paper. Mr Choo then announced that the paper would also be discussed under 7c.
- d. **Implementing resolutions: A review of WPs of 28<sup>th</sup> Session**

Mr Choo gave an overview on the papers mentioning resolutions (Excel table *UNGEGN wps\_referring to resolutions*). He also focused on the factors that hinder implementing resolutions, mainly the lack of awareness and financial problems (also postponed to 7).

Ms Kerfoot noted that with 52 different resolutions there was an interesting order of the top mentioned resolutions.

## **6. Progress Report of Working Group on Publicity and Funding**

Transfer of chair to Mr Gammeltoft.

- a. Completed items since last WG meeting**
- b. Funding activities**

Mr Gammeltoft reported on the progress in individual funding: Ms Calvarin had been successful in funding two francophone participants (Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie). The Secretariat was considering funding on the usual level (2-3people).

- Report about the possibility of funding in the upcoming UNGEGN-Bulletin (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, with the aid of Ms. Élisabeth Calvarin*)

### **i. Toponymy training courses**

Mr Ormeling reported about the training courses that took place after the last meeting in New York. There was a special 5 days course in Tunis on how to train names comities. Participating countries were were Burkina Faso, Algeria and Botswana. All in all about 40 participants. Support for five participants came from the UNSD. Ms Friha thanked the trainers, especially Ms Calvarin and Mr Ormeling for the good training course. She reported that the sharing with the other countries was very interesting, fieldwork was also done. It was appreciated by national bodies – the Minister of Defense opened the course. There would be willingness to have further experts from UNGEGN on this work. Thanks to UNSD, progress had been made since the course.

Mr Ormeling then reported about the course in Oran. It was not funded by the UN due to only national participation.

Mr Watt asked if there was interest for further training courses. Mr Ormeling replied that Brazil would be interested to build a training center for toponymy.

### **ii. Toponymic terminology database**

Mr Gammeltoft reported about little development since the last time due to the change of job of the programmer.

### **iii. Translation of publicity material**

Mr Gammeltoft reported that the secretariat would be helpful in putting translated material on the homepage but couldn't fund translations themselves.

Ms Kerfoot asked about funding for upcoming UNGEGN Session, also if there was a way to reach out to Asian countries like Nepal, Bhutan or East Timor. Mr Watt answered that the main problem was non existing contacts. Ms Kerfoot asked if there were contacts with India. Mr Watt replied

that he had contacted India and the Indian Division but did not get an answer. Ms Friha mentioned the general problem of how to contact countries who never had attended UNGEGN meetings.

- Reach out to countries (especially from South-East-Asia) not yet represented at UNGEGN to attend at the next session in Bangkok. (*Mr. William Watt, Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

Mr Gammeltoft reported that Korea had been helpful in the past and would be contacted again. He asked about further funding possibilities. Mr Helleland reported that the Norwegian program was shut down. Ms Friha remarked that the priority for the Session in Bangkok should be given to Asian countries.

**c. Public outreach**  
**i. Information Bulletin**

Mr Gammeltoft informed about the first topic oriented issue of the Bulletin (names as cultural heritage). After a slow start articles were coming in steadily and the last bulletin had 60 pages. Topic orientation should be considered a successful approach. His article republished in academia.edu had 400 views and 300 downloads – that showed that articles in the bulletin were interesting for the public, too.

He announced that the next bulletin would have some articles on cultural heritage, as well. He also asked for help for proofreading articles in French and Spanish.

He also informed that the Bulletin had a new, more attractive layout.

Ms Friha asked about any kind of reviewing process, especially if it came to politically sensitive cases. Mr Gammeltoft answered that he in person would read all articles and also look at political issues.

**ii. UNGEGN website including social media, e.g. Facebook and twitter**

Mr Gammeltoft informed that there was no UNGEGN twitter profile whereas in Facebook there would exist two pages.

- Ask the Secretariat about how to go on with social media like twitter and Facebook. Ask former rapporteur of the WG Hubert Bergmann about existing accounts (especially Facebook group "UNGEEN"). (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, Mr. Gerhard Rampf*)

Mr Gammeltoft then reported that the homepage itself worked well. He encouraged participation to update the events page regularly. Ms Kerfoot stipulated to encourage WGs and Divisions to put their dates on frontpage AND eventpage. Ms Friha was asking why the workshop was not mentioned though she had written to the Secretariat. Mr Gammeltoft explained that one has to e-mail specifically to put things on the events-list. Mr Gammeltoft considered writing an article in the Bulletin to explain the procedure.

Mr Ormeling asked if all documents from Sessions had been scanned. Ms Kerfoot answered that there were still some scattered pages missing. Mr Watt emphasized the great job the Secretariat has done in that regard making older documents available.



- Follow-up-call for missing documents from Conferences and Sessions as mentioned in WP 31/7, 28<sup>th</sup> Session. Since some of the documents have been submitted in the meantime, a previous reassessment is advisable. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

### **iii. Wikipedia information**

Mr Gammeltoft informed that former Coordinator for TG Mr Bergmann had set up the site but it was unknown what had been done since. Now there existed more languages for the entry UNGEGN but it was not clear who wrote these.

- Update information on Toponymic Guidelines on the respective Wikipedia-pages. Call for translating the Wikipedia-articles into different languages in the UNGEGN Bulletin. (*Mr. Gerhard Ramp*)

### **iv. Media kit**

Mr Gammeltoft informed that there had not been any updates since the last time. The Korean translation in was new and available at the homepage.

### **v. IGU/ICA Joint Commission on Toponymy**

Mr Ormeling reported about the general assembly in Rio de Janeiro. The working group was upgraded to commission, chairs were Paulo de Menezes and Cosimo Palaciano, vice chair Peter Jordan. The attention to the conference was very good not least because of very active chairs. Ms Kerfoot asked if the meetings had certain topics. Mr Ormeling answered that the last convention in Rome had “Name changes”. Ms Kerfoot asked if the contributions would get published. Mr Choo informed that Paul Woodman would publish the Rome convention.

### **vi. Onomastic fora**

Mr Gammeltoft told about ICOS, he represented UNGEGN with flyers, stand etc. He informed that the next ICOS would take place in Debrecen, Hungary, in 2017, probably August. Mr Atoui asked about the presence of people from Africa. Mr Gammeltoft informed that there was very poor attendance from African and Asian countries.

- Get in touch with ICOS representatives to ask for support for potential participants especially from Africa and Asia. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

### **vii. Cartographic fora**

See item v. IGU/ICA.

Mr Helleland informed about a conference in Budapest with toponomastic-section and 12 papers (including Peter Jordan).

Mr Choo closed the first part of the meeting at 17:21.

Mr Gammeltoft opened the meeting at 9:05. He announced the end of the session at 11:30 and the follow up breakfast session at Hotel Neptun (afterwards start of Norden Division meeting).

## **7. Improving the work of UNGEGN**

### **a. UNGEGN/UNCSGN operation modalities**

Mr Gammeltoft and Mr Choo after some organizational remarks opened the floor.

Mr Watt summarized the results of the conference-call from the day before. He summed up that there seemed to be the expectation within the UN for a change and to reduce the financial footprint of UNGEGN. He emphasized that no matter what the outcome of the following discussions would be a justification for the decision would be important. He then explained his point of view and favored a two/four year cycle and reduced time for the conference dependent also on how many papers would come in.

Mr Gammeltoft replied that in any case there would be not more than three options: doing nothing and justify it, a four year cycle and a six year cycle. Mr Watt expressed his concerns that a five year gap seemed to long for strategic settings. Also a conference only model (an option Mr Schweinfest had mentioned in the conference-call) would not be a proper solution. Ms Kerfoot added that without the Sessions the whole UNGEGN structure and Bureau would be lost. She then reported that Mr Nyström would be in favor of Conferences because these would produce resolutions.

Mr Helleland added that there would also be the possibility of regional meetings (Sessions) between the conferences. But he critically objected that this would also mean the loss of one core part of UNGEGN. There would also be in question if this would be possible on every continent.

Ms Kerfoot added that there were resolutions existing for the meeting of working groups.

Mr Atoui proposed one conference every two or three years and meeting of division or committees in between. Mr Choo objected that committees were organized on topics not countries. Ms Kerfoot added that since only ECOSOC was able to make resolutions UNGEGN could restrict itself to making recommendations. Ms Friha added that with the model of Mr Atoui these could be made by committees.

Ms Kerfoot expressed her concerns about financing in-between meetings. Mr Watt joined in - there could be even less participants than now.

Mr Ormeling asked if meetings could be linked to the (regional) UNGGIM meetings. Mr Watt expressed his concerns that this might rise regional cooperation problems.

Mr Helleland asked if the UNGEGN structure was unique within the UN. Ms Kerfoot replied that the Statistical Commission would meet in a one year interval or shorter.

Mr Watt emphasized not to lose focus about what UNGEGN does, namely resolve/develop place name issues in countries. For this purpose Sessions would be more efficient than Conferences, meaning if something would come in place of Session it would have to have the same effect.

Ms Friha said a link with UNGGIM could influence decision makers and therefore enforce the role of standardization – the presence of UNGEGN partners in UNGGIM meetings would be a strategic measure. Mr Atoui added the relation to UNGGIM should be strong but the different goals and should clearly be kept.

Mr Watt suggested in case of a four year cycle the Secretariat should support this and give a framework on how to represent UNGEGN at UNGGIM.

Ms Kerfoot asked Mr Watt about the possibilities of back-to-back meetings with UNGGIM. Mr Watt answered that this could be explored but until now it had not been made by clear by Secretariat who attended to which events. Mr. Helleland and Mr Atoui expressed their concerns about back-to-back conferences. Ms Friha again pointed out the importance of having a clear representation and stand in UNGGIM conferences. There could be regional representatives or UNGEGN could assign somebody (chair, vice chairs) to attend to UNGGIM.

Ms Kerfoot, Mr Leskinen, Mr Watt and Mr Ormeling briefly calculated the saving potential (eight events instead of ten would be about 20% savings in 14 years).

Mr Choo summed up the positions expressed so far: 1) UNGEGN should stay independent, 2) the time schedule could be changed, 3) the Session-Conference-structure could be altered (in relationship with UNGGIM or not), and 4) the duration of Session or Conferences could be reduced if possible. He then put the question how to proceed, respectively what to decide in this meeting. The results could be disseminated as suggestion/proposal or there could be a series of options later distributed by e-mail etc. Mr Watt replied he did not think that there should be made a conclusion at this point. Ms Kerfoot indicated the time constraint until January – somebody would have to come up with a final option. The restraints could be explained it in the Bulletin. Mr Gammeltoft added that costs were calculated per day not per Session/Conference so there could be an aim to reduce days in general. There should be two propositions in the Bulletin. Mr Watt added one would be to stay with the status quo the other to reduce the cycle and days.

Mr Watt, Ms Kerfoot and Mr Gammeltoft stressed out the importance of keeping a working structure especially of the heading parties. Division meetings could in no way be a surrogate for Sessions, even if they worked perfectly.

Considering the time restraints the attendants agreed on the following procedure:

- Distribute a document (position paper) to participants of the WG-meeting describing max. 3 options on future possible UNGEGN/UNCSGN operation modalities. Feedback on this document should be given within one week. Afterwards the possibilities will be sent out in a special edition of the UNGEGN-Bulletin for further feedback. (*Mr. William Watt, participants of the WG-meeting*)

Mr Ormeling pointed out the importance of explaining the procedure especially the overlap strategy with UNGGIM in the bulletin article.

Mr Watt, Mr Gammeltoft, Ms Kerfoot and Ms Friha engaged in a brief exploration on how the Session/Conference microstructure could be optimized (days, presentations etc.).

#### **b. UNGEGN Statute (new point)**

Mr Choo put the statute on the screen and explained that it was finally revised in 2012 when Asia South-East Division and Pacific South-West Divisions split. He gave a short review of the statute and introduced the suggestion of Ms Paikkala to insert item numbers *I. Aims g*) and *II. Principles 5*) stating that everything is done under the basic idea of preserving intangible cultural heritage. He then opened the floor for discussion.

Mr Leskinen added that this idea was brought up at a Norden Division conference yet in 2005. Already then it was stated that an inclusion of this topic might not be that simple.

Mr Ormeling proposed to also include the collaboration with statistical organizations (besides the mapping organizations) under item number *3. Functions*.

Mr Choo suggested that before adding specific items there should be a consensus that the statute needed a revision at all. He therefore asked the participants when and under which circumstances the statute would get revised in general.

Ms Kerfoot explained the last revision (2002): the revision was made because the statutes were written in a rather passive way. This was changed to a more proactive style. So it was less a matter of content and more a matter of general change in language. To avoid frequent changes some parts like division names have been outsourced to annexes – these can be changed without a conference. She asked with possible changes in near future if it was a good time for making revisions of this kind. It should be discussed with the Secretariat.

Mr Watt added that question how much detail there should be in the statute. He completely agreed that the topic of cultural heritage was very important with place names but he thought it might better situated in an underneath the statute layer “statements of direction” with other focus points (cultural heritage, open data ...).

Ms Torensjö also favors this approach and thought it to be more practical than including the topic in the statutes.

Mr Choo proposed that the Finnish colleagues would submit a working paper on including cultural heritage elements in the statutes in Bangkok to raise awareness. This would remind other experts to make other proposals to be inserted in the statute – then there could be a discussion on which further details to include in the statute.

Mr Young-Hoon Kim also reminded the participants that time for revision would be needed.

Mr Helleland summed up the proceeding as following: working paper at the upcoming Session discussion and possible changes of the statute at the Conference 2017.

### **c. Review of evaluation questionnaire forms received at the 28<sup>th</sup> Session**

Referring to the excel sheets submitted to the participants beforehand Mr Choo summed up some main results for further discussion: ad *II. Programs and Contents*: many experts wanted to have more time for discussion etc.; the usefulness of exhibitions was considered lowest, also low came the usefulness of (sub)division meetings; also other indicators showed that the experts wanted more time; the distinction discussion/information papers was rated low.

Mr Watt said that the though it was sad that not all papers could be discussed and the distinction between the two would even play a bigger role with a restricted timeframe. A tendency for experts to focus on issues rather than on information papers could be the result.

Mr Choo went on describing that division and displays setting in NY was rated low. Finally the five days session did have relatively poor results. He then asked for comments on the evaluation.

Mr Leskinen stated that the percentage in general was either very high or high which all in all would be very high. Mr Watt added that the conferences and the sessions could be considered very successful but still would have some room for improvement. The working group and division meetings were out of hand because these were organized by working groups/divisions themselves. Mr Gammeltoft remarked that one problem for improvement would be the condensed timeframe, this would also be true if the sub-organizational meetings were one or two days beforehand. Short discussion on problems with overlapping meetings (24 divisions; working groups; workshops). Mr Gammeltoft proposed considering evening meetings. Ms Kerfoot replied that some divisions were already going for dinner.

Mr Young-Hoon Kim proposed a final joint online survey with all delegates at the end of sessions.

Ms Kerfoot replied that this could be problematic if it was on a too fine level because it could be discouraging for moderators, chairs etc. (e.g. because of language problems).

Mr Gammeltoft said that two items could be addressed immediately: the display location in NY should be improved and the possibility of extra timeslot for meetings should be considered. Mr Atoui added that lunch meetings should be reserved for technical meetings to give these priority. Ms Kerfoot added that low rates for display in NY were important for planning for the Bangkok meeting.

To get a clearer picture on why some rating were lower, Mr Watt suggested to add fields for remarks to the form. Mr Choo replied that in favor of shortness these fields had been dropped.

Ms Kerfoot asked if there were many changes to be expected for the next session in Bangkok. Mr Choo said there would be changes. The questionnaires would be circulated to the convenors beforehand and questions could be included on demand. The only restriction was the two page format. The languages would be English, French and Spanish.

Ms Friha suggested the announcement during the session about the availability of the questionnaire (also on the internet) to get feedback from participants leaving the session early. Also results should be sent home to chairs.

Ms Calvarin added that different languages seemed very important to also get the feedback from countries that cannot have translation.

Ms Kerfoot added that there should not be two questionnaires (e.g. from the Bangkok conference center).

- Elaborate/modify the questionnaire for the upcoming session (adaptations especially regarding comments are advisable). (*Mr. Sungjae Choo and Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation*)

#### **d. Planning for 29<sup>th</sup> Session, Bangkok, April 2016**

Mr Watt stated that this item was already discussed at the teleconference. He then asked for further ideas for special presentations. He stated there would be a presentation by UNGGIM and possibly another on Cultural Heritage. Ms Kerfoot suggested local topic from Bangkok. Ms Torensjö added that at the Nairobi meeting there was an interesting presentation on the need of addresses, something like this would be interesting.

- Get suggestions for topics for special presentations in the upcoming Session. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

#### **i. Suggestions for approaches to optimize a 5-day session**

#### **ii. Ideas for special presentations, displays, workshops (sponsored by**

**WGs)**

#### **e. Planning for the 11<sup>th</sup> Conference/30<sup>th</sup> Session, 31<sup>th</sup> Session (Proposal from France)**

#### **f. World Geographical Names Day 2017**

Mr Gammeltoft stated that WGND seemed a good idea but he would need some help to put this further. Mr Ormeling proposed to make a special presentation at UNESCO and to make it official in the bulletin. Mr Choo said that WGND would be an activity at the level of UNGEGN. Therefore he proposed a position paper on what it was for, what would be done etc. Then it would be possible to present the idea at the national mapping agencies. Mr Ormeling proposed an additional essay contest.

Ms Torensjö asked the Finnish experts on their experiences of a similar action in Finland. Ms Paikkala answered there was a working paper presented in Vienna (available on the Norden Division homepage).

Mr Choo asked if there was a specific date or week. Mr Gammeltoft answered no. Mr Choo followed up with the question for the authoritative status to announce the day. Mr Gammeltoft answered that might be a problem because the UN might not support further x-days.

Ms Kerfoot stated that an x-day would have to be proposed by a state (which would be late anyway). A different approach would be to agree within UNGEGN and then promote it to the countries. Mr Gammeltoft expounded that there existed a working paper by Ms Eva-Maria Bison on the topic and he would contact her to ask for further support/material on world names day.

- Contact Ms. Marie-Ève Bisson on pursuing an "International Geographical Names Day" (see WP 35/13, 28<sup>th</sup> Session). Ask Secretariat for information on chances of a high-level approach. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, Ms. Helen Kerfoot*)

Ms Calvarin proposed that France could promote WGND at the meeting in France. Ms Kerfoot added that the UNGEGN 50 years celebration would also be a good opportunity to promote WGND.

#### **g. Resolutions from the Conferences**

Mr Gammeltoft stated that the topic was covered to some extent already but asked Mr Choo to give some more information. Mr Choo showed again results from the survey (excel sheet 28<sup>th</sup> UNGEGN Evaluation analysis). He focused on *III. Resolutions and General Work of UNGEGN*. From the comments he gave three main reasons for hindering the implementation of resolutions: 1) awareness of resolutions; 2) no resources for implementation (human and/or financial) and 3) lack of coordination (link between resolution and national standardization). He then stated that in the last years work much has happened to address these issues. In response to 1) the resolution database (working well in three languages as of 2015); to 2) this would be the basic mandate of the working groups, to encourage member states and experts to implement the resolutions; to 3) ongoing analysis of last sessions on how resolutions are implemented in working papers (experts should be encouraged to state in their working papers the corresponding resolutions).

Mr Watt stated that tremendous work had been done to make resolutions available and that experts should be encouraged to actively look for resolutions. Also case studies (working papers) would be important to make implementations more visible.

Mr Choo added that the German and Dutch Speaking Division's working papers could serve as a model because they focused strongly on mentioning corresponding resolutions.

#### **i. Resolution database on the web**

See above

#### **ii. Implementation of resolutions**

See above

**iii. New resolutions**

No comments

**h. Continuing efforts to make the work of Divisions more effective**

Mr Gammeltoft posed the questions what to do with divisions where there was no or little contact. He brought as an example the Celtic Division and showed the problems to even get in contact due to huge changes in the division's structure.

Mr Choo asked if comments in the bulletin about being more active would be useful.

Mr Watt stated he had contacted divisions in his area but didn't get replies. It seemed like a matter of perseverance.

Ms Calvarin stated that to be effective as a division it would be necessary to encourage nations without commissions to have commissions. Therefore it would be necessary to sensitize the governments who often wouldn't even know about UNGEN to set in a names commissions. UNGEGN should make a resolution to encourage nations without commissions to re-/activate commissions. Mr Ormeling added that in this case UNGGIM could be very useful to make these countries/people aware of the status of their countries at a higher level and encourage implementing naming/standardizing processes. Ms Friha added that a resolution already existed. Ms Calvarin responded it had to be activated.

**i. Progress report of the Task Team for Africa**

Mr Atoui reported that two meetings were held. Two further meetings were planned for 2015 (two days in Algiers and during the International Books Exhibition, also in Algiers). One meeting of the Arabic Division was already planned for 2016 with invitation of representatives from Mali, Niger, and Chad. The latter three countries were invited because Arabic was as an official language and population of northern parts was mainly Berber and Arabic.

Also there was work on a roadmap/guidelines for African countries on how to make toponymic commission.

Furthermore there would be a proposal for a new North African Division in the next session in Bangkok.

Ms Kerfoot asked about contacts to UNECA in Addis Abeba. Mr Atoui responded contact had been made and Ms Friha added that she had been invited to present their work at a statistical meeting. Ms Kerfoot asked about details for contacts, Mr Atoui responded that in spite of difficulties they try to stay in contact with the responsible staff.

Ms Friha suggested a meeting like the one in Botswana because some implementations got stuck in the middle. Mr Atoui added that after the meeting in Cameroon new toponymic commissions had been set in (Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Tunisia). Ms Calvarin also referred to the special presentation from New York on databases – it had been very important for Mali to make their database better. Ms Kerfoot added that UNOCHA was important for the implementation. She said there were some good slides about Somalia loosing resources, security, etc. because of a lack of name standardisation and resulting name confusion.

**j. Future funding**

Covered also under 6b.

Mr Ormeling asked how to get financial help for the proposed toponymy course in Brazil and how get funding for the extended toponymic trainings manual. Mr Watt answered that making the extended trainings course downloadable should not be a problem other support should be asked from the Secretariat. Concerning Brazil he suggested to ask the Secretariat for normal support because the Portuguese Division was organized cross country. Mr Leskinen asked for the language of the course. Mr Ormeling answered that translations was envisaged by Brazil because the course should be used afterwards for the creation of a training center.

- Ask Secretariat on how to get help for the proposed upcoming Training Courses in Toponymy in Brazil. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Ask Secretariat for further support in publishing the *Advanced Toponymy Manual* (see WP 33/8, 28<sup>th</sup> Session) on the UNGEGN homepage. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

#### **k. Suggestions for UNGEGN Information Bulletin, UNGEGN Website**

Mr Gammeltoft reported about the cultural heritage issue of the Bulletin that had been very successful. He then asked for future ideas and topics.

#### **8. Future of the two Working Groups (membership, rapporteur, ongoing works)**

Mr Gammeltoft stated that the working groups worked together well and progress was good. Ms Friha and Mr Atoui suggested to broaden the working group and ask some active experts to join.

#### **9. Other business**

Mr Ormeling reported about a big map exhibition from ICA during the 2016 UNGGIM meeting in New York and invited the participants to send as many toponymic maps as possible. Ms Kerfoot suggested to announce this in the Bulletin.

#### **10. Summary of actions**

- Distribute a document (position paper) to participants of the WG-meeting describing max. 3 options on future possible UNGEGN/UNCSGN operation modalities. Feedback on this document should be given within one week. Afterwards the possibilities will be sent out in a special edition of the UNGEGN-Bulletin for further feedback. (*Mr. William Watt, participants of the WG-meeting*)
- Compile an e-mail for Mr. Schweinfest before 9/26/2015 with questions concerning infrastructure, side events and individual sponsoring for the next UNGEGN Session in Bangkok. (*Mr. William Watt, Mr. Sungjae Choo*)
- Formalize relationship between UN-GGIM and UNGEGN. Clarify the question of how to fund the necessary delegations. (*Mr. William Watt, Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)



- Get in touch with UN-GGIM to prepare future formal relationship. UNGEGN Vice-Chair Mr. Ferjan Ormeling agreed to contact UN-GGIM Co-Chair Mr. Timothy Trainor (*Mr. Ferjan Ormeling*)
- Report about the possibility of funding in the upcoming UNGEGN-Bulletin (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, with the aid of Ms. Élisabeth Calvarin*)
- Reach out to countries (especially from South-East-Asia) not yet represented at UNGEGN to attend at the next session in Bangkok. (*Mr. William Watt, Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Ask the Secretariat about how to go on with social media like twitter and Facebook. Ask former rapporteur of the WG Hubert Bergmann about existing accounts (especially Facebook group "UNGEEN"). (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, Mr. Gerhard Rampf*)
- Discuss with the UNGEGN Secretariat on how to secure a uniform transferring of past events properly transferred from 'Upcoming Events' to 'Events' on the UNGEGN homepage. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Follow-up-call for missing documents from Conferences and Sessions as mentioned in WP 31/7, 28<sup>th</sup> Session. Since some of the documents have been submitted in the meantime, a previous reassessment is advisable. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Update information on Toponymic Guidelines on the respective Wikipedia-pages. Call for translating the Wikipedia-articles into different languages in the UNGEGN Bulletin. (*Mr. Gerhard Rampf*)
- Get in touch with ICOS representatives to ask for support for potential participants especially from Africa and Asia. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Contact Ms. Marie-Ève Bisson on pursuing an "International Geographical Names Day" (see WP 35/13, 28<sup>th</sup> Session). Ask Secretariat for information on chances of a high-level approach. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft, Ms. Helen Kerfoot*)
- Ask Secretariat on how to get help for the proposed upcoming Training Courses in Toponymy in Brazil. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Ask Secretariat for further support in publishing the *Advanced Toponymy Manual* (see WP 33/8, 28<sup>th</sup> Session) on the UNGEGN homepage. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)
- Elaborate/modify the questionnaire for the upcoming session (adaptations especially regarding comments are advisable). (*Mr. Sungjae Choo and Working Group on Evaluation and Implementation*)
- Ask the Secretariat for technical support (survey tool) to do an online evaluation and subsequent follow-ups. (*Mr. Sungjae Choo*)
- Get suggestions for topics for special presentations in the upcoming Session. (*Mr. Peder Gammeltoft*)

## 11. Next meeting

The next meeting is in Bangkok,

## 12. Closing

Mr Watt thanked NGII and the host for their support. Mr Gammeltoft thanked the participants and closed the meeting at 11:40