28 February 2025

English

United Nations Group of Experts On Geographical Names
2025 session
New York, 28 April – 2 May 2025
Item 5 (a) of the provisional agenda *
Technical expertise: Names collection, office treatment,
features beyond a single sovereignty and international cooperation

Dynamic interplay of use, meaning, and origin in geographical names standardization

Submitted by Norway

Summary **

As our global society becomes increasingly interconnected, the standardization of geographical names faces complex challenges in balancing modern societal requirements in cultural preservation. The report provides an examination of the dynamic interplay among three fundamental elements of geographical names - use, meaning, and origin - and their implications for evidence-based standardization practices.

The relationship between these elements forms a complex system of continuous influence and evolution. Each element shapes and transforms the others through patterns of interaction that naming authorities must understand in order to manage standardization processes effectively. Historical origins inform initial meanings and usage patterns, while contemporary usage can transform meanings and create distance from historical origins. Similarly, cultural significance drives both historical research and modern application. Modern digital technologies, international commerce and global communications create unprecedented demands for standardized geographical names. Simultaneously, there is growing recognition of geographical names as repositories of historical, cultural, and cosmological knowledge. That complexity requires sophisticated approaches to standardization that can serve both practical needs and cultural preservation goals.

The implementation of evidence-based standardization must draw from an expanded range of sources beyond traditional written records. While archival documents remain crucial, geographical names authorities now recognize the equal importance of oral histories, traditional knowledge systems and community memory. That broadened understanding of valid evidence requires new methodological approaches for documenting and verifying naming information from diverse sources. Indigenous knowledge systems present opportunities and challenges. Traditional knowledge often preserves crucial information about place names through oral transmission, ceremonial

practices and cultural memory. Standardization authorities must develop appropriate protocols for gathering and validating that information while respecting cultural sensitivities and Indigenous rights to knowledge management.

Looking ahead, geographical names standardization must continue to adapt to changing technological capabilities while strengthening its commitment to cultural heritage preservation. That includes developing more sophisticated approaches to data management, enhancing international collaboration and creating more inclusive standardization processes. Success requires sustained commitment from naming authorities to developing systems that can effectively manage complexity while serving diverse user needs.

The future of geographical names standardization lies in creating flexible yet robust systems that can accommodate both technological advancement and cultural preservation needs. That requires ongoing dialogue and collaboration among naming authorities, technical experts, cultural knowledge holders, and other stakeholders to develop approaches in geographical names standardization management to implement methods for recording the use, meaning and origin of geographical names.

———————

1. Introduction

The standardization of geographical names represents one of the most complex challenges facing naming authorities worldwide. As our global society becomes increasingly interconnected, the need for consistent and culturally sensitive approaches to geographical name standardization has never been more critical. This complexity stems from the intricate interplay of three fundamental elements: *use*, *meaning*, and *origin*.

The modern context of geographical names standardization presents unique challenges. Digital mapping technologies, international commerce, and global communications have created unprecedented demands for standardized geographical names. Simultaneously, there is growing recognition of the importance of preserving cultural heritage and indigenous knowledge systems embedded within geographical names. To be able to navigate the cross-field of modernization and cultural preservation requires a sophisticated understanding of how geographical names function within society.

Any geographical names standardization process consists of multiple competing interests (cf. GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9). These include:

- The practical needs of modern navigation and administration
- The maintenance of linguistic diversity and cultural identity
- The preservation of historical accuracy and cultural heritage
- The rights and perspectives of indigenous peoples and local communities
- The requirements of international communication and data exchange

Furthermore, the increasing awareness of geographical names as carriers of intangible cultural heritage has expanded our understanding of their role in society. Names are no longer viewed simply as labels for geographic features but are recognized as repositories of historical, cultural, emotional, and cosmological knowledge. This expanded perspective requires standardization authorities to develop more nuanced and inclusive approaches to their work (cf. GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11).

This paper examines how the three fundamental elements of geographical names - use, meaning, and origin - interact and influence the standardization process. It pays particular attention to their implications for evidence-based standardization practices and the incorporation of indigenous knowledge systems. By understanding these relationships, naming authorities can

develop more effective and culturally responsive standardization procedures that serve both practical modern needs and cultural preservation goals.

2. Fundamental Elements and Their Relationships

Geographical names are characterized by three distinct yet interconnected elements:

1. **Use:** represents the active employment of geographical names in contemporary society, its use in both local community usage and in official administrative applications. This includes variations across different cultural and linguistic groups and modern applications in digital navigation, tourism, and governance.

2. **Meaning:** encompasses the broader cultural significance of names and internal life as culturally significant expressions. The meaning of a geographical name places the name in an (oftentimes) perceived understanding of the name and its relation to historical events. The meaning of a geographical name is increasingly also recognized as conveying an entryway into indigenous cosmologies where places are interwoven with creation stories and spiritual significance.

3. **Origin:** traces the historical and etymological roots of names, examining the circumstances of their creation, determining the source language and lexical elements constituting the geographical name expression. The etymology of a geographical name often signify landscape features, historical ownership or events and place them in a temporal and spatial context. This historical investigation reveals how names have evolved through different linguistic and cultural filters over time.

3. Dynamic Interplay of Elements: A Critical Analysis

The complex relationship between geographical names' use, meaning, and origin creates a dynamic system of continuous influence and evolution. Within this system, each element shapes and transforms the others through intricate patterns of interaction that naming authorities must thoroughly understand to effectively manage standardization processes.

When examining how origin influences meaning and subsequent use, we observe a fundamental pattern where historical foundations shape how names are interpreted and employed in modern contexts. The etymological roots of geographical names provide the initial semantic framework, though this original meaning often evolves as names pass through various linguistic and cultural filters. Historical context plays a crucial role in this evolution, particularly in cases where sociopolitical circumstances, such as colonial and post-colonial periods, have significantly impacted naming patterns. The city of Rotterdam exemplifies this relationship, where its original meaning as "dam on the Rotte River" has become largely divorced from its modern usage, demonstrating how practical application can diverge from historical origins while maintaining continuity of identity.

Contemporary usage patterns yield considerable influence over both meaning and our understanding of origins. The modern context of geographical names has been transformed by digital mapping, global communication, and administrative requirements, each contributing to how names evolve in current usage. Local communities often develop their own usage patterns, sometimes differing from official forms, while multiple linguistic communities may maintain different variants of the same name. This evolution is particularly evident in cases where functional changes have disconnected names from their original geographical context. Silicon Valley serves as a prime example of this transformation, having evolved from a casual journalistic nickname into an officially recognized geographical designation, illustrating how modern usage can generate new meanings that eventually achieve formal recognition.

The semantic content of geographical names plays a vital role in connecting historical origins with contemporary use. Cultural significance, particularly in indigenous naming systems, often drives both historical research and modern application of names. Traditional meanings frequently preserve crucial historical information, while oral traditions contribute valuable context for understanding naming origins. This relationship becomes particularly significant in cases where

deeper understanding of cultural meanings has led to changes in official usage, as seen in many indigenous geographical names throughout Australia, such as the recent renaming of Fraser Island to K'gari, where recognition of traditional meanings has resulted in modified standardization practices and enhanced protection of naming rights.

These relationships create continuous cycles of influence where temporal evolution, cultural dynamics, and administrative decisions interact constantly. Historical changes in usage affect modern interpretation of meanings, while contemporary understanding influences how we perceive origins. Migration patterns and multicultural societies develop parallel naming systems, and global communication increasingly influences local usage patterns. Administrative decisions, through standardization processes, both respond to and shape these evolving patterns. The implications of dynamic relationships for standardization processes are profound. They necessitate comprehensive documentation practices that encompass historical research, current usage patterns, and the evolution of meaning over time. Standardization authorities should develop decision-making processes that balance historical accuracy with current use while respecting cultural significance and recognizing evolving meanings (GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9). Furthermore, future management of geography-ical names requires flexible systems capable of accommodating ongoing evolution while maintaining necessary standards. For example, the standardization of indigenous geographical names requires particular attention to these dynamic relationships. The process must account for traditional meanings preserved through oral histories, contemporary usage patterns in both indigenous and non-indigenous communities, and the historical context of naming. This complex interplay demands sophisticated approaches that can respect and preserve cultural heritage while meeting modern administrative needs.

The challenge for naming authorities lies in developing standardization practices that can effectively navigate these dynamic relationships (GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9). Such practices must be sufficiently robust to maintain linguistic consistency and historical accuracy while remaining flexible enough to accommodate evolving usage patterns and cultural considerations. This requires ongoing documentation of how names change over time, regular assessment of current usage patterns, and careful consideration of how standardization decisions might influence future evolution of names. Understanding these dynamic relationships also helps authorities anticipate and manage naming conflicts more effectively. By recognizing how different elements influence each other, standardization bodies can better predict potential issues and develop more nuanced approaches to resolving naming disputes. This understanding supports the development of policies that protect cultural heritage while facilitating practical modern use of geographical names (cf. GEGN.2/2025/60/CRP.60).

The dynamic interplay between use, meaning, and origin in geographical names represents a complex system that demands careful consideration in standardization processes. Success in managing these relationships requires sophisticated approaches that can balance historical accuracy, cultural sensitivity, and practical utility while acknowledging the continuous evolution of how societies use and understand geographical names. This understanding forms the foundation for effective standardization practices that can serve both current needs and future developments in geographical naming. This analysis suggests that future standardization efforts should continue to develop more nuanced approaches to managing these relationships, particularly as global communication and cultural awareness continue to evolve. The challenge lies in maintaining this delicate balance while ensuring that standardization practices remain practical and implementable across diverse contexts and cultures.

4. Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Cultural Dimensions in Geographical Names

The cultural dimension of geographical names extends far beyond simple location markers, encompassing rich layers of meaning embedded in both indigenous knowledge systems and non-indigenous folkloric traditions. These cultural frameworks provide essential context for understanding how communities have historically related to their landscapes and continue to interpret their surroundings through shared narratives and collective memory. Within indigenous

knowledge systems, geographical names serve as sophisticated repositories of traditional knowledge, encoding complex information about landscapes and their significance within cultural worldviews. These names often function as mnemonic devices, preserving information about sacred sites, ceremonial grounds, and the spiritual essence of places across generations. The naming of landscapes in indigenous traditions frequently emerges from creation stories, where physical features are inextricably linked to ancestral narratives and spiritual understandings. For example, many Aboriginal Australian geographical names not only identify locations but also encode information about water sources, seasonal food availability, and sacred law, demonstrating how geographical names can serve as both practical guides and carriers of cultural knowledge.

Parallel to indigenous naming systems, non-indigenous communities have developed their own rich traditions of folkloric place-name narratives. Medieval European settlements often acquired names linked to local legends, saints' lives, or historical events, creating a tapestry of storytelling that continues to influence local identity. These folkloric elements manifest in various ways, from simple origin stories explaining town names to complex narratives about landscape features that reflect historical events or moral teachings. For instance, many coastal communities maintain detailed oral traditions about specific geographical features, incorporating historical shipwrecks, legendary figures, or cautionary tales that served both to entertain and to warn of dangerous areas. Modern urban environments also generate their own folkloric traditions around geographical names, often incorporating elements of local history, community experience, and shared cultural memory. Neighborhood names may evolve through community usage, reflecting historical events, demographic changes, or local characters that have left their mark on the collective imagination. These urban folklore traditions, while more recent than indigenous or traditional rural naming practices, demonstrate the continuing vitality of cultural naming processes in contemporary contexts.

The intersection of official geographical names with local folklore creates fascinating layers of meaning that exist alongside administrative designations. A single location might carry multiple narrative traditions: its official name recorded in government documents, its indigenous name preserving traditional knowledge, and its folkloric associations maintaining local cultural memory. This multiplicity of meaning demonstrates how geographical names function as points of convergence for different systems of knowledge and understanding. The role of storytelling proves particularly significant in both indigenous and non-indigenous contexts. Traditional stories about places serve multiple functions: they act as educational tools, passing down practical knowledge about landscapes; they reinforce cultural values and social bonds; and they help maintain connections between communities and their environments. In indigenous contexts, these stories often carry additional layers of spiritual and ceremonial significance, while in non-indigenous settings, they might focus more on historical events, local characters, or moral lessons.

The preservation of these various cultural dimensions presents both challenges and opportunities for naming authorities. Traditional knowledge systems, whether indigenous or folkloric, often operate through oral transmission, making documentation and verification complex processes that require careful consideration of different forms of evidence. The challenge lies in finding ways to acknowledge and preserve these cultural dimensions while meeting the practical requirements of standardization (GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11). Furthermore, the interaction between different cultural traditions around geographical names can create rich dialogues about place and meaning. When indigenous naming traditions encounter non-indigenous folkloric elements, the resulting cultural exchange can enrich understanding on both sides, though it may also create challenges for standardization authorities attempting to reconcile different naming traditions. The role of geographical names in cultural transmission extends to language preservation efforts. For indigenous communities, geographical names often preserve ancient linguistic elements and grammatical structures that might otherwise be lost, while folkloric traditions in non-indigenous communities similarly maintain local dialects and historical language usage patterns. This linguistic dimension adds another layer of complexity to the cultural significance of geographical names.

The implications for standardization processes are significant. Authorities must develop approaches that can accommodate multiple layers of cultural meaning while maintaining practical utility (GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9). This might include developing multiple registers for geographical names, where official administrative designations exist alongside documented cultural variants, each serving different but complementary purposes. Digital technologies offer new opportunities for preserving and sharing these cultural dimensions of geographical names. Interactive mapping platforms can now incorporate multiple layers of information, allowing users to access both official designations and cultural narratives associated with particular locations. This technological capability presents new possibilities for preserving and transmitting the rich cultural heritage embedded in geographical names while maintaining standardized forms for administrative purposes.

This understanding of the cultural dimensions of geographical names, encompassing both indigenous knowledge systems and non-indigenous folkloric traditions, enriches our appreciation of how places acquire and maintain meaning within human societies. It suggests that effective standardization must go beyond simple designation to acknowledge and preserve the complex cultural heritage embedded in geographical names, ensuring that these vital aspects of human cultural expression are not lost in the process of administrative standardization.

5. Implications for Evidence-based Standardization in Geographical Names

The complex interplay between use, meaning, and origin in geographical names presents significant implications for evidence-based standardization processes. These implications demand careful consideration as naming authorities develop and implement standardization procedures that must balance historical accuracy, cultural sensitivity, and practical utility in an increasingly interconnected world. The foundation of evidence-based standardization lies in comprehensive historical documentation, which must draw from an expanded range of sources that go beyond traditional written records. While archival documents and historical maps remain crucial, authorities now recognize the equal importance of oral histories, traditional knowledge systems, and community memory in establishing the provenance and evolution of geographical names. This broadened understanding of valid evidence requires standardization bodies to develop new methodological approaches for documenting and verifying naming information from diverse sources.

Indigenous knowledge systems present particular challenges and opportunities in this context. Traditional knowledge often preserves crucial information about geographical names through oral transmission, ceremonial practices, and cultural memory. Standardization authorities must develop appropriate protocols for gathering and validating this information while respecting cultural sensitivities and indigenous rights to knowledge management. This might involve establishing collaborative relationships with indigenous knowledge holders and creating specialized documentation procedures that acknowledge different ways of knowing and remembering.

Current usage considerations form another critical component of evidence-based standardization. Modern patterns of name usage often diverge from historical forms, reflecting evolving linguistic practices, demographic changes, and practical adaptations. Standardization authorities must carefully balance respect for historical accuracy with recognition of established contemporary usage. This balance becomes particularly complex in multilingual environments where different communities may have developed distinct but equally valid naming traditions for the same geographical features. The documentation process must also account for the layered meanings that geographical names acquire over time. Names often carry multiple significances: their literal meaning, historical associations, cultural connotations, and practical applications in contemporary society. Effective standardization requires systematic methods for recording and evaluating these different layers of meaning, understanding how they interact, and determining their relative weight in standardization decisions.

Quality control in name standardization increasingly relies on triangulated verification methods that consider multiple sources of evidence (cf. GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11). Historical documentation provides baseline information about origins, while current usage patterns indicate practical acceptance within communities. Cultural meanings, including both indigenous knowledge

and folkloric traditions, offer crucial context for understanding how names function within society. This multi-faceted approach to verification helps ensure that standardized names serve both practical and cultural purposes while maintaining historical accuracy.

The implementation of standardization procedures faces numerous practical challenges. Authorities must navigate competing claims based on different historical interpretations, manage cases where meaning has evolved significantly from original intentions, and address situations where multiple communities maintain different but equally valid naming traditions. These challenges require developing flexible yet consistent approaches that can accommodate various scenarios while maintaining standardization principles. Policy development for geographical name standardization must establish clear frameworks for evaluating and weighing different forms of evidence (GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11). These policies should outline specific criteria for accepting traditional knowledge, procedures for documenting oral histories, and methods for validating contemporary usage patterns. They must also establish protocols for handling culturally sensitive information and managing potential conflicts between different naming traditions.

Digital technologies offer new opportunities for implementing evidence-based standardization processes. Geographic information systems can now incorporate multiple layers of naming information, allowing authorities to maintain standardized forms while preserving alternative names, historical variants, and cultural associations. These technological capabilities support more sophisticated approaches to name standardization that can better serve diverse user needs while maintaining necessary consistency. The evolution of standardization practices must also account for the dynamic nature of geographical names themselves. Names continue to evolve through use, acquire new meanings, and adapt to changing social contexts. Standardization systems must therefore include mechanisms for periodic review and update, ensuring that official forms remain relevant while preserving historical and cultural connections.

International collaboration presents both challenges and opportunities for evidence-based standardization. While different nations maintain distinct approaches to name standardization, increasing global interconnection requires greater coordination of naming practices. This suggests the need for developing shared methodological frameworks that can accommodate different cultural approaches to naming while facilitating international communication and data exchange.

The future of evidence-based standardization lies in developing more sophisticated approaches that can effectively manage the complexity of geographical names while serving diverse user needs. This includes creating flexible systems that can accommodate multiple naming traditions, maintaining clear documentation of decision-making processes, and ensuring that standardization serves both practical and cultural preservation goals. Success in geographical name standardization ultimately requires maintaining a delicate balance between competing needs and considerations. By adopting comprehensive approaches to gathering and evaluating evidence, authorities can develop standardization practices that preserve the rich cultural heritage embedded in geographical names while ensuring their practical utility in modern contexts. This balance supports the essential role of geographical names in human society while protecting their value as repositories of cultural knowledge and historical memory.

6. Implementation Challenges in Geographical Names Standardization

The practical implementation of geographical names standardization presents authorities with a complex array of challenges that increasingly demand sophisticated technological solutions alongside traditional administrative approaches. These challenges emerge from the intersection of technical requirements, cultural considerations, and administrative necessities, requiring approaches that can effectively serve diverse stakeholder needs while maintaining consistency and accuracy in naming practices (GEGN.2/2025/9/CRP.9).

A primary challenge lies in developing policy frameworks that can effectively address the multiple dimensions of geographical names. Standardization authorities must create guidelines that are simultaneously comprehensive enough to address complex naming situations and flexible

enough to accommodate unique local circumstances. The emergence of linked data technologies offers promising solutions for managing this complexity, particularly in cases where multiple naming traditions exist for the same geographical feature.

The integration of indigenous knowledge systems and traditional naming practices presents particular implementation challenges that linked data architectures are uniquely suited to address (GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11). While many authorities now recognize the importance of these cultural dimensions, practical implementation requires sophisticated data models that can accommodate different epistemological frameworks. Linked data approaches enable the development of ontologies that can effectively represent traditional knowledge alongside standardized naming conventions, creating bridges between different knowledge systems.

Ontological development for geographical names requires careful consideration of multiple knowledge frameworks. Traditional approaches to geographical names ontologies have focused primarily on administrative and technical requirements, but modern systems should expand to encompass:

1. Cultural Knowledge Structures
   - Traditional naming principles and practices
   - Spiritual and ceremonial associations
   - Seasonal and temporal relationships
   - Community-specific usage patterns

2. Relationship Networks
   - Connections between different naming traditions
   - Links to cultural practices and ceremonies
   - Temporal evolution of names
   - Spatial relationships and boundaries

3. Linguistic Components
   - Etymology and language evolution
   - Dialectal variations
   - Traditional pronunciation patterns
   - Semantic relationships

The practical management of these systems requires robust technical infrastructure that can support multiple data models while maintaining system integrity. Digital platforms must be designed to accommodate:
   - Distributed database systems supporting multiple knowledge frameworks
   - APIs for accessing and updating traditional naming information
   - Integration with existing geographical information systems
   - Tools for community contribution and validation

Implementation success depends on developing appropriate ontological frameworks that can effectively represent both standardized naming conventions and traditional knowledge systems. These frameworks should support the following elements:

```
///
ex:GeographicalFeature
    names:standardizedName "Official designation"
    names:traditionalName "Indigenous name"
```

```
names:historicalContext "Historical background"
names:culturalSignificance "Cultural meaning"
names:seasonalUse "Traditional timing"
names:ceremonialContext "Associated practices"
names:communityContext "Local usage patterns"
///
```

Quality control in this enhanced system requires comprehensive verification methods that consider multiple sources of evidence while maintaining data integrity. Linked data approaches facilitate this by enabling clear documentation of provenance and relationships between different naming traditions. Regular review processes should be established to ensure that standardized names remain relevant and appropriate over time, with mechanisms for updating linked data relationships as understanding evolves.

The implementation of these systems requires careful attention to access control and data protection, particularly for sensitive cultural information. Authorities must develop:

- Granular permission systems for different types of data
- Clear protocols for managing cultural intellectual property
- Mechanisms for community control over traditional knowledge
- Systems for protecting sensitive cultural information

Recommendations for successful implementation include:

1. Technical Infrastructure Development

    - Invest in robust (linked data) platforms
    - Develop specialized tools for managing traditional knowledge
    - Create user-friendly interfaces for community participation
    - Establish clear data validation protocols

2. Community Engagement

    - Involve traditional knowledge holders in system design
    - Create appropriate interfaces for community contribution
    - Establish protocols for managing sensitive information
    - Develop training programs for community participants

3. Policy Framework Enhancement

    - Update standardization procedures to incorporate linked data approaches
    - Develop clear guidelines for managing multiple naming traditions
    - Establish protocols for protecting cultural intellectual property
    - Create frameworks for ongoing system evaluation

4. Resource Allocation
    - Secure dedicated funding for system development
    - Invest in staff training and capacity building
    - Establish partnerships for resource sharing
    - Maintain long-term support for system evolution

The future of geographical names standardization lies in developing these sophisticated approaches that can effectively manage complexity while serving diverse user needs. Linked data technologies provide crucial tools for creating flexible systems that can accommodate multiple

naming traditions while maintaining clear documentation of decision-making processes and ensuring that standardization serves both practical and cultural preservation goals.

Success requires sustained commitment from naming authorities and adequate resource allocation. This includes:

- Regular review and update of technical systems
- Ongoing development of ontological frameworks
- Continuous engagement with stakeholder communities
- Active participation in international standardization efforts

The implementation of these recommendations requires careful attention to local circumstances while maintaining consistency with international standards. By leveraging linked data technologies and developing comprehensive ontological frameworks, authorities can create standardization systems that effectively balance competing needs while preserving the rich cultural heritage embedded in geographical names. An ontological example of this could be:

```
///
ex:GeographicalFeature123
    rdfs:label "Official Name"
    trad:indigenousName "Traditional Name"
    trad:story "Associated narrative"
    trad:significance "Cultural significance"
    trad:season "Traditional timing of use"
    trad:ceremony "Associated ceremonies"


ex:Place456
    names:standardizedName "Modern standardized name"
    names:historicalName "Historical variant"
    names:folkloreName "Folk tradition name"
    names:indigenousName "Indigenous designation"
    rdfs:seeAlso <URI-to-cultural-documentation>
///
```

7. Conclusion

Understanding the dynamic interplay between geographical name use, meaning, and origin is essential for effective standardization practices that serve both current needs and future developments in geographical naming. This comprehensive approach ensures that standardized names are historically accurate, culturally appropriate, and practically useful while preserving their rich historical and cultural significance. The success of geographical name standardization ultimately depends on maintaining this delicate balance between historical accuracy, cultural sensitivity, and practical utility.

The emergence of linked data technologies offers promising new directions for geographical names standardization, particularly in addressing the complex challenges of integrating traditional knowledge systems and cultural heritage preservation. These technological advances provide frameworks for managing multiple naming traditions while maintaining the integrity of standardization processes. The development of sophisticated ontological structures enables authorities to bridge different knowledge systems, creating more inclusive and comprehensive approaches to geographical names management.

The future of geographical names standardization will likely see increasing integration of digital technologies with traditional knowledge systems. This convergence presents opportunities for developing more nuanced approaches to name standardization that can effectively preserve and transmit cultural knowledge while meeting modern administrative requirements. The challenge lies in creating systems that are technically robust while remaining accessible to diverse user communities and respectful of cultural protocols.

The role of naming authorities continues to evolve, requiring new competencies in both technical implementation and cultural facilitation. Success in modern geographical names standardization depends not only on maintaining accurate records and consistent procedures but also on fostering meaningful engagement with communities and developing systems that can accommodate multiple ways of knowing and understanding geographical names. This evolution suggests the need for ongoing professional development and capacity building within standardization authorities.

Looking ahead, the field of geographical names standardization must continue to adapt to changing technological capabilities while strengthening its commitment to cultural heritage preservation. This includes developing more sophisticated approaches to data management, enhancing international collaboration, and creating more inclusive standardization processes. The integration of linked data technologies with traditional knowledge systems presents particular opportunities for innovation in how we document, preserve, and share geographical names information.

The recommendations presented in this working paper provide a foundation for moving forward with these developments. By adopting comprehensive approaches to gathering and evaluating evidence, leveraging new technologies appropriately, and maintaining strong community engagement, authorities can develop standardization practices that serve both practical needs and cultural preservation goals. This balanced approach supports the essential role of geographical names in human society while protecting their value as repositories of cultural knowledge and historical memory.

As we look toward future developments in geographical names standardization, continued attention to the dynamic relationships between use, meaning, and origin remains crucial. Understanding these relationships helps authorities anticipate and manage evolving challenges while maintaining the integrity of naming systems. The success of future standardization efforts will depend on our ability to create flexible yet robust systems that can accommodate both technological advancement and cultural preservation needs.

These considerations suggest the need for ongoing dialogue and collaboration among naming authorities, technical experts, cultural knowledge holders, and other stakeholders. Such collaboration will be essential for developing approaches that can effectively manage the complexity of geographical names while serving diverse user needs. The future of geographical names standardization lies in our ability to bridge different knowledge systems and create inclusive approaches that honor both tradition and innovation.

Points for discussion

The Group of Experts is invited to:

(1) Consider how naming authorities more flexible standardization frameworks that balance the three fundamental elements of geographical names (use, meaning, and origin) while meeting both practical requirements and cultural preservation needs.

(2) Discuss approaches for integrating indigenous knowledge systems and oral histories into standardization practices, including protocols for gathering and protecting culturally sensitive information.

(3) Explore how linked data technologies can enhance standardization by accommodating multiple naming traditions, documenting relationships between systems, and creating more inclusive approaches to geographical names management.

Literature

Azaryahu, M. (2011). The power of commemorative street names. Environment and planning D: Society and Space, 14(3), 311-330. https://doi.org/10.1068/d140311

Azaryahu, M., & Kook, R. (2002). Mapping the nation: Street names and Arab-Palestinian identity. Nations and Nationalism 8 (2), 2002, 195-213. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00046

Basso, K. (1996). Wisdom sits in places: Landscape and language among the Western Apache. University of New Mexico Press

Chen, H., Choong, C., Li, J., Liu, Y., & Tian, T. (2024). the cultural landscape characteristics of traditional villages in southeast guizhou: an analysis conducted on the basis of village names.. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5343970/v1

Conti, L. (2024). understanding culture, cultural identity, and cultural heritage in the post-digital age.. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1006912

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

GEGN.2/2025/11/CRP.11. (2025). Recommendations for constructing an inclusive and sustainable geographical names authority.

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

Hadi, W. and Mulyono, M. (2023). Ecolinguistic insights in nias village name: unravelling the dynamic bond between language and environment. Reila Journal of Research and Innovation in Language, 5(3), 216-233. https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v5i3.13552

Kadmon, N. (2000). Toponymy: The lore, laws, and language of geographical names. Vantage Press. New York.

Kladnik, D., Geršič, M., & Perko, D. (2020). Slovenian geographical names. Acta Geographica Slovenica, 60(3), 7-190. https://doi.org/10.3986/ags.9394

Mamontova, N. and Thornton, T. (2022). the multiperspectival nature of place names: ewenki mobility, river naming, and relationships with animals, spirits, and landscapes. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 28(3), 875-895. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.13776

Nkansah, S. and Bonsu, E. (2024). indigenous place names: a literary toponomastics study of suburb names in cape coast. Discourses on Culture, 21(1), 43-72. https://doi.org/10.2478/doc-2024-0003

O'Neill, M. (2018). "a completely new approach" to indigenous cultural heritage: evaluating the queensland aboriginal cultural heritage act. international indigenous Policy Journal, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2018.9.1.6

Room, A. (1997). Placenames of the world. McFarland & Co Inc. Jefferson, NC & London.

Rose-Redwood, R., Alderman, D., & Azaryahu, M. (2010). Geographies of toponymic inscription. Progress in Human Geography 34(4) (2010) 453–470.

Roy, L. (2015). indigenous cultural heritage preservation. Ifla Journal, 41(3), 192-203. https://doi.org/10.1177/0340035215597236

Villette, J., Burenhult, N., & Purves, R. (2022). maps meet myths: understanding jahai place naming through geographical information systems. Journal of linguistic Geography, 10(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlg.2021.11

Völkel, S. (2023). named entities, naming practices, and their meanings – linguistic types and cultural contexts. international Journal of Language and Culture, 10(2), 151-175. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijolc.00048.vol

Williamson, B. (2023). historical geographies of place naming: colonial practices and beyond. Geography Compass, 17(5). https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12687