

## **Consultation on the Norwegian Place-Names Act**

### **Historical Background**

The Norwegian Place-Names Act was passed on 18 May 1990 and became law on 1 July 1991. The Act and its Regulations provide rules for laying down the spelling of place-names, Norwegian, Saami and Finnish, and for the use of place-names in multilingual areas. Under the provisions of the Act a regional name consultancy service was also established, with a secretariat and consultants for Norwegian, Saami and Finnish place-names, and a central register of place-names under the Norwegian Mapping Authority. The name consultancy service was to have the task of providing advice and guidance in place-name matters. An appeal board was also established. The Act was presented at *The Sixth United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names*, New York, 25 August–3 September 1992 as document E/CONF.85/L.85 (also published in Vol. II Technical Papers, pp. 218–219 of that Conference).

After the Act and Regulations had been in force for almost 10 years, an evaluation was conducted to determine how the legislation had functioned during this period. A questionnaire was circulated in 1997, in which numerous local authorities and affected organisations and institutions were asked questions related to the practising of the rules.

### **Evaluation group**

On the basis of the responses from the investigation and other problematic issues that had come to light in the course of the ten years during which the Act had at that time been in force, a working group with representatives from the name consultancy service/appeal board for place-name cases, the Norwegian Mapping Authority and the Ministry of the Church and Cultural Affairs produced an evaluation report. The Norwegian Language Council also participated in this work at times. The working group's report was submitted in 2001 and was then distributed for consultation to all local authorities, ministries and affected organisations and institutions. The responses to the consultation showed broad support for the idea of amending the law: in particular there was agreement on simplification of the rules.

Inter alia the report proposed amendments on the following points:

- The procedure in place-name cases is extremely time-consuming and demanding in terms of resources. Consideration ought therefore to be given to amendments that may simplify this, and that will make the rules clearer and thus more accessible to all who are to practise them, at the same time as the democratic and onomastic aspects are safeguarded.
- A number of the provisions have shown themselves to entail an unreasonable amount of time, local strife and appeal cases. Amendments that seek to remove or mitigate these provisions should therefore be considered.
- There also appeared to be a need to make rules for some areas that are not included in the present Act, such as a purpose section and provisions concerning the protection and determination of names.
- Further, a number of editorial amendments are necessary, as is clarification of unclear points, e.g. by means of clearer definitions.

### **Historical monuments and addresses**

The Ministry of the Church and Cultural Affairs sent out a consultation document with 23 March 2004 as the closing date for statements. In its proposal the Ministry emphasises that place-names can have several functions. They are *historical monuments* that transmit a multifaceted picture of older generations' experiences and insight into the interplay between man and Nature, and they are a valuable source of local history, at the same time as they represent an important factor for the well-being of the people in a local community. The names of places also belong to our linguistic heritage, they are part of the dialects, and usually follow the same phonological development as other words. They are therefore an integral and irreplaceable part of the vocabulary of the local community, and will as a rule be pronounced in conformity with the form of speech there.

However, the names of places are first and foremost *addresses* that help us to find our way about in the world around us. Just as *personal names* are necessary to distinguish persons from one another, *place-names* are necessary to identify particular places in a certain and unambiguous way so that taxis and emergency vehicles, for example, can find their way swiftly and surely.

The authorities wish to take care of our place-name heritage not only as a basis for investigating cultural history and the history of population settlement, but also through giving these names an appropriate spelling on maps and signs and in registers, and by using them in connection with the assignment of addresses and other naming under the Place-Names Act.

### **Purpose section**

The current Place-Names Act has no purpose section. The Ministry now proposes such a section, because by expressing the intention and scope and extent of the Act, it would help the users to understand the purpose of the provisions and thus the factors on which weight should be placed when cases are being dealt with. All the bodies that submitted statements about this were in favour of the insertion of a purpose section, including the Norwegian Language Council, the Co-operation Board for Name Research, the Name Consultancy Service for Norwegian Place-Names, the Saami Assembly and the Norwegian Saami Institute, as well as many local authorities.

### **Application**

The current statute is applicable when individual administrative decisions are made, when regulations are issued or when textbooks are published. Further, any company that is publicly owned or any foundation that is established by the public authorities shall comply with the Act. The Ministry proposes that the Act shall apply when any state or local government body is to determine place-names or the spelling of place-names. Further, it is proposed that for the actual use of place-names the Act shall apply in addition to companies that are fully publicly owned and to textbooks that are to be used in the schools. Posten Norge AS is a typical example of a company that the State owns in full, but that is not deemed to be a public body, and in the case of which this type of problematic issue is therefore relevant.

The present statute was not made applicable to Svalbard, Jan Mayen and the Norwegian dependent territories, the Norwegian Continental Shelf and Norway's Economic Zone on account of the many special factors entailed by international agreements and treaties and consideration for other nations. The name stock in these areas is also of a different nature

from names in mainland Norway. The same sets of conditions also apply today, which means that it is not relevant to increase the geographical extent of the statute on this point.

### **Protection of names and naming**

It is uncertain whether the lack of rules relating to the protection of names and naming in practice constitutes any threat to place-names as historic monuments, or in any other way represents a problem of any great extent. There is however a unanimous wish from the onomastic community, from the Appeal Board, the Mapping Authority and a number of local authorities for such provisions to be introduced. The Ministry therefore takes the view that rules relating to this matter ought to be included in the Act.

The purpose of these provisions must be to safeguard existing name traditions and at the same time to ensure that old names are not improperly used in commercial activity, for example where a well known name is used of a new place that has no connection with the original bearer of the name for such purposes as increasing the market value of the new place.

The report proposes that these provisions should also contain a clause to the effect that when names are given to new objects, one must to the greatest possible extent follow the naming custom in the place. This is an important guideline, but to emphasise that this must be considered as a guideline – something one ought to follow, not something one must follow – the Ministry chose on this occasion not to include this clause in the new Bill, but rather to express it in the comment on the provisions.

### **Dealing with a case for the first time**

It is important that any changes do not encroach upon the democratic and onomastic aspects of a case. At the same time it is necessary to be aware that determining the spelling of names that are to be used in practical daily life is not an onomastic research project, but first and foremost an everyday aid. All people must be able to find their way to where they are going, and to know where they are.

In order to simplify the process one can envisage a number of subsidiary measures:

1. General administrative decisions, cf. above, concerning e.g. whether one shall write *tjørn*, *tjønn*, *tjern* or *tjenn*, *sæter* or *seter*. This is in keeping with what is already practised by the Norwegian Mapping Authority.
2. Exceptions may be made for certain groups of names that are only to be used locally/regionally, e.g. in small localities and address names, cf. above. Here there will no doubt be a problem of definition: how large or small is a locality that may be excepted? And very many, perhaps the majority, have been used of several name-bearers.
3. Joint meetings may be held with decision-making bodies, name consultants and affected local authorities. This is particularly relevant in the case of map revisions, and it requires meticulous work in advance, but may be used in certain cases.
4. The Norwegian Mapping Authority will be the decision-making body for all names in all state contexts, including the names of farms and single holdings that linguistically

and geographically coincide with inherited place-names. The number of decision-making bodies will then be reduced to the Mapping Authority, local authorities and, in the case of spellings that are to be determined by the King, the Storting or a ministry.

5. The spelling of a name in its primary function shall as a general rule be decisive of the spelling in other functions of the name. By primary function is meant the name of the locality of which the name was originally used, e.g. a mountain, a farm. The primary function must thus be determined first. How this rule is to be practised must be stated precisely and explained in comments on the section so that unreasonable results are not produced, e.g. that the spelling of a small stream shall be decisive of the spelling for a centre of population. Further, it must be a condition that the local spoken form is the same in the different functions and that there are no other grounds to suggest different written forms. The Name Consultancy Service shall co-ordinate the administrative decision procedure so that the spelling of the name in its primary function is adopted first.
6. It is not necessary to notify all parties to a case by a direct approach in writing. In the Ministry's view it should be sufficient to write to owners/lessees in cases concerning the names of their own holdings. Beyond this it should be satisfactory to insert announcements in "no fewer than 2 newspapers that are read by the general public in the place", cf. subsection 2 of section 27-1 of the Planning and Building Act. Writing to local organisations does not seem necessary.
7. The body with the power of decision shall be responsible for co-ordinating the procedure.
8. The municipal authorities shall be responsible for all naming and determination of spelling for address names in the municipal authority area.
9. A combination of two or more of these measures appears most appropriate. Item 2 does not safeguard the onomastic aspect. The remaining measures are in the Ministry's view useful and expedient: they will simplify the procedure and lead to decisions that are more in conformity with the rules.

In those instances in which new information is received in a case for which a final decision has been made, it should be possible to reconsider the case. The case will then be treated as a new case and will follow the procedural provisions of the Act.

### **Procedure after the proposal**

The procedure will not comprise significantly fewer steps, but the actual proceedings will be greatly simplified:

- a. A name case is to be taken up with the decision-making body, which shall send proposals for the spelling to the relevant municipal authority for consultation. If it is a case involving two or more decision-making bodies, the others shall be notified as now. The municipal authority has the right to express its views on all names in the municipal authority area, and shall furthermore ensure that all those who have the right to express their views in the municipal authority area are notified and permitted to express their views (item 6). If the case concerns the name of a single holding that

coincides with an inherited place-name, a direct approach in writing is to be made to owners/lessees with a time limit for presenting comments. All persons who have the name as the whole or parts of their single-holding name have the right to express their views. In addition an announcement shall be published in no fewer than 2 newspapers that are commonly read in the place. The announcement must contain information as to where the case documents are on display, and the closing date for statements.

- b. The municipal authority sends all the statements together with its own to the name consultants, who advise the decision-making body on the spelling.
- c. A decision on the spelling is made. If the case concerns a name with several functions, its spelling in its primary function shall be determined first.
- d. The decision is to be sent to the Central Register of Place-Names, to the municipal or county authority concerned, to any other public bodies that are parties to the case, and to the name consultants. The local authority concerned shall send notification direct to owner/lessees in cases that concern the names of their own holdings with, as the case may be, information about the right of appeal and the time limit for appeals. Other decisions relating to names are published in the same manner as other local government decisions.

Some statements that were received also pointed out that it is important for the name consultancy services for Saami or Kven place-names to be brought into the process at an early stage. This was both because place-names in these languages may be unknown, and also to ensure that it is the correct written form that is sent out for consultation. In other areas too it may turn out to be necessary to have different rules for the treatment of Saami and Kven place-names, and the Ministry will come back to this in its work on the Regulations.

### **On the weight to be given to the views of owners/lessees**

It may seem as if the present set of rules does not take adequate consideration of the views of owners/lessees when the spellings of single-holding names that coincide with inherited place-names are to be determined. For many owners the name is a symbol of family tradition and other ties that connect them to the property, and weight must be given to this feeling of tradition. One should therefore give particular consideration to the written tradition in the case of such single-holding names and not change a traditionally used spelling against the wish of the owner, if the written form otherwise lies within what the rules permit. As examples may be mentioned orthographic forms like Hage(n) and Bråten, where the local spoken form may be hagan, hågån, bråtan, bråtån. The same must apply when it comes to the choice of the definite or indefinite form. This matter has been thoroughly treated under item 8.4.1. In order that the views of owners/lessees shall be given greater weight than previously, the Ministry proposes that it should be inserted in the comments on the provision that the views of owners/lessees shall be given weight when the spelling is determined.

### **Local Government decisions**

Today “the municipal council or such person as it so empowers” passes resolutions on the spelling of the names of centres of population, farm groups, municipal districts, municipal streets, roads, markets, residential estates, parks etc. In reality there are great differences from one municipal authority area to another when it comes to which body makes decisions on the

spelling. In order that the Act shall reflect today's situation, which is considered by the Ministry as satisfactory, it is proposed that "The municipal council or such person as it so empowers" be amended to "The municipal authority". "The county council or the person it so empowers" will be amended to "the county authority", on the same grounds as those stated above.

## **Appeals**

The number of appeal cases has been much higher than expected since the Act came into force. In addition to the causes that have been mentioned above, the Ministry also wishes to refer to the fact that with the new Act there came clearer appeal provisions and that some of these provisions generate appeal cases. This applies for example to the provision concerning the definite/indefinite form, and the provision in the present section 4 that the starting point for the determination of the spelling shall be the traditional pronunciation. The aim is to reduce the number of appeals, to simplify the procedure and to have a closer look at the rules otherwise.

The Ministry agrees that grounds should be given for appeals. With such a requirement a potential appellant will have to consider very carefully the basis for the appeal before it is lodged. Section 32 of the Public Administration Act provides very cautious requirements for appeals and the way in which these are worded, but rules for the spelling of place-names do not belong to the core area of the system of legal safeguards on which this caution is based. By giving grounds an appellant will also be assured that the appeal body knows which views and contentions shall be assessed, cf. the second sentence of the second paragraph of section 34 of the Public Administration Act. Appeals which basically do not give grounds will also have to be dealt with, but the requirement for a hearing on the merits is that grounds are in fact given for the appeal at the instigation of the appeal body. If grounds for the appeal are not given then either, the appeal is to be dismissed as unfounded.

## **Use of place-names**

The present section 8 provides that the Norwegian Language Council and the Saami Language Council may be allowed to express views in appeal cases that raise questions of principle. Since the Saami Language Council no longer exists, this right is to be transferred to the Saami Assembly. Kven is not an official language, so there is no official language body that can express views in a corresponding manner. The Ministry will therefore have to come back later to the question of which body, if any, shall have the right to express views in appeal cases concerning Kven that raise matters of principle.

Many of the bodies consulted responded that the rules are not very well known, and that it was therefore difficult for them to answer the questions. Experience shows that many public bodies often fail to use spellings that have been decided. The Ministry therefore proposes that a clarification be inserted in the provision to emphasise that when the spelling of a place-name has been decided, it shall *without further notice* be adopted for use by all public bodies. This also applies where an equally valid Saami and/or Kven place-name has been determined.

Often there will not be any Saami or Kven names with determined written forms. It is therefore proposed to include a provision that decisions must be made at the same time for existing names in Norwegian, Saami and Kven. If there is no information as to whether there are parallel names, the name consultancy service must investigate this. It is proposed to

replace “*Norwegian name form*” by “*Norwegian name*”, since in multilingual name usage one speaks of names in the different languages as proper names, not forms of names.

The Norwegian Mapping Authority and the Norwegian Language Council have held well attended courses on the Act in all counties, first and foremost directed at local government officers, but this is not enough. Decisions are not followed up, and both local authorities and other public bodies fail to follow up other obligations under the Act, such as obtaining and giving views while a case is pending. When the statutory amendments have been passed, extensive information work must therefore be set in motion directed at all those who are to implement the new set of rules.

The general rule is that it is the place-names that are used by those who normally live in the place that shall be used by the public authorities on maps and signs and in registers etc. That a person is permanently resident in the place presupposes a regular connection with the place.

### **Names of farms and single holdings**

It has shown itself to be the case that most often it is the farm name that is of the greatest interest to the public authorities, e.g. for the assignment of addresses, signposting and the placing of names on maps. In the second paragraph of section 5 it is proposed that the spelling of a place-name in its primary function shall as a general rule determine its spelling in secondary functions. Farm names are most often primary in relation to both single-holding and farm-group names, and other names derived from the name of the farm. It is therefore important to have clear rules for the manner in which the names of farms shall be treated.

It is necessary to ensure that owners/lessees of single-holdings do not always have to comply with the spelling of the name of the farm. The special protection an owner/lessee of a holding enjoys when it comes to the name of his own property shall also apply here in full.

In the light of this the Ministry proposes amendment of the provision as to particular rules for names of single holdings. In relation to the determination of single-holding names that fall under this provision of the Act, it is especially important to remember that particular weight *shall* be given to the views of an owner/lessee.

### **Spelling rules**

There are a number of factors that must be weighed and balanced when the written form is being determined. In addition there are some factors that must not come into play, because one is not concerned here with a piece of scientific work or a collection of place-names, but the form of a name that is to function in practice in many contexts. This is an important distinction that it is useful to keep in mind the whole time: spelling that is determined under this Act shall not influence academic work on place-names, collections of names or private use of the name.

As a point of departure one can at any rate consider the following factors:

- the local pronunciation in the course of time
- earlier written form(s) in public use
- written forms as reinforcers/preservers or destroyers of dialects
- one or more written forms for the same name in the same locality over time

- what is pronunciation, what is grammar?
- what considerations shall be ascribed weight/most weight?

### **Names of historical or literary figures in place-names**

Many place-names include the names of historical or literary figures. These may be forenames, surnames or both, title/occupational designation: Maries gate, Tordenskiolds gate Sigrid Undsets vei or Erling Skakkes gate.

In the case of naming after historical figures in modern times, or in the case of new names, one shall use the spelling actually used by the person in question. In the case of naming after literary figures, the spelling to be used is that found in the work from which the name is taken (in Norwegian). For older historical names the spelling is to be brought up to date with present-day orthography, e.g. Halvdan Svartes gate. Sometimes the person wrote his or her name in several different ways, and it is not possible to say today that any of them were right or wrong. In such cases the decision-making body must make a choice after first having obtained a statement from the name consultants. The same will also be the case when it is not possible to say where the name comes from. Names with a long tradition shall not be changed, so that where a name is based on a “wrong” spelling, it shall continue to be used provided it is established by tradition.

### **Written forms – local spoken forms**

In the first paragraph of section 4 it is proposed that “the inherited local pronunciation” be amended to “the local spoken form”. This means the pronunciation that is in general use among people who live in the place. If two or more spoken forms are in general use, one shall take as a point of departure the spoken form that has the longest tradition in the place.

Name forms that have been influenced by writing, and more recent name forms are a part of Norwegian name tradition. If an owner/lessee or a local community identifies with these forms, weight shall be ascribed to this. It is important that local communities should feel that these are their names. Furthermore, the provisions in the legislation shall not freeze the shaping of the written forms once and for all. This means that any dialectal changes over time shall also be able to influence the place-names, so that amendment resolutions may be passed in the light of dialectal change(s).

Another alternative is to retain the wording of the present section 4. If the present wording of this provision is retained, it will be necessary to make clear how the provision is to be practised by adding a list of criteria for what is meant by saying that a local pronunciation is “inherited”. As this provision stands today, without any clarifications, it generates a number of unnecessary appeal cases.

### **Determination of equally valid forms**

In some instances it will be relevant to lay down equally valid forms. Mainly this will be a matter of two alternative forms, for example Majorstua and Majorstuen, but one can imagine situations in which it is relevant to have several equally valid forms, for example where both the unbound and bound forms in two or more variants are in use. The Ministry therefore proposes that alternative conditions be inserted in the provision, of which one or more must be satisfied for it to be possible to lay down equally valid spellings. If two or more of the



alternative conditions are satisfied, this strengthens the case for saying that alternative written forms shall be accepted as equally valid.

## **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PLACE-NAMES ACT:**

The proposed amendments are in italics.

### *§ 1 Purpose and extent*

*The purpose of this Act is to safeguard place-names as cultural monuments and to promote appropriate conditions for these names to constitute a unitary nomenclature.*

*The Act applies where any state, county or municipal body shall determine place-names or the spelling thereof, or use them in the performance of its duties. The Act also applies to the use of place-names in companies that are fully publicly owned and in textbooks that are to be used in the schools.*

*This Act does not apply to Svalbard, Jan Mayen and the Norwegian dependent territories, the Norwegian Continental Shelf and Norway's Economic Zone.*

### *§ 2 Definitions*

*In this Act the following terms shall have the following meanings:*

- a. *place-name, name of a geographical locality.*
- b. *farm name, the same as cadastral name; the name of the whole area to which one or more single-holding numbers are linked.*
- c. *single-holding name, name of a property with its own single-holding number or leasehold number under a cadastral number.*
- d. *inherited place-name, place-name that has been handed down orally or in writing from earlier generations.*
- e. *local spoken form, the form as it is pronounced in general use by people resident in the place.*
- f. *name-bearer, the place, point, line, area, park etc. that has or is given a name.*
- g. *current orthographic principles, general rules for the way in which sounds and combinations of sounds shall be reproduced in writing.*
- h. *current orthography, the orthography which is applicable at any time and which is to be found in approved wordlists.*

### *§ 3. Protection of names and naming*

*As a general rule a place-name may not be adopted for use in a place where it does not traditionally belong when it*

- a. *is in use as a family name and is among the less common ones, or*
- b. *is in any other manner a distinctive name, or may be confused therewith, or*
- c. *ought to be protected on other grounds*

*An inherited place-name may not be replaced by a name without tradition in the place unless particular grounds so indicate.*

#### § 4 Spelling rules

Unless otherwise provided by this Act, for the determination of the spelling the point of departure shall be *the local spoken form of the name*. The spelling shall follow current orthographic principles for Norwegian and Saami. For *Kven* place-names the spelling shall follow current orthographic principles in Finnish.

*Where the same name has been used of different name-bearers in the same place, the spelling in its primary function shall be indicative of its spelling in its other functions. Two or more written forms of the same name for the same name-bearer may exceptionally be laid down as equally valid if one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:*

- a. *there are several pronunciation variants of the name because the locality has great geographical extent, or lies in a dialectical or administrative boundary area*
- b. *two written forms of the name are well established by tradition*
- c. *there is strong local interest in two or more of the forms*

#### § 5. Determination of the spelling

Cases relating to the spelling of place-names may be taken up by:

- a. A public body and any other such persons as are mentioned in the first sentence of the first paragraph of § 9.
- b. An owner or lessee when the single-holding name comes under the second paragraph of § 8.
- c. A local organisation with a particular tie to a place-name.
- d. The name consultants where place-names in their area are concerned.

*The municipal authority passes resolutions on the spelling of names of centres of population, farm groups, municipal streets, roads, marketplaces, residential areas, parks etc. The municipal authority also passes resolutions on the spelling of all names that are to be used as official addresses in pursuance of § 4-1 of the Land Registration Act, with the exception of single-holding names. Otherwise the County Authority passes resolutions on the spelling of the names of county roads, parks etc.*

The Norwegian Mapping Authority passes resolutions on the spelling of other place-names *unless otherwise provided by statute or regulations*.

Where there is any doubt about who shall lay down the spelling of a place-name in pursuance of these rules, the matter may be submitted to the Ministry for decision.

#### § 6. Further provisions on procedure (now § 7)

*When a name case has been taken up with the decision-making body, the matter shall be made known to those who have a right to make statements. An owner or lessee has the right to make a statement in cases concerning single-holding names, and his or her views shall be ascribed particular weight. Municipal authorities have a right to express their views when the decision shall be made by a body other than the municipal authority itself. County authorities have a right to express their views in cases that include more than one municipal authority area. Local organisations have a right to express their views in cases concerning any place-name in*

respect of which the organisation has a particular tie. *Before any decision on spelling is made, the name consultants shall give advice on the spelling.*

*The case documents shall be sent direct to an owner or lessee. In addition the case shall be announced in no fewer than 2 newspapers that are generally read locally, or be made known in any other appropriate manner.*

Unless otherwise provided by statute or in pursuance thereof, the provisions of Chapters IV, V and VII of the Public Administration Act do not apply to cases under the Place-Names Act.

#### § 7 *Reconsideration (new)*

*Where new information is received in the case, the case may be taken up again by any such persons as are mentioned in § 5(a-d). A new decision shall be made pursuant to the provisions of this Act.*

#### § 8. Particular provisions as to the names of single holdings (now § 5)

*An owner or lessee may determine the name of his or her own holding. Nevertheless an owner or lessee is not entitled to change the name of any single holding that comes under the second paragraph of this section, unless special grounds so indicate.*

The spelling of any single-holding name which linguistically and geographically coincides with inherited place-names, or with other place-names which in pursuance of the provisions of this Act or of other Acts and regulations shall be used by the public authorities, shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of §§ 4 and 5.

*For other names of single holdings the owner or lessee determines the spelling.*

#### § 9. Use of place-names (now § 3)

When the spelling of a place-name has been determined under this Act and entered in the register of place-names, the spelling shall be used by all *state, county and municipal bodies* and companies that are fully publicly owned *on their own initiative*. The same applies to the writing of names in textbooks that are to be used in the schools.

Saami and *Kven* place-names that are used among people *who are permanently resident* in the place shall normally be used by the public authorities on maps and signboards and in registers etc. together with *any Norwegian name*. *The decision must be made at the same time for parallel names in Norwegian, Saami and Kven.*

*Public bodies and such other persons as are mentioned in the first paragraph of this section shall continue to use the written forms that are in public use when the Act comes into force until such time as any decision to amend is made.*

#### § 10 Appeal (now § 8)

There is a right of appeal against a decision on spelling for any person who pursuant to the first paragraph, (a) and (b), of § 6 is entitled to take up cases concerning the spelling of place-names. This right of appeal also applies to decisions made by municipal and county

authorities. *Grounds for an appeal shall be given* . There is no appeal against decisions made by the King and the Storting.

For the preparation of an appeal case the rules of procedure provided by § 7 apply correspondingly.

Appeals against decisions other than those that are made by a ministry shall be dealt with by an appeal board appointed by the King. In appeal cases that involve matters of principle, the appeal board may give the Norwegian Language Council, *the Saami Assembly* and the Ministry leave to express their views.

Any ministry that makes decisions on spelling has a duty to review the case on appeal. In such cases the Ministry shall seek advice from the appeal board.

Otherwise the provisions of Chapter VI of the Public Administration Act apply.

#### § 11. Place-name consultants (now § 9)

The Ministry appoints place-name consultants for Norwegian and Finnish place-names. *The Saami Assembly appoints place-name consultants for Saami.*

The name consultants shall provide guidance and advice on the spelling of place-names.

#### § 12. Register of place -names (now § 10)

A central register of place-names shall be established.

Notice of all written forms that have been finally determined shall be given to the register of place-names by the body that has made the decision.

The information in the register is public.

*Payment may be required for print-outs or copies of information from the register or for on-line connection.*

#### § 13 Exceptions (now § 11)

When particular grounds so indicate, *the Ministry may make exceptions from the provisions of the Act and Regulations.*

#### § 14 (now § 12)

*The Ministry may issue regulations for the supplementation and implementation of this Act.*