UNESCO Publications Board
Policy Meeting: Minutes

Meeting date: 23 November 2011
Meeting time: 10.00 AM
Location: Room 5.021, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris

I. Call to order
ADG/ERI called the meeting to order at 10.00 AM and welcomed all present.

II. Attendees
It was noted that unfortunately no Director was available to represent SC at this meeting. An attendance sheet was circulated for signatures. The following persons were present:

Chair
Mr Eric Falt, Assistant Director-General, ERI

Members
Mr David Atchoarena, Director, ED/PDE
Ms Angela Melo, Director, SHS/HPD
Ms Marina Apaydin, Deputy Director Management CLT/WHC
Mr Indrajit Banerjee, Director, CI/INF
Ms J. Pearson, Director, MSS/CLD
Mr Axel Plathe, Head of Kathmandu Office & UNESCO Rep. to Nepal (Member for Field Offices) [*attending via teleconference*]
Ms Estelle Zadra, IIEP [*representing Mr Khalil Mahshi, Director, IIEP (Member for Institutes)*]

Ex officio Members
Ms Saniye Gülser Corat, Director, ODG/GE
Ms Vida Habash, AFR/CEO/CEM
Ms Krista Pikkat, BSP/UN [*representing Ms Ranwa Safadi, BSP/PB*]

Secretary
Mr Ian Denison, Chief, Publications Unit, ERI/DPI

Observers
Mr Neil Ford, Director ERI/DPI
Ms Patricia Toigo, Publications Officer, ED
Ms Anne Candau, Publications Officer, SC
Ms Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy, Publications Officer, CLT
Ms Natalia Denissova, Publications Officer, CI
Ms Natalia Tolochko, Assistant Publications Officer, SC

Ms Ulrika Peppler-Barry, Chief, ED/EO/KMS
Ms Lea Bernard, SC/WWAP
Mr Patrice Boned, SC/IOC
Mr Cheikhna Sankare, EO/AFR
Ms Clare Stark, BSP/ADG
Mr Martin Wickenden, Chief MSS/CLD/D/PMU
Mr Rudi Swinnen, Chief of Section, MSS/CLD/D
Ms Eunice Ong, MSS/PIU
Ms Flora Moutard, IOS/AUD

Ms Samantha Wauchope, ERI/DPI/PBM
Ms Tara Bukow, ERI/DPI/PBM
Ms Cristina Puerta, ERI/DPI/PBM

III.   Item 1. Budget cuts – how to identify and monitor cuts in spending on publications?

1.   The Chair opened the discussion by referring to the Director-General's memo of 9 November 2011 (DG/Memo/11/11) on reducing publications at UNESCO. He highlighted the specific actions requested by the DG to accelerate a reduction in costs:

→ Produce fewer publications, reduce production by at least 50%
→ Prioritize quality and multilingualism, concentrate resources on flagship publications
→ Place responsibility for expenditure on publications at the Executive Office level in each Sector
→ Sectors to take more responsibility for publications produced by field offices.
→ CLD to tighten its controls over wasteful printing.

2.   The Chair stressed the need for broad changes in sector publication plans for the 2012-2013 biennium and in the number of proposals approved by the Board. The Board has approved 82% of the proposals submitted since its first meeting in June, a rate that would have to decrease.

▪ The Member for CLT suggested that the Board is now in a better position to decline submissions, noting that the high rate of acceptance in the first few meetings was due in part to the process being new, with many submissions concerning projects in the final stages of development.

▪ The Member for ED noted that few submissions have been received from field offices, and the number of publications passing through the Board does not reflect the reality and magnitude of field offices' publishing activities.

▪ The Member for MSS warned that, although the Board deals with publications and not documents or other printed material, efforts to reduce publications could lead to manuscripts being produced in the guise of 'documents' to circumvent quality control processes.

▪ The Board agreed that a strong commitment and concerted effort to reduce publications is necessary from all sectors and field offices, especially at the senior levels. Every ADG, Director and Chief of Section must take responsibility for reducing their publications.

3.   The Chair invited comments from each Member on their sector's commitment to and actions towards cutting back on publications:

4.   **The Member for ED** expressed the sector's strong support for the actions requested by the DG and its recognition of the need to reduce the quantity of publications and improve their quality. He noted that the formation of the Publications Board in June and its success so far was already a reflection of the commitment of all sectors to these objectives. The Member reiterated that this process requires the commitment of all colleagues, including reaching out to the field, if these objectives are to be met. The Member added that certain programmes and projects are fully or mostly financed by extrabudgetary funds, and some of these agreements are specifically linked to publishing. Sectors need to be able to address these situations

▪ The Board agreed that all sectors must consider the huge imbalance among field offices in terms of the production of publications and find common ground to rationalize publication activities across all UNESCO offices. This will require abandoning 'business as usual' and moving forward with different practices.

▪ The Board acknowledged that funding agreements and obligations must be addressed. It was noted too that all ADGs have been asked by the DG to draw on extrabudgetary resources to make up some of the regular programme deficit.

▪ ED is presenting 17 submissions at the upcoming Board meeting, 7 from the Bangkok office. The Chair proposed that some projects in the final stages of development could be published online only, while some at an earlier stage of development could be cancelled.

5. **The Member for SHS** affirmed the sector's deep commitment to reducing publications. The sector is consolidating its efforts sector-wide to meet this objective, focussing resources on developing robust publication series and prioritizing 'bestsellers' – publications that attract a high readership. The sector has been working to improve its publications strategy over the past year, favouring quality over quantity, but recognizes that the situation has changed and we must be responsive. SHS will greatly reduce its number of planned titles. The Member reiterated concerns about how sectors can address field offices' publishing activities.

6. **The Member for CLT** outlined the Sector's plans to implement necessary reforms, noting that this has begun with the sector's decision not to present any submissions to the next meeting of Publications Board. The sector has circulated the DG's memo to all staff and is planning a strategic, sector-wide meeting in the coming weeks, following from the outcomes of the present meeting, to discuss its publishing strategy going forward and for the next biennium. The sector recognized the challenge of better coordinating CLT publication activities and strategies in field offices.

7. **The Publications Officer for SC** conveyed the full support of the Sector's ADG to reducing publications sector-wide and encouraging online publication rather than print. The sector had 160 publications in its plan for the 2010-2011 biennium, a number they will reduce to a maximum of 80 for the next biennium. The Publications Officer reiterated the particular challenges faced by colleagues in field offices and others external to the Paris office.

   ▪ The Board agreed that each ADG must be involved in this effort: it is not the role of the Publications Board to make decisions on subject matter, but to increase awareness of online publishing and other options and to improve the quality of publications produced by UNESCO.

   ▪ The Secretary pointed out that the DG's memo also called for the responsibility for publications expenditures to be placed at the executive level in each Sector, in order to pool resources and prioritize quality and multilingualism.

8. **The Member for CI** underlined the Sector's full agreement with the steps called for in the DG's memo. CI will review its planned publications extensively to comply with these actions and to determine what should and shouldn't be published. The Member added that CI has a very active programme of publishing online that includes developing ePubs, an area that the Sector is planning to pursue further in the coming biennium. He pointed to the growing popularity of ePubs, for which sales on Amazon.com are now higher than print.

   ▪ Mr Abel Caine, CI explained that the Sector recently converted 20 of its most popular publications to ePub versions that can be read on tablets, smartphones and similar hand-held devices. He noted that most publications are now not read in paper form, and in Africa most are read on mobile phones. Mr Caine added that when the ePub format is combined with open licenses, the open source community can create free translations, although the inherent loss of control over the translated versions must be taken into consideration in each case.

9. **The Member for Field Offices** acknowledged that he had not received any feedback from field offices regarding the DG's memo, although he is confident that they would implement the measures called for. He agreed that very field offices have submitted few publication proposals to the Board so far, and that this does not accurately reflect their publishing activity. Measures must be sought to ensure that all publications come through Board. The Member noted that only 5 offices out of 50 had replied to the table he had circulated to all field offices to collect their input for the present meeting. This is an indication of the work needed to ensure that all field offices are aligned in this effort and follow the required processes.

   ▪ The Secretary recognized the difficulty of encouraging field offices to be involved in certain processes. ERI provided heads of offices an opportunity during the General Conference to be briefed on its activities, however attendance was very low, with only four or five heads of offices at the meeting. He suggested that part of the problem is the division of labour among sectors and a lack of clarity on the lines of communication with field offices.

10. **Mr Cheikhna Sankare, EO/AFR** explained that the Africa Department produces few publications and has not as yet presented any submissions to the Board. The Department produces only two regular publications – one of which, a review of UNESCO's activities regarding Africa, is published at the end of each biennium and is currently being printed. These two publications are essential to the Department's action and to UNESCO's targets regarding Africa. In the next biennium, the Department will respond and reduce costs by developing a better, more targeted, distribution plan.

11. **The Member for MSS** acknowledged the DG's call for UNESCO's production services to tighten controls over printing. The Member reaffirmed the Sector's capacity to assist colleagues in determining print runs and defining distribution priorities. She pointed out, however, that many publications are produced using other production services, and in some cases control or monitoring and procedures are bypassed – a situation that must also be addressed. The Member explained that CLD does not systematically verify whether a publication sent to them for printing has been reviewed by the Board, as this is the responsibility of the Sector concerned, although those that have been given ISBN numbers have been approved by DPI/PUB.

    ▪ The Publications Officer for CLT suggested that CLD should question publications that arrive without an ISBN.

    ▪ The Secretary suggested that reinforcing the role of publication officers could help to ensure that processes are not bypassed. The UNESCO Publication Guidelines say that nothing should be printed without the publication officer's visa, and this requirement can be used to ensure that publications are not sent to CLD without the Board's approval.

    ▪ The Secretary added that the minutes of Board meetings could also be used by heads of offices and ADGs as proof that approval for a project has been obtained.

12. The Secretary noted that certain publication processes must be clarified, in particular the relationship between field offices and sectors with regards to publication proposals and how they should be submitted to the Board, whether from the field directly or through the sectors. The role of the Board in relation to publication proposals from UNESCO institutes, such as IIEP and UIS, which have their own Governing Boards and have established their own internal publication control systems, must also be considered.

IV. **Item 2.** **Preparation of the 2012-2013 Publications Plan**

1. The Secretary, Chief ERI/DPI/PUB, introduced the need to develop an Organization-wide Publications Plan for the 2013-2013 biennium to submit to the Executive Board in February. The Publications Plan is the first of three stages in the quality control process:

    1. Approval of the Publications Plan
    2. Submission of projects to the Publications Board
    3. Application for an ISBN number.

2. The Secretary presented a spreadsheet to be used in the absence of a dedicated planning tool to develop the 2012-2013 Plan. Many fields respond directly to requests made by the Executive Board. The form is a draft and the Unit is open to suggestions to improve it.

    ▪ The Member for Field Offices welcomed the preparation of the spreadsheet and the biennial Plan. Bangkok has requested a tool to achieve this, noting that even a simple tool can be effective.

    ▪ The Board agreed that this is an important planning exercise that must be taken very seriously given the current budgetary situation. The DG and the Executive Board will need to see in the Plan clear reductions from all sectors.

3. The Board agreed that while the Plan should aim to be as accurate as possible, some leeway would be required to allow for changes in plans in the course of the biennium.

- The Secretary suggested that 20% leeway would be appropriate. Although figures were not yet available for the current biennium, in the 2008-2009 biennium 75% of publications in the Plan were eventually published, 25% were cancelled or carried over to next biennium and approximately 10% new publications were produced.

4. Questions were raised on the relationship between the first two stages of the publications process and the need to complete both the Publication Plan and individual Board submissions forms for each publication.

   - The Secretary explained that the Publications Plan provides a quick overview only. More detailed information is required to complete the Board submission form: including budget breakdowns, gender and peer review, information on contents and authors.

   - The Board agreed that it is preferable to avoid asking colleagues to fill out the same information multiple times. ERI is working to develop a system whereby data provided in the Publication Plan can automatically populate the equivalent fields in the submission form.

   - The Member for ED suggested that in the absence of a replacement for Klopotek, the key reference for colleagues planning publications should be the questions asked in the Publication Board submission form, as they force colleagues to reflect on what they put in the plan.

5. The Member for CLT welcomed the development of the spreadsheet but suggested that there must be a clear rationale behind plans – the process must be driven by MLAs and an overarching strategy. A high-level document, not simply a list of planned publications, was essential to ensure that MLAs and strategies were precursors to all publishing activities and budgets. The Member suggested tying an executive summary on publications to MLAs for each sector.

   - The Publications Officer for SC supported this suggestion and proposed that planned publications should be incorporated into SISTER. The Member for Field Offices added that the Bangkok office strongly favours biennial planning and has also suggested that publications should be closely linked to SISTER.

   - The Secretary pointed out that earlier requests to link publications to workplans and to include publication plans in SISTER were refused on the grounds that SISTER cannot go into that level of detail.

   - Ms Clare Stark, BSP/ADG offered to bring this up with the SISTER team.

6. Members questioned the role of the Board and the process of submitting each sector's Publication Plan.

   - The Board agreed that it is not the Board's role to approve or refuse publications at the Plan stage, but to act as a filter process in finalizing the Plan itself.

   - Each sector's Publication Plan must be approved by the sector ADG before being submitted to the Board.

   - The Board will provide an intersectoral vision in reviewing the Plan from a broader perspective to identify problem areas. It will consider the number and extent of plans developed by each sector and field office and of the Plan as a whole.

7. The Member for SHS remarked that the term 'expected outcomes' was unclear and difficult to evaluate, and that the word 'distribution' in the field concerning free/for sale was ambiguous.

   - The Secretary explained that 'expected outcomes' was a field specifically requested by the Executive Board.

   - The Board agreed to reword the field on free/for sale publications.

8. The Member for MSS noted that an estimated overall budget was required for each entry, and restated the support that MSS can provide to colleagues in evaluating production costs.

9. The Board agreed that once all comments have been integrated into the spreadsheet, the sheet would be circulated for completion by all sectors, field offices and institutes.

   - A return deadline of 22 December was proposed.

V. **Item 3.** **Guidelines for using iTunes U**

1. The Chair introduced the draft 'UNESCO on iTunes U' guidelines for review by the Board.

    ▪ The Board agreed that iTunes U is first and foremost for video and audio material. Posting large publications is not the most effective use of iTunes U, a point that we all need to impress on colleagues.

2. The Secretary urged all sectors to recognize the useful contribution that iTunes U offers and to develop video content for iTunes U. Rather than producing printed proceedings, for example, conferences can be more effectively recorded for iTunes U. We must think how students want to use the platform.

    ▪ The Member for CLT recalled that during initial discussions Apple had stressed that the platform is best suited to media 'born digital' – a point we should all keep in mind.

    ▪ The Board agreed that we need to circulate the UNESCO on iTunes U guidelines widely, to encourage colleagues to develop useful content.

3. The Member for Field Offices welcomed the guidelines and the potential offered by iTunes U, but suggested that similar guidelines are needed in other new media areas more closely related to the purpose of the Publications Board. All sectors need guidance on creating and distributing ePubs, for example, which enable us to develop content suitable for various platforms including Kindles, iPads and smartphones.

4. The Member for ED requested that more information be provided within the guidelines on the clearance process for colleagues submitting content. He proposed that the first stage of this clearance process should be submission to DPI to verify copyright issues before CI puts anything online.

5. Members raised concerns about the category list and the terminology used. This has been discussed with Apple and at present UNESCO cannot influence Apple to change these codes.

    ▪ The Board agreed to add a disclaimer to the guidelines noting that the category codes were fixed by Apple and we have no power to change these.

6. The Member for ED suggested that a special meeting of the Publications Board be held once per year to consider iTunes U strategy, statistics, success etc.

    ▪ The Board agreed to consider at least a one-time meeting to review these areas.

VI. **Item 4.** **Gender mainstreaming: process, guidelines, role of gender focal point in planning stages.**

1. The Member for GE introduced the draft guidelines on mainstreaming a gender perspective into UNESCO publications. The Member noted that the upcoming training programme for the gender focal point network would be an opportunity for GE to familiarize all focal points with these guidelines and the requirements of the Publications Board submission process.

2. The Chair pointed out that no other UN agency has produced similar guidelines. The Board congratulated GE on developing such a useful, ground-breaking document, which will help all sectors produce better publications.

    ▪ The Member for SHS added that the Publications Board played a part in this achievement by instigating the process.

3. The Member for GE highlighted the difference between gender mainstreaming guidelines and guidelines on gender-neutral language. She emphasized that gender mainstreaming guidelines concern the planning stages of a project, not the language used in the final manuscript.

    ▪ The Member for CLT commended this distinction, which is often misunderstood. She noted that it is vital that colleagues recognize the difference between the two and the need to mainstream gender from the planning stages of all projects.

4. The Member for ED asked for clarification on the gender review process and whether the information provided in the submission form is an adequate basis for conducting the gender review.

   ▪ The Member for GE reiterated that it was important that projects are reviewed by the gender focal point at the conceptual stage, to ensure that gender equality issues would be adequately addressed, however the submission form alone would not enable the focal point to understand the project adequately, and a more detailed discussion would be required.

   ▪ The gender focal point's assessment should be included when the Publications Board proposal is submitted to DPI, who will forward the comments to GE ahead of each Board meeting.

5. The Member for CLT suggested adding a link to the list of gender focal points.

   ▪ The Member for GE agreed to do so.

6. The Member for Field Offices noted that the Bangkok office have asked why so much emphasis is being placed on gender considerations. He suggested that a session on the gender review itself as well as the process should be included during the gender focal point training week.

7. The Member for CLT questioned whether GE will also be updating the gender-neutral language guidelines. She suggested that a new edition would benefit from more unusual and less obvious examples of terminology.

   ▪ The Member for GE assured the board that these guidelines were being updated.

8. The Member for SHS pointed out that many of the terms included in the 'Key Definitions and Terms' section do not appear in the guidelines otherwise. She suggested that this section is too long and detailed and would benefit from being simplified to include only terms used in the text. A link to a more detailed glossary could be included in the resources section.

   ▪ The Member for CLT seconded these suggestions, and proposed moving the shortened 'Definitions' section to a more prominent location, perhaps before the terms are used.

   ▪ The Member for GE agreed with these suggestions.

9. The Member for CLT asked GE to revise the colour shading of the checklist, which was difficult to read when printed in black and white.

10. The Member for SHS suggested that guidelines on capacity building and the development of an evaluation system could also improve gender mainstreaming efforts.

11. The Member for ED pointed out that UNESCO produces a great diversity of publications, some of which do not use data. He suggested this be considered in revising the guidelines to avoid any misunderstanding or misinterpretation. He also noted that the guidelines should be made available in French.

   ▪ The Member for GE agreed to take these comments into consideration and assured the Board that a French version would be produced.

12. The Chair proposed adding some best practice examples of UNESCO publications that are not dedicated to gender issues, but where gender has been mainstreamed well throughout the process.

   ▪ The Member for GE agreed that such examples would be included as they are produced. She cited the upcoming UN World Water Development Report as a publication for which GE has been closely involved from the conceptual stages.

13. The Member for GE thanked all for their input and agreed to update the draft guidelines before the next meeting of the Board.

VII.   <u>Item 5</u>. Field offices and the Publications Board

1. The Member for Field Offices presented comments from five field offices on the role and functioning of the Publications Board. He noted that a variety of questions have been raised, some of them relating to items already on the agenda today, and that field offices had diverging opinions on some issues.

2. Issues relating to information and knowledge management, including the gender review process and ISBN applications, are of concern to many field offices. The Member for Field Offices welcomed the discussion of these today and the production of guidelines and the 2012-2013 Publications Plan.

3. The language of publications and the production of translations are very important to field offices. The Member for Field Offices proposed that these be addressed at a later meeting.

4. Some offices, including Bangkok, welcome greater policy guidance on publications, while others are concerned that the Publications Board process is too centralized:

    - Cairo suggested the establishment of regional Publication Boards.

    - Bangkok is supportive of a centralized Board, but asks for greater clarity over the chain of responsibility and greater involvement in the process. Offices outside Paris are not able to represent their projects in person at the Board, which programme specialists from HQ sectors have done. Sector publication officers and Board Members are not as familiar with their projects and may therefore have less interest in them.

    - The Board agreed that field offices must be kept informed and involved in the process.

5. The Secretary pointed out that some of the questions raised by the field offices relate to policy issues, others to individual concerns. DPI/PUB can respond to certain of these, although some would need to be discussed at later Board meetings.

6. The Secretary referred to earlier comments from Members on the involvement of field offices in the Publications Board, especially concerning the submission process. In this context, he drew attention to the request in the DG's memo that sectors should take more responsibility for publications produced by field offices.

    - The Member for field Offices agreed that the process is still unclear. He suggested that BFC should coordinate their input regarding policy issues and processes, but that submissions to the Board should go through the sector publication officers.

7. The Member for CLT reiterated the need for strict alignment of publication strategies with MLAs and workplans, pointing out that this was very important for field offices.

8. The Member for ED asked whether the opinion of the five offices presented today was representative of all field offices. He suggested that the low response rate to the questionnaire circulated by the Member for Field Offices indicates that we have to address how well the Board can reach out to the field. The Member noted that very few submissions have been received from field offices.

    - The Secretary agreed that the volume of submissions from field offices did not reflect the level of their publishing activity.

9. The Board agreed that there is a need to improve coordination between HQ and field offices, and for the Board and publications officers to work closely with colleagues in the field.

VIII.   <u>**Item 6.**</u> **Guidelines on publishing proceedings**

1. The Chair read out the proposed text concerning the publication of proceedings:

   'Proceedings of UNESCO conferences and meetings should, in most cases, be distributed via online channels, in written, audio, or audio-visual format. Where necessary, shorter summary or communication materials can be printed for promotional purposes.'

2. The Board agreed to remove 'in most cases' and the reference to communication materials.

3. The Member for ED suggested allowing for a limited number of copies of proceedings to be printed in some cases. The current policy in the ED sector is that proceedings should be published online, with an understanding that a few copies can be printed in special circumstances.

   ▪ The Publications Officer for SC supported this suggestion, referring to the specific example of a recent proceedings publication produced by SC/EES, for which some printed copies were required for a follow-up conference held in Africa where participants didn't have access to online publications. She suggested allowing the printing of a limited quantity of copies with the caveat that the reason for this exception must be presented to and approved by the Publications Board.

   ▪ The Member for MSS agreed that, although generally there is no need to print proceedings, we must allow for particular circumstances.

4. The representative for institutes pointed out that conferences often bring in external experts who provide great added value to UNESCO programmes; additionally organizing a conference is a major task and undertaking on the part of UNESCO staff and others as well as the experts who develop papers and presentations for us, and these are very important contributions. She stressed that we do not want to lose this manner of obtaining contributions to our work.

   ▪ The Member for MSS agreed with the importance of these contributions, but pointed out that conference proceedings would still be developed and published, without producing printed copies.

5. The Member for CI questioned how the Board is to discern what other types of publications should be printed.

6. The Board agreed on the following text:

   'Proceedings of UNESCO conferences and meetings should be distributed via online channels, in written, audio, or audio-visual format. Exceptionally, with the authorization of the Board, published proceedings could be considered for printing in very limited quantities.'

IX.   <u>**Item 7.**</u> **Guidelines on use of forewords, prefaces and introductions in UNESCO publications**

1. The Chair introduced the draft guidelines on forewords, prefaces and introductions. He reiterated the need to reduce their use to ensure they remain effective.

   ▪ The Board agreed on the need for such guidelines.

2. The representative for institutes suggested that the Director of Institutes should sign forewords for publications produced by institutes.

   ▪ The Board agreed with this suggestion.

3. The Member for Field Offices noted that in field offices, not all sectors are represented by a Regional Director – in Asia there is a Regional Director for ED but not for SC.

   ▪ The Board agreed that the Member for Field Offices would propose a suitable text for publications prepared by field offices.

4. The Publications Officer for CLT proposed adding a reference to Conventions, which are regulated in different manner from sector programmes and should have forewords signed by the Secretary of the Convention.

  ▪ The Publications Officer for SC noted that the IOC is similarly regulated and preferred the sector ADG to sign such forewords.

  ▪ The Member for GE suggested that Secretaries of Conventions could if necessary add comments in a short afterword or similar.

5. The Secretary pointed out that the DG is often approached to sign forewords for non-UNESCO publications, and that it is important that she sign UNESCO publications as well.

  ▪ It was noted that there is a risk of diminishing the impact of the DG's signature if she signs too many forewords, and that this should therefore be limited to important publications.

6. The Member for ED suggested that sector ADGs decide which publications need a foreword at all, which forewords they should sign, and which publications should be proposed to the DG for a foreword.

  ▪ The Member for CI proposed that the Publication Board should decide which publications should be presented to the DG for a foreword. He suggested adding a clause to the guidelines stating that requests for DG forewords should be proposed to the Publication Board first.

  ▪ The Member for GE argued that it should be the prerogative of the DG to decide whether she would like to write or sign a foreword, and that she should be given a broad choice.

7. The Member for MSS referred to the guidelines on prefaces and suggested adding the words 'if there is a lead author and if this person is not a UNESCO staff member'.

  ▪ The Chair agreed with this suggestion and proposed that ERI/DPI rework the section on prefaces.

8. The Member for MSS asked for clarification on whether names should be used, and when. She pointed out that there is no guidance on back cover content, where some people add photographs and information on staff members.

  ▪ The Publications Officer for ED requested that DPI also review the guidelines on citing staff members. The current text '…who have gone beyond their usual tasks' leads to confusion.

  ▪ The Board agreed that contributing staff members can be recognized, but as the publication is a work of the Organization, this should be done discreetly – with names in small print within the book and not on the front cover.

  ▪ The Chair agreed that ERI/DPI will develop the guidelines further.

X. <u>Item 8</u>. **Publications Board Submissions and ISBN applications**

1. The Secretary introduced the guidelines document.

2. The Secretary noted that some field offices have the authority to grant ISBNs, however they should always use UNESCO ISBNs, not national ones. He added that the ISBN application process at DPI acts as an important quality control, which offices who grant ISBNs themselves can miss out on.

  ▪ The Member for ED explained that the fact that field offices and institutes have been using other channels to obtain ISBNs is in line with efforts to give them greater responsibility for quality control. He added that certain offices, including IIEP, Bangkok and Brasilia submitted quality control frameworks at the time, which were validated, but not all offices did this.

- The Member for Field Offices agreed that UNESCO should continue with the policy of assigning ISBNs through field offices and institutes, but that training must be available to ensure that quality control measures are followed.

- The Board agreed that such offices should use UNESCO ISBNs.

3. It was suggested that using a single form for the Publication Board submission and ISBN application would facilitate the process.

- The Board noted that the ISBN application was a later stage in the process and required the submission of contracts and rights agreements, as well as a finalized cover and layout files.

- Ms Cristina Puerta, ERI/DPI/PUB agreed to simplify the ISBN form and remove any overlap with the questions included in the Publications Board submissions form.

4. The Member for ED requested clarification on UNESCO's legal responsibility in light of the standard disclaimer.

- The Secretary explained that UNESCO is legally responsible for all content it produces. Although disclaimers are commonly used by publishers to diminish this responsibility, in fact UNESCO remains legally responsible for its content.

XI. Item 9. Finalization of the Publications Board submission form

1. The Secretary introduced the revised draft Publications Board submissions form. He explained that it has taken account of comments and suggestions made over course of the five Publications Board meetings held so far.

2. The Member for GE suggested adding a follow-up question to Q4 in the case of a re-edition, asking why the new edition is being proposed – is it an update, a response to a specific demand? She also suggested specifically tying the two questions on indicators and benchmarks (Q32 and 33) to the questions on the target audience/s and their needs (Q19 and 20).

- The Board agreed with these suggestions.

3. The Member for Field Offices proposed inserting a question 'do you propose to request a foreword from the DG?'

4. The Member for Field Offices asked whether there are any consequences in relation to Q3 on whether the publication is in the biennial Publications Plan, and if not, what is the reason for this question?

- The Chair explained that this question provided background information on the project and identified publications that are in the Plan under a different title. He added that this information is also useful for statistical purposes.

5. The Publications Officer for CLT suggested that Q25a on the gender focal point evaluation be revised to clarify that it is not the manuscript that must be submitted to the gender focal point, but the publication proposal and concept.

- The Member for GE Gender agreed, and also suggested that the question should make reference to gender equality.

- The Board agreed with these suggestions.

6. The Member for ED requested clarification on when the submission form should be submitted.

- The Board agreed that proposals should be submitted early in the process, during the concept stage and following approval by the sector ADG.

- The Secretary suggested that a project is ready to be submitted when it has been developed to the extent that the questions on the form can be answered, including the budget outline.

7. Mr Cheikhna Sankare, EO/AFR noted that Priority Africa suffers from problems of perception, visibility and comprehension throughout UNESCO. These problems extend to all sectors, field offices and the regional community. AFR is working to develop strategies to make its actions more visible. The Member asked how AFR can make use of the opportunities offered by the Publication Board to advance discussion of the Africa perspective within each sector? The Member proposed adding a question to the form asking for a preliminary evaluation of the proposal by AFR, noting that this would be a good mechanism to guarantee the involvement of the Africa Department.

- The Board agreed that Priority Africa needs to be reflected on the form.

- The Chair suggested adding a sub-heading to the form titled 'Priority Africa', with the question 'what steps have you taken to consider Priority Africa in this publication?'

- The Member for AFR reiterated the importance of guaranteeing that Priority Africa is considered by all sectors and offices.

- The Board noted that this is a regional priority, whereas Gender is a thematic priority. Not all publications relate to Africa, but all have a gender dimension.

Minutes submitted by Samantha Wauchope, ERI/DPI/PBM
Minutes approved by the Publications Board, 14 December 2012