



UNESCO Publications Board

Meeting Minutes

Meeting date: 5 March 2014

Meeting time: 11:00 a.m.

Location: 5.021, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris

Call to order

The Secretary, called the meeting to order at 10:59 a.m. and welcomed those Members and observers present.

Attendees

An attendance sheet was circulated for signatures. The following people were present:

Chair

Mr Eric Falt, Assistant Director-General, ERI

Members

Mr David Atchoarena, Director, ED/TH

Mr Mr Indrajit Banerjee, Director, CI/KSD

Ms Anne Candau, Publications Officer, SC [*representing Mr Han Qunli, Director, SC/EES*]

Mr Gwang-Jo Kim, Director, FU/BGK, Member for Field Offices [*attending via teleconference*]

Ms Angela Melo, Director, SHS/HPD

Ms Mechtild Rossler, Deputy Director, CLT/WHC

Mr Brian Smith, IIEP [*representing Mr Khalil Mahshi, Director, IIEP*]

Mr Rudi Swinnen, Chief, ADM/CLD/D

Ex Officio Members

Mr Cvetan Cvetkovski, ODG/GE [*representing Ms S. G. Corat, Dir. ODG/GE*]

Ms Vida Habash, AFR/EO

Ms Clare Stark, BSP/PB [*representing Ms Ranwa Safadi, BSP/PB*]

Secretary

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

Observers

Ms Mimouna Abderrahmane, Publications Officer, SHS

Ms Jinchai Clarke, ERI/DPI/PBM

Mr Guy Debonnet, CLT/WHC/P/SPU

Ms Natalia Denissova, Publications Officer, CI

Ms Catherine Domain, Assistant Publications Officer, ED

Mr Alton Grizzle, CI/FEM/MAS

Mr Alexandros K. Makarigakis, SC/DRR

Ms Akané Nozaki, Public Information Officer, FU/BGK [*attending via teleconference*]

Ms Lydia Ruprecht, Chief a.i. ED/ERF/KMS

Ms Natalia Tolochko, Assistant Publications Officer, SC

Ms Vesna Vujicic-Lugassy, Publications Officer, CLT

Minutes Secretary

Ms Isabelle Nonain-Semelin, ERI/DPI/PBM

I. Item 1. Approval of minutes

The Board approved the minutes of the 11 February 2014 meeting.

II. Item 2. Review of publications proposals

8 proposals were presented to the Board. The Board approved 6 proposals, including 4 resubmissions and 1 Category 4 proposals. 2 proposals were returned for reconsideration, review and resubmission.

1. One proposal was put into Category 4 :

	<i>Proposal No.</i>	<i>Series</i>	<i>Title</i>
1.	0314_SHS02		La prévention du dopage dans le sport : insuffisances et défis

III. Item 3. A.O.B

The next meeting of the Publications Board will be held on Tuesday 1 April 2014.

The following general points were made during the discussions:

1. The Chair said that it seemed that one of CI's publications was being laid out by CLD. The Chair stressed that the Sector should liaise with the secretariat for the Publications Board before starting such work.
2. The Member asked for clarification as to the approval process for Category 4 publications. The Secretary described the procedure once more: the Secretary discusses each of the Category 4 proposals with the responsible Sectors, the submissions are then presented for approval as a list. If no objection to this categorization is raised by any Member of the Board, the proposals are approved "as a block" at the level of the Board, but not as a block at the beginning of the biennium.
3. The Member for Field Offices asked to be consulted at an early stage to have sufficient time to provide inputs.

IV. Item 4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Isabelle Nonain-Semelin, ERI/DPI/PBM

Annex 1 – Agenda

1. Approval of the minutes of the 11 February 2014 Publications Board meeting
2. Review of publication proposals
3. A.O.B.
4. Adjournment

Annex 2 – Overview of proposals reviewed

The proposals are listed below in the order in which they were actually reviewed.

	<i>Proposal No.</i>	<i>Series</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Estimated media impact</i>
1.	0314_SHS02		La prévention du dopage dans le sport : insuffisances et défis	4	Approved	-
2.	0314_ED01		(Resubmission 0214_ED03) Writing Quality Textbooks	3	Approved	4
4.	0314_SC01		(Resubmission 0214_SC01) Guidelines for Earthquake Resistant Non-Engineered Construction	3	Approved	6
3.	0314_CI01	UNESCO Series on Internet Freedom	(Resubmission 0114_CI02) The Safety of Online Journalists and Emerging Media Actors	2	Approved	9
5.	0314_SHS01	SHS Ethics Series	(Resubmission 0214_SHS01) Global Bioethics: What for?	3	Approved	3
6.	0314_CLT01		Najaf: History and Contemporary Developments	2	Revise and resubmit	-
7.	0314_CI02		IAMCR and the Scholarly Agenda for the Global Alliance on Media and Gender	3	Revise and resubmit	-
8.	0314_CLT02	World Heritage Paper Series	Engaging Local Communities in World Heritage	3	Approved	8

1. Publication Proposal 0314_SHS02

La prévention du dopage dans le sport : insuffisances et défis

The Secretary explained that it was the only Category 4 proposal to be submitted for approval by the Board and asked whether anyone objected to this categorization or approval.

There was no objection, therefore, the Board moved to approve the proposal.

Proposal approved for web

2. Publication Proposal 0314_ED01

Writing Quality Textbooks (Resubmission 0214_ED03)

The Member for ED presented the proposal:

- The proposal is a resubmission.
- The comments from the Board have been taken into account:
 - The title is now more concise: “Writing quality textbooks” (instead of “Training tool for writing textbooks free from prejudice based on gender, culture and religion”).
 - Regarding the gender balance for authorship, there are contributions from both men and women.
 - The Rabat Office has now been included in the internal peer review.
 - The Abdulaziz Centre on the Culture of Peace has been deleted from the external peer reviewers as there was a potential conflict of interest. The Member also stressed that the publication had been tested in a workshop with experts from different regions of the world.
 - The target audience has been clarified: the publication targets textbook writers writing books for primary and secondary school students.
 - With regard to the need for a co-publishing agreement, it is now clear that the publication will be a UNESCO publication only, therefore no co-publishing agreement will have to be established.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair thanked the Member for the improvements.
2. The Chair stressed that the form submitted may not be in its last updated version as the Abdulaziz Centre on the Culture of Peace is still mentioned as an external peer reviewer.
 - The Member for ED confirmed that this was not the updated form.
3. The representative for BSP asked whether the donor will be acknowledged in the publication.
 - The Member for ED replied that as a normal practice, there is a reference made to the donor, for example on the cover or on the back cover.
4. The Chair asked whether colleagues from CLT had been consulted, as suggested, to review Module III on Teaching Cultural Diversity.

The Member for CLT explained that colleagues from the General History of Africa had been involved, but she could not say whether her suggestion to have Module III reviewed by colleagues from the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions section has been followed.

- The Member for ED agreed that colleagues from the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions section should definitely be consulted.
5. The Chair asked whether IBE has been consulted. In addition, the Member for Field Offices said that this publication is of interest for the Asia-pacific region, which raises the issue of the peer review from Asia. Since there are Category 1 and Category 2 institutes in Asia-Pacific, specialized in peace and education, would it still be possible to include their inputs? Moreover the Bangkok Office initiated the “Asian Shared History Texts Project” and could provide inputs as well.

- Regarding the internal peer review and the suggestions made during the last meeting of the Publications Board, the Member for ED explained that the UNESCO Internal Bureau of Education (IBE) had no direct involvement in this specific programme. As for the Category 2 Centre in Korea (i.e. Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding), it had been considered that it was not in the best position to review the proposal because the subject is broader than just peace and education. However, the Member for ED said that the Sector would be happy to add the Bangkok Office as an internal reviewer, which may lead to cooperation between both teams.

As far as the external peer review was concerned, the Member repeated that specific workshops had involved specialists from different regions of the world (including Asia).

In terms of dissemination, this product is part of a broader programme and, as part of phase 2 of the project, activities will contribute to its dissemination and to its use.

6. The costs for printing are considered to be rather high.

Estimated Media Impact: 4

Proposal approved for print and web

4. Publication Proposal 0314_SC01

Guidelines for Earthquake Resistant Non-Engineered Construction (Resubmission 0214_SC01)

The Member for SC presented the proposal:

- The proposal is a resubmission.
- This is a re-edition of a 1986 publication.
- Three of the original authors have decided to update the original publication.
- The comments from the Board have been taken into account:
 - Regarding the title, the Sector explained that it was the same as the original title 30 years ago. It was felt that changing it might confuse the audiences. The Sector suggested that this title should be kept, with a subtitle.
 - The Board had considered that the budget for design was too low whereas the printing costs were over-estimated. The Sector has revised that budget accordingly.
 - With regard to photographs, CLT had offered to provide some.
 - As for monitoring, it will be done through downloads. The print copies will be distributed during events. However, measuring the impact of the publication will be difficult since it could only really be done after an earthquake! Then, there could be an evaluation of how the guidelines were used. Accumulated knowledge is needed.
 - Comments from CLT and ED were solicited, but no major, significant comment has been made.
 - Regarding the role of authors in revising the publication, three of the original authors decided to revise and update it.
 - As for other language versions, Spanish was considered to be the most useful translation. Nevertheless, although there is a definite commitment from the Sector to publish a Spanish version, no funds have been identified yet for this purpose.
 - Regarding the gender aspect, it would be difficult to include reference to the role of women in the text because it is a very technical publication, but it was done in the introduction and the foreword which have been prepared for the Director-General.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair said that the publication is a very important one, but expressed regrets that the submission was not better.
2. The table of contents has not been changed.
 - The Sector stressed that the publication will basically consist of guidelines, and said that the table of contents would follow the one in the previous edition.

3. There would be an opportunity to look at World Heritage sites, therefore more input should come from CLT.

The Member for CLT said that SC had been in contact with CLT's Focal Point on Sustainable Development, Disaster Risk Reduction and Capacity Building, and that photographs had been offered.

4. The choice of Spanish for another language version was considered to be a good one, although the Board was not entirely satisfied by the fact that there were no funds identified for this yet, but only a "commitment".
 - The Sector underlined that although they entirely agree on the fact that there is a need to translate this publication, the budget is currently very small and no additional funds can be allocated for this.

The Ex Officio Member for AFR inquired about the number of French-speaking countries which are prone to earthquakes, in order to determine whether there would be a need for a French version as well.

- The Sector explained that Spanish was a better choice than French because more Spanish-speaking countries are prone to earthquakes. There are also other countries in Asia, therefore the Sector will see whether cooperation with Field Offices is possible.

The Member for Field Offices said that once there are demands from stakeholders, the Field Offices would be happy to disseminate and publish in local languages.

5. Regarding gender, the representative for ODG/GE said that it had been agreed during the last meeting of the Board that this was a technical publication. The maximum that can be done is to draw attention, in introductory parts for example, on the fact that women are too scarce in the profession. The Sector came up with ideas and ODG/GE has been satisfied by the suggestions.
 - The Sector stressed that the publication is gender-neutral: it aims at saving lives.
6. The Secretary asked if there had been an evaluation of the impact of the first edition, and whether it had been the motivation for this second edition.
 - The Sector explained that the new version was based on new knowledge and new techniques in engineering. The aim of this new edition is to provide more tools. It was not necessarily motivated by the impact of the first publication.
7. The representative for BSP underlined that the Sector could take the GMR evaluation mechanism as an example. She also insisted on the fact that the evaluation process does not necessarily have to be too comprehensive. It can be done through feedback from stakeholders, surveys etc.

The Secretary stressed that with Open Access, it is now possible to push as many language versions as possible and as many uses as possible, and all of this can be measured.

Estimated Media Impact: 6 (but the Sector still needs to look at the evaluation and translations)

Proposal approved for web and print

3. Publication Proposal 0314_CI01

**The Safety of Online Journalists and Emerging Media Actors
(Resubmission 0114_CI02)**

The Member for CI presented the proposal:

- This is a resubmission.
- Online issues are getting more complicated nowadays with regard to ethics, privacy, etc. The proposal deals with the safety of journalists online. It will be useful in terms of mapping. It will open a new pathway for UNESCO, for leading discussions on the safety of journalists.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair said that the proposal had been improved considerably.
2. The launch date has been revised and tied to a specified event.
3. The Chair stressed that two concerns remained:
 - More information is needed regarding the external peer review committee.
 - The Member for CI said that the comments from the Board have been taken into consideration. He added that the peer review has been quite extensive (with reviewers from the UK, Argentina, India, South Africa, France, Philippines, Egypt, and Jordan). One observer for CI added that information regarding the peer review had been added the day before, after an internal evaluation by directors had taken place.
 - The proposal could benefit from more funding for the quality, the layout, photographs. Indeed there is no budget for photographs and illustrations, or for evaluation and monitoring.
 - The Member for CI noted the comments regarding the layout and monitoring, and agreed that there was room for improvement.
4. The Ex Officio Member for AFR, like during the previous meeting of the Board referred to what had been indicated in Box 18 of the submission form with regard to Priority Africa: “It is a global study that includes chapters and cases about Africa”. She considered that, with such an indication, she expected to see this reflected in the table of contents, which was not the case. As a result, she was not in a position to evaluate whether Africa was sufficiently taken into account, except if the draft was forwarded to her.
 - The Member for CI noted the comment, but stressed that the advisory board included two members from Africa. One observer for CI said that the first draft has been received and that Priority Africa was taken into account in almost all parts of the publication.
5. The Member for Field Offices made two comments:
 - Would it be possible for the Bangkok Office to inject inputs?
 - The expected date of publication is June 2014, however World Press Freedom Day is in May. Would it be possible for Bangkok to launch it on this occasion, before June?

- The Member for CI said that inputs could be provided by the Bangkok Office, but they will have to be provided quickly. As for the second question, he was not sure whether the publication would be ready in May.
6. The Chair confirmed that the proposal should be in Category 2 of publications and said that there was a clear appeal for it.
 7. The Secretary reminded that another CI publication was to be launched in May for World Press Freedom Day.

It was requested from CI to inform the Members of the Board of which publication will be launched on that date.

Estimated Media Impact: 9 (but CI needs to work closely with DPI for the promotion of the publication)

Proposal approved for web and print

5. Publication Proposal 0314_SHS01

Global Bioethics: What for? (Resubmission 0214_SHS01)

The representative for SHS presented the proposal:

- The proposal is a resubmission.
- Comments made by the Board during the 11 February 2014 meeting have been taken addressed or taken into account:
 - Despite what was said previously by the Board, the Sector maintains that it is a Category 3 publication (and not a Category 2 one).
 - The title has been revised (the previous tentative title was “UNESCO’s Future of Global Bioethics”).
 - With regard to gender, nothing has been modified (in spite of ODG/GE’s suggestion that SHS should work closely with ODG/GE to make the gender perspective more visible).
 - With regard to comments made by AFR, the latter has been consulted, however it is not possible – as was suggested - to make the publication more attractive by adding photographs or illustrations. Nevertheless, the Member for SHS said that illustrations for each theme developed in the publication could be improved on the website.
 - The budget has been revised. It is now of 22,000 USD for both the English and the French version.
 - The review, which had been considered not to be very convincing, has been revised.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair said that the new title is simple but works.
2. The new launch date is more logical [21st session of the International Bioethics Committee (IBC) and joint session of the IBC with the Intergovernmental Bioethics Committee].
3. Regarding the general idea behind the publication, it is still unclear and seems to lack ambition: the Sector wants to do something important to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the bioethics programme, but the publication will only consist of a collection of articles and/or testimonies, which may not be the best approach, even if it is understood that the budget is limited.
4. More information regarding the peer review should be provided. The representative for Field Offices asked which Field Offices had been involved in the internal peer review.
 - The Member for SHS said that there would be no problem to identify the peer reviewers. But she insisted that it should not prevent the approval of the submission in the meantime.
5. As for the post-face to be written by ADG/SHS, its usefulness is questionable since, by the time the proposal is published, there will be a new ADG. It would be better not to have this post-face, or to ask the Director-General to sign it.

- The Member for SHS agreed that the post-face would not be necessary.
6. The budget breakdown in the submission form does not seem to add up.
- The Publications Officer for SHS said that the budget for one language version is 11,000 USD. The rest will be used for a second language version.
7. The Chair stressed that even if the publication is approved as a Category 3 publication, it is regrettable not to have a Category 2 publication.
- The Member for SHS insisted on keeping the proposal in Category 3.
8. The representative for ODG/GE said that since the last meeting of the Board, ODG/GE had a very satisfactory meeting with SHS. The gender checklist now reflects the discussions which have taken place.

The representative for ODG/GE explained that the publication should indeed show the link between gender and bioethics. ODG/GE is satisfied with the gender balance of the authors. He added that the articles will certainly take this perspective into account explicitly or implicitly. If no article is specifically dealing with gender and bioethics, the representative for ODG/GE insisted that there should be one (but he reminded that there was still no table of contents available so far, it is therefore difficult to see how gender is taken into account).

- The Member said that the Sector could indeed prepare a specific article.
9. The Ex Officio Member for AFR wanted to express support for the publication. She underlined the fact that this publication would help in the preparation of a second and more substantive publication on this topic, with illustrations, etc.

She also explained that it has been very difficult to find experts from Africa in this area, although the Sector had made efforts in this regard.

10. The representative for Field Offices asked which Field Offices had been involved in the internal peer review.
- The Publications Officer for SHS was not sure, but said that Field Offices in Latin America had probably been involved.
11. The Chair said that the proposal is reasonable, but a little disappointing.
12. The Publications Officer for SHS said that the series within which this publication comes is a Category 2 (SHS Ethics Series). However, the programme specialist in charge of the publication had decided that it should belong to Category 3. The Publications Officer for SHS wondered therefore whether the publication should remain within this series.
- The Secretary replied that if the publication is in Category 3, then it should not belong to the Category 2 series.

Estimated Media Impact: 3 (the format not being very attractive)

Approved for web and print

6. Publication Proposal 0314_CLT01

Najaf: History and Contemporary Developments

The Member for CLT presented the proposal:

- Najaf is an historic city in Iraq. It is the centre of the Shiite community, and both a spiritual and cultural capital.
- The publication aims at filling a knowledge gap about this city.
- The title is one of the three publications about Najaf proposed by the Iraq Office under the self-beneficiary project funded by the Iraqi Ministry of Culture (“Preserving Najaf’s Cultural Heritage and Promoting its International Visibility” project).
- One of these publications (“The Holy City of Najaf: History and Heritage”) has already been approved by the Board on 31 July 2013. The submission will complement the first one.
- There is a potential partner, Saqi Books, of which the Secretary has been informed, and the publication is potentially for sale.
- It is a 400 pages document targeting the academic and scientific community.
- The volume editors are women and there are also women among the authors.
- It will be published in English, as well as in Arabic.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair said that if the submission is to complement the first publication already approved by the Board, this should be reflected in the title (which is currently very similar despite a slightly different arrangement).
 - The Member agreed that the title could be improved, but stressed that the current one was only provisional.
2. The Chair project is well-funded.
3. The Chair was surprised that the submission is foreseen in black and white only, and inquired about the reasons for this.
4. The Chair asked why the publication will be in print form only.
5. There is no co-publishing agreement in place so far. The Secretary said that he had spoken to the potential publisher last year, but there has been no development since then.

The Chair stressed that the question of the co-publishing agreement should be sorted out.

6. The Chair asked why this publication is in Category 3 and not in Category 2 (it is technical, but only to some extent). The Secretary said that indeed the submission felt like a Category 2 publication.

The Chair concluded that the submission should be moved to Category 2, but this will have an impact on the format and design: it should be in colour as a result.

- The Member replied that the Sector would follow the Board’s guidance and would share this recommendation with the project coordinator, but this would also have an impact on the budget.

The Secretary said that there are three publications under this project. The first one is a coffee table book, the present submission is more academic. The question is what will be the third one, and how the three publications would fit together?

- Regarding the complementary aspect, the Member explained that the first publication is about the history of the city and includes original photographs. The present submission focuses on knowledge and culture. And the third publication will be about the Imam Ali Holy Shrine.
7. The representative for ODG/GE said that he fully agrees with the comments from the Sector’s Gender Focal Point: history cannot be changed, but history can be accounted for. If possible, if there is a famous female historical figure, this should be included in the publication.
- The Sector said she would relay this suggestion to the volume editors.
8. The Chair referred to the Minutes of the 31 July 2013 meeting of the Publications Board during which concern had been expressed on the fact that the first publication could be a lobbying project. There might be a potential conflict of interests due to fact that the publication was financed by the Iraqi Ministry of Culture and that the publication was about a site registered on Iraq’s tentative list of World Heritage site.
- The Sector explained that not the entire city but only the cemetery Wadi As Salam is included in Iraq’s tentative list. It is not a problem to cover a site on the tentative list. Moreover, the Sector’s policy has been changed in 2010 during a meeting held in Thailand regarding the World Heritage Committee (establishing upstream approaches to help countries to identify sites which are of true potential outstanding universal value). Therefore, the Member does not think that there is any conflict of interests.
9. The Chair asked whether the first publication had already been published.
- The Sector replied that it had gone to press and would be published in one month or two.
10. In view of all the comments above, the proposal should be revised for resubmission next month.

Proposal to be revised and resubmitted

7. Publication Proposal 0314_CI02

IAMCR and the scholarly agenda for the Global Alliance on Media and Gender

The Member for CI presented the proposal:

- The proposed title is too long and has already been shortened, although it is not reflected in the submission form yet.
- In 1995, the Beijing Platform for Action proposed strategies that would enable women’s human rights to find allies in media and information technologies. CI decided to launch the UNESCO campaign “Towards a Global Alliance on Media and Gender” in 2013. In 2014, the Global Alliance on Media and Gender (GAMAG) was launched at the Global Forum on Media and Gender in Bangkok.
- The International Association for Media and Communication Research (IAMCR), one of the largest research groupings, has been a key partner in these initiatives. After the forum in Bangkok, it was decided that UNESCO and IAMCR would cooperate to publish the proposal.
- Top scholars from around world have been involved and the proposal is bound to be an exceptional publication.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair asked whether the Sector really intends to publish this proposal on 8 March.
 - The Observer for CI responsible for the publication confirmed that the publication will be launched on that date if it is approved by the Board during the meeting. The publication is ready to be posted online.
2. The Chair asked why the proposal is submitted so late.
3. The peer review is not satisfactory: there is only one peer reviewer who is also writing the preface. The Member for ED added that it would be good to have additional peer reviewers. The proposal should also be reviewed by the Gender Division.

The Member for SHS considered that other Sectors, such as CLT and SHS, could review the proposal.

- The Member for CI was of the opinion that inputs from other sectors are not necessary for all publications, but said that the draft could be circulated, even if this meant that the deadline for publication would not be met.
4. There is no launch plan.
 5. No co-publishing agreement is in place.
 - The Member asked whether a co-publishing agreement was really required.

The Chair replied that he raised this issue only because the Sector had mentioned the co-publishing agreement in the submission form.

6. The representative for ODG/GE stated that the proposal is very important and seems to be a good reflection of the work of UNESCO in this field. As he was not aware of the project prior to the receipt of the submission, the representative for ODG/GE was not certain that the publication could be launched on 8 March. ODG/GE offered to help to work more on the text itself.

- The Member for CI agreed on the fact that the Sector should have worked closely with ODG/GE.

The Member for ED said that colleagues from ED could review Chapter 16 which focuses on “Gender mainstreaming in education”.

- The Member for CI said that the proposal will be shared with ED for inputs.
7. The Ex Officio Member for AFR stressed that several chapters will cover Africa, however only one of the authors is from Africa. The same comment applies to the peer reviewers.
 - The Member for CI agreed that at least one peer reviewer from Africa should be included.
 8. The Chair concluded that approval could not be requested just a few days prior to the anticipated date of publication. The proposal was submitted much too late. All elements will have to be looked at, including the review of the proposal by ODG/GE. A new launch date will have to be found as a result.
 9. In view of the comments above, the proposal should be revised and improved for resubmission next month.
 - The Member for CI agreed, but emphasized that this will be an exceptional publication and agreed to circulate the draft for inputs.

Proposal to be revised and resubmitted

8. Publication Proposal 0314_CLT02

Engaging Local Communities in World Heritage

The Member for CLT presented the proposal:

- The proposal focuses on the key theme of local communities, which is crucial for the management of sites.
- As can be seen from the table of contents, the proposal covers all aspects of managing sites and all the different processes of the Convention.
- The proposal is part of the COMPACT programme (Community Management of Protected Areas for Conservation). It was originally funded by the UNDP and GEF. 10 sites on all continents were involved in the project.
- The publication will be in two colours (and not in black and white as indicated).
- The launch will be in June 2014 at the World Heritage Committee, and potentially in Sydney in November 2014 during the IUCN World Parks Congress, with the Director-General attending.
- The proposal is part of the World Heritage Paper Series. Normally, the series belongs to Category 2, therefore the proposal should be in Category 2 as well (but the Member wished to check this with the Board).
- The proposal will be published in English and French.
- An evaluation by IOS is underway, therefore comments made by the Board during previous meetings have been taken into account.
- Two workshops have taken place in the field, during which the publication was tested.

Comments from the Board:

1. The Chair stated that this was a very impressive submission: it is early, with a clear title, the peer review looks good, Field Offices have been involved, it will be in English and French, the budget is well-displayed.
2. The Chair thanked the Sector for working on the evaluation of the Series.

The Secretary explained that the reason why an evaluation by IOS is underway is that it was felt that there was a difference in quality among the publications within the series.

3. If the publication is to be moved to Category 2, then adjustments will have to be made to meet all requested criteria.

The Secretary said that until the results of the evaluation are known, it will have to be accepted that the Series includes both Category 2 and Category 3 publications, although the Secretary personally thinks that the proposal belongs to Category 3.

The Member for ED objected that the Board just had a discussion concerning SHS publications about the fact that publications within a series had to belong to the same category as the series.

The Secretary replied that the previous discussion involved new publications, whereas this particular series, is a long-standing one, hence the evaluation.

4. The representative for ODG/GE said that the publication did not raise any issue. It does engage in the promotion of the involvement of women. The approach is adequate.
5. The Ex Officio Member for AFR confirmed that it is a good publication. 6 African sites are presented and the publication has been tested during workshops in 2 African countries.
6. The Member for Field Offices said that, although the proposal focuses on Africa, there are also good examples in Asia and the Bangkok Office could provide inputs for the region.
 - The Sector explained that the publication is really based on accumulated experience during a 12-year project, therefore it will not be possible to add things. The publication focuses more on engaging communities in conservation. However, if the publication presents the work which has been done in Africa, it also includes 2 sites in Asia and will be valid for the rest of the world.

The Secretary asked whether the proposal focuses only on Africa.

- The Sector said that it was not the case.
7. The Secretary inquired about how the proposal will overlap with the publication entitled “Benefits Beyond Borders”.
 8. In response to comments by the Member for CI, the Sector replied that the additional 15,000 USD were a contribution from UNDP (which provided for the costs of the honorarium for the consultant who worked on the publication).

Estimated Media Impact: 8

Approved for web and print