

UNESCO INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

REPORT OF THE GOVERNING BOARD CHAIRMAN ON THE REVIEW OF THE GOVERNANCE, PROCEDURES, AND WORKING METHODS OF THE IIEP GOVERNING BOARD

During its 58th session (11-12 December 2018), the IIEP Governing Board was invited to take note of the General Conference's recommendations (Document 39 C/20) and to assess their level of implementation.

Out of the 131 recommendations, 50 recommendations concern the General Conference and the Executive Board and 74 concern UNESCO's international and intergovernmental bodies, including 10 for category 1 Institutes.

The majority of the 74 recommendations concern bodies that are managed by a large elected bureau, ruled by complex procedures, a contrast from the IIEP Governing Board. Other recommended measures are already in place at IIEP (e.g. reduce term limits to two consecutive mandates).

On the general recommendations for all international and intergovernmental bodies (recommendations 54 to 80)

How to improve efficiency:

The Governing Board meets in full session once a year for a two-day meeting. For the last 10 years, the Board has adopted some cost-efficiency measures, such as:

- Use of distance modes to organize virtual meetings and conference calls;
- Reduction of the in-person Board meeting from 3 to 2 days;
- Documents are sent electronically to Board Members;
- Documents are strategic and results-oriented;
- The number of documents produced is stable and the length has been reduced;
- Preparation of a strategic note informing Board Members about the main strategic points prior to regular sessions of the full Board (starting in December 2018).

The Governing Board notes also that the IIEP working group established in 2016 at the request of the *open-ended Working Group on governance, procedures, and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO* concluded its work by a set of proposals that are already implemented (See Annex 1: IIEP Governing Board report to President of the General Conference, January 2017).

How to improve the harmonization of the role of the Bureau and transparency of its work:

The size of the IIEP Governing Board is modest and there is no elected Bureau. The rules of procedures/statutes adopted by the Board are published and distributed to Board members.

Alignment with overarching priorities of UNESCO:

The Governing Board agrees with recommendations 74 and 75. Currently, IIEP's Chairperson presents a four-minute report to the Commission II, which is not followed by a debate. A new more strategic and results-oriented reporting format with a debate would allow for a more substantive dialogue between Member States and the Governing Board. The Board draws attention to the new fact sheet on IIEP's Governing Board, prepared to strengthen the orientation session for new members (see Annex 2).

Coherence, coordination and synergies, and sharing best practices

The annual budget for the Governing Board is stable and constitutes around 2.4% of the total IIEP budget (2017). IIEP has shared extensively its best practices with the Governing Boards of other Institutes (e.g. on the procedures and documents, etc.).

The Board argues that there is no logic in all institutes having the same statutes, as their purposes and governance are different. In addition, the UNESCO contributions should not be uniform across all Institutes but should rather be in proportion to the overall budget and performance of each Institute, as recommended by the International Oversight Service¹. Increased contributions would help guarantee that the Institutes maintain their independence from donors and continue to work for the production of global public goods.

On the specific recommendations for the Category 1 Institutes:

The Governing Board reiterates its statement on the critical importance of the functional autonomy of Education Category 1 Institutes (See Annex 3: resolutions 537 and 538, 14 December 2017).

To improve communication with Member states, IIEP has already implemented the following:

- Organization of annual meetings between the IIEP management team and Regional groups at UNESCO (e.g.: GRULAC, Africa Group);
- Publication of the main GB documents on IIEP's website;
- Publication of all external evaluations and management response on IIEP's website.

In addition, the Board recommends:

- To issue a fact sheet on IIEP's contribution to SDG4;
- To send the document GB/4 Part 1 - Approved (Report of the Director on IIEP's activities and operational plan) to all Permanent Delegations.

At the end of the discussion, the Board adopted the following resolution and invited the Chair to present it to the President of the General Conference.

1. See IOS report, *Review of the International Institute for Educational Planning*, ref: IOS/EVS/PI/124 REV., March 2013

Resolution 560

The Governing Board,

Having read the Annex 1 of the document referenced 39 C/20, Working Group on the Governance, procedures, and working methods of the Governing bodies of UNESCO, and the letter of the President of the General Conference,

Considering the set of recommendations submitted to the open-ended Working Group on governance, procedures, and working methods of the governing bodies by the IIEP Governing Board (January 2017),

Recognizes the improvements already made since 2017,

Welcomes the recommendations made to improve the reporting of the IIEP Governing Board to the General Conference,

Invites the Director to share with all Permanent Delegations the document 58 GB/4 part I,

Further invites the IIEP Chairperson to present the conclusion of the debate that takes place during the 58th session (12 December 2018) to the President of the General Conference.

Annex 1:

**Report of the IIEP Working Group:
Follow-up to the recommendations of the external auditor's report to improve
governance of UNESCO's entities**

Submitted to the President of the General Conference on 17 January 2017



17 January 2017
Original: English

**UNESCO
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING**

**FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S REPORT
TO IMPROVE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO'S ENTITIES**

CONTEXT

The report of the Audit of the Governance of UNESCO and attached Entities, Funds, and Programmes, was presented to the 2015 UNESCO General Conference (documents 38 C/63 and 38 C/COM.APX/DR.2). The summary of this discussion, and the decisions, were presented to the IIEP Governing Board at its 55th session (December 2015).

By its 38 C/Resolution 101, the General Conference decided to establish an open-ended Working Group on governance, procedures and working methods of the governing bodies of UNESCO. The President of the General Conference chairs the Working Group. The resolution specifically: "Invites all intergovernmental programmes, committees and organs of the conventions to inscribe, in 2016 if feasible, an item on their agenda concerning the follow-up to the recommendations of the External Auditor's report contained in document 38 C/23, to improve their governance by concrete measures, and to report on their proposals to the Chairperson of the open-ended working group".

In response, an IIEP Governing Board working group discussed four items:

1. Review the mandate and composition of the Governing Board.
2. Enhance the cost-efficiency and effectiveness of the Governing Board.
3. Facilitate the strategic decision-making process.
4. Improve the coordination with HQ and among other Institutes.

On 8 December 2016, during its 56th session, the Governing Board analysed the Working Group proposals as follow:

1. **Review the mandate and composition of the Governing Board**

Current situation

The Institute is governed by its own Board, within the mandate set out in its Statutes and by its own Rules of Procedure. The Board consists of 12 members, of which four are designated by the UN agencies specified in the Statutes for a period of three years, seven members are elected from around the world for their contribution to education and human resource development for a period of four years, and a Chairperson who is also elected from among educators, economists and other specialists of international repute in the field of human resource development for a period of five years. The Board meets annually to review the past year's activities, debate and approve its annual budget and programme, and determine the strategies and policies of the Institute within the general strategic and programmatic priorities of UNESCO. It reports on the activities of the Institute to the General Conference of UNESCO at the end of each biennium, and also submits the Institute's contributions to UNESCO's biennium programme and budget (C/5) and medium-term plan (C/4).

This composition of the Board stems from the rationale of the Institute developed at the time of its creation. IIEP was created as a Training and Research institution that would support countries to develop strong education systems. The objective was to create a group of high-level experts able to innovate, and translate theory into practice, to develop efficient education systems internationally. The capacity of IIEP to attract the best experts was at stake. The Consultative committee on the creation of the IIEP (that met on 25-26 June 1962) "recognizes the importance of creating a truly autonomous institution not directly tied to the governing bodies of the international agencies providing for its financial support. This degree of autonomy is a prerequisite for attracting the high level experts and students who will be needed to make the Institute a success." Members of the Group of Experts debated the mode of designation and election of Board Members but the majority of the Expert Group "recognized the impossibility of achieving the task contemplated unless such autonomy was given."

A number of specific criteria, which lay down the foundations of a strong Board, emerge:

- Expertise: The level of expertise is the first criterion to be used to select an incumbent.
- Independence: Board members are elected in a personal capacity to ensure independence vis-à-vis any institution or country.
- Diversity: Regional diversity is guaranteed by four region-based seats. Institutional diversity is guaranteed by four members appointed by sister institutions (World Bank, UN secretariat and UN agencies).

Evaluations of IIEP's governance have repeatedly emphasized the quality of the Board. An important aspect of the Governance of the Institute is its functional autonomy from UNESCO. In the words of one evaluation², "Functional autonomy is a precondition for the high quality of its activities, for example, through the capacity to recruit and retain high-calibre staff, and is also key to its excellent reputation among the funding agencies".

IIEP Board Members discussed this issue under item 7 on the Delegation of authority. (See resolutions attached).

² Davis, N. and Mutch, L. 2006. *Evaluation of UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning*. Paris: UNESCO, Evaluation Section, Internal Oversight Service.

Areas to strengthen:

- a. Selection of Governing Board Members: To maintain the current diversity of Board Members, the Governing Board and its Nominating Committee should receive more information from IIEP's management on the type of expertise from the region or the experience to prioritize.
- b. The principle that Board Members sit in their personal capacity must be maintained.
- c. Orientation of New Board Members: New members could receive more guidance, for instance, through the development of a set of guidelines and/or terms of reference, specifying what the expectations are. When they are elected, candidates should be questioned about potential conflicts of interest through a questionnaire.
- d. Regular information: Keeping Governing Board Members well informed of IIEP developments between annual board meetings: the eNewsletter and regular information notes from the IIEP Director are significant improvements and should be encouraged.

Proposals:

- a) For each vacancy, IIEP management could provide an overview of the kind of expertise the Board might need.
- b) Each new Member could be given a set of guidelines specifying what the expectations are.
- c) Each Board Member could sign a conflict of interest declaration once a year.
- d) Board Members could be kept engaged throughout the year by sending regular briefings to complement the public IIEP news announcements and IIEP Letter. Depending on their personal expertise, Board Members could be invited to support IIEP in fund-raising activities or in reflection activities more regularly.

2. Enhance the cost-efficiency and the effectiveness of the Governing Board**Current situation:**

The Governing Board meets in full session once a year for a maximum of three days. The Executive Committee (five Members including the Chairperson) meets regularly at a distance for a maximum of two hours, and meets face-to-face once every two years for one day. The Nominations Committee meets virtually as needed, usually shortly before the full Board meeting, and then finally in person as part of the Governing Board ordinary session.

The annual budget is stable. The share and is distributed as follow:

2015	Regular Budget US\$	% of total IIEP Budget (Regular and extrabudgetary budget, for IIEP Paris, Dakar and Buenos Aires)
Organizing meetings (mainly travel & per diem)	95,629	0.48%
UNESCO staff involved in the activities of the Governing Board (approximate budget in lump sum. Documents preparation)	141,935	0.70%

Areas to strengthen

The working group considered that the duration and frequency of meetings were appropriate. IIEP's secretariat makes good use of distance modes to organize virtual meetings and conference calls. The best way to increase efficiency would be to engage more with Board Members throughout the year (see point 1 above). The Executive Committee may take on a more important role if it could meet at a distance quarterly. Although it would not be necessary to send all documents earlier, the IIEP secretariat could share with Board Members a strategic

note informing them about the main issues at stake, or organize conference calls with some Members to seek advice. This would allow Board Members to better prepare for the meetings.

Proposals:

- a) To organize quarterly virtual meetings of the Executive Committee
- b) To start the work of the Nominations Committee earlier in the year
- c) To send strategic notes informing Board Members about main strategic points prior to regular sessions of the full Board.

3. *Facilitate the strategic decision-making process*

Current situation:

The Governing Board bases its main discussions on the Report of the Director on the activities carried out and on the Operational Plan for the next year. The quality of reporting to the Board is generally of a high standard. Board reporting emphasizes programmatic and financial issues in particular. On a number of matters of strategic and programmatic importance, the Board has played a particularly active governance role while being careful not to interfere with the day-to-day running of the Institute.

Areas to strengthen:

Regular communication between the Board and the Management could increase the efficiency of the very busy and packed three-day GB session, without interfering with the day-to-day running of the Institute. The Executive Committee could hold quarterly virtual meetings to discuss strategic issues (see item 2).

Proposals:

To organize quarterly virtual meetings of the Executive Committee, one of them being focused on the work of the two regional offices. Reports should be shared among all Board Members

4. *Improve the coordination between UNESCO Headquarter and governance bodies of the Institutes*

Upon the recommendations of the External Auditor, the General Conference adopted a resolution by which the Education sector and Category 1 Institutes should organize a two-yearly meeting, on an experimental basis, of Category 1 Institutes in the Education Sector and to structure the coordination between two sessions.

The first meeting, organized during the 2015 General Conference, was informative.

Areas to strengthen

The meeting might be more efficient as a structured meeting focusing on common burning issues relevant to all or most institutes. A clear agenda should be proposed prior to the meeting. There might also be value in including the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, given how important education is to its work, even though it is not formally within the Education Sector.

Proposals:

- a. To set an agenda for this meeting in advance.
- b. To consider including UIS
- c. Propose to Board Chairs to meet virtually in between the biennial meetings that take place at the time of the General Conference.

At the end of the discussion, the Governing Board adopted the following resolution:

Resolution 538

The Governing Board,

Having heard ADG/ED's proposed changes to the statutes of Category I Education Institutes,

Appreciates ADG/ED's guarantee that no modification of IIEP's statutes will be submitted to UNESCO Governing Bodies without prior approval of IIEP's Governing Board.

Expects to receive a proposal via the Director,

Requests the Director to analyze its implications and report to the Board, and **commits to** giving due consideration to the proposal and, as appropriate, to commenting on any relevant document to be submitted to the UNESCO Governing Bodies, and

Notes that the Governing Board has responded to the request of the President of the General Conference to review its governance procedures following the

Annex 2:

Resolutions taken by the IIEP' Governing Board at its 56th session (7 December 2016)

Resolution 537

The Governing Board,

Having examined the proposed Revised Table of Derogation of Authority and Functional Autonomy of Category I Education Institutes, **having reviewed** the memorandum ref. ED/EO/SPM/16.10 dated 01/06/2016 from ADG/ED to Directors of education-related Category 1 institutes and **having heard** the presentation of the ADG/ED on the said Table,

Recalling the shared interest of the Director-General and IIEP Governing Board in maintaining IIEP as a Center of Excellence, which strengthens the overall reputation of UNESCO,

Recognizing that this excellence rests on IIEP's autonomy to attract and retain both strong technical expertise and diverse funding partners that has resulted in a sustainable financial model,

Notes that notwithstanding the statement in memo ref. ED/EO/SPM/16.10, the Governing Board was not consulted regarding proposed changes prior to this Board meeting (December 2016),

Objects particularly to (i) the loss of derogation of authority to appoint staff on UNESCO established posts through P4, and (ii) the requirement that the cost of IIEP's established posts do not exceed the UNESCO financial allocation,

Is concerned that these two changes in the proposed Revised Table of Derogation of Authority and Functional Autonomy of Category I Education Institutes, would undermine the autonomous nature of IIEP and the relationship between Headquarters and the Institute,

Believes that possible implications have not been fully explored and could negatively affect (i) maintaining a critical number of staff for core functions, (ii) attracting and retaining technical excellence, and (iii) maintaining the confidence of funders in UNESCO as a whole as well as in IIEP, and **requests** the Director to perform a risk assessment and present it to the Board,

Recognizing the uniqueness of IIEP regarding its size, predictability of its funding, long-standing performance record, level of reserves covering all staff liabilities, and overall prudent management of human and financial resources, namely: an annual audit, regular external evaluations of the programmes, a stabilization reserve account covering one year of full payroll, strict adherence to the HR Manual and the presence in-house of an HR officer, all of which result in transparent and responsible management,

Reaffirms the differential rather than uniform approach to the level of autonomy, which incentivizes all Category I Education Institutes, according to the General Conference's decision in 2005 to adopt the Executive Board document ref. 171 EX/18 §32, which states *"Functional autonomy means that Institutes and Centers are given sufficient authority and flexibility to carry out their mandate fully and effectively. The degree of functional autonomy varies according to each Category I entity."*

Consequently requests the Chair to communicate the Board's concerns to the Director-General that the proposed changes represent significant risks to the Institute, the implications of which should be fully explored.

Requests the Chair to report back to the Board.

Resolution 538

The Governing Board,

Having heard ADG/ED's proposed changes to the statutes of Category I Education Institutes,

Appreciates ADG/ED's guarantee that no modification of IIEP's statutes will be submitted to UNESCO Governing Bodies without prior approval of IIEP's Governing Board.

Expects to receive a proposal via the Director,

Requests the Director to analyze its implications and report to the Board, and **commits to** giving due consideration to the proposal and, as appropriate, to commenting on any relevant document to be submitted to the UNESCO Governing Bodies, and

Notes that the Governing Board has responded to the request of the President of the General Conference to review its governance procedures following the external audit.

Annex 3.

Fact Sheet on IIEP Governing Board

IIEP was created in 1963 within UNESCO, but with full autonomy and flexibility in its operations. The Governing Board is the guardian of this autonomy. It oversees IIEP's activities and makes crucial decisions on its programme and budget. IIEP also has wide latitude in managing its own administrative affairs in accordance with UNESCO's rules and procedures. It is fully accountable in the management of its own budget and, while it receives regular budgetary contributions from UNESCO, it has the authority to receive financial support from any other appropriate source.

Board members are elected or appointed in their own capacity, which means that their decisions do not depend on a government or the organization they represent. The Board meets annually to review the past year's activities, debate, approve its annual budget and programme, and determine the strategies and policies of the Institute within the general strategic and programmatic priorities of UNESCO. The Board reports on the activities of IIEP to the General Conference of UNESCO at the end of each biennium. It also submits the Institute's contribution to UNESCO's biennium programme and budget (called C5) and Medium-term plan (C4).

Main functions of the Board

The principal functions of the Board can be summarized as follows:

- a. To determine the general policy and the nature of the Institute's activities within the framework and general policy of UNESCO;
- b. To approve IIEP's four year strategy and associated monitoring and evaluation plan, ensuring it is in line with UNESCO's strategy;
- c. To decide how the funds available to the Institute are to be used and to adopt the annual budgets;
- d. To oversee of IIEP's Stabilization Reserve Fund;
- e. To lay down the conditions for the admissions of participants to the Institutes' courses and meetings;
- f. To advise IIEP management on strategic issues, such as management of risks;
- g. To make whatever general arrangements it may deem necessary to implement the programme of the Institute;
- h. To make recommendations to the Director-General of UNESCO as to the appointment of the Director and other IIEP senior officials;
- i. To provide feedback to the ADG/ED on the Director's performance
- j. To submit a report on the Institute's activities to each of the ordinary sessions of the General Conference of UNESCO; and
- k. To nominate and elect new members and the Chair of the Governing Board, except for the four UN seats;
- l. To adopts its own Rules of Procedure in line with good practice.

Elections

The Board consists of 12 members, of which four are designated by UN Agencies for a period of three years, and seven members are elected from across the globe for their contribution to education and human resource development for period of four years, renewed once. Four of these should have regional expertise, with one from each of the regions of Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Arab States. A Chairperson is also

elected from among educators, economists, and other specialists of international repute in the field of human resources development for a period of five years renewed once. If, however, the Chairperson is elected from among the members of the Board, his total period of consecutive service on the Board shall not exceed 10 years

When a vacancy occurs, the Chairperson shall notify all Board Members and invite nominations to fill the vacancy. All Board members shall consult widely and think carefully about submitting nominations for seats on the Governing Board, given the imperative of maintaining a strong, knowledgeable, and independent Governing Board, capable of providing sound policy and substantive guidance as well as proficient oversight. The quality of the Governing Board is among the historic success factors of IIEP.

In proposing a candidate, Board Members should keep in mind the following criteria:

- a. Expertise: The level of expertise is the first criterion to be used to select a candidate.
- b. Network capacity: The extent of a candidate's integration into a wide network can help IIEP establish new partnerships.

The Nominating Committee meets when a vacancy needs to be filled. Meetings are held on the same days as the ordinary session of the Board, except in exceptional cases. Prior to the meeting during the Board session, the Nominating Committee often holds preparatory meetings, in person or remotely. The Nominating Committee is composed of the Chairperson of the Board and of three other members, to be elected at each ordinary session from among the members of the Board.

The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee is composed of the Chairperson of the Board and four other members, who are elected at each ordinary session by the members of the Board. Between the annual sessions of the Board, the Executive Committee maintains all of the powers and duties of the Board.

The Executive Committee meets at least once a year. The meetings are normally organized virtually. Once every two years, the Committee could meet in person, in Paris, to prepare the Chairperson's report to the General Conference.

***Ad hoc* Committee on Finance and Administration**

This Committee has been in place for many years. It analyzes the finance and budget of IIEP. It meets the first morning of each ordinary session to review the draft budget proposed by the Director. The Committee designates a rapporteur that presents to the full Board the Committee's analyses of the budget. The *Ad Hoc* Committee is composed of the Chairperson of the Board and two other members, who are elected at each ordinary session by the members of the Board.

The IIEP programme

The IIEP programme is defined within the framework of a Medium-Term Strategy for a four-year period. This strategy, approved by the Board and submitted to the General Conference of UNESCO, is aligned with the UNESCO Strategy (General Conference document referenced "C/4" and approved for a period of eight years). The current IIEP Strategy (2018-2021) outlines how IIEP contributes to the achievement of the SDGs and of the Education 2030 Agenda.

IIEP's programme is planned on an annual basis. The traditionally referenced document "GB/4" presents the programme. It is organized into two parts: the first part is programmatic and presents both the Director's report for the year ending and the

operational plan for the following year. The second part is financial and budgetary, covering human resources, IT and physical infrastructure.

The Governing Board is invited to approve four resolutions each year:

- The Appropriation Resolution by which the Board approves the budget for the past year;
- The Programmatic Resolution by which the Board approves the programme carried out and the programme proposed for the following year;
- The Appropriation Resolution by which the Board approves the budget for the following year and gives the Director the expenditure authorization for the following year;
- The Resolution by which the Resolution approves the External Auditor's report on IIEP accounts.

The IIEP programme is generally presented according to IIEP's traditional modalities of action: training, technical cooperation, research, and outreach and advocacy activities.

Budget and Finance

The IIEP's budget is composed of two parts, Regular programme budget and Extrabudgetary budget:

Regular income:	% of total budget	Example : Amounts in 2018
UNESCO allocation	11 %	2 140 101
Notes: the allocation is approved by the General conference every two years		
Voluntary contributions	39%	7 305 299
Please note: non-earmarked (core) or soft-earmarked funding is used to fund regular IIEP activities (training, research, technical cooperation, and outreach) and the staff that delivers these activities. Such funds are provided under contractual arrangements, but have few restrictions or specific deliverables. Long-standing donors include: Argentina, France, Sweden, Switzerland, and Norway.		

Extrabudgetary income

Contracts with governments	25%	2 346 193
Contracts with other entities	25%	6 428 857
Please note: the extra-budgetary income has increased tremendously since 1999. This budget includes contract-funded initiatives, which are aligned with IIEP's core role of developing the capacity of Member States.		

Financial Management

The composition of IIEP expenditure, in terms of staff and direct costs has remained relatively unchanged for the last 20 years. Staff costs have ranged from around 40-45% of the total budget.

Safeguards

Volatility in funding leaves the Institute open to the risk of having to downsize or

upscale its activities (including potentially hiring and firing staff) at short notice unless it builds up reserves during periods of strong income growth to draw down during period of income reduction. To address this risk, IIEP put in place a number of precautions:

The Stabilization reserve:

In 1993, the Governing Board created a stabilization reserve account for the purpose of:

- Providing additional resources, through interest revenue gained, to enable the Institute to finance its yearly programme at a level compatible with the expectations of Members States;
- Covering the payment of separation and other benefits of retiring or departing staff members;
- Providing resources, from the accrued capital, in order to finance the Institute's yearly programme, should exceptional economic or financial conditions warrant it, on the understanding that these resources will be returned to the account within three years.

A risk register:

IIEP needs to increase its capacity to address threats and opportunities, both internal and external. IIEP also needs to achieve its goals through the UNESCO-wide Results-based Management (RBM) approach, of which risk management is an integral part. Systematic management of risk is necessary for IIEP to improve decision-making and the delivery of its programme activities. IIEP maintains a risk register that includes identified risks for its three offices. These risks relate to IIEP's programme, human resources, finances, legal issues, communications, and its IT infrastructure. IIEP regularly updates this risk register and shares it with the Governing Board.

Expectations for a Board Member

- Oversee IIEP's programme and budget: Board Members are invited to carefully read, on an annual basis, the documents referenced as GB/4 and to raise any issues or concerns they might have. IIEP's Management welcomes any advice, warnings, and precautions.
- Board members are the guardians of IIEP's autonomy. In addition, Board Members ensure that IIEP implements its programme, according to the Board's decisions and within the framework of the general policy of UNESCO.
- Attend meetings. The full Board meets only once a year for only two days. It is Board members' obligation to attend fully these two days.
- Select candidates when a vacancy occurs. To fulfill its mission, the Board needs to remain as a group of high-level experts able to innovate, and translate theory into practice, and to support IIEP in developing efficient education systems worldwide. They must seek new candidates early enough to allow the Nominating Committee to make strong recommendations to the Board.
- Promotion: Board Members, to the extent possible, can leverage their network to promote IIEP's achievements and to support the Director's fundraising and other initiatives as requested by management and the Board Chair.

- Avoidance of Conflict of Interest. All Board members are expected to avoid conflicts of interest or perceptions of conflict of interest. Every Board Members would be invited to fill a Declaration of Conflict of Interest (In preparation).