**COPY OF CSE EMAIL to Charles Houen, IPEd Secretary
24 October 2013**

Dear Charles

Please find **attached** the CSE committee’s response to the IPEd WP3 questionnaire. Last week, I explained the delay in returning it to you.

CSE committee devoted 80% of its last meeting to this questionnaire. It was a well-attended meeting and a very animated discussion. Despite some divergent views around the table, two broad themes were common throughout.

The first was a recognition of the enormous amount of effort the WP3 had put into the circulated documents, and a desire for the WP3 to be thanked and congratulated for that.

The second was a sense of disappointment and frustration that the documents (a) displayed a bias towards the DMM, and (b) did not thoroughly articulate why the fees needed to be increased at such a scale.

The bias is evident in the way some Q&A questions are framed, and especially in the tables in the business case document. In the IFM columns, there are statements that make assumptions about that model that distort the balance of the proposals against the IFM; this is most apparent when expressing doubts about IFM’s prospects of enabling a national identity and achieving benefits from shared functions, despite that being inconsistent with the repeated reference elsewhere to IFM with shared functions. Furthermore, the budget comparisons are based on ‘no shared functions’, which hinders more informed comparisons.

Not only should the budget comparisons accommodate the prospect of shared functions, there is an apparent assumption elsewhere that any shared functions would have to be carried out by paid staff without ongoing voluntary effort in the state societies. This seems misguided.

Overall, the CSE committee felt that, despite the consultations and progressive development of the arguments over recent months, some assumptions underlying the proposals have not been fully set out and substantiated, particularly assumptions leading to the confronting scale of the proposed fee increases.

Can I close by reiterating the last two substantive paragraphs of the CSE letter to the IPEd Chairman on 11 October:

*Given the prodigious volunteer effort to bring us all this far on a matter of such fundamental importance to the future of the editing profession, it would be lamentable indeed to not achieve the most widely-accepted and widely-owned outcome possible because we were hasty at the most critical phase of the process*.

*We seriously recommend IPEd consider allowing more time for society members to truly understand the current situation and to calmly analyse and consider the propositions,* ***including getting more questions answered*** *than are in the Q&A paper, and even helping to frame the best possible referendum questions. [Emphasis added.]*

Kind regards

Alan

***Alan Cummine******President, Canberra Society of Editors*** *Ph: 02 6236 8309 / Mb: 0407 488 927
Em:* *alan.cummine@gmail.com*