

RESPONSE OF CANADA
to the
UNESCO CONSULTATION OF MEMBER STATES
on the
DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET
2006-2007 (33 C/5)

July 2004

Canadian Commission for UNESCO

and

**United Nations and Commonwealth Affairs Division
Department of Foreign Affairs, Government of Canada**

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
General Comments	4
I. Implementing The Third And Last Biennium of the Medium-Term Strategy for 2002- 2007 (31 C/4)	6
• Linkages to MDGs	8
• UNESCO's Functions	8
II. Programme Priorities	9
• Education	10
• Natural Sciences	13
• Social and Human Sciences	16
• Culture	18
• Communication and Information	21
III. Other Programme Issues and Developments	23
• Interdisciplinarity	24
• Mainstreaming	24
IV. Programme Delivery and Impact	25
• Results-based Approach	25
• Decentralization	26
• Role of National Commissions	28
V. Budget and Resource Issues	29
Conclusion	30
Annex I UNESCO Questionnaire on the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (Draft 33 C/5), May 2004	31

Note: Section titles and the questions that appear in the text are taken directly from the *Questionnaire on the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (Draft 33 C/5)*. The paragraph numbers refer to the paragraph(s) immediately preceding the question.

INTRODUCTION

At its 31st session in 2001, the General Conference of UNESCO approved the Medium-Term Strategy for the period 2002-2007 (31 C/4) which sets out the main strategic thrusts for UNESCO's action for the six-year period.

Built around a single unifying theme, *Contributing to peace and human development in an era of globalization through education, the sciences, culture and communication*, the Medium-Term Strategy defines a limited number of strategic objectives – a total of 12 for the entire Organization and three for each of UNESCO's four main domains.

These strategic objectives are complemented by two cross-cutting themes: the *Eradication of poverty, especially extreme poverty*, and the *Contribution of information and communication technologies to education, science and culture, and the construction of knowledge societies*. These cross-cutting themes are intrinsic to all programmes, and strive to create an environment that will foster intersectorality in UNESCO's action, both at Headquarters and in the Field.

In May 2004, UNESCO distributed a questionnaire (see Annex I) to solicit comments and proposals from Member States, Associate Members, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the priorities and issues that should guide the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (33 C/5) during the third, and final, phase of implementation of the Medium-Term Strategy.

This document represents the response of Canada to the questionnaire. It reflects the views of government and non-governmental members of the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, and of other experts in the fields of education, the natural, social and human sciences, culture, communication and information. The consultation was co-ordinated, and this document prepared, by the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, and submitted to Foreign Affairs Canada for consideration and submission to UNESCO.

The Canadian Commission for UNESCO would like to extend its sincere thanks to the members of the Commission, representatives of federal and provincial government departments, professional associations, non-governmental organizations and individuals who contributed to the consultation for preparation of this document. Without their knowledge, expertise and insight, we would not have been able to present this comprehensive, and uniquely Canadian, perspective on the role and future activities of UNESCO.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Canada wishes to congratulate UNESCO for its significant accomplishments in results-based management and programme reform during the past biennium. These reforms began with the *Medium-Term Strategy, 2002-2007* (31 C/4) were further refined in the *Programme and Budget, 2002-2003* (31 C/5) and *2004-2005* (32 C/5), and we believe will continue to be reflected in the *Programme and Budget for 2006-2007* (33C/5).

We welcome the opportunity, therefore, to provide comments and recommendations for consideration in the preparation of the 33 C/5. As an overall comment, we found the *Questionnaire on the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (Draft 33 C/5)* unnecessarily long, complicated, and repetitive. The questionnaire contains 49 paragraphs with each paragraph being followed by a series of questions. We have counted a total of 138 questions, with one paragraph (24) consisting of only 3.5 lines followed by a total of nine (9) distinct questions. The complexity of all of the questions in the *Questionnaire* requires extensive prior knowledge of UNESCO programmes and budgets, and resulted in considerable frustration for respondents during the consultation process.

We are also concerned that the format and length of the *Questionnaire* points to a larger problem with the final document (33 C/5). If the preparatory process is this complicated, we have serious concerns about the clarity, length and even the utility of the draft 33 C/5 that will emerge from the process.

The Questionnaire also takes a strong sectoral approach to the work of UNESCO which, while we understand this reflects the format of the current C/5, question how intersectorality or an interdisciplinary approach can be achieved when the orientation of the Organization is clearly not in this direction. The approach to the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development provides a clear example of this when it is only addressed in the context of Major Programme I (Education) despite the obvious linkages to Major Programmes II (Natural Sciences) and III (Social Sciences) and UNESCO's own insistence that Culture (Major Programme IV) is an integral part of sustainable development.

Canada also recommends that the Principal Priority in Major Programme V be reformulated as "freedom of expression and access to information." The previous emphasis on "access to information and knowledge for development" assumes that access to information is sufficient but overlooks the fact that without freedom of expression the information being accessed cannot be credible.

The 33 C/5 should also draw upon the research being undertaken, and the knowledge being created, by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. This research and knowledge will provide an invaluable tool in evidence-based policy development and will ensure that UNESCO activities are both timely and future-oriented.

Similarly, UNESCO must focus its activities on providing leadership and direction rather than implementing a series of small development projects. In doing so, it must seek active partnerships and co-operate with other organizations that have the requisite experience in implementing projects at the regional, sub-regional and country level.

As an upstream agency with an ethical mandate, UNESCO has, from its inception, established new parameters for international debate and intercultural dialogue on a myriad issues pertaining to education, the sciences, culture and communication. We sincerely hope that the 33 C/5 will continue this tradition.

I. Implementing the Third and Last Biennium of the Medium-Term Strategy for 2002- 2007 (31 C/4)

Paragraphs 1- 3

*Were the unifying theme and the strategic objectives and sub-objectives of document 31 C/4 Approved adequately reflected in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5?
 What could be done to enhance the linkage between 31 C/4 and the 33 C/5?
 Do you consider that the Organization's action in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5 is leading to a progressive attainment of all or only specific strategic objectives of the 31 C/4?
 Are there strategic objectives that are unlikely to be met and what adjustments or corrective action do you suggest? (This question will be posed separately for each major programme and cross-cutting theme.)*

Response of Canada

Canada is satisfied with the overall presentation and linkages of the strategic objectives of the 31 C/4 in the 31 C/5 and the 32 C/5. To enhance the linkages between the 31 C/4 and the 33 C/5, we recommend that the 33 C/5 place specific emphasis on programme objectives that have not been completed, or only partially completed. An assessment of programme activities that were initiated but not completed during the first two biennia should therefore be undertaken in the course of the preparation of the 33 C/5. Specific actions should then be proposed to ensure that the Medium-Term Strategy will have been successfully implemented at the conclusion of this biennium.

Paragraph 4

*Do you consider that there exist elements which may warrant a major shift in emphasis, orientation or expected outcome in one or more of the strategic objectives or approaches formulated in document 31 C/4?
 If so, which modifications would you propose? In what domains?
 And what would be the implications for the preparation of the 33 C/5?*

Response of Canada

Specific recommendations concerning the principal priority in each of the Major Programmes are found in the relevant sections of the questionnaire.

We recommend that the Principal Priority in Major Programme V of “the contribution of information and communication technologies to the development of education, science, culture and the construction of a knowledge society” be reoriented and that emphasis be

placed on “freedom of expression and access to information” (see also Canada’s Response to paragraph 33.)

Specific actions to use ICTs in the development of a “knowledge society” are now included in UNESCO’s activities as a result of the Action Plan adopted at the World Summit on the Information Society in December 2003. The implications of the uses and abuses of ICTs (and not just connectivity) must now be actively considered in UNESCO’s programme activities and as part of the implementation of the Action Plan.

Paragraphs 5 - 6

Do you consider that the formulation of regional strategies and in future of cluster strategic frameworks is an asset for the global strategic planning and programming process of the Organization? Do you perceive room for improvements or adjustments? Are you satisfied with the revised programme cycle sequence, starting with national and cluster consultations, to be followed by regional consultations as one principal input to the elaboration of the preliminary proposals for the 33 C/5 and the subsequent formulation of the 33 C/5?

Do you favour the conduct of national and cluster consultations? Do you have suggestions for their preparation and organization?

Response of Canada

Canada supports regional strategies with the *caveat* that they must be carefully managed and integrated into a larger, coherent strategy for the whole Organization. If this is not done, UNESCO runs the risk of having a series of fragmented approaches that will result in unnecessary costs, duplication of effort and inefficient operations.

It must also be noted that the Europe and North American Region does not have clusters, and that any shift in emphasis to a cluster approach must take this into consideration. We are also concerned about the proposed “second round” of consultations on the draft 33 C/5 at the cluster level as this will effectively exclude the Europe and North American Region from a second opportunity to comment on this document. If the decision is made to proceed with cluster consultations, a means must be found to ensure that all regions have an equal opportunity to make their views known.

Linkages to MDGs

Paragraph 7

*Are you satisfied with the presentation of the links of MDGs to UNESCO's activities?
Does the 32 C/5 contain excessive references to MDGs?
Should a more focused approach be pursued referring only to the most relevant MDGs?
What measures – presentational and substantive – could be taken to relate UNESCO's action better to the most relevant MDGs?*

Response of Canada

The MDGs must be considered in their entirety and cannot be subjectively approached from the perspective of those that are the “most relevant.” It is understood that MDG 1 (the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger) and MDG 2 (the achievement of universal primary education) place particular responsibilities on UNESCO, but MDG 6 (the fight against HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases) and MDG 7 (the ensurance of environmental sustainability) cannot be separated from the 12 Strategic Objectives found in the 31 C/4, UNESCO's responsibilities for Education for All, or as the lead agency for the United Nations Literacy Decade and the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. In fact, Education for Sustainable Development is the key to attaining **all** of the MDGs.

The MDGs will only be realized in partnership with many other organizations, and UNESCO must actively seek both traditional and new partners. Working through partnerships will enable UNESCO to demonstrate its comparative advantage in these areas and, as appropriate, to take a leadership role in areas where it has the greatest competence.

UNESCO's Functions

Paragraph 8

*In your opinion, is UNESCO fulfilling each of its five main functions adequately? Should the list of functions be revised?
Should in future more emphasis be placed on certain functions and if so, which ones?
Should capacity-building at the country level be reinforced – if so in what areas and through which measures? Should other functions and roles – such as “knowledge broker”, “benchmarking organization”, “advocacy and awareness-raising” – be added?*

Response of Canada

We support the maintenance of the existing five main functions and do not favour adding new functions. The concepts of “knowledge broker,” “benchmarking organization,” “advocacy and awareness-raising” can all be incorporated into the existing five functions. To address them specifically would result in more jargon with no significant impact on UNESCO’s working methods. We would suggest, however, that a new approach be taken toward the five main functions that involves integrated decision-making and greater inter-connectivity among them.

It is already the practice that some sectors are more active in specific functions – the Culture Sector in standard-setting, for example – and it is understood that this emphasis will and should change over time within each sector.

Capacity-building at the cluster – not the country - level should be reinforced as the role of the cluster office already includes capacity-building for the countries within the cluster. This would also serve to strengthen the decentralization process by having qualified staff simultaneously serving several countries. We also encourage UNESCO to use the knowledge and experience found in its Institutes and the National Commissions to assist with capacity-building.

II. PROGRAMME PRIORITIES

Paragraph 9

Do you favour following in document 33 C/5 again the structure of Major Programmes, introduced in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5, around one principal priority and a limited number of other priorities?

Do you consider it desirable to tighten the formulation of principal priorities with a view to avoiding dissipation of resources among too many activities?

Do you favour the allocation of increased resources for a principal priority in 33 C/5 over the level of the resources approved in 32 C/5? Do you favour to continue reinforcing staff allocations to areas of principal programme priorities?

Do you consider that the present distribution of programme resources among the major programmes should be maintained? Or should there be a reconsideration of the relative shares and if so, based on what criteria?

Response of Canada

Canada supports maintaining one principal priority and a limited number of other priorities for each Major Programme, but also encourages UNESCO to approach the principal priority in each Major Programme from a holistic perspective. That is, the other priorities within the sector and those of other sectors should be mutually supporting so that they contribute to the overall objectives of UNESCO. Education for Sustainable

Development, for example, should not be the unique responsibility of the Education Sector as the work of all sectors will contribute to the attainment of this objective.

The question of increased resources for a principal priority in the 33 C/5 is also asked with respect to each of the specific principal priorities for each Major Programme and will be addressed in the response to the questions posed in paragraphs 10, 17, 24, 28 and 33.

Education

Paragraph 10

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP I as in document 32 C/5 Approved?

Do you consider, that - if the present principal priority is retained – a concentration in programme content around key areas of this priority should be contemplated?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Response of Canada

Canada strongly favours the retention of basic Education for All (EFA) as the principal priority for Major Programme I in the 33 C/5. As two of the six goals found in the Dakar Framework for Action (2000) have since become Millennium Development Goals, it is imperative that UNESCO maintain this priority.

The approach to EFA should be reconsidered however. UNESCO by itself does not have the resources to achieve universal primary education by 2015, and it must work with multiple partners, including civil society, if it is to be successful in this area. EFA will not be achieved without the active participation of the Member States, and UNESCO must therefore develop meaningful and relevant approaches, while at the same time ensuring that the individual Member States are empowered to achieve the desired results.

It must also be remembered that there are six Dakar Goals, and that EFA is only one of them. EFA must therefore be approached in the context of **all** of the Dakar goals. Canada would also like to compliment UNESCO on the excellent quality of the Global Monitoring Report and the invaluable information it contains on the state of implementation of all of the Dakar Goals.

As EFA has already been allocated 79% of the budget for Major Programme I, it is difficult to contemplate additional resources for this priority if other priorities are to be successfully realized.

Paragraph 11

Should those priorities be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what other priorities should, in your view, be considered?

Or should the formulation of the other priorities be amended – and if so how – always bearing in mind the limited availability of resources and staff?

Response of Canada

The “other priorities” in Education should be maintained in the 33 C/5, but these should also be approached in the context of the United Nations Literacy Decade, the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development and quality education in all its manifestations. Education for a culture of peace should also include education for responsible citizenship and human rights education.

Paragraph 12

Do you consider the present level of support provided to assist countries in reaching EFA goals by 2015 satisfactory? If not, what other country-level activities or modalities would you suggest?

Response of Canada

It is not clear whether this question refers only to financial resources or whether it also includes human resources. On the assumption that it addresses both, we agree with the financial resources now allocated to EFA. With respect to human resources, we would again encourage UNESCO to work in close cooperation with other UN agencies and programmes, non-governmental organizations and civil society to “lever” human resources at the country level.

Ministries of Education in Member States must also be active participants in the implementation of EFA as little progress will be made without them.

Paragraphs 13, 14, 15

What orientations would you recommend for UNESCO to take in the context of the UN Literacy Decade and the Education for Sustainable Development Decade (2005-2014)?

Response of Canada

Canada recommends that the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD) be approached from the perspective of Education for Sustainable **Human** Development, and as such that it be an over-arching umbrella for all programme activities in all Sectors. We also recommend that consideration be given to having Sustainable Human Development become a cross-cutting theme in the next Medium-Term Strategy.

We are surprised that discussion of the DESD only appears in the questions related to Major Programme I and that no mention is made of the Decade under any of the other Major Programmes. As an alternative, we suggest that a transdisciplinary perspective encompassing social, economic and environmental aspects, teaching, learning, and research, analysis (critical thinking), collaboration, cooperation and responsible citizenship, guide UNESCO's approach to the Decade. Some work has already begun in this direction with the linkages between cultural diversity and biological diversity found in the *Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, and the relevant sections of the 32 C/5.

Particular attention should also be given to the work of non-governmental organizations, academic and research institutions, and government ministries already involved in sustainable development. This will help to develop a transdisciplinary approach and will maximize UNESCO's comparative advantage in education, the sciences, culture and communication.

The UN Literacy Decade (UNLD) and the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD) should also be seen in the context of EFA as they are mutually supportive, and the "secondary" priorities for Major Programme I. It is not necessary to develop new or parallel implementation strategies, as both UNLD and DESD are integral parts of the current priorities and should be implemented as such.

Paragraph 16

Do you favour an increased action by UNESCO in the field of ICTs for education? Which focus and modalities of action would you propose (e.g. ICT-enhanced education, ICT literacy, creation of multimedia learning centres, ICT-based teacher training? Which other suggestions do you have for UNESCO action in applying ICTs for education.

Response of Canada

Canada favours the increased use of ICTs in education, but cautions that the use of ICTs and connectivity to the Internet are not synonymous. Instead, all forms of ICTs from radio, to libraries, multimedia learning centres, CD ROM and where possible, access to the Internet, should be used.

The emphasis must remain on quality education with measurable results, however, not quantitative indicators such as the number of countries, institutions or individuals who have access to the Internet. ICT literacy and ongoing training especially for teachers are essential, but often expensive, and must be maintained and enhanced as technology changes. In other words, lifelong learning and literacy retention must be incorporated into any action plan developed in this area.

Natural Sciences

Paragraph 17

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP II as in document 32 C/5 Approved?

Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in programme content? Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP II? If so, which one?

Response of Canada

Canada continues to support the retention of water and ecosystems as the principal priority for Major Programme II in the 33 C/5. UNESCO has been very successful in recent years in raising awareness about water-related issues, particularly through the exemplary work of the World Water Assessment Programme. In this regard, we recommend that UNESCO continue to play a leadership role within the United Nations system working with, and coordinating where possible, the many organizations and programmes dealing with water-related issues.

Paragraph 18

Should those “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered?

Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

Response of Canada

While the “other priority” of capacity-building in the basic and engineering sciences is critical, Canada recommends that emphasis be placed on ethics and responsibility in the development and use of scientific knowledge. The two are not mutually exclusive, however, and we suggest that the promotion of principles and ethical norms in capacity

building for science and engineering to guide scientific progress and development would effectively combine the two.

The “other priority” of protection of the environment and sustainable use and management of natural resources should also be retained with particular emphasis on the need for countries to collaborate in the area of natural resource management as this is a clear trans-border issue.

Finally, we recommend that follow-up in the areas identified by the World Conference on Science be continued on a priority basis, including commitments made in respect of disadvantaged groups, interaction between science, industry and the public sector, traditional knowledge, and capacity-building in national policy-making in science and technology.

Paragraph 19

Do you consider that the focus in the 32 C/5 on WSSD-related activities in support of WSSD and JPOI is sufficient? If not, do you have proposals for strengthening UNESCO's contribution in that regard.

Response of Canada

UNESCO is to be commended for its attention to WSSD-related activities, specifically in the area of water and sanitation and the commitment in the 32 C/5 (MP II.1) to reduce the number of people without access to safe drinking by 2015. We would recommend, however, that stronger linkages be made to education in water management, conservation, and sustainable practices, especially at the local level.

The 32 C/5 also includes commitments to the JPOI goals regarding an ecosystem approach for the sustainable development of oceans, but there is insufficient emphasis on the commitments with respect to sustainable fishing.

Paragraph 20

Are you satisfied with the activities by UNESCO thus far in support of SIDS, especially with its CSI platform?

Do you have at this stage, prior to the Mauritius meeting, already suggestions for the future orientation of UNESCO's action in support of SIDS?

Response of Canada

Canada is generally satisfied with both the SIDS program and the CSI platform, but given their vulnerability to environmental disasters and climate change, special emphasis could be placed on SIDS in the context of the Decade for Education for Sustainable Development. This would provide a cross-sectoral approach to SIDS and issues that are specific to them.

Future orientations of UNESCO's actions in support of SIDS could include sustainable and non-depleting forms of energy (solar and wind power), development of sustainable tourism and ecotourism in collaboration with the MAB programme, and the continued facilitation of, and information about, wise coastal practices.

UNESCO should also use its comparative advantage in marine science, through the IOC, to address SIDS-related questions. In response to specific ecological concerns and SIDS, UNESCO should ensure that it does not duplicate the efforts already being undertaken by other specialized agencies and programmes of the United Nations system.

Paragraph 21

*Do you favour the formulation of such intersectoral initiatives and the creation of de facto main lines of action for their implementation?
Would you propose the inclusion in 33 C/5 of additional intersectoral approaches – and if so, which ones?*

Response of Canada

Canada strongly favours the development of intersectoral initiatives and the development of main lines of action for their implementation. The Decade of Education for Sustainable Development provides an excellent opportunity for this, as does human rights, and ethics in science and technology.

Paragraph 22

Do you have any comments or suggestions with a view to enhancing the role and contribution of UNESCO in UN-Water and UN-Oceans?

Response of Canada

The UN-wide coordination of water and oceans is a welcome initiative and will be crucial to the success of the UN in contributing to the management and protection of water resources. UNESCO's strength is, and will remain, its ability to respond to questions

relating to the ethical and sustainable aspects of water usage, as well as conflict resolution related to water.

Paragraph 23

Are you satisfied with the reflection and integration of the work of the five programmes in past C/5 documents? Do you have specific proposals how their contribution can be integrated into 33 C/5?

Is the work of these programmes sufficiently concentrated or do you have suggestions in that regard?

Response of Canada

While considerable progress has been achieved in recent years toward greater integration among the five science programmes, efforts need to continue in this direction in order to address the complexity of environmental issues and sustainable development. It is also recommended that connections be made to the work of COMEST and other UNESCO programmes such as LINKS that have implications for, and could contribute to, the work of the five science programmes.

Social and Human Sciences

Paragraph 24

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP III as in document 32 C/5 Approved?

Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in terms of programme content?

Do you consider the major thrusts and the scope of Major Programme III satisfactory?

Do you have any specific suggestions for improvements or change?

Are you in favour of the development of further normative instruments?

Do you consider it necessary to promote ethics education and capacity-building as key activities? Would you suggest new activities in these areas (e.g. human cloning; environmental ethics)?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase? Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP III? If so, which one?

Response of Canada

Canada favours the retention of ethics for Major Programme III, but suggests that it not be limited to science and technology but instead expanded to embrace all of UNESCO's principal priorities.

With the adoption of the *Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights* in 1997, the *International Declaration on Human Genetic Data* at the 32nd General Conference and the decision to proceed with a declaration on universal norms on bioethics for the 33rd General Conference, we believe that UNESCO has made laudable progress in establishing international standards in these areas. We recommend, however, that more efforts should be placed on promoting existing instruments to ensure their ratification and implementation by Member States.

Paragraph 25

Should the three “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

Response of Canada

The three “other priorities” should be retained in the 33 C/5 in their current formulation.

Paragraph 26

*Are you satisfied with the focus and scope of normative and standard-setting activity undertaken by UNESCO in this field?
Do you have any suggestions to be reflected in the 33 C/5?*

Response of Canada

Canada is satisfied with the subject(s), focus, and scope of normative and standard-setting activity in Major Programme III. As noted above in our response to the questions following paragraph 24, we recommend that concentration of resources be placed on promoting existing instruments to ensure their ratification and implementation by Member States rather than adopting new normative instruments that have insufficient signatories to enter into force.

Paragraph 27

Do you have specific suggestions to be reflected in the 33 C/5 for the further implementation of the UNESCO strategy?

Following the approval by the General Conference of the UNESCO strategy on human rights, would you favour to designate “the promotion of human rights and struggle against discrimination” as a new cross-cutting theme for the entire Organization?

Response of Canada

We do not favour the adoption of “the promotion of human rights and the struggle against discrimination” as a new cross-cutting theme at this time as we do not believe that cross-cutting themes should be added piecemeal. Instead we recommend that this question be revisited during the preparation of the next Medium-Term Strategy in 2006 when the unifying theme, cross-cutting themes, strategic thrusts, and strategic objectives for the Organization are considered in a coherent fashion.

Culture**Paragraph 28**

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP IV as in document 32 C/5 Approved?

Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in terms of programme content?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase? Or have the efforts aimed at concentration reached a satisfactory level?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP IV? If so, which one?

Response of Canada

Canada strongly supports the retention of “promoting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue” as the principal priority for Major Programme IV, and feel that the resources that have been allocated to it are appropriate. We also believe that cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue are fundamental to the mandate and mission of UNESCO and that they should be inherent in all activities of the Organization.

Paragraph 29

*Should the focus on standard-setting activities be maintained in the 33 C/5?
 Are there other areas that may need consolidation and monitoring of achievements, also with a view to nourishing policymaking processes?
 Are you satisfied with the interaction and synergy between standard-setting activities and instruments? Do you see a need for complementary research-based activities – and if so, which ones?*

Response of Canada

Since the 30th General Conference in 1999, UNESCO has been actively developing normative instruments in the area of culture. Once the convention on the protection of the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions is adopted (at the 33rd General Conference), we recommend that the focus shift to the implementation and monitoring of existing normative instruments. Member States have been slow to ratify certain other conventions despite the time and energy UNESCO devoted to their development.

Paragraph 30

*Should MP IV pursue and expand its focus on intersectoral and interdisciplinary activities, such as those already envisaged in 32 C/5?
 Do you wish to suggest additional areas for distinct intersectoral and interdisciplinary action?*

Response of Canada

With “intercultural dialogue” as the principal priority for Major Programme IV, UNESCO must continue to encourage intersectoral and interdisciplinary activities across all sectors. It is also somewhat surprising to see interdisciplinary activities being described in paragraph 30 as an “innovative feature” of Major Programme IV which suggests that intersectoral and interdisciplinary working methods are not yet part of the “culture” of work of the Organization. If this is indeed the case, every effort should be made to strengthen an interdisciplinary approach to all main lines of action.

Paragraph 31

Do you favour to maintain the present focus in the work on cultural heritage in the 33 C/5? Are there new aspects or activities which might merit special attention and reflection?

Do you have suggestions for further strengthening the activities, contribution and impact by the World Heritage Centre?

Response of Canada

While we favour the focus on cultural heritage and its preservation, we also believe that intersectoral initiatives such as arts education should be more prominent in the 33 C/5. If arts (and culture) education becomes central to the education and cultural policies of both less developed countries and developed countries, the need for the preservation of the cultural heritage will be better understood.

We also recommend that greater emphasis be placed on living artists and contemporary creation as this is also part of our cultural heritage. By doing so, linkages that exist and occur naturally in society between education, communication and information will become evident and will facilitate the integration of these activities into multiple sectors.

Paragraph 32

Are there any trends, perspectives or action that you wish to see included relating to the Global Alliance that should be reflected in the 33 C/5?

Response of Canada

The Global Alliance should be examined in the context of the work being done by other international networks and the work of NGOs, professional associations and artists' guilds at the national level.

The work of the Global Alliance must also be considered from the perspective of the work being done to develop a convention on the protection of the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions, although the relationship between the two may only become apparent after the adoption of the convention at the 33rd General Conference. It is also recommended that an assessment of the work being done at the country level to promote cultural diversity and develop capacity-building be undertaken to determine the future orientation of this new activity.

Communication and Information

Paragraph 33

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP V as in document 32 C/5 Approved?

Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in programme content? Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP V? If so, which one?

Should the two “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

Response of Canada

As noted in our response to the questions following paragraph 4, we recommend that “freedom of expression and access to information” become the principle priority for Major Programme V in the 33 C/5. Without freedom of expression and diversity of content, access to information is of limited value.

Paragraph 34

How could UNESCO better translate these four principles into its programmes in order to achieve impact-oriented action? What other initiatives or concrete proposals would you suggest to further promote and operationalize the concept of knowledge societies, especially in the context of the expected outcomes of the second phase of WSIS (Tunis, 2005)?

Response of Canada

Canada continues to strongly believe that less emphasis should be placed on large conferences that result in solemn declarations and/or action plans that are not implemented, and that instead the required resources should be allocated to follow-up activities and the implementation of the action plan resulting from the conference. UNESCO must actively work therefore to implement the Action Plan of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS), and this should be reflected in the Main Lines of Action for Major Programme V in the 33 C/5.

Emphasis should be placed on infoethics and, in the context of cultural diversity and development, on knowledge societies that reflect these principles through local, multilingual content. To maximize the resources allocated to these activities, we strongly

encourage UNESCO to assume a leadership role within the United Nations family by initiating partnerships with other UN programmes and agencies to achieve the goals set by WSIS.

We are unable to make specific “concrete proposals” to operationalize the outcomes of the second phase of WSIS (Tunis, 2005) as the meeting has not yet taken place and the outcomes are therefore not known.

Paragraph 35

*What major themes or areas would you suggest for further intersectoral action or possible joint main lines of action with other major programmes?
What are, in your opinion, the most promising fields where ICTs and education intersect and where UNESCO could make a significant and unique contribution? And how do you want them to be addressed?*

Response of Canada

Paragraph 30 describes interdisciplinary activities as being an innovative aspect of Major Programme IV, and paragraph 35 describes Major Programme V as being “by its very nature intersectoral.” Does this suggest that Major Programme I, II, and III are neither innovative nor intersectoral? We also question why the question only refers to areas where ICTs and education intersect. As stated several times previously, we strongly favour an intersectoral/interdisciplinary approach to all UNESCO programme activities.

We recommend that infoethics, the use of ICTs for education for human rights, and teacher training be added to the list of intersectoral activities or possible joint main lines of action with other programmes. The tendency should be resisted, however, to believe that everything must be digitized and that if something is not or cannot be digitized that it is somehow not important.

Similarly, we caution that ICTs should not be exclusively equated with connectivity and use of the Internet. The challenges of a constant supply of electricity, software in multiple languages, and the ongoing requirement to upgrade computers present serious challenges to the successful use of computer technology. Other forms of ICTs, including something as fundamental as radio, continue to be important means of mass communication and should not be discounted. Interpersonal relations must also be maintained in the context of dialogue amongst civilizations whereby people can share common values, aspirations and purpose.

III. OTHER PROGRAMME ISSUES AND DEVELOPMENTS

Paragraphs 36-38

Do you have specific proposal for future orientations and action by UNESCO with respect to the fight against poverty, support to NEPAD and LDCs, the contribution to conflict and post-conflict areas and the dialogue among civilizations as well as the fight against terrorism?

Are there other key programme issues that should be addressed by UNESCO in the pursuit of its functions and where it has a comparative advantage?

Are there activities, issues or themes which you consider should be terminated or abandoned in view of their limited impact or their marginal relevance for the Organization's mandate?

Would you favour the introduction of a sunset clause for programme activities? If so, how should it be applied?

Response of Canada

As indicated elsewhere in this response, Canada favours UNESCO working with partners, both within and outside the United Nations system, in the fight against poverty, NEPAD and LDCs, work in conflict and post-conflict situations and in the fight against terrorism. Intercultural dialogue is also essential in each of these areas and UNESCO's mandate and programme activities provide a comparative advantage in this area.

Canada continues to favour a results-based approach to programme implementation, programme evaluation and sunset clauses for programme activities. The latter is not yet adequately reflected in the C/5 as while programme activities and budget can only ever be reflected per biennium, there is never any suggestion that a particular programme activity has a limited duration. Sunset clauses that envisage concluding a programme beyond a six year horizon (the duration of a Medium-Term Strategy) cannot be considered to be true sunset clauses.

Interdisciplinarity

Paragraph 39

Are the strategies for the two cross-cutting themes of the 31 C/4 sufficiently well reflected in the range of projects selected and included in document 32 C/5 Approved? If not, what other approaches should be pursued to attain their objectives better? What measures should be adopted, in your opinion, to ensure the effective integration of these themes/strategies into the Organization's programmes? Overall, do you feel that 32 C/5 Approved contains a sufficient degree of intersectoral activities and efforts? If not, where would you call for strengthening and more pronounced initiatives? Do you support in 33 C/5 a renewed allocation of resources for projects pertaining to the two cross-cutting themes? Do you favour a continuation and intensification of joint main lines of action and in which areas?

Response of Canada

Interdisciplinarity should be both a working method and a tool to make UNESCO's work more relevant to the needs of Member States and as an effective means of developing solutions to "real world problems." This can be done by identifying the key issues or problems, then actively seeking the horizontal linkages between them.

Canada believes that the 32 C/5 contains adequate intersectoral activities and projects, but is not convinced that this spirit of cooperation has carried through to their implementation. As noted previously, this Questionnaire and the approach to obvious intersectoral and interdisciplinary issues suggest that there is more talk than action in the area of interdisciplinarity.

Mainstreaming

Paragraph 40

Do you consider that the issues to be mainstreamed (as defined in document 31 C/4 – namely the needs of women, youth, LDCs and Africa), as well as the culture of peace, were sufficiently addressed in document 32 C/5 Approved? If not, what could be done to improve the situation? Do you support the mainstreaming approach in general? How could this approach be more effectively applied? Do you favour a more limited list of mainstreaming areas, and if so, what would be your preference? Or, do you favour the addition of other mainstreaming issues – and if so, which ones (recognizing that this would require an adjustment in the 31 C/4)?

Response of Canada

To a degree, this question is contradictory because if the identified issues and groups are mainstreamed into all programme activities then the issues or groups should not need to be addressed individually in the C/5. Nonetheless, Canada continues to support mainstreaming of these groups as well as a culture of peace.

As noted in our response to the Questionnaire on the 32 C/5 two years ago, if mainstreaming is to be successful it must eliminate barriers so that it occurs naturally without having to continue to approach it as a policy objective. The continuing posing of questions about mainstreaming suggests that the concept has not yet become part of the corporate culture of UNESCO.

Paragraph 40 also refers to the mainstreaming of issues and the placement of a special focus on the needs of “disadvantaged and excluded groups and the most vulnerable segments of society.” While we believe that this is increasingly being reflected in UNESCO’s activities, we also note that UNESCO does not seem to be following the example of other UN agencies that are mainstreaming the rights people with disabilities.

Finally, it would be interesting to see some reporting of the results and impact of mainstreaming on the work of the Organization.

IV. PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND IMPACT

Results-based approach

Paragraph 41

*Are you satisfied with the development and introduction of the results-based programming approach, as reflected in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5?
Do you have suggestions for further improvements and presentation of the results components in the 33 C/5?*

Response of Canada

Canada continues to strongly support a results-based approach to UNESCO’s programme activities, and wishes to congratulate the Organization for the progress it has made in this regard from the 31 C/5 to the 32 C/5. Some programme areas continue, however, to measure quantitative outputs (the 32 C/5 contains indicators such as “number of agreements elaborated”; “number of accessions obtained” for example) rather than qualitative evidence of the results achieved.

We, therefore, also strongly support the proposed orientation for the 33 C/5 that will reflect results-based programming and budgeting, expected results for each main line of action and the inclusion of measurable performance indicators. What is not mentioned in this context, but should be included, is the provision for regular programme evaluations as part of the budget approval process.

Decentralization

Paragraphs 42 - 43

*How would you see an optimal blend and balance between global and field oriented approaches within the activities of the different Sectors/Major Programmes?
 What type of specific tasks and actions would you expect cluster offices – and national offices where they exist – to perform, bearing in mind UNESCO’s overall functions?
 How would you suggest that Field Offices pursue UNESCO’s functions – as described in the 31 C/4 – in support of Member States?
 What type of issues in each of the fields of competence of the Organization should appropriately be dealt with at a regional level?
 Do you consider that some Regular Programme funds of Programme Sectors and/or field offices should be earmarked for generating extrabudgetary funds (i.e. reintroduction of a “Cooperation for Development” component?)*

Response of Canada

Cluster and country offices should be responsive to the situation and specific needs of the cluster/country, while at the same time providing the Secretariat with timely information about the impact and relevance of UNESCO’s work. If they are able to function effectively within the existing administrative structure, they will also provide both visibility and an effective presence for UNESCO at the sub-regional level. If cluster offices are merely smaller versions of the Secretariat in Paris, however, it is questionable whether it is worthwhile pursuing the current decentralization policy.

Cluster and country offices therefore require some flexibility and discretionary budgetary authority when implementing programme activities. Canada does **not** support the idea that cluster or country offices should be required to raise extra-budgetary funds as this would place them in direct competition with national organizations also seeking to obtain funding to promote their activities, many of which also serve to promote UNESCO’s goals and values.

Paragraph 44

How should such meetings be funded – under the Regular Programme allocations of field offices, through a specific Participation Programme contribution or by combining both?

Response of Canada

Canada believes that regional consultations on the draft programme and budget, Quadrennial and Statutory Regional Conferences, and Cluster Consultations of National Commissions for UNESCO should be funded from the regular Programme and Budget and **not** from the Participation Programme which is meant to further UNESCO's work in Member States.

As noted in paragraph 44, these are important meetings that play an increased role in the programming cycle and they should therefore have the necessary resources allocated to them.

Paragraph 45

Do you consider that – taking account of the specific character of each of the fields of competence of UNESCO-- such rates reflect for each field a proper balance between field oriented and global approaches?

Response of Canada

Canada supports the proposed decentralization of funds for programme activities in the 33 C/5.

Paragraph 46

How could UNESCO and Member States together better involve the appropriate national stakeholders in UNESCO's fields of competence into the process of elaborating the above documents, their approval by national authorities, their translation into concrete policies and actions, and the mobilization of requisite funds?

Response of Canada

We recommend that the Secretariat work through, and with, Member States and National Commissions to identify national stakeholders in UNESCO's fields of competence. This

would facilitate greater participation by NGOs, academic institutions and civil society, representatives of which already actively work with National Commissions.

The development of policies in this context would also result in both a domestic (national) component as well as an international one, which would then be more easily subject to approval by national authorities and the development of policies that reflected the specific circumstances in each country.

Role of national commissions

Paragraph 47

Based on the results of phase 1 of the major Action Plan for Capacity-building amongst National Commissions pursuant to Executive Board decision 161 EX/Decision 8.3, and given the progress in the decentralization process, what further and innovative measures or initiatives could be introduced and applied to enhance the interaction between National Commissions and the Secretariat, in particular with cluster and national offices and regional bureaux, and to help raise the impact and visibility of the Organization's action at regional/country levels?

What measures could be taken to improve further communications between the Secretariat and National Commissions?

Response of Canada

National Commissions are correctly described in the 32 C/5 as “constitutionally recognized focal points for UNESCO’s actions in Member States,” **not** as “privileged partners” as was the language often used until three years ago. This recognition of the role and importance of National Commissions is welcomed, although the tendency to “off load” programme implementation responsibilities onto National Commissions must be resisted. If National Commissions are to play their appropriate – and constitutional – role, they must operate in a triangular relationship between the governments, civil society and UNESCO.

National Commissions also play a critical role in raising awareness about UNESCO and its activities at the regional and country levels. To do so effectively, however, the UNESCO Secretariat must facilitate communication between itself and staff of National Commissions, and facilitate the work of National Commissions by the timely provision of information and promotional material about UNESCO programmes, theme days, years and decades, and standard-setting instruments.

Finally, consultation meetings must function as true consultations where divergent points of views are welcomed, discussed and acted upon. The unique position of National Commission means that they are able to provide direct feedback to the Secretariat about

UNESCO activities in their country, and it must be accepted that not all news is good news.

V. BUDGET AND RESOURCE ISSUES

Paragraph 48

Which approach would you favour for the 33 C/5 with respect to the budget ceiling:
 (a) zero nominal growth (i.e. \$610 million);
 (b) zero real growth (i.e. \$610 million plus recosting plus anticipated cost increases);
 (c) real growth and if so, to what extent?
 Do you favour the maintenance of the present distribution of programme resources among the various major programmes? If not, what distribution or formula would you propose? (see also last question in para. 9)
 Do you consider it necessary to improve the structure and presentation of the budget? If yes, what are the areas where improvements are required and how could those be accomplished?

Response of Canada

Canada favours budget scenario a) zero nominal growth. With respect to the budget structure and presentation, we welcome the increasing use of visual material (pie charts, graphs, etc.) to summarize budget presentations, while at the same time recognizing the need for detailed budget spreadsheets and technical details.

Paragraph 49

Do you have suggestions for further improving the linkage between and presentation of regular and extrabudgetary resources?

Response of Canada

The presentation of the relationship between regular and extrabudgetary resources was presented much more clearly in the 32 C/5 and this format should be maintained in the 33 C/5.

We welcomed the decision in the 32 C/5 to only include activities for which extra-budgetary funds had already been committed and support the continuation of this approach. In order to provide a fuller picture, we encourage UNESCO to find an appropriate method to present anticipated extrabudgetary funds and activities which are not yet secured at the time of drafting the C/5.

Conclusion

The challenges faced by today's – and tomorrow's – world constantly reinforce what UNESCO has known for over 50 years: that solutions can only be found through the synergies that exist among education, the social and natural sciences, culture, and communication and information. This is UNESCO's strength, and we must continue to build upon it at every opportunity.

To this end, the preparation of the biennial *Programme and Budget* has become even more important, and must situate UNESCO so that it remains forward-looking, has a clear sense of its priorities, and the strategies and organizational flexibility necessary to convert challenges into opportunities.

Canada is proud to play an active role in this process.



united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization
organisation des nations unies pour l'éducation, la science et la culture

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON
THE DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET
FOR 2006-2007 (33 C/5)**

This questionnaire has been designed to solicit comments and proposals from Member States and Associate Members as well as from intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on key issues and approaches which should guide the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (33 C/5). This questionnaire should also be seen in the context of the deliberations by the General Conference at its 32nd session on the preparation of the Draft Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (33 C/5), the results of which are being circulated as a separate document.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Programme and Budget for 2006-2007 (33 C/5) will represent the third and last biennial C/5 document covering the period of the Medium-Term Strategy 2002-2007 (31 C/4). The 33 C/5 will therefore be an opportunity to ensure that the strategic objectives of the 31 C/4 are attained to the largest extent possible. At the same time, the preparation of the document will allow a consolidation and/or further development of various measures taken in the context of the programming reform, launched by UNESCO with the beginning of the 31 C/5. This involves in particular the concentration and prioritization of the programme, the introduction of a results-based approach, decentralization, new partnership approaches and a promotion of intersectorality, which are expected to lead to enhanced relevance of the Organization and to increased impact in and benefit to Member States.

I. IMPLEMENTING THE THIRD AND LAST BIENNIUM OF THE MEDIUM-TERM STRATEGY FOR 2002- 2007 (31 C/4)

2. At its 31st session, the General Conference approved the Medium-Term Strategy for the period 2002-2007 (31 C/4) which sets out the main strategic thrusts for UNESCO's action over that period. Built around the unifying theme **Contributing to peace and human development in an era of globalization through education, the sciences, culture and communication**, the Medium-Term Strategy contains a set of 12 strategic objectives for the entire Organization, three for each of UNESCO's four domains (education, the sciences, culture and communication and information). These strategic objectives are complemented by those corresponding to the two cross-cutting themes of the 31 C/4, namely the **Eradication of poverty, especially extreme poverty** and **The contribution of information and communication technologies to education, science and culture, and the construction of knowledge societies**, which are to be intrinsic to all programmes and which are designed to strengthen intersectorality both at Headquarters and in the field (see Annex).

3. The General Conference and the Executive Board have consistently requested that particular attention be given to the need to articulate and reflect clearly the link between the strategic objectives in the 31 C/4 document and the priorities and activities proposed in successive C/5 documents. With 33 C/5 being the last C/5 document for the present medium-term period, this requirement will acquire particular pertinence. Thus, a consolidation of the Organization's action will have to be designed so as to satisfy to the fullest the strategic objectives of the 31 C/4 and its expected outcomes.

Were the unifying theme and the strategic objectives and sub-objectives of document 31 C/4 Approved adequately reflected in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5? What could be done to enhance the linkage between 31 C/4 and the 33 C/5?

Do you consider that the Organization's action in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5 is leading to a progressive attainment of all or only specific strategic objectives of the 31 C/4? Are there strategic objectives that are unlikely to be met and what adjustments or corrective action do you suggest? (This question will be posed separately for each major programme and cross-cutting theme.)

4. As the Medium-Term Strategy was conceived as a "rolling strategy", capable of revision by the General Conference, if so required – there exists the possibility to revisit, reformulate or modify certain strategic objectives and expected outcomes at the 33rd session of the General Conference, if Member States so desire. Such a revision could be inspired by:

- major developments in the international and regional contexts, affecting or impinging on UNESCO’s fields of competence;
- the emergence of critical issues or factors that could significantly influence the attainment of the expected outcomes;
- the results and outcomes of the Organization’s action thus far, also drawing on the findings of evaluations; and
- policy recommendations resulting from consultations and assessments, including those undertaken by UNESCO Programme Sectors and by field offices in the process of decentralization.

Do you consider that there exist elements which may warrant a major shift in emphasis, orientation or expected outcome in one or more of the strategic objectives or approaches formulated in document 31 C/4? If so, which modifications would you propose? In what domains? And what would be the implications for the preparation of the 33 C/5?

5. In response to a request by the General Conference at its 31st session, regional strategies pertaining to the 31 C/4 were developed for each region in 2002 through a consultative process involving national commissions and UNESCO field offices. These regional strategies aimed at adapting UNESCO’s global strategies to regional features, conditions and needs, without however diluting the global approaches and orientations approved by the General Conference. Most of the regional strategies, which were taken note of by the Executive Board in 2002, built on ongoing regional and subregional integration processes. The regional strategies served as a frame of reference for the preparation of the 32 C/5, but even more so for the work plans for 2004-2005.

6. Beyond, a few cluster offices have already engaged in the formulation of cluster “strategies” or cluster strategic frameworks (e.g. Rabat or Windhoek), in close consultation with the National Commissions concerned. Building on this experience, it is envisaged that the overall consultation process for the 33 C/5 be expanded to provide for national as well as cluster consultations preceding the regional consultation. It is hoped that these processes will bring about a better reflection of national and subregional concerns in the 33 C/5.

Do you consider that the formulation of regional strategies and in future of cluster strategic frameworks is an asset for the global strategic planning and programming process of the Organization? Do you perceive room for improvements or adjustments?

Are you satisfied with the revised programme cycle sequence, starting with national and cluster consultations, to be followed by regional consultations as one principal input to the elaboration of the preliminary proposals for the 33 C/5 and the subsequent formulation of the 33 C/5? Do you favour the conduct of national and cluster consultations? Do you have suggestions for their preparation and Organization?

Linkages to MDGs

7. In 32 C/5 efforts were made to present explicit links with the Millennium Declaration of the United Nations and its set of outcome-oriented, time-bound Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), mostly focusing on 2015. In fact, each major programme was preceded by an outline to what extent which MDGs will be pursued. However, it must be borne in mind that a series of recent

reports and assessments suggests that the MDGs may not be attained unless efforts are being redoubled.

Are you satisfied with the presentation of the links of MDGs to UNESCO's activities? Does the 32 C/5 contain excessive references to MDGs? Should a more focused approach be pursued referring only to the most relevant MDGs? What measures – presentational and substantive – could be taken to relate UNESCO's action better to the most relevant MDGs?

UNESCO's functions

8. The 31 C/4 identifies five main functions for UNESCO: a laboratory of ideas; a standard-setter; a clearing house; a capacity-builder in Member States; and a catalyst for international cooperation. During the last three years, these diverse yet complementary and mutual reinforcing functions have played a strategic role across the entire range of the Organization's programmes and action which has sharpened its role, authority and impact in the multilateral context. For instance, capacity-building activities at country-level are often aimed at reinforcing national capacities in the area of norms and standards, or in that of statistics and of exchange of information. In addition, other roles or functions loom larger with the years: in a world increasingly driven by access to and use of knowledge, UNESCO is more and more called upon to play a role of "knowledge broker" and benchmarking organization; it is also called to act as "honest broker" between a range of stakeholders in its fields of competence; and it needs to focus increasingly on advocacy and awareness-raising, e.g. in the context of the EFA and other campaigns.

In your opinion, is UNESCO fulfilling each of its five main functions adequately? Should the list of functions be revised? Should in future more emphasis be placed on certain functions and if so, which ones? Should capacity-building at the country level be reinforced – if so in what areas and through which measures? Should other functions and roles – such as "knowledge broker", "benchmarking organization", "advocacy and awareness-raising" – be added?

II. PROGRAMME PRIORITIES

9. In both the 31 C/5 and the 32 C/5 Approved, each of the five Major Programmes was structured around a principal priority and a limited number of other priorities. Over the past two biennia, principal priorities benefited from an increase in resources. As shown below for each Major Programme, concentration of resources around the principal priorities has increased in the 32 C/5, thus contributing to a better overall focus of the programme activities. The question therefore arises how a further concentration can be accomplished in the next C/5 document, especially with a view to avoiding too general a formulation of a principal priority and thus a dissipation of resources earmarked for a principal priority among too many activities, which may run counter to the notion of concentration.

Do you favour following in document 33 C/5 again the structure of Major Programmes, introduced in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5, around one principal priority and a limited number of other priorities?

Do you consider it desirable to tighten the formulation of principal priorities with a view to avoiding dissipation of resources among too many activities?

Do you favour the allocation of increased resources for a principal priority in 33 C/5 over the level of the resources approved in 32 C/5?

Do you favour to continue reinforcing staff allocations to areas of principal programme priorities?

Do you consider that the present distribution of programme resources among the major programmes should be maintained? Or should there be a reconsideration of the relative shares and if so, based on what criteria?

Education

10. In the 32 C/5 the principal priority for Major Programme I (MP I) is *Basic education for all*. It has been assigned 79% of the overall amount of resources allocated to MP I programme activities (excluding cross-cutting theme/CCT projects) in 32 C/5 Approved, compared to 67% in the 31 C/5 Approved.

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP I as in document 32 C/5 Approved? Do you consider, that - if the present principal priority is retained – a concentration in programme content around key areas of this priority should be contemplated?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

11. In the 32 C/5, the following other priorities were selected for MP I: educating for a culture of peace; science and technology education; technical and vocational education; and higher education.

Should those priorities be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what other priorities should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the other priorities be amended – and if so how – always bearing in mind the limited availability of resources and staff?

12. Based on present trends, 28 countries are at serious risk of not achieving any of the three quantitative EFA goals by 2015 – primary net enrolment, levels of adult literacy, gender parity in primary gross school enrolment – and 43 countries are likely to miss one of these goals by 2015 (EFA Global Monitoring Report 2002). UNESCO assists these countries through concentrated and targeted action, in cooperation with national authorities, acting in the context of existing poverty reduction strategies and national priorities.

Do you consider the present level of support provided to assist countries in reaching EFA goals by 2015 satisfactory? If not, what other country-level activities or modalities would you suggest?

13. The right to education constitutes a pillar of EFA and many internationally recognized educational norms and standards call for monitoring of the quantitative progress – in close collaboration with the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS). UNESCO is increasingly called upon to provide information on qualitative steps taken by countries to ensure the right to education and on obstacles in the realization of this right – in line with UNESCO's function as a clearing house or observatory on national educational policies and practices, in cooperation with other international entities (such as the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, etc.). Furthermore, the promotion and pursuit of "quality education" is becoming an increasingly important area.

Do you see the need for an increased action by UNESCO in the field of the right to education, including a monitoring of norms and standards as well as of national policies and initiatives in the area of education? Which particular modalities of action would you like to see implemented?

Do you have any suggestions for strengthening UNESCO's action in the area of quality education?

14. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is threatening human development in a large number of countries. It affects students, teachers and other education personnel and severely undermines educational institutions, staff and investments. It is identified as a key obstacle in the attainment of EFA goals. UNESCO has committed to increased and integrated efforts in the field of “prevention education”, in cooperation with all concerned partners, and taking into account the multi-sectoral aspects of this challenge.

Do you favour an increased support to UNESCO's action in the field of “HIV/AIDS prevention education”? Do you have suggestions for improved integrated action by UNESCO drawing on the competencies of all sectors in the fight against HIV/AIDS? In that connection, do you see the need for introduction of joint main lines of action or even a new cross-cutting theme in the 33 C/5 on HIV/AIDS prevention education (with the proviso that a new cross-cutting theme might necessitate the adjustment of 31 C/4)?

15. UNESCO is the lead agency for the United Nations Literacy Decade (2003-2012) and is expected to play a lead role in the Education for Sustainable Development Decade (2005-2014).

What orientations would you recommend for UNESCO to take in the context of the UN Literacy Decade and the Education for Sustainable Development Decade (2005-2014)?

16. The potential of information and communications technologies (ICT) for education and the growing need for ICT literacy looms increasingly large in “knowledge societies” and “knowledge economies”, as highlighted by the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). In the process, UNESCO may be challenged to intensify its involvement in experimental and pilot projects as well as in larger-scale use of ICTs at various levels of education and in teacher training. This could well be pursued in close intersectoral cooperation between the Education and the Communication and Information Sectors, with the latter already earmarking substantial programme resources in the 32 C/5 for this area (see also the section on Communication and Information below).

Do you favour an increased action by UNESCO in the field of ICTs for education? Which focus and modalities of action would you propose (e.g. ICT-enhanced education, ICT literacy, creation of multimedia learning centres, ICT-based teacher training? Which other suggestions do you have for UNESCO action in applying ICTs for education.

Natural Sciences

17. In the 32 C/5 Approved, the principal priority for Major Programme II (MP II) is water and associated ecosystems which has been assigned 46% of the overall amount of resources allocated to MP II's programme activities (excluding CCT projects), compared to 36.4% in the 31 C/5 Approved. Furthermore, budgetary reinforcement had been accorded to the programmes of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) in the follow-up to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD).

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP II as in document 32 C/5 Approved? Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in programme content?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP II? If so, which one?

18. In the 32 C/5, the following two other priorities were selected for MP II: (i) capacity-building in the basic and engineering sciences, including the fostering of a culture of maintenance, and in the formulation of science policies; (ii) protection of the environment and sustainable use and management of natural resources, including emphasis on renewable sources of energy and special focus on small island developing States.

Should those “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

19. Follow-up to the WSSD and the Johannesburg Plan of implementation (JPOI) is an abiding and long-term task for UNESCO and the international community at large.

Do you consider that the focus in the 32 C/5 on WSSD-related activities in support of WSSD and JPOI is sufficient? If not, do you have proposals for strengthening UNESCO’s contribution in that regard.

20. In 2004, a review of the United Nations Programme of Action for Small Island Developing States (Barbados + 10) will be held in Mauritius. The General Conference in its resolution 33 C/48 decided that in the light of the outcome of the Mauritius meeting pertinent proposals shall be included in the 33 C/5 and in subsequent C/5 documents.

Are you satisfied with the activities by UNESCO thus far in support of SIDS, especially with its CSI platform? Do you have at this stage, prior to the Mauritius meeting, already suggestions for the future orientation of UNESCO’s action in support of SIDS?

21. For the first time, 32 C/5 Approved contained a programmatic innovation in the form of cross-sectoral initiatives, constituting de facto joint main lines of action, namely on “promoting education and capacity-building in science and technology” and on “enhancing the linkages between biological and cultural diversity”.

Do you favour the formulation of such intersectoral initiatives and the creation of de facto main lines of action for their implementation? Would you propose the inclusion in 33 C/5 of additional intersectoral approaches – and if so, which ones?

22. Two United Nations system-wide coordination mechanisms have recently been established by the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB), namely UN-Water (involving SC/HYD) and UN-Oceans (involving SC/IOC), in which UNESCO plays an important lead role.

Do you have any comments or suggestions with a view to enhancing the role and contribution of UNESCO in UN-Water and UN-Oceans?

23. UNESCO has the benefit of contributions by five scientific and environmental programmes – IGCP, IHP, IOC, MAB and MOST (which is under MP III).

Are you satisfied with the reflection and integration of the work of the five programmes in past C/5 documents? Do you have specific proposals how their contribution can be integrated into 33 C/5? Is the work of these programmes sufficiently concentrated or do you have suggestions in that regard?

Social and Human Sciences

24. In the 32 C/5 Approved the principal priority for Major Programme III (MP III) is “the ethics of science and technology, with an emphasis on bioethics” which has been assigned 26% of the overall amount of resources allocated to programme activities (excluding CCT projects), compared to 15.3% in the 31 C/5 Approved.

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP III as in document 32 C/5 Approved? Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in terms of programme content?

Do you consider the major thrusts and the scope of Major Programme III satisfactory? Do you have any specific suggestions for improvements or change?

Are you in favour of the development of further normative instruments? Do you consider it necessary to promote ethics education and capacity-building as key activities? Would you suggest new activities in these areas (e.g. human cloning; environmental ethics)?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP III? If so, which one?

25. In the 32 C/5, the following three other priorities were selected for MP III:

- (i) promotion and protection of human rights and democracy and enhancement of human security through social and human sciences;
- (ii) revitalizing philosophical reflection, the human sciences and prospective and anticipatory studies;
- (iii) developing studies and strategies on social transformations and disseminating best practices.

Should the three “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

26. The principal priority focuses on the ethics of science and technology, with an emphasis on bioethics.

Are you satisfied with the focus and scope of normative and standard-setting activity undertaken by UNESCO in this field? Do you have any suggestions to be reflected in the 33 C/5?

27. The promotion of human rights and the fight against discrimination is the focus of a Programme within MP III, in the context of the strategy approved by the General Conference.

Do you have specific suggestions to be reflected in the 33 C/5 for the further implementation of the UNESCO strategy?

Following the approval by the General Conference of the UNESCO strategy on human rights, would you favour to designate “the promotion of human rights and struggle against discrimination” as a new cross-cutting theme for the entire Organization?

Culture

28. In the 32 C/5 the principal priority and main theme for Major Programme (MP IV) is “promoting cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue”, which has been assigned 62% of the overall amount of resources allocated to programme activities (excluding CCT projects), as compared to 38% in the 31 C/5 Approved. The “other priorities” are: reinforcing normative action in the field of culture, creativity and strengthening links between culture and development.

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP IV as in document 32 C/5 Approved? Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in terms of programme content?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase? Or have the efforts aimed at concentration reached a satisfactory level?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP IV? If so, which one?

29. In the 32 C/5, the importance accorded to standard-setting activities is a clear characteristic of MP IV, transcending several of its subprogrammes and main lines of action.

Should the focus on standard-setting activities be maintained in the 33 C/5? Are there other areas that may need consolidation and monitoring of achievements, also with a view to nourishing policy-making processes?

Are you satisfied with the interaction and synergy between standard-setting activities and instruments? Do you see a need for complementary research-based activities – and if so, which ones?

30. Interdisciplinary activities have become an innovative and visible feature of MP IV. The recognition of the cross-cutting and encompassing nature of culture also seems to be growing. Interdependencies exist, for example, between education and culture and between communication and culture, and the exploration of links between cultural diversity and biodiversity clearly constitutes a new challenge for interdisciplinary action by UNESCO, as already recognized in 32 C/5 and the creation of de facto main lines of action with MP II.

Should MP IV pursue and expand its focus on intersectoral and interdisciplinary activities, such as those already envisaged in 32 C/5? Do you wish to suggest additional areas for distinct intersectoral and interdisciplinary action?

31. The experience gained by UNESCO and the evolving concept of cultural heritage have enabled the Organization to renew its approach to world heritage. Full importance is currently accorded to a promotion of the preservation of intangible cultural heritage so as to make it an

integral part of preservation policies. The rehabilitation of the cultural heritage in pre- and post-conflict situations (along with the related standard-setting action) has also become an important vector for intercultural dialogue, among others. The activities of the World Heritage Centre have become an important and successful flagship activity of the Organization, giving it visibility and profile.

Do you favour to maintain the present focus in the work on cultural heritage in the 33 C/5? Are there new aspects or activities which might merit special attention and reflection?

Do you have suggestions for further strengthening the activities, contribution and impact by the World Heritage Centre?

32. Within the framework of the Global Alliance for Cultural Diversity efforts are made to assist developing countries or countries in transition in the establishment of viable and competitive cultural industries and to formulate cultural policies that create conditions in which a range of cultural expressions can flourish.

Are there any trends, perspectives or action that you wish to see included relating to the Global Alliance that should be reflected in the 33 C/5?

Communication and Information

33. In the 32 C/5 Approved the principal priority of Major Programme V (MP V) is “fostering equitable access to information and knowledge for development, especially in the public domain” which has been strengthened and will be allotted 68% of the overall resources of MP V (excluding CCT projects as compared to 55% in the 31 C/5 Approved). The two other priorities are promoting freedom of expression and communication development. – It may be recalled that during the debate of the preparations for the 33 C/5 at the 32nd session of the General Conference, some delegations proposed that the principal priority for MP V in future should be the free flow of ideas, freedom of expression and universal access to information.

Do you favour the retention of the same principal priority for MP V as in document 32 C/5 Approved? Do you consider, that while the principal priority should be retained, it should be more focused in programme content?

Should the principal priority in document 33 C/5 again be further strengthened in terms of resource increase?

Do you prefer the designation of a new principal priority for MP V? If so, which one?

Should the two “other priorities” be maintained in document 33 C/5? If not, what “other priorities” should, in your view, be considered? Or should the formulation of the “other priorities” be amended and more focused – and if so how?

34. The Declaration of Principles and Plan of Action adopted by the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS, Geneva, December 2003) reflect international consensus on the values that should underpin the building of inclusive and pluralistic societies, in which all can benefit from the potential of ICTs. For UNESCO, these texts constitute a recognition by the international community of the four key principles that the Organization has been promoting consistently as being essential for the development of equitable knowledge societies, “freedom of expression; equal access to education; universal access to information, especially in the public domain; and cultural and linguistic diversity”.

How could UNESCO better translate these four principles into its programmes in order to achieve impact-oriented action?

What other initiatives or concrete proposals would you suggest to further promote and operationalize the concept of knowledge societies, especially in the context of the expected outcomes of the second phase of WSIS (Tunis, 2005)?

35. MP V is by its very nature intersectoral. In addition to the projects pertaining to the two cross-cutting themes of the 31 C/4, strengthening intersectoral and interdisciplinary cooperation is an ongoing task for the Organization. The debates at the General Conference highlighted a number of themes for such cooperation, including ICTs and education; the production of culturally diverse and multilingual contents; higher education, including training of trainers; the role of libraries and archives in building knowledge societies; media education; etc. The World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) reaffirmed education and capacity-building as two of the key fields where ICTs could play an important role in outreach and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

What major themes or areas would you suggest for further intersectoral action or possible joint main lines of action with other major programmes?

What are, in your opinion, the most promising fields where ICTs and education intersect and where UNESCO could make a significant and unique contribution? And how do you want them to be addressed?

III. OTHER PROGRAMME ISSUES AND DEVELOPMENTS

36. Several key programme issues are being addressed by UNESCO across the board. They comprise: activities pertaining to the fight against poverty, which is central for UNESCO in the pursuit of **MDG 1** calling for the halving of the number of people living in extreme poverty by 2015; support to **NEPAD**; and contributions to the **Brussels Plan of Action** adopted at the Third United Nations Conference on Least Developed Countries.

37. Likewise, UNESCO's contribution to reconstruction and reconciliation in conflict and **post-conflict** areas, especially Afghanistan, the Palestinian territories and in Africa, has increased over the past biennia and may call for better reflection in the C/5 document.

38. Strengthening the commitment to the fight against **terrorism** has moved to the forefront of the international attention and cooperation. In line with General Conference Resolution 31 C/39, UNESCO has intensified its activities in the area of the **dialogue among civilizations**, where it is pursuing a multisectoral approach drawing on contributions from all its domains. Following General Conference Resolution 32 C/47, future activities and initiatives are aimed at regional and subregional levels, focusing on the areas identified by the General Conference, namely education, science and technology, cultural diversity in all its dimensions and the media.

Do you have specific proposal for future orientations and action by UNESCO with respect to the fight against poverty, support to NEPAD and LDCs, the contribution to conflict and post-conflict areas and the dialogue among civilizations as well as the fight against terrorism?

Are there other key programme issues that should be addressed by UNESCO in the pursuit of its functions and where it has a comparative advantage?

Are there activities, issues or themes which you consider should be terminated or abandoned in view of their limited impact or their marginal relevance for the Organization's mandate?

Would you favour the introduction of a sunset clause for programme activities? If so, how should it be applied?

Interdisciplinarity

39. With a view to strengthening **interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary action**, \$10.4 million have been allocated in the 32 C/5 for projects related to the two cross-cutting themes identified in the Medium-Term Strategy (31 C/4). The selection of these cross-cutting theme projects, prepared by a mandatory involvement of three or more sectors/offices, was – as was the case for the 31 C/5 Approved – the result of a competitive process at the Secretariat level, drawing on Headquarters and the field alike. The 41 **cross-cutting projects** contained in the 32 C/5 Approved (19 pertaining to poverty eradication and 22 related to the contribution of ICTs to the construction of knowledge societies) offer a sample of action that the Organization can deploy in pursuit of the two objectives. These projects are clearly not the only intersectoral action by the Organization, but are complemented by other intersectoral initiatives, some of which have been addressed in earlier portions of this questionnaire, such as the new joint main lines of action introduced for the first time in the 32 C/5.

Are the strategies for the two cross-cutting themes of the 31 C/4 sufficiently well reflected in the range of projects selected and included in document 32 C/5 Approved?

If not, what other approaches should be pursued to attain their objectives better? What measures should be adopted, in your opinion, to ensure the effective integration of these themes/strategies into the Organization's programmes?

Overall, do you feel that 32 C/5 Approved contains a sufficient degree of intersectoral activities and efforts? If not, where would you call for strengthening and more pronounced initiatives?

Do you support in 33 C/5 a renewed allocation of resources for projects pertaining to the two cross-cutting themes? Do you favour a continuation and intensification of joint main lines of action and in which areas?

Mainstreaming

40. Beginning with document 31 C/4, a new approach had been introduced, abandoning the concept of priority themes and groups and replacing it with the **mainstreaming approach**. Accordingly, the needs of Africa, the least developed countries (LDCs), women and youth are now to be mainstreamed throughout all programmes in the C/5 documents, throughout the period 2002-2007. This implies that the demands emanating from these groups must be addressed by all sectors in all their programmes. In addition, as envisaged in the 31 C/4, throughout all UNESCO's efforts, there will be a special focus on the **needs of disadvantaged and excluded groups** and the most vulnerable segments of society. Likewise, the Organization is committed to promote a culture of peace, especially in the context of its role as lead agency for the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for Children of the World (2001-2010) and in the follow-up to 31 C/Resolution 39 of the General Conference.

Do you consider that the issues to be mainstreamed (as defined in document 31 C/4 – namely the needs of women, youth, LDCs and Africa), as well as the culture of peace, were sufficiently addressed in document 32 C/5 Approved? If not, what could be done to improve the situation?

Do you support the mainstreaming approach in general? How could this approach be more effectively applied?

Do you favour a more limited list of mainstreaming areas, and if so, what would be your preference? Or, do you favour the addition of other mainstreaming issues – and if so, which ones (recognizing that this would require an adjustment in the 31 C/4)?

IV. PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND IMPACT

Results-based approach

41. In the 32 C/5 Approved, a major effort was made to introduce and apply in a systematic way results-based programming and budgeting, through the formulation of expected results for each main line of action and the formulation of performance indicators, covering to the maximum extent possible and in a measurable manner the results area. The preparation of the 33 C/5 is an important opportunity to ensure further refinement of the results-based approach for all areas of the Organization – Headquarters, field offices and institutes – by introducing benchmarks pertaining to various performance indicators.

Are you satisfied with the development and introduction of the results-based programming approach, as reflected in 31 C/5 and 32 C/5?

Do you have suggestions for further improvements and presentation of the results components in the 33 C/5?

Decentralization

42. As an intergovernmental organization with a universal mandate, UNESCO is expected to formulate strategies addressing world problems. However, such strategies can be effective only if they are sufficiently flexible to be adapted to the specific problems of Member States, as expressed at the regional, subregional or national level. The **decentralization strategy** is therefore designed for combining both relevance and field efficiency: on the one hand it aims at serving Member States more effectively by responding to their particular needs and circumstances by drawing full benefit from the wealth of knowledge, experience and ideas accumulated or generated throughout the world and, on the other hand, to inform policies and actions at the global level by taking stock of field experience. This dual approach fully expresses UNESCO's unity of conception and action, major comparative advantages of a universal organization.

43. Within the decentralization strategy, cluster offices – and national offices where they exist – are the principal platform for programme management and delivery at the level of Member States, in particular with a view to assisting in policy design and capacity-building together with a mobilization of extrabudgetary funds for the implementation of development projects in line with the Organization's mandate and programmes. The latter function is not supported by specific funding in current C/5 documents. It is currently left to the judgement of Sectors and field units to identify and allocate decentralized funds for this purpose. A different approach existed until the 1996-1997 biennium (28 C/5) whereby "Cooperation for Development" funds had been earmarked under each Major Programme with the specific purpose of strengthening cooperation with Member

States and funding sources (including the identification and design of projects and their negotiation with potential donors).

How would you see an optimal blend and balance between global and field oriented approaches within the activities of the different Sectors/Major Programmes?

What type of specific tasks and actions would you expect cluster offices – and national offices where they exist – to perform, bearing in mind UNESCO's overall functions?

How would you suggest that Field Offices pursue UNESCO's functions – as described in the 31 C/4 – in support of Member States?

What type of issues in each of the fields of competence of the Organization should appropriately be dealt with at a regional level?

Do you consider that some Regular Programme funds of Programme Sectors and/or field offices should be earmarked for generating extrabudgetary funds (i.e. reintroduction of a "Cooperation for Development" component)?

44. The experience of cluster consultations launched over the last biennium thanks to the 2000-2001 carry-over funds have demonstrated the importance of such steps in enhancing the relevance of programmes of cluster (national) offices and building fruitful working relations among national commissions and field offices. They are expected to play an increased role in the programming cycle of the Organization as building blocks in the design of the next programmes and budgets (C/5 documents), as well as in the monitoring of programme implementation.

How should such meetings be funded – under the Regular Programme allocations of field offices, through a specific Participation Programme contribution or by combining both?

45. Document 32 C/5 Approved envisages substantial decentralization of programme funds of up to 67% in some major programmes. The actual rates vary from one major programme to another, depending upon the content, nature and type of activities envisaged, and also the staffing situation and delivery capacity in field offices. The overall, global rates of decentralization of programme funds stipulated for each major programme in the 33 C/5 are as follows: Major Programme I: 65.9% (excluding Institutes); Major Programme II: 40.8% (excluding IOC); Major Programme III: 36.7%; Major Programme IV: 45.4%; and Major Programme V: 47.5%.

Do you consider that – taking account of the specific character of each of the fields of competence of UNESCO-- such rates reflect for each field a proper balance between field oriented and global approaches?

46. Over the past two biennia, UNESCO has played a constructive and proactive role in UN system-wide initiatives, through Chief Executives Board (CEB) and United Nations Development Group (UNDG) mechanisms, which seek a coordination of efforts by all United Nations agencies and programmes in terms of policies and approaches as well as in coordination and cooperation at the field level. This last aspect is of particular importance for UNESCO's decentralized network of field offices and their expected contribution to the formulation of Common Country Assessments (CCA), United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF), Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PSRPs) and MDG reports at the national levels.

How could UNESCO and Member States together better involve the appropriate national stakeholders in UNESCO's fields of competence into the process of elaborating the above documents, their approval by national authorities, their translation into concrete policies and actions, and the mobilization of requisite funds?

Role of national commissions

47. The **National Commissions** as a constituent element of UNESCO play a critical role in the conceptualization, implementation and delivery of UNESCO's programmes. Ongoing efforts to enable them to fully discharge their role as bodies for consultation, liaison, information, evaluation and programme execution will be strengthened, while expanding their field of action to include the search for funding and the mobilization of new partnerships.

Based on the results of phase 1 of the major Action Plan for Capacity-building amongst National Commissions pursuant to Executive Board decision 161 EX/Decision 8.3, and given the progress in the decentralization process, what further and innovative measures or initiatives could be introduced and applied to enhance the interaction between National Commissions and the Secretariat, in particular with cluster and national offices and regional bureaux, and to help raise the impact and visibility of the Organization's action at regional/country levels?

What measures could be taken to improve further communications between the Secretariat and National Commissions?

V. BUDGET AND RESOURCE ISSUES

48. The determination of the budget ceiling for 33 C/5 will be a central task. For the first time in many biennia, the 32 C/5 benefited from a real growth and the ceiling was pegged at US \$610 million, also coinciding with the return of the United States to the Organization.

Which approach would you favour for the 33 C/5 with respect to the budget ceiling:

- (a) zero nominal growth (i.e. \$610 million);*
- (b) zero real growth (i.e. \$610 million plus recosting plus anticipated cost increases);*
- (c) real growth and if so, to what extent?*

Do you favour the maintenance of the present distribution of programme resources among the various major programmes? If not, what distribution or formula would you propose? (see also last question in para. 9)

Do you consider it necessary to improve the structure and presentation of the budget? If yes, what are the areas where improvements are required and how could those be accomplished?

49. In the 32 C/5, a major change was introduced pertaining to the presentation of extrabudgetary funds. Care was taken to ensure that both regular budget and extrabudgetary resources are complementary under one common umbrella as defined by the strategic objectives of document 31 C/4 and the programme priorities of the 32 C/5. Likewise, only those extrabudgetary resources were reflected in the 32 C/5 which had already been received by the Secretariat or which were committed in signed donor documents.

Do you have suggestions for further improving the linkage between and presentation of regular and extrabudgetary resources?

UNIFYING THEME

UNESCO contributing to peace and human development in an era of globalization through education, the sciences, culture and communication.

TWO CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

- Eradication of poverty, especially extreme poverty ■
- The contribution of information and communication technologies to the development of education, science and culture and the construction of a knowledge society ■

THREE MAIN STRATEGIC THRUSTS

Developing and promoting universal principles and norms, based on shared values, in order to meet emerging challenges in education, science, culture and communication and to protect and strengthen the "common public good"

Promoting pluralism, through recognition and safeguarding of diversity together with the observance of human rights

Promoting empowerment and participation in the emerging knowledge society through equitable access, capacity-building and sharing of knowledge

TWELVE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Education	Sciences	Culture	Communication and Information
<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Promoting education as a fundamental right in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;■ Improving the quality of education through the diversification of contents and methods and the promotion of universally shared values;■ Promoting experimentation, innovation and the diffusion and sharing of information and best practices as well as policy dialogue	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Promoting principles and ethical norms to guide scientific and technological development and social transformation;■ Improving human security by better management of the environment and social change;■ Enhancing scientific, technical and human capacities to participate in the emerging knowledge societies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Promoting the drafting and implementation of standard-setting instruments in the cultural field;■ Safeguarding cultural diversity and encouraging dialogue among cultures and civilizations;■ Enhancing the linkages between culture and development, through capacity-building and sharing of knowledge.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Promoting the free flow of ideas and universal access to information;■ Promoting the expression of pluralism and cultural diversity in the media and world information networks;■ Access for all to information and communication technologies, especially in the public domain.