

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE DRAFT MEDIUM-TERM
STRATEGY FOR 2008-2013 (34 C/4) AND
DRAFT PROGRAMME AND BUDGET
FOR 2008-2009 (34 C/5)**

UK National Commission for UNESCO Response

14 July 2006

Introductory Remarks

- The beginning of this new strategic planning cycle at UNESCO should be seen in the context of the larger on-going debate and work on **UN Reform**. The *High-Level Panel on System-Wide Coherence* recently appointed by the UN Secretary General provides a rare **window of opportunity** for UNESCO to engage with an ambitious process to reorient the UN system towards a more results-driven and tightly coordinated network of organisations which will ultimately allow delivery of optimal development support to all member states.
- It is important to highlight the distinctive contribution of **civil society** to the work of UNESCO, unique among UN specialised agencies. One challenge is to engage civil society energies and creativity, with appropriate programmes and mechanisms, complementing the efforts of governments and UNESCO.
- This questionnaire – despite its attempt to consult many of UNESCO’s stakeholders – appears to be too much of a strait jacket to allow for **much creative thinking**. Such thinking would be necessary to draw up the large-scale strategic objectives the Organization might want to tackle in its next medium-term strategy. At this stage, a number of the questions below merely mirror the existing administrative structure of the Organization instead of allowing for substantive debate.
- Unfortunately, **insufficient data on the results actually obtained during the current medium-term strategy** have been communicated prior to this new consultation. Member States are not presented with a critical evaluation of successful or failing projects or programmes in a timely manner in order to take this information into account.
- In general, **UNESCO’s own reform process** undertaken by the Director-General in his first term seems to have **slowed down or reached a plateau**. After successfully correcting a number of apparent “wrongs” in the six years of his first mandate, it is now time to address actively the remaining challenges and to right-size the Organization before engaging in a new medium-term strategy. This programming and budgeting exercise should aim at a comprehensive strategic reallocation of human and financial resources and not be limited to a simple, rhetorical reformulation of programme objectives.
- This is the opportunity to define better **UNESCO’s mission statement** and to clarify what it should be doing at the global level and how it should be operating in-country. Both in defining its overall policy mission as well as in outlining its operational activities, UNESCO will need to regain its place as a **respected specialized agency within the UN system**.

➤ **Cluster 1: Mission – overarching objectives – strategic programme objectives for the 34 C/4**

Q.1: Would you suggest other issues of relevance to define the future role and mission of UNESCO?

No. The existing issues need to be rationalised and made clearer. UNESCO needs to adopt one single mission statement, which defines its policy and standard-setting role. This mission statement will need to be valid for all programme sectors and thus throughout the Organization. This needs to be understood and accepted by all members of the secretariat. Proper linkage with the MDGs has to be shown.

Q.2: What would you consider to be the main mission challenges for UNESCO in the coming medium-term period, taking into account global and regional trends as well as emerging challenges?

UNESCO's main challenge in the coming years will be to regain its proper place as a specialized agency among the larger UN family in order to reaffirm its role as a policy driving and standard setting organisation.

After agreeing and defining what it should be doing at the global level (e.g. good policy work in the fields of standard-setting, policy research, implementation and monitoring) the Organization will have to commit itself and its resources to implementing this work successfully.

The Organization will need to be much clearer on what it wants to do and what it can achieve through its very specific contributions to the country-level programming.

Work carried out away from headquarters needs to be driven by local needs and should feed explicitly and concretely into agreed global development goals, policies and standards (e.g. the MDG). The Organization's work at the country-level needs to be harmonized with other UN agencies on site through processes such as the CCA and UNDAF.

UNESCO must commit itself to focus, and if necessary to limit its country level work on modalities it can actually support given its limited financial and human resources. Most likely, this will be concrete policy advice, assistance in the implementation of existing instruments (capacity building and advocacy), as well as the monitoring of implementation and the tracking of progress against policy commitments. It should also concentrate on the countries of the greatest need.

In order to function as the actual lead agency in its core competencies, the Organization will have to undergo further substantial realignment of its resources and continue to focus on a few, well identified areas in order to be able to improve the quality of its policy work.

Ultimately, this will most likely require a staff audit aiming at recruiting and retaining senior policy experts at headquarters and a targeted redeployment of policy experts to the field who will integrate into their respective UN country teams.

*Q.3: Based on your views of UNESCO's mission, what should be the **limited number of overarching objectives in the 34 C/4** covering all the Organization's fields of competence.*

In order to fulfil its mission as a specialized agency and in order to live up to its potential, the Organization will need to define one overarching objective for its global role (covering all sectors) and one for its interventions in-country.

At the global level this objective will be to regain its place as trusted and relevant organisation in the UN family for policy work in its core competencies (global policy dialogue, research and policy formulation), to act as a standard-setter, and as a monitor of global efforts.

At the country level, the Organization will need to focus on activities closely linked to its global role (e.g. support to legal instruments and expert policy advice, advocacy and policy monitoring, capacity building through policy work). The Organization should avoid competing with much larger development agencies due to the limited funds it has at its disposal since the ongoing scattering of funds on small development projects are of very limited comparative advantage and of virtually no impact.

*Q.4: What should be the most **important measurable outcomes for each of these overarching objectives**, which you are proposing?*

At the global level, these outcomes need to be linked properly to UN wide development goals and policy debate in its fields of competence, whereas goals defined for country programmes need to have been agreed through the UN common country programming approach.

The overarching outcome at the global level is the regaining of its role as the respected leader on policy in areas of its mandate and a significant influence on policies globally and in-country.

Q.5: Are you in agreement to retain *these five functions of UNESCO for the 2008-2013 period*?

Would you like to propose other functions – and if so which ones? Or would you suggest a prioritization among the existing functions?

No, certainly no more functions. We would express UNESCO's functions better around these three areas:

- i. policy research work, policy advice, and exchange of best practices in policy development;
- ii. standard-setting;
- iii. work in-country (policy implementation through capacity building.)

It would have been helpful to receive an evaluative performance report prior to this consultation on how UNESCO has fulfilled these "functions" in the current C/4.

[NB: The terms used here are slightly misleading. "Functions" 2-4 are really modalities for policy work. "Function" 5 is a rather meaningless reformulation of the very nature of an international organisation. We would suggest a greater degree of caution as to the often imprecise and self-serving term "laboratory of ideas" as the Organization's first function since it does not allow definition of UNESCO's work in the policy cycle. All the existing functions should be scrapped and absolved into the areas set out above.]

Q.6: In your situation, how can UNESCO best support improved national dialogue in *the education sector* and serve as a catalyst for *better coordination among international partners*?

This is the wrong question. It should be about UNESCO's global work.

- i. UNESCO must be the lead agency for policy research and formulation and thus be able to fulfil the whole cycle of policy work from global needs assessment to policy research, followed by exercises in global policy formulation, implementation and monitoring.
- ii. At the country level, UNESCO will then be involved in supporting the government-driven efforts to further action on policies in the areas of its mandate through such measures as policy advice, country needs assessment, costing, capacity building and policy advocacy at the country leadership level.
- iii. Policy work done at local level will then feed back into UNESCO's global role as standard setter and policy monitor.
- iv. It is however not UNESCO's role to do small project work since the Organization lacks the proper resources as well as respectability among funding agencies. UNESCO should thus content itself and concentrate all its effort on the policy role proper to a specialized agency.

Q.7: In building *coordinated support at national level*, which of these areas (one or more) should UNESCO focus its efforts on, in order to have the biggest impact on the country's performance in *EFA*?

Q.8: Is this *the best role*? And, if so, what areas of focus do you consider in *building the sustainable capacity of national institutions in EFA policy formulation, planning and implementation*?

UNESCO needs to rebuild its capacity to act as a trusted policy advisor in-country. The Organization needs to concentrate its expert resources in a small focused set of priority countries (LDCs, pilot countries for UN common country programming) in all these areas and should only act as a policy advisor and advocate for EFA.

**Q.9: What input would you like to give UNESCO on the orientation of these strategic directions, regarding their relevance, importance, scope and feasibility
In pursuing these directions, what roles would you see as most appropriate for UNESCO as an international organisation?**

See introductory remarks and previous answers. The following remarks also apply to the other Major Programmes of UNESCO, not just Education.

- i. UNESCO needs to recapture its role as lead agency with a standard setting function for a small set of concrete competencies. These will be in the fields of education, culture, the sciences and communication and information, but will not overlap with other UN agencies.
- ii. UNESCO will only carry out policy work in its undisputed fields of competence in order to avoid this duplication and to regain relevance.
- iii. Current projects that do not involve concrete policy work will need to be stopped and any future projects need to fit into better-defined methodology for policy work at HQ.
- iv. UNESCO must cease dispersing its limited resources on too many programmes and isolated projects without proper impact at the global or country level.

[NB: It might be advisable to create a central unit that oversees and facilitates policy work in its technical aspects, including providing support services to the concrete work carried out in programme sectors.]

*Q.10: From your perspective, in what ways would strengthen **South-South cooperation** enhance your achievement of EFA goals, and how could UNESCO best support that process?*

There is some potential for S-S cooperation at country-level, but this will need to be fully integrated into the Global Action Plan.

At this point it is not sure how much UNESCO itself should get involved, other than ensure that this important area of cooperation is developed (i.e. UNESCO can act as a facilitator but should not carry out small projects in this area.)

*Q.11: What are your proposals regarding the three inter-related needs to be addressed by the Panel for the Overall Review of **Major Programme II and III**, taking into account the objectives stated in 33 C/Resolution 2?*

*Q.12: What would you propose to be the **strategic objectives for the Sciences**? Please indicate up to two such strategic programme objectives, together with expected outcomes.*

In regard to questions 11 and 12: The current Overall Review needs above all to reinforce UNESCO's leadership role on international science policy.

Therefore the Review Panel needs to look into the activities in the field of the sciences not only at UNESCO but within the larger UN system in order to harmonize and coordinate policy work and to avoid duplication. UNESCO will strive to maximize its impact within the fields of its core mandate.

See answers above in regard to the difference between UNESCO's global role and its in-country work in support of EFA. The same also applies here: We need one objective for what it should be doing at the global level, and one for what UNESCO should be doing in-country.

UNESCO should make better use of its numerous intergovernmental programmes, through enhanced exploitation of their synergies and coordination across the UN system. Also there is a need for efforts in the simplification and harmonization of secretarial support to those programmes.

The intergovernmental programmes should be closely linked to the policy work carried out by the Executive Board and feed into policy panels / subcommittees that are envisaged by the Executive Board.

*Q.13: If you are in favour that document 34 C/4 should provide for **separate strategic objectives for the Natural Sciences and for the Social and Human Sciences**, please indicate them for each of the two fields:*

Natural Sciences:

Social and Human Sciences:

We do not favour this. Their policy role is essentially the same; a separation of objectives would be purely artificial and based on current administrative arrangements of the two sectors. We would like UNESCO to take up the following challenges in the upcoming years:

- i. UNESCO needs to strive to create an effective science programme that formulates interdisciplinary science policies in response to global challenges.
- ii. A problem-oriented approach will by definition need to integrate all sciences.
- iii. As such, the question above is not the right one since it mirrors current administrative structures, which heavily impact on the programme planning process instead of deriving the Organization's work plans from global goals.
- iv. The objectives for both current sectors (as with the other programme sectors) will thus need to define problem areas derived from the MDGs and formulate concrete activities of policy work that will support Member States to attain these globally agreed goals soon after the end of the next medium-term strategy (2015).
- v. This commitment will need to translate into concrete projects that can be explicitly linked especially to the following MDGs among other agreed standards:
 - MDG 1 (Poverty),
 - MDG 2 (Gender equality),
 - MDG 7 (Protection of the environment), and
 - MDG 8 (Global partnership for development).
- vi. All of UNESCO's action both at the global and country levels will need to be coordinated within the UN system.

*Q.14: Which should be **the strategic objectives for Culture**? Please indicate up to two such strategic programme objectives, together with expected outcomes*

*Q.15: Which should be **the strategic objectives for Communication and information**? Please indicate up to two such strategic programme objectives, together with expected outcomes:*

See answers for questions 11-13: The programmes will need to regain their global standard setting and policy role in a better-integrated UN system. (See also answer to question 3, in regard to UNESCO's role as a specialized agency.)

*Q.16: Do you favour the **retention of cross-cutting themes for the 34 C/4**? Do you prefer to maintain the present two themes or do you have other suggestions?*

Since this had led absolutely nowhere, probably not. At this point, we have only insufficient data to make any results-based assessment of these initiatives.

The "cross-cutting" spirit, i.e. interdisciplinary approaches, should be an automatic feature of all programme objectives and project proposals at UNESCO. If projects are drawn up from a problem-based perspective, then proposed solutions will also include "cross-cutting" elements.

UNESCO will, however, need to make a much greater effort to ensure that all aspects of a defined objective will be checked against the necessary input from other programme sectors. This will require a new approach in project management that draws on all sectors (possibly coordinated through the central planning services) before a proposed project can go live.

*Q.17: Are you in favour of continuing the practice whereby **flagship programmes**/ activities/projects are highlighted in the 34 C/4 and 34 C/5? If so, what criteria should be used to select such flagships? Do you have suggestions for designating specific flagships?*

Probably not. UNESCO itself should be one flagship with a unified mission statement and strategy, i.e. an organisation which in itself is recognized as the flagship (policy leader) of the UN system for its fields of competence.

We suggest that all current "flagships" be evaluated against the criteria mentioned above: Those not meeting them will need to be terminated before the end of the current C/5.

In general these criteria (positive results / visibility) should be logically applicable to all ongoing UNESCO projects, if not they will also need to be terminated before the end of the current C/5.

➤ **Cluster 2: Sectoral priorities for the 34 C/5**

*Q.18: Are you in favour of retaining for document 34 C/5 the structure whereby each major programme would have **one principal priority and a limited number of other priorities**?*

If you consider that prioritization should be structured otherwise, what would you suggest?

*Q.19: Which **principal priority** would you propose for each of the five major programmes in the 34 C/5?*

*Q.20: Which **“other priorities”** would you propose for each Major Programme in the 34 C/5?*

At this point, these lists basically include all ongoing projects in UNESCO and do not allow for a proper focus on actual objectives. It is unlikely that the Organization can take on “further” priorities at this point.

This designation of “principal priority” and “further priorities” appears thus to be a purely rhetorical exercise to mirror once more the existing organisational structure and not a prioritisation of objectives.

From a logical perspective, it makes little sense to have all activities labelled “priorities” since this would not leave any space for real prioritisation according to emerging and changing needs. We would require additional performance data on the activities labelled “priorities” in order to assess their relevance.

So far, it is not clear how the separation in different levels of prioritisation has affected the results actually obtained. It would also be helpful to receive an evaluation of the relative advantage this has brought to programme planning within UNESCO.

By simply adding “priorities”, the Organization will not have sufficient resources to carry out its workload. On the contrary: only by drastically cutting its still scattered programmes and by reallocating human and financial resources to the agreed objectives can these be realistically achieved.

See also answers 11-13: The Organization needs to reverse its planning process from one which mirrors administrative structures to a problem-driven one.

The overarching objectives for the whole Organization will then need to be translated into projects that are from their initial design stages drawn up in an interdisciplinary manner.

➤ **Cluster 3: Fostering intersectorality**

*Q.21: Are there in your opinion **other topics/themes** that should be pursued in an **intersectoral and interdisciplinary** manner?*

*Q.22: Should UNESCO choose **a small number of carefully selected intersectoral approaches** into which it would invest the critical resources intersectorality requires? Which ones?*

*Q.23: How should UNESCO proceed in order to pursue the **proposed intersectoral activities**?*

*Q.24: Do you **support a continuation of the modality** whereby a number of intersectoral projects pertaining to the cross-cutting themes of the C/4 are to be implemented during successive C/5s?*

None of this has worked very well.

In the course of the Overall Review for Major Programmes II / III, the UK will provide a contribution on how intersectorality can be made a reality. This contribution will also apply to other programme sectors.

The Task Force on UNESCO in the 21st century has carried out the necessary work on potential intersectoral themes quite well. The outcome documents remain relevant.

At this point, we only have insufficient data on the current projects to make such a decision. We would need a clear evaluation of the current procedures and suggest the inclusion of sunset clauses into ongoing projects.

*Q.25: Do you favour the continued use of the **mainstreaming approach** as a programming principle for document 34 C/4 and its application in subsequent C/5 documents?*

If not, what alternative approaches would you suggest?

*Q.26: If so, what areas would you recommend for **mainstreaming in 34 C/4 and 34 C/5**:*

(a) *maintain the present mainstreaming mandate for Africa, LDCs, women and youth?*

(b) *Reduce the present number of mainstreaming areas and groups by dropping _____ ?*

(c) *Add as new areas for mainstreaming: _____ ?*

As it stands currently, none of this means that anything actually happens. We suggest a similar approach should be adopted as the one mentioned in regard to CCTs and intersectorality.

UNESCO's Secretariat will need to check all areas of work against their potential to include the mainstreaming of the above mentioned themes. Only if real potential for tangible outcomes exist, should the claim towards mainstreaming be made.

In order to achieve this, the Organization will need to differentiate between different sets of mainstreaming. It is already agreed that the whole UN system is committed to adopt a human-rights-based approach in programming. However, not all its programmes can equally benefit the other themes mentioned (gender, LDC, Youth, Africa). Making an all inclusive claim will too quickly turn into lip service instead of a real, results-oriented commitment towards any of these themes.

Projects will need to be revised after proper consultation with expert units within the secretariat. The actual expertise of these units, however, will need to be evaluated and possibly strengthened (if mainstreaming themes are to be retained) before the end of current C/4.

➤ Cluster 4: Delivering the programme – partnerships and UNESCO's role within the United Nations system – improving the visibility of the Organization

Q.27: Do you have any amendment to the programme management cycle – covering both the preparation and implementation of the C/4 and the C/5 documents?

UNESCO's programme management cycle will need to be linked to the policy cycle outlined above (policy research/ formulation/ advocacy/ implementation and monitoring).

In order to do this, UNESCO needs radically to change its approach to programme planning and project management in order to integrate all the potential the Organization "hides" in its various silos and field outposts.

This includes the building-in of intersectorality into all its programmes and concrete areas of work. Above all UNESCO will need to integrate results-based budgeting and human resource allocation into the current programme planning process. The Organization will thus need to change from its current top-down budget allocation process to a strategic objectives-based approach where the allocation of resources only intervenes in the very last phase.

Just choosing single projects is thus the wrong approach: from the very beginning, all areas of work developed to attain the overall objectives for the Organization must be designed with the resource input and the comparative advantage offered by the different programme sectors.

The current planning process of rolling projects upwards through the sectors towards eventual inclusion in the rather unreadable Draft C/5 needs to be reversed:

- i. After the consultation process, the large themes and problem areas defined by Member States need to be presented to all sectors, which will need to form theme-based intersectoral working groups.
- ii. After sufficient in-house and UN system-wide consultation these theme based working groups will need to propose concrete areas of work and coherent programmes which can then in turn be presented to the Member States for approval.
- iii. At the outcome of this consultation with Member States, the Organization will need to organize an internal bidding process for funding and staffing for areas of work that can be allocated on a competitive and results-oriented basis.
- iv. The Organization will need to establish clear selection criteria for its programmes (e.g. links to support the attainment of MDGs) and track progress of all ongoing work in a constant and transparent manner.
- v. Built-in programme monitoring and evaluation will decide whether programme funding will be renewed from one C/5 to the next. This will require the formulation of meaningful performance indicators and sunset clauses into any concrete project in order to allow for effective evaluation of the work carried out by the Organization.
- vi. Information about the implementation of work and its intermediary results need to be made accessible to Member States in real time in order to allow for better oversight of the Secretariat.
- vii. The oversight work carried out in the Organization needs strengthening, as does the reporting on ongoing and finished evaluations to the governing bodies.

Q.28: Do you have suggestions how UNESCO could best continue to support Africa in its development efforts, especially through NEPAD?

Involve NEPAD fully in consultation processes about what work UNESCO should be doing in areas of policy development to meet Africa's needs. This will be focused on the Organization's core functions. UNESCO will most likely want to provide support for (sub-) regional policy panels for Education, Science and Culture linked to regional integration bodies (African Union, subregional bodies)

Q.29: Do you have suggestions for measures, initiatives or modalities that could further the role of National Commissions and enhance the interaction between National Commissions and the Secretariat, in particular cluster and national offices and regional bureaux?

National Commissions play an integral part in UNESCO policy and in-country work in as much as they can be not only the voice for Civil Society on the international scene, but they can also have an important role for UNESCO's outreach activities at country level.

- i. In-country, systematically to include NCs in policy panels (through the strengthening of sectoral subcommittees).
- ii. On the global level, through the inclusion in policy panels at the Executive Board and the preparation of High-level segments at the General Conference.
- iii. Also include intergovernmental science programmes in the work of the proposed policy panels for the Executive Board and High-level segments during the General Conference.
- iv. Provide further opportunities for partnering initiatives between NCs.

Q.30: Given the trend towards increased harmonization and integration of United Nations system activities at the country level, do you have particular suggestions for further enhancing UNESCO's involvement and impact?

This is a very important question in the context of UN reform. The following will enhance UNESCO's involvement and impact:

- i. Fully integrate UNESCO field staff into the UN countries teams with a special assignment to fulfil the Organization's policy role.
- ii. Provide support to field staff through senior policy experts at HQ.
- iii. Roll back the costly (autonomous) field presence and look for savings through joint agreements (housing, administrative tasks, security) with other UN agencies.
- iv. Dispatch expert staff knowledgeable in key policy areas based on a needs assessment carried out with other UN agencies.
- v. Align field staffing with strategic programme objectives.
- vi. Possibly limit assignments to shorter interventions, based on policy needs in country.
- vii. Link up with regional integration bodies and support policy networks relevant to UNESCO's core mandate.

- viii. Clearly link UNESCO's field budget with overarching, global policy work.
- ix. Roll-out the new UNESCO field presence (as described in points 1-9) in small number of selected pilot countries.
- x. Take a leadership role in implementing the efforts of current UN reform proposals (10 – 20 countries applying the “Three ones”: One country team, one programme and budget, one office).

*Q.31: Do you consider that UNESCO should continue its **involvement in post-conflict and post-disaster countries**? If so, which action by UNESCO would be in your opinion be the most effective response to such situations?*

Post-conflict countries are important and UNESCO needs to be involved in them, but the response needs to be considered as part of one strategic whole within the UN system.

As a specialized agency UNESCO will need to find its place within the renewed UN system, especially in regard to humanitarian and peace-keeping situations. Since UNESCO carries out policy work, it will need to articulate much better within but also to other UN agencies what the need for policy work will be in post-conflict situations.

Limited operational capacities need to be set aside in areas of cultural heritage and C&I in the field of journalist safety in ongoing conflict situations.

The Organization will need to spell out very concretely how its comparative advantage can be described and how it expects to ensure the necessary resources in order to be a credible partner in the fast-moving post-conflict situations. At this point, the Organization does not seem to have identified its policy role (related to its core mandate) in these situations.

One of its roles can be concrete reconciliation work between the Organization's core stakeholder groups (scientists, educators, artists) in post-conflict situations.

*Q.32: Do you have **specific suggestions for UNESCO's partnership** approaches that should be reflected in the 34 C/4?*

*Q.33: What kind of synergies would you see as essential to **get better and more effective partnerships**?*

*Q.34: Do you have proposals for **new partnerships** which UNESCO should initiate and pursue?*

See answers above in regard to the policy cycle. Each stage will need to scan the horizon (UN and in-country) to avoid duplication and seek synergies:

- i. Research should be carried out with UN research bodies such as UNU, UNRISD, regional commissions, etc (see ongoing UN Mandate Review initiated by UN Secretary-General in the context of the High-Level Panel).
- ii. Policy formulation must be done in consultation with other relevant sectoral UN agencies.
- iii. Advocacy with CSOs.

The “context maps” provided in the current C/5 documents are rather useless documents since they only list a disparate number of institutions, agencies, CSOs, research institutes and the like.

The Organization will much rather need to spell out precisely at the inception of each project (see proposal for project management bidding process above) what partnerships have been entered into and how these partnerships are formalized.

Instead of a long shopping list, it would be helpful to have a concrete set of partners and then also critically evaluate these partnerships at the end of each programme cycle.

Special attention must be paid to the UNESCO Chairs and UNITWIN networks, which should be the privileged source of expertise for the Secretariat. Chairs should be appointed for a limited period of time and only in accordance with the strategic objectives and derived research projects that will be agreed upon for mid-term strategy 33 C/4.

The Secretariat will need to provide better data stemming from the evaluation of the UNESCO Chairs programme and terminate dormant Chairs. Also, the overall management scheme for UNESCO Chairs will need to be simplified and most likely be linked to programme work in the policy networks each overarching strategic objective will create.

The Organization's policy research function can often more to be delegated to competent institutions, possibly by fostering global policy research networks on precise topics.

An important area of application is UNESCO's sectoral reports and the UNESCO World Report. Since the Organization does not have research capacity of its own, it should seriously consider contracting the research and write-up of such documents to competent institutions. The creation and effective involvement of scientific steering committees will be a key element to improve the programme delivery.

All too often, the production of relatively poor quality reports prepared by UNESCO still comes with costs that are largely out of proportion. We will need an evaluation and audit of current Reports and partnerships in order to fully assess the question.

The Organization will need to look into more efficient, more competent and more economical ways to produce its Reports.

Policy expertise that is contracted through UNESCO will need to be made more transparent:

- i. Consultant contracts should follow a public bidding process to ensure that the Organization actually obtains the necessary expertise it finances through its programme funds.
- ii. The lists of institutions contacted to submit proposals should be made public before the end of the bidding process.
- iii. Research results need to be made easily accessible to the larger policy community in expedient ways.
- iv. The Organization will need to ensure that policy research is contracted out to reputable individuals and institutions and needs to aim for a higher degree of geographic diversity in the consulting work commissioned.

*Q.35: What measures could be taken to draw effectively on the work and contributions of **category 2 centres** more effectively in the pursuit of the strategic programme objectives of UNESCO?*

Need to fit into one overall strategic framework with aims, which clearly link with those flowing from UNESCO and wider UN as a whole. They can have a major role in contributing to UNESCO's policy work.

*Q.36: What is your opinion with regard to the factors that could make the **Organization's information and communication activities** more effective and consequently afford it greater visibility?*

*Q.37: How could the Organization's **visibility be strengthened locally** by encouraging cooperation between the various bodies concerned? Can they make proposals that would lead to improvements in the way the Secretariat and national actors, including National Commissions, plan and intensify their cooperation in this field?*

Regain respectability and relevance within the UN system; once this is achieved, visibility will come automatically through good policy work.

The Organization will then still need to focus on a number of smaller technical details such as:

- one coherent communication strategy that is valid for and respected by the whole Organization;
- one single, central communication unit that does all press and communication work for the Organization (no more scattering across sectors and within sectors), as well as
- a reinforced and coherent web and print presence which needs to be applied throughout the Organization;
- gearing its communication efforts especially to the global policy community, less so to the general public in order to fulfil its role as a specialized agency;
- make proper use of ICTs in order to allow for an efficient and transparent way to communicate (especially conference reports and policy debates held by the Organization).

At this point, however, there is “little to report” on UNESCO and its poor media presence unfortunately echoes its relative irrelevance in the international system.

➤ **Cluster 5: Resources (for response by Member States only)**

*Q.38: Do you have suggestions which further measures could be introduced to ensure and strengthen a **coherent programming of all available resources, i.e. regular and extrabudgetary resources combined, around the approved strategic and programme priorities?***

First, UNESCO will need to grasp better its role as a specialized agency and consequently gain increased understanding of the logic behind its finances. The Organization’s regular budget in form of assessed contributions should be sufficient to carry out its regular programme. We suggest the following points for discussion in view of an extrabudgetary policy the Organization might want to adopt in the near future:

- i. A proper and integrated budget and programme planning process should allow for the actual costing of the proposed strategic policy objectives the Organization will set out in 33 C/4.
- ii. At this point it seems especially ill-conceived that the Organization enters into competition with other UN funds, programmes or agencies especially when it comes to running country-level programmes that are more of development than policy character.
- iii. We suggest an audit of all extrabudgetary programmes to date in order to assess the relevance of these contributions to the achievement of strategic objectives.
- iv. Special attention must be paid to the high transaction costs that extrabudgetary projects burden onto UNESCO. Since the Organization as a specialized agency is not set up to take in large amounts of funding in order to carry out even larger programmes, it should limit extrabudgetary fundraising activities to a very small, limited number of projects that directly derive from existing regular programme projects.
- v. No new extrabudgetary projects should be started unless they are an extension, reinforcement or continuation of positively assessed existing regular programme projects.
- vi. Extrabudgetary should thus only be conceived as “matching funds” to existing regular budget programmes. Especially in the case of “priority projects”, the Organization will need to ensure proper initial funding from its regular budget to underline the actual priority of such proposals.
- vii. Extrabudgetary projects need to be evaluated on a regular basis and the governing bodies need to be able to carry out their oversight function in similar ways when it comes to regular and extrabudgetary projects.
- viii. Since it is unlikely that the regular budget level will rise over the short term, it is therefore quite necessary for the Organization to assess its current spending and make necessary reallocations within the existing limits to attain fully its regular programme objectives.

Q.39: Do you prefer that the budget envelope for the 34 C/5 be based on

- (a) zero nominal growth,*
- (b) zero real growth, or*
- (c) real growth – and if so, how much?*

Zero Nominal Growth for now.

But a hugely increased budget would be justified for a top-class organisation, really helping meet world challenges comprehensively. Increases will, however, have to be justified by considerable improvements in performance.