

Should the proposed context map be developed at the level of the major programme? Or at programme or subprogramme level? Should it also be developed for and integrated into regional and subregional strategies and programmes?

III. STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION OF DOCUMENT 32 C/5

20. After the General Conference, considerable efforts have been made by the Secretariat to revisit the formulation of the expected results included in draft document 31 C/5, aligning them better with the strategies, priorities and planned activities.

Are you satisfied with the presentation and formulation of the revised expected results at the Main Line of Action level as they appear in the Approved Programme and Budget for 2002-2003 (31 C/5 Approved)? Are there areas for improvement? Where and how?

Do you, in general, consider the structure of document 31 C/5 – i.e. five major programmes, with one principal priority and other priorities as well as assigned cross-cutting projects – satisfactory? Would you propose structural changes in general or pertaining to major programme presentation, and if so, which?

Would you like to see a more explicit designation and presentation of flagship projects in document 32 C/5?

21. The application of results-based programming and budgeting, management and monitoring calls for new methodological tools; allowing both more flexibility in the choice of modalities and forms of actions and a greater precision in the definition and assessment of results. In this context, the new format and calendar of preparation of the C/3 document (Report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization) should allow the governing bodies to have at their disposal, at an earlier time than hitherto, the necessary elements of assessment to facilitate informed decision-making. The progressive development and refinement of SISTER comprising information on regular and extrabudgetary programme resources – which will soon be accessible at the Main Line of Action level to National Commissions and Member States – also constitute an important step in enhancing a transparent implementation and monitoring of the programme.

Are evaluations referred to in the programme and budget sufficiently related to past results? What can be done better in the future?