

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?