

At first glance this example may seem to indicate a highly complex procedure. It may be questioned, for example, whether the Plan itself should actually indicate relative priorities at the programme action level since this could perhaps be done more effectively during the development of each biennial programme and budget. But it is not a complex procedure and has several advantages over the hypotheses offered by the General Conference and the options outlined in 21C/4:

- a) It requires priority setting and changes in priorities without the assumption that resources will grow at a given rate;
- b) It allows for priority setting at each level where independent judgements about the relative importance of elements at that level can and should be made;
- c) It allows for competition among centres of responsibility within the Organization for the limited resources at each level, assuming that these centres do not correspond with the levels, that is, no sectoral problems or objectives;
- d) It provides measures of the degree of concentration or dispersion of resources at all levels;
- e) It permits indication of the termination or introduction of themes, targets and programme actions during the Plan period;
- f) While it does not set up expectations of increases in resources, it allows for this possibility without the implication of shifts in priorities.

Other Suggestions

QUESTION 12: Apart from the foregoing questions, you may include any further suggestions and recommendations which you may wish to make as a contribution to the preparation of the Medium-Term Plan for 1984-1989.

No other suggestions are presented here for consideration since the substantive questions themselves were seen as the most strategic points at which to introduce such suggestions. Further suggestions that arose at the consultative meeting could be listed here or incorporated in responses to other questions where appropriate.

Ottawa
April 22, 1981