

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.