

doc
CA1
EA
81E81
ENG

DOCS

CA1 EA 81E81 ENG

External Affairs background paper
on Unesco's second medium-term
plan. --

43260822

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DEC 4 1991

Background paper on Unesco's
Second Medium-Term PlanRETURN TO DEPARTMENTAL LIBRARY
RETOURNER A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE DU MINISTEREIntroduction

It is useful to see the present consultation by the Director-General on the preparation of Unesco's Second Medium-Term Plan in the broader context of the planning and programming process in the Organization.

Unesco's programme is planned on a biennial basis with the General Conference at each of its biennial sessions approving the programme and budget (the C/5 series of documents) for the next two years. In general there has been a great deal of continuity in Unesco's programme with some activities having been pursued for more than two decades. From the early years the General Conference showed an interest in the future programme of the Organization, beyond the next two years, and began to adopt resolutions with the intent of influencing the substance and direction of the biennial programme and budget that would be submitted at its next session two years hence. When, in the early sixties, it became apparent that some longer term planning framework was needed, the General Conference requested the Director-General to propose such a framework for its consideration. These longer term planning documents (the C/4 series) eventually evolved into the Medium-Term Plan, the first of which was approved in 1976 in Nairobi for 1977-1982 (19C/4), now extended to 1983. The first Plan was still seen as experimental, flexible and open to modification at each session of the General Conference during its period. Some modifications were introduced at the 20th session of the General Conference in 1978 (20C/4), but at the 21st session in 1980, attention was already focused on the preparation of the second Medium-Term Plan.

The purposes that the Medium-Term Plan is expected to serve in the Organization have been articulated by the General Conference and the Director-General:

- 1) To provide a conceptual link between the general purposes of Unesco as defined in its Constitution and its programme;
- 2) To provide to the General Conference a more effective way of influencing the future directions of Unesco's programme;
- 3) To provide greater concentration and coherence to the programme of the Organization as a whole;
- 4) To facilitate and achieve greater interdisciplinarity and integration across the various sectors in the programme of the Organization;

- 5) To provide a conceptual framework for the systematic evaluation of the programme of the Organization.

The extent to which the first Medium-Term Plan has served these purposes well has not been systematically assessed as a basis for possible improvements in the next plan. A preliminary study, sponsored by the Canadian Commission for Unesco, came to the tentative conclusion that the first Plan was not very effective in serving these purposes. This is the only independent, external assessment made so far, but it was not available in time to influence discussions at the 21st session of the General Conference in Belgrade last year. It has now been mailed to all National Commissions of Member States and could conceivably have some influence on the current consultation.

Internally to Unesco, the Director-General offered a brief assessment of the first Plan in the preliminary discussion document on the second Plan (21C/4, Part II), where the impression given was that the Plan had been satisfactory and that no major changes in the basic concept were needed. He did, however, raise questions about the nature and number of the objectives. The General Conference went along with this favourable assessment and the general resolution on the second Medium-Term Plan (21C/Resolution 100) on the whole did nothing more than reaffirm the principles, criteria, concerns and guidelines articulated by the General Conference at its sessions during the seventies. The cards are therefore stacked in favour of a great degree of continuity between the first and second Medium-Term Plans, reinforcing the general inertia of larger organizations that make significant departures from established patterns difficult.

The present consultation, seen in the context of the overall process of the preparation of the second Medium-Term Plan reinforces this impression. The 20th session of the General Conference (1978) asked the Director-General to consult with Member States in the preparation of a preliminary document on the second Medium-Term Plan that would outline the issues to be addressed in the preparation of the Plan, for consideration of its 21st session. That consultation did not take place. The document 21C/4 was prepared entirely by the Secretariat and became available only a few weeks before the start of the 21st session last September. Detailed discussion of the document took place in the various commissions and on the basis of these discussions, a working group produced a draft resolution, which was approved in the plenary session (21C/Resolution 100 - Annex).

The present consultation will therefore be the only opportunity for Member States to make an input into the preparation of the second Plan. On the basis of an analysis of the

responses received, the Plan will be drafted and, after consideration by the Executive Board in the Spring of 1982, it will be submitted to an extraordinary session of the General Conference in October 1982. The draft Plan will be available some months before the extraordinary session and further consultations within Member States will be possible as part of the preparatoin of delegations for the session.

The questionnaire used in the present consultation is a frustrating document since it does not provide opportunities to deal with the specifics of the Plan. The questions are phrased at such a general level and are so diffuse that wide divergence in responses can be expected. The questionnaire stays at the level of world problems, action to be taken, contributions to their solution, lines of emphasis and constraints. There are no references to objectives, themes, targets, programme actions -- the concepts used to structure the plan and to specify its content. While the responses to the questionnaire could no doubt be translated into these Plan components, it will be a formidable task that will leave a wide margin of discretion to the Secretariat.

This type of questionnaire would have been appropriate and useful a decade ago when the first attempt to define world problems was made, which resulted in document 16C/4, intended as a long-term outline plan. The analysis of world problems, on which the questionnaire focuses, has not changed substantially in the whole series of planning documents from 18C/4 to 21C/4. In contrast, the questionnaire used in the consultation during the preparation of the first Medium-Term Plan (19C/4) was a detailed document, providing opportunities for structured responses. Instead, this questionnaire seems to be based on the assumption that the second Plan can be developed from scratch, with minimal reference to the present Plan and programme.

These considerations have to be kept in mind when responses to the questionnaire are prepared. The challenge is to formulate responses in such a way that they are most likely to influence the definition and selection of objectives, themes, targets and programme actions. It does not seem very likely that the world problems to which Unesco's programme will be oriented in the second Medium-Term Plan will be perceived significantly differently as a result of this consultation. But the questions could be answered by expressing views on the more specific components of the Plan where there is a need for change and where Canada's views could conceivably have an impact.

The main purpose of this paper is to provide background information and analysis that may be useful in developing responses to the questions in the questionnaire. Each question will be dealt with in the following way: Relevant

background information will be summarized to provide a more specific context within which responses can be considered. Some considerations that might have a bearing on possible responses to the question will be suggested.' And a range of possible responses or elements of responses will be offered for consideration by the meeting. In most cases these responses could be seen as a range of options; the intent of the paper is to facilitate a considered response without prejudging matters. In some cases several questions will be grouped and discussed together for greater coherence and background material will not always be strictly separated for considerations.

General Problems

QUESTION 1: In your view, what are the main problems which face the world today and which, by their probable development between now and the end of the century and more particularly over the next decade, seem to you likely to have major impact on the future of societies, on the satisfaction of the aspirations and needs of peoples and of individuals, and on the achievement of "a decent life in the future" and "further social progress"?

Background:

The problem orientation in Unesco's planning dates from the 17th session (1972) when the General Conference set aside the draft plan (17C/4) and asked the Director-General to develop a framework for medium-term planning based on an analysis of the major world problems in the fields of the Organization's competence. The resulting document (18C/4) identified four inter-related problem areas: human rights and peace, advancement of knowledge, development, and harmony between man and environment. Within these four areas 12 problems were identified ranging from human rights and peace to such instrumentalities as concepts and methodologies. They were clearly not formulated on comparable levels of generality, nor with reference to comparable aspects of the world.

The 18th session of the General Conference accepted the definition of problem areas and reduced the number of problems from 12 to 10, mainly by redefining and combining some. But the unevenness of levels of generality and reference remained in the 10 problems which became the basis of the first Medium-Term Plan (19C/4). The definition and analysis of world problems in 19C/4, 20C/4 and 21C/4 have not changed substantially and it seems unlikely that the responses to this question will result in a major shift in the analysis contained in the introduction to 21C/4.

Considerations:

It should be noted that this question makes no reference to Unesco's fields of competence. There is a subtle difference between referring to world problems in Unesco's fields of competence and referring to all world problems and then asking what role Unesco can play in the solution of these problems through contributions in its fields of competence. While the latter approach seems sensible enough, this subtle difference could elicit responses that could potentially add several world problems to Unesco's list and disperse the Organization's efforts even further.

One of the main considerations in responding to this question might, therefore, be how the response could contribute to the reduction of the number of world problems Unesco will address in the 1980's as compared to the 1970's and hence to reduce dispersion of effort and facilitate greater concentration.

One way of approaching this problem is to refer not only to Unesco's fields of competence - education, science, social science, culture, communication - but also to its purposes as defined in its Constitution - contributing to peace and security; furthering universal respect for justice, the rule of law and human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the common welfare of mankind. Another way is to avoid definitions of world problems that fall more directly within the mandate of other United Nations specialized agencies, for example, the population explosion, the environment, industrialization and labour problems such as unemployment.

It should be noted that Member States are not consulted on the status of the 10 problems towards which the first Medium-Term Plan was oriented. Were these problems appropriately defined? Could some of them be combined and others eliminated to reduce the number of problems addressed by the programme of Unesco? The generality of this question will tend to encourage responses that reaffirm the problem statements in the first Plan and to add others. Consideration should, therefore, be given to the most effective way of counteracting this tendency.

Responses:

It might be prudent first to suggest certain criteria for the selection of world problems that Unesco should address in the 1980's. The following criteria, for example, are implied in the considerations suggested above:

The Organization should address only problems that:

- a) directly relate to or derive from its purposes as defined in its Constitution;
- b) are not currently a main preoccupation or mandate of another U.N. specialized agency;
- c) clearly require contributions from all of Unesco's fields of competence in the search for solutions;
- d) are global in scope and are problems that people and societies face, rather than being defined in terms of a particular sector such as education or science and technology, for example.

Application of these criteria would suggest the following as world problems that Unesco's programme should address in the 1980's:

1. The achievement of peace and security, including disarmament;
2. The realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms;
3. The achievement of justice and the rule of law at both national and international levels;
4. The achievement of human-centred development;
5. The advancement of humankind in Unesco's fields of competence;
6. The building of a new world order based on human solidarity, interdependence and mutual interests.

All of these problems already feature in Unesco's programme in one form or another. The third one, while clearly deriving from a purpose defined in the Constitution has not received prominent attention in the last two decades. One does not need to present a detailed analysis of the political and economic situation in the world today to suggest that it is one of the major problems humanity faces.

Referring to these as "world problems" is somewhat of a misnomer: The actual definitions do not define problems in the negative sense but rather challenges or goals in the positive sense. This has been true of problem definition in Unesco from the start. Whether it would be prudent to suggest a change in terminology from "problems" to "goals", "purposes", or "challenges" is somewhat doubtful.

QUESTION 2: To illustrate this analysis, please indicate how these problems affect your country or your region. What impact do they, or might they have on, for example, the various sectors of activity, the living conditions of the population or social and cultural values and behaviour?

Background:

This question is probably intended to gain some insights into how the relevance of world problems to particular countries and their impacts on these countries are perceived by the Member States. This concern with relevance to the interests, problems and goals of Member States has been a consistent element in the General Conference's conception of medium term planning, and the programme itself, from the beginning. There is, of course, wide divergences in relevance among countries with greater degrees of convergence among developed, developing and socialist countries as groupings, and also within the various regions.

Considerations:

A detailed response to this question could become quite complex and elaborate, especially if it was answered separately for each world problem suggested in question 1. In

the case of Canada such an elaborate response does not seem called for since, first, Canada is one of the more advanced countries in terms of the extent to which these problems have serious national manifestations and, second, Canada does not normally expect direct tangible payoffs from its participation in Unesco in terms of domestic issues. Also, the level at which it is suggested that world problems be defined in response to question 1, does not require detailed illustrations of the sort sought in this question.

An integrated statement on the relevance of these problems to Canada would probably suffice and would have the added advantage of not unintentionally adding to the volume of the resulting planning document.

If a more detailed response was preferred, it could probably best be generated during discussions at the consultative meeting where various regional perspectives on the impact of the problems on Canada could be articulated and eventually incorporated in such a response.

Response:

Canada is concerned with these world problems both with respect to their impacts on and relevance to the people of Canada at the national level and as a member state of the international community. As one of the more privileged countries, it is more concerned with progress towards solution of these problems on the international level, particularly in less privileged countries, than with direct benefits at the national level. Peace, security and disarmament have long been high priority foreign policy objectives of Canada; the consequences of failure to make progress in this area will be equally devastating to people everywhere. Canada is constitutionally committed to the realization of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of its culturally, ethnically, linguistically and regionally diverse population and is concerned about the continuing violation of these fundamental principles of human society in other parts of the world, as well as within its own borders. The achievement of a just society and the rule of just laws go beyond human rights and freedoms and Canada continues to work towards greater justice in law and reality nationally; this problem is also considered one of the main factors in the current world crisis. While Canada is one of the more developed societies, it continues to suffer from both maldevelopment and underdevelopment; the achievement of human-centred development is vital for the future well-being of industrial and developing societies alike. Many of the problems that plague the world today -- hunger, malnutrition, poverty, destitution and oppression -- can be related to a gap or lack in advancement of humanity in education, science and technology (including, and perhaps

particularly in social science and technology), culture and communication. Progress in these fields will deal with the causes rather than the symptoms and will be more effective in the long run than direct attacks on these problems, which should also be continued (by the appropriate agencies) to relieve human misery. Canada is well aware that the changes that are required in the international system, particularly progress towards a new world order based on human solidarity, interdependence and mutual interests, will require major adjustments in Canada and other industrial societies. What these adjustments will be and how they can be anticipated and work out, need urgent study at both national and international levels. But Canada also realizes that it is ultimately in the best interest of everyone everywhere that significant progress towards the solution of this fundamental problem in the evolution of human society be made in this decade.

Role and Missions of Unesco

QUESTION 3: What do you conceive to be Unesco's role in the study and elucidation of these problems and in raising the awareness of those in authority and the population at large?

QUESTION 4: What lines of emphasis do you think should be given to the efforts to find solutions to these problems, taking into account recent developments in international affairs?

QUESTION 10:

(a) In the light of your comments and suggestions above, what overall idea does your country or Organization have on Unesco's role and its main missions during the eighties?

(b) In paragraph 2 of 21C/Resolution 100, the General Conference:

"Considers that the main forms Unesco's actions should take in contributing to the solution of global problems might be the following:

- (a) encouraging research, reflection and intellectual and scientific co-operation;
- (b) familiarizing the general public throughout the world with the nature of these problems in order to make the world community conscious of their importance and urgency;
- (c) promoting the dissemination of knowledge and exchanges of experience;
- (d) contributing to the framing of policies and strategies with a view to finding practical solutions to these problems;

- (e) implementing action-oriented programmes, with a view to development and in favour of the developing countries in particular".

With regard to the problems of priority areas which you have identified in replying to the previous questions, do you have any suggestions to make concerning the forms which Unesco's action should take during the eighties?

Background:

It should be fairly clear that these three questions are essentially the same. Question 3 deals with only part of question 10 (10(b) a) and b)). Question 4 does not specifically refer to Unesco and it is not clear what is meant by "lines of emphasis." To the extent that it refers to actions Unesco can take, it will adequately be covered by a response to Question 10.

The forms of actions suggested by the General Conference in paragraph 2 of 21C/Resolution 100 have been reiterated before and represent some international consensus on what Unesco should be doing.

Considerations:

It is suggested that the responses to these questions be made with reference to the role of Unesco, that is, that responses to questions 3 and 4 be referred to question 10. But it is suggested that the response be given immediately following the questions on world problems, since it is logically the next step to consider what Unesco could do in relation to these problems. The responses to these questions provide an opportunity to say something about the objectives that the Organization should set for itself in the second Medium-Term Plan. The language used in defining the forms of action (in Question 10) is reminiscent of the way in which objectives were formulated in the first Medium-Term Plan.

Since one of the concerns about the first Medium-Term Plan was that there were too many objectives, it would be useful to think of ways in which the number of objectives could be reduced. A reduction in the number of world problems addressed has already been suggested. Another suggestion might be to select a limited number of objectives with respect to each world problem that would indicate what the Organization plans to do in relation to that problem. If the assumption is made, as it is in paragraph 2 of 21C/Resolution 100, that the same forms of action would be pursued in relation to each of the global problems, it would be useful to suggest that the forms of action indeed be considered the objectives of the Organization. The logical structure of the plan and programme of Unesco could then be fairly simple and could be represented by a matrix of the world problems and the objectives with respect to them:

World Problems

Objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.						
2.						
3.						
4.						
5.						

Another consideration might be whether the order in which the forms of action are listed in paragraph 2 is the proper order of priority that Unesco should give to these actions or objectives. The last one, (e), will have to be rephrased to refer to all world problems, not just to development, and in that event, might deserve a higher place, perhaps second, in the order of priority.

In addition to the forms of action, Unesco's role and mission should also be defined in terms of the way in which it would do things, or the modes of action. In the first Medium-Term Plan these modes of action were sometimes specified in a section on the "principles of action" that would apply in the pursuit of an objective. There was a great deal of variety and divergence in the content of these sections, and it would be helpful to suggest that in the development of the second Medium-Term Plan a certain set of principles of action or modes of action be applied to all objectives with respect to all world problems. The following are some of the principles of action that have been proposed in the past and that are still valid for Unesco's programme in the 1980's. Unesco should

1. act as a catalyst, a stimulator of action by others to achieve the maximum multiplier effect for its limited resources;
2. seek the collaboration of institutions at all levels in the execution of its programmes;
3. facilitate cooperation among institutions at all levels by providing frameworks and assisting them in networking;
4. provide guidelines and encourage action along these lines by others rather than do everything itself;
5. respect the autonomy of institutions and seek to strengthen their capacities for self-reliance and self-determination through its actions.

Responses:

1. Suggest that a limited set of objectives, be defined with respect to each world problem.
2. Suggest that objectives be defined in terms of the forms of action the Organization will pursue and that an order of priority be established among them.
3. Suggest that a limited set of principles of action be adopted that will be applied in the pursuit of each objective in relation to each world problem.

The Fields of Competence of Unesco

Questions 5 - 9 all deal with Unesco's fields of competence and it is suggested that they be considered together to avoid duplication and redundancy.

QUESTION 5: What contribution do you consider could be made, in the fields of education, science, culture and communication, to the devising and application of solutions to these problems? Your reply might be based on an analysis of action being taken or under consideration in each of these areas, and of the line being followed in the policies applicable thereto:

QUESTION 6: Please indicate the constraints that these problems and their development entail, particularly in your country or region, in Unesco's fields of competence in respect of the development of education, progress in scientific research, including research in the social sciences, cultural development and the development of communication and information systems.

QUESTION 7: Please indicate also, for each of Unesco's particular fields of competence, what are the major problems and the ones which appear likely to be of crucial importance between now and the end of the century?

QUESTION 8: In the light of your replies to questions 5, 6 and 7 above, what action do you think should be taken and what policies should be pursued, nationally and at the level of regional and international co-operation, in Unesco's fields of competence?

QUESTION 9: On the basis of your comments in reply to questions 1 to 8, and in the light of your own experience, please give such detailed observations and suggestions as seem to you to be called for by the considerations contained in the Annex to 21C/Resolution 100, highlighting those that relate to aspects of the Organization's future action which you consider should be given priority and suggesting, where appropriate, priorities other than those which emerge from that Annex.

Background and Considerations:

Questions 5 and 6 are general and ask about the contribution Unesco's fields of competence can make to the solution of the world problems and what constraints the problems represent for development of these fields. Tomes have been written on these subjects and the first Medium-Term Plan contains voluminous analyses of just these relations. The contributions of education and science and technology to development have been analysed exhaustively both within Unesco and by other agencies in the U.N. system. The constraints that the arms race, underdevelopment and violations of human rights and freedoms pose to developments in science and technology, education, communication, have been equally well documented. Can anything be contributed that is fresh and may lead to new insights and actions?

The 21st session of the General Conference suggested that the planning document be brief and succinct. There was a general consensus that the elaborate analyses that characterized the first Plan could be condensed, if not dispensed with. Elaborate answers to these two questions, dealing with each of Unesco's fields of competence, might be construed by the Secretariat as an interest on the part of Member States in more elaborate analyses in the second Plan.

Question 7 asks for the identification of specific problems within each of the fields of competence. This question will probably be of interest to Member States who look to Unesco for assistance in developing their capacities in these fields, particularly developing countries. A member state in Canada's position would probably want to ask: Are there any important problems that Unesco has neglected in the past and are any of the problems it addressed in the first Plan no longer of sufficiently high priority to be included in the second Plan? Given the concern with greater concentration in the programme that Canada, along with other Member States and the General Conference, has expressed in the past, a straight-forward response to this question might not be advisable because it is likely to result in the identification of more specific problems, instead of in the reduction of their number.

Question 8 remains general in its request for suggestions of actions to be taken and policies pursued at the national, regional and international levels, presumably by Member States, regional bodies and international agencies. A good example of the kind of analysis that is requested here would be the World Bank's sectoral papers, particularly the one on education. Question 9 finally comes down to focus on Unesco and refers to the annex of 21C/Resolution 100, which contains statements developed in the commissions, which dealt with the different fields of competence at the 21st session. In the interest of giving some specific guidance to Unesco in the preparation of the second Plan, this would be a good starting

point from which to suggest priorities in each of the fields of competence. But credible responses to this whole range of questions would be a mammoth task. One possible approach is to provide answers that would reinforce the policy concerns that Canada has repeatedly expressed over the years with the sectoral programmes, such as the need for greater coherence and concentration, greater interdisciplinarity and more collaboration with and networking of institutions.

In any event, it would be presumptuous for any individual to attempt to suggest specific responses to these questions for all Unesco's fields of competence. Most of the content of the responses to these questions dealing with the different fields of competence will probably be generated by the Canadian Commission for Unesco in its consultations with the professional communities and others.

There are, however, some concerns with Unesco's programme, as noted above, that cut across the various fields of competence, as reflected in the statements in the annex. Some of these have already been noted in the discussion of principles of action under questions 3, 4 and 10. It might be suggested that in each of Unesco's fields of competence the second Plan should be designed to ensure that each sectoral programme

- a) gives priority to the special contributions that field of competence will be expected to make to the world problems selected;
- b) adopts an integrative approach in all its actions, with emphasis on the development of effective interdisciplinarity, both within the sector and in relation with others;
- c) develops a coherent programme with concentration on a few priority areas through major projects and international programmes;
- d) seeks to assist in building up indigenous capacities through training, infrastructure and institution building in the field of competence in developing countries, through programmes oriented to problems and priorities determined in the country or region in relation to the world problems selected;
- e) makes collaboration with institutions at all levels and the fostering of international cooperation through networking and linking a major mode of action;
- f) focuses on those technical and substantive aspects of the field of competence where Unesco can make the most effective contribution to the development of the field;
- g) seeks to contribute to the development of more effective applications and utilization of the field of competence in relation to the world problems by encouraging greater communication between specialists in the field, policy makers and the general public.

These principles of programme organization and execution have direct implications for the structure of the second Medium-Term Plan at the objective, theme and target levels, which are not included in the questionnaire, but where the real weaknesses of the first Plan lay. They would have implications for the way these elements are formulated as well as the number that are included in the Plan. For example, one implication would be that each sector would address fewer objectives and themes than in the first Plan and that there would be no specifically sectoral objectives as there were in the first Plan. Also, since targets could not be defined only in qualitative terms, quantitative indicators of the elements listed above could be incorporated in the targets.

Responses:

Specific responses with respect to the sectors or fields of competence of Unesco could be generated at the consultative meeting, but would probably mostly emerge in the consultations of the Canadian Commission for Unesco with the relevant professional communities and others.

The general concerns about the sectoral programmes discussed above in terms of principles of programme execution and organization, or such modifications as are indicated, could be included in the responses if considered appropriate.

Resource Indications

QUESTION 11: The Preliminary Report of the Director-General on the Medium-Term Plan for 1984-1989 (document 21C/4) submitted to the twenty-first session of the General Conference included, in its Part II, a section devoted to resource indications (paragraphs 46 to 49) which is summarized in a table entitled "Alternative Resource Indications".

In its 21C/Resolution 100, the General Conference devoted paragraph 4, to this question; the Conference therein:

"Invites the Director-General, in consultation with Member States and the Executive Board, to make an in-depth study of the arrangements for presenting resource indications in the next Medium-Term Plan, by examining, inter alia, the following hypotheses:

- (a) that, to give an idea of the distribution of resources, the Plan should indicate the relative importance attached to its various elements;
- (b) that, with a view to highlighting priorities, the Plan should include resource indications expressed in the form of biennial growth rates in real terms.

Which of these two alternatives do you think it desirable to choose, and why? Do you think it preferable to adopt another solution?

Background:

The question of resource indications in the Medium-Term Plan has been the subject of some controversy and differences of opinion. The first Medium-Term Plan did contain resource indications expressed in terms of differential biennial growth rates for objectives. The problem arose because these indications, while not constituting commitments on the part of Member States, tended to become self-fulfilling prophecies: actual growth tended to match or exceed these indications. While there is agreement that resource indications are useful in that they provide some idea of the relative priorities in terms of which the Organization's total resources will be distributed, there is reluctance to include such indications that tend to become de facto commitments.

At the 21st session of the General Conference Member States were divided on this issue. Some, mostly developed countries, preferred not to have any resource indications in the second Plan itself, leaving resource allocations to be decided in each biennial programme and budget; others, mainly developing and socialist countries, wanted resource indications in the Plan, but did not agree on what method should be used. Hence the paragraph in 21C/Resolution 100 quoted in this question, inviting the Director-General to make an indepth study of the matter.

Considerations:

The two alternative hypotheses offered in the paragraph reflect some of the differences of opinion that surfaced in the General Conference. Alternative a) would be very limited in that it would only indicate relative priorities at the beginning of the Plan period. It implies either an assumption that these priorities will remain the same for the entire planning period, whatever the growth rate in the total resources of the Organization, or an assumption that changes in these priorities will be decided at the time when resources are allocated in each successive biennial programme and budget, depending on the overall growth rate of resources. While the second assumption may seem reasonable, it still does not provide a basis for decisions about changes in priorities that are not based on expectations that resources will increase.

Canada, along with most western countries, has consistently opposed increases in Unesco's budget during the first Medium-Term Plan. It is mainly in consistency with this policy position that the hypothesis (b) would be considered unacceptable, even though it has the advantage of indicating changes in priorities during the Plan period. Assuming that this

policy stance will remain valid during the second Medium-Term Plan period, what positions should Canada take in responding to this question?

Responses:

One option would be to present the arguments against any resource indications in the Plan. This is unlikely to be a popular and successful strategy.

A second option would be to present the arguments in favour of hypothesis (a), that is, for only base period indications of the distribution of resources to indicate relative priorities at the outset, leaving any changes in priorities to be decided at each session of the General Conference during the Plan period when it approves the programme and budget.

The weakness of this option is that it still does not make a statement against the anticipation of increases in the budget during the Plan period and does not encourage priority changes in terms of the reallocation of existing resources rather than the anticipation of increases.

A third option that would be more consistent with Canada's position is that the following resource indications should be included in the second Medium-Term Plan:

- a) The initial relative priorities to be indicated by the distribution of resources at the beginning of the planning period in both constant dollars and percentages at the levels of (i) the world problems addressed by the Plan; (ii) the objectives oriented to the world problems; (iii) the themes into which each objective is divided; (iv) the targets established for each theme (assuming more than one target per theme); and the programme actions aimed at each target (assuming more than one).
- b) Within each of levels (i) world problems, (ii) objectives, (iii) themes, (iv) targets and (v) programme actions, relative priorities will also be expressed by indications of resources to be allocated to each element as a percentage of the resources designated for that level.
- c) The changes proposed in relative priorities during the planning period to be indicated by giving for each level (as in (b) above) the distribution in percentage terms of the same resources in each of the subsequent two biennial periods at all five levels.

The following illustration of the resulting resource indications, using arbitrary figures, may be helpful. A total resource budget of U.S. \$200 million is assumed for the base period; it is further assumed that all elements at all levels are listed in order of priority and that the highest priorities will make increasing claims on resources during the Plan period. Resource indications are first given at the total programme level and then at each level down for only the highest priority element.

a) Total Programme Resources: U.S. \$200 m = 100%
(assuming 6 world problems addressed)

	Base	2nd Biennium	3rd Biennium
World Problem I	25	26	27
World Problem II	20	20	21
World Problem III	18	18	18
World Problem IV	15	17	19
World Problem V	12	11	10
World Problem VI	10	8	5
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

b) World Problem I: U.S. \$50 m = 100%
(assuming 4 objectives)

	Base	2nd Biennium	3rd Biennium
Objective I.A	40	41	42
Objective I.B	30	27	25
Objective I.C	20	23	25
Objective I.D	10	9	8
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

c) Objective I.A: Base: U.S. \$10 m = 100%
(assuming 4 themes)

	Base	2nd Biennium	3rd Biennium
Theme I.A.1	35	37	40
Theme I.A.2	30	30	30
Theme I.A.3	25	23	20
Theme I.A.4	10	10	10
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

d) Theme I.A.1: Base: U.S. \$3.5 m = 100%
(assuming 5 targets)

	Base	2nd Biennium	3rd Biennium
Target I.A.1.(a)	35	37	40
Target I.A.1.(b)	30	33	35
Target I.A.1.(c)	20	15	15
Target I.A.1.(d)	15	10	0
Target I.A.1.(e)	0	5	10
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

e) Target I.A.1 (a): Base: U.S. \$1.2 m = 100%
(assuming 3 programme actions)

	Base	2nd Biennium	3rd Biennium
Programme Action I.A.1.(a)(i)	50	60	70
Programme Action I.A.1.(a)(ii)	30	30	30
Programme Action I.A.1.(a)(iii)	20	10	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

The resource indications resulting from these priority setting decisions at each level can be easily converted into percentages of total resources to indicate relative overall priorities. In the following table the summary figures for only the highest priority elements are provided as an illustration:

Level	Base Period Constant U.S. \$ (millions)	1st Biennium		2nd Biennium		3rd Biennium	
		% of Total Res.	% of Res. at each Level	% of Total Res.	% of Res. at each Level	% of Total Res.	% of Res. at each Level
Total	200	100	-	-	-	-	-
World Problem I	50	25	25	26	26	27	27
Objective I.A.	20	10	40	10.7	41	11.3	42
Theme I.A.1	7	3.5	35	4.0	37	4.5	40
Target I.A.1.(a)	2.4	1.2	35	1.5	37	1.8	40
Programme Action I.A.1.(a)(i)	1.2	0.6	50	0.9	60	1.3	70

--- . ---

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

3 5036 20071708 3

DUE DATE

DOCS
CA1 EA 81E81 ENG
External Affairs background paper
on Unesco's second medium-term
plan. --
43260822

60984 81800