



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Executive Board
Hundred and eighty-second session

182 EX/24

PARIS, 3 August 2009
Original: English

Item 24 of the provisional agenda

**REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
ON EVALUATIONS COMPLETED IN 2009 AND PRELIMINARY SCENARIOS
FOR AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF UNESCO**

SUMMARY

In accordance with 181 EX/Decision 19, the Director-General hereby submits a short report on three evaluations completed in 2009, together with his comments, and presents possible preliminary scenarios for a comprehensive, external evaluation of UNESCO. All evaluation reports are published on UNESDOC and available on IOS's website.

This document has administrative and financial implications with respect to conducting a comprehensive, external evaluation (see Part II).

Action expected of the Executive Board: proposed decision in paragraph 16.

BACKGROUND

1. At its 181st session, the Executive Board reiterated that the Director-General should continue to report periodically on evaluations completed.¹ Three evaluations are presented to the Board pursuant to this decision in Part I of this paper. In the same decision, the Executive Board also invited the Director-General to present possible preliminary scenarios, including the financial implications, for a comprehensive external evaluation of UNESCO. These scenarios are contained in Part II of this document.

PART I – PRESENTATION OF EVALUATIONS

¹ 181 EX/Decision 19.

Evaluation of Strategic Programme Objectives 1 and 2 (Education Sector)

Brief description and background of the activities evaluated
SPO1 calls for “strengthening global lead and coordination role for EFA and providing support to national leadership in favour of EFA”. SPO2 calls for “developing policies, capacities and tools for quality education for all and lifelong learning as well as promoting education for sustainable development”.
Budget
Regular programme (RP) resources in support of SPOs 1 & 2 total \$108.5 million for 2008-2009 (including the \$17.3 million RP contribution to Education Institutes and Centres) in which \$50.8 million are allocated for activities and \$57.7 million for staff. The seven thematic areas covered in this evaluation represent \$18 million (including Institutes and Centres) or around one third of the Sector’s RP activities budget and an estimated \$75 million of extrabudgetary activities (representing some 60% of all ED extrabudgetary activities in the biennium).
This evaluation
This evaluation was programmed in the 34 C/5 Evaluation Plan to assess progress towards achieving the expected outcomes of SPOs 1 & 2 and how progress might be enhanced through improving programme policy, design and delivery. It focused on the following thematic areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPO1: UNESCO’s global coordination role for EFA, UNLD, and DESD; and • SPO2: The provision of technical assistance and capacity-building at country level in the areas of literacy, teacher education, technical and vocational education, and sector-wide policy and planning. <p>The evaluation was conducted by a five-person team from New Zealand and France at a cost of \$116,900.</p>

Findings and conclusions	Recommendations
SPO1: Strengthening UNESCO’s global lead and coordination role for EFA and providing support to national leadership	
Achievements: UNESCO’s principal comparative advantage lies in its designated lead role in education, its reputation as an “honest broker” and its ability to bring together key stakeholders at the international level. UNESCO has been successful in generating greater awareness within the international community of the challenges of achieving EFA goals and, to a lesser extent, the objectives of the UNLD and DESD. UNESCO has made progress in building and maintaining political commitment. It is hoped that these achievements will translate into future financial commitments.	
Challenge: It remains difficult to engage United Nations partner agencies to actively support the two United Nations Decades and, to some extent, the EFA agenda.	Seek a more participatory process in identifying the comparative advantages and value-added of key United Nations partner agencies. Priority should be given to identifying synergies, joint activities and making more effective use of combined resources.
Challenge: It remains unclear what successful global coordination and leadership looks like. The absence of a clear definition and specific objectives for UNESCO’s global coordination and leadership roles inhibits critical analysis of the most appropriate modalities.	Set clearer, more specific and measurable expected outcomes and responsibilities for UNESCO’s global coordination role of the EFA agenda and two United Nations Decades. Strategically review the overall approach to global coordination and, specifically, which modalities will most effectively deliver the desired outcomes.
Challenge: The ED Sector and wider UNESCO family have not realized the full potential of available resources (financial and intellectual). With some exceptions, different parts of UNESCO tend to compete for resources rather than work together towards overarching priorities.	Continue efforts to reorient resources within the ED Sector towards the strategic priority areas of UNESCO and the United Nations. Build capability in the regional bureaux and institutes and ensure the field network has common education priorities.

Findings and conclusions	Recommendations
SPO2: Developing policies, capacities and tools for quality education for all and lifelong learning as well as promoting education for sustainable development	
Achievements:	
<p>The ED Sector has made progress in defining its areas of comparative advantage, sharpening its strategic focus, and concentrating its efforts on a more manageable number of activities. There are many examples of technical assistance and capacity-building efforts, particularly supporting countries to develop and implement education strategies and plans, which have contributed to improved outcomes at country level. Examples of good practices were found in all focus areas for this evaluation, particularly in the areas of literacy and sector-wide policy and planning. The Cap-EFA scheme has given much-needed impetus and focus to capacity-building efforts in literacy and teacher education.</p>	
<p>Challenge: The demands on UNESCO to provide country-level technical assistance and capacity-building are very large relative to the Organization’s capacity to respond. Although the Organization has strengthened its areas of comparative advantage, it still lacks effective policies, systems and processes for allocating scarce resources on the basis of need. Extrabudgetary projects are not always aligned with RP activities.</p>	<p>Build on UNESS to achieve even stronger alignment between top-down ED Sector priorities and bottom-up country-level needs and better integration of RP and XB activities at country level. Further consolidate country-level work programmes by focusing on fewer, higher-impact activities.</p>
<p>Challenge: Many country-level activities are small-scale, reactive responses to countries’ and donors’ needs, uninformed by strategic country-level programming, directed at relatively minor <i>downstream</i> activities, characterized by modalities that are short-term in nature, often in the presence of insufficient and/or transient political commitment.</p>	<p>Further strengthening of programmatic focus can only be addressed through reforms in activity planning and human and financial resources allocation. Such reforms cannot be initiated by the ED Sector alone. However, the Sector can strengthen modalities/mechanisms less susceptible to these challenges, including greater use of centralized funding mechanisms (e.g. CAP-EFA) and improving capability of field staff in country-level programming.</p>
<p>Challenge: Technical expertise/capability is extremely limited in a number of areas, such as in TVET and teacher education. In other areas, with the exception of IIEP in the area of sector-wide policy and planning, widely dispersed capacity leads to a lack of critical mass.</p>	<p>Scale-up capacity and capability in areas of priority where UNESCO remains weak, notably literacy, TVET and teacher education. Consolidate expertise in priority areas including through high-performing mobile teams of professionals.</p>
Actions already taken/to be taken by the Director-General	
<p>The Director-General has requested the Education Sector, in collaboration with other sectors and bureaux, to draw up an action plan for the implementation of relevant recommendations.</p>	

Evaluation of Strategic Programme Objective Three (Natural Sciences Sector)

Brief description and background of the activities evaluated
Under SPO 3, UNESCO is charged with “leveraging scientific knowledge for the benefit of the environment and the management of natural resources”. The evaluation assessed progress in achieving the 34 C/4 expected outcomes, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) UNESCO’s leadership for United Nations system activities in the areas of freshwater and the oceans at the global and national levels firmly established; (b) Global monitoring reports produced periodically for the state of freshwater and the oceans; (c) Principles and guidelines for science-based sustainable management of natural resources agreed upon and implemented in all regions through national policies.
Budget
Regular programme and extrabudgetary resources in support of SPO 3 total \$38.1 million for 2008-2009 (excluding the \$65 million extrabudgetary contributions to UNESCO-IHE Institute of Water Education).
This evaluation
This evaluation was programmed in the 34 C/5 Evaluation Plan to assess progress towards achieving the expected outcomes of SPO 3 and how progress might be enhanced through improving programme policy, design and delivery. The evaluation, conducted by a two-person team from Cameroon and Germany, cost \$57,000 and focused on programme activities in the 32, 33 and 34 C/5 periods.

Findings and conclusions	Recommendations
UNESCO’s leadership in freshwater and oceans	
Achievements: UNESCO has a comparative advantage over other United Nations agencies because of its intersectoral synergies. A number of success stories in freshwater and marine resource management have demonstrated UNESCO’s leadership. UNESCO has shown strong performance in conducting global assessments (e.g. WWAP), in bridging science, culture and policy (e.g. MOST), in acting as a network facilitator to address global concerns (e.g. MAB, WWAP, IOC, IGCP), and in addressing cross-cutting issues, such as climate change (e.g. WWDR 3, IPCC) which impacts many aspects of society. UNESCO-IHP has been ranked as the most influential international organization on freshwater issues in a recent survey of nearly 40 international water-related institutions.	
Challenge: UNESCO’s dependence on access to external resources often leads to a more project-based approach and implementation role.	UNESCO should leverage its comparative advantage by addressing cross-cutting issues and focusing more on policy advice.
Global monitoring reports on the state of freshwater and oceans	
Achievements: UNESCO’s assessments of water resources with links to education, culture and social and human sciences are highly relevant to sustainable development (MDG 7). Increasingly, the WWDR is becoming the main dissemination platform for policy response in the area of IWRM.	
Challenge: The present global assessments of groundwater resources need to include regional details to become more relevant for national water management plans.	Efforts should be stepped up to deliver crucial information on freshwater resources management at the regional/transboundary levels.
Challenge: While the dissemination of climate change predictions by IPCC is well recognized, the implications of the predictions for livelihoods and ecosystems in different regions require further analysis.	IPCC reports should be “translated” into local-level scenarios for appropriate adaptation and mitigation measures.

Principles and guidelines for sustainable management of natural resources	
Achievements: UNESCO continues to be a prime point-of-contact for capacity-building and outreach. Efforts to enhance capacity for sustainable water management are kept at a high level and field offices are facilitating the formulation of national policies.	
Challenge: To collaborate on equal levels, the quality of education and outreach at partner institutions needs improvement. UNESCO has available technical know-how which can be shared using its National Commissions, networks and intergovernmental programmes.	UNESCO should continue to build the capacity of national/regional institutions and governments so that they can assume “full ownership for programmes” in their country/region.
Priority on Africa and gender equality	
Achievements: UNESCO, through IHP, has effectively contributed to the establishment of the AMCOW and the Africa Groundwater Commission. The implementation of IWRM at the river-basin level has led to ecosystem management approaches, the use of appropriate tools such as GIS and best practices among water-related groups and networks.	
Achievements: The concept of Biosphere Reserves (BRs) as learning centres for sustainable development has been implemented, such as in Gunung Leusser National Park.	
Challenge: The institutionalization of the AfriMAB Charter and the implementation of the Madrid Action Plan, especially for making BRs sustainable development poles in Africa, still require outreach and strong advocacy.	UNESCO should encourage and assist Member States to enact legislation giving the BRs legal status and to publicize and promote BRs at national and international levels.
Actions already taken/to be taken by the Director-General The Director-General has requested the Science Sector, in collaboration with other sectors and bureaux, to draw up an action plan for the implementation of relevant recommendations.	

Evaluation of the pilot phase of the Merit-Promotion Programme (MPP)

Brief description and background of the activities evaluated	
To complement the two existing avenues to promotion (reclassification and competition to a higher-graded post), the Director-General introduced a limited merit-promotion programme in January 2008 on a pilot basis. The objectives of the MPP were to: promote a results-based culture; recognize outstanding results or contributions; recognize high levels of technical and other competences; and recognize staff mobility (in particular geographical mobility). Staff members holding a fixed-term or indeterminate contract for a minimum of four years and who had not been promoted at any time during the previous four-year period were eligible. Under the pilot, 34 staff members (1.6% of the Organization's workforce) received merit promotions.	
Budget	
\$675,750 drawn from the Reclassification and Merit-Promotion Reserve	
This evaluation	
The evaluation purpose was to assess: the contribution to the MPP objectives; the implementation and process of the MPP; the link between the MPP and reclassification; and the evaluation and selection of candidates. The evaluators undertook a desk review including benchmarking with promotion programmes in other international organizations, reviewed files of the candidates recommended for an MPP, interviewed HRM staff and members of the Promotion Panel, ADGs/Directors of Bureaux, chiefs of Executive Offices and representatives of staff associations, and ran two online questionnaires for nominated MPP candidates and for members of the review panels. The evaluation was conducted from January to March 2009 by IOS with the assistance of a consultant with extensive experience in HRM and was quality-assured by an external, HRM-specialized evaluator. The external expertise sought for the evaluation totalled approximately \$15,000.	
Findings and conclusions	Recommendations
Contribution to objectives	
Achievement: The MPP received a high degree of support and is perceived as an important instrument for recognizing outstanding staff performance.	
Challenge: The MPP is currently limited to financial reward.	Consider complementing the current monetary award with non-monetary instruments, such as study awards, greater recognition of promoted staff, increased job flexibility or assignment to special projects.
Challenge: It is too early to tell whether the MPP has contributed to a results-based culture in UNESCO or lifted staff motivation.	Enhance the visibility and impact of the system by improving communication of the merit promotions so that successful candidates serve as role models.
Implementation and process	
Achievement: The vast majority of interviewees expressed satisfaction and trust towards the functioning of the Promotion and Review Panels.	
Challenge: The absence of structured feedback on the process and outcomes, which can result in a perceived lack of transparency and equity.	Develop a more structured feedback process outlining decisions and reasons thereof. Responsibilities for provision of limited feedback should be specified.
MPP and reclassification	
Challenge: The complementarities and differences between the MPP and reclassification are not well understood across the Organization. Criteria between merit promotion and reclassification overlap.	Clarify the complementarities and differences between the MPP and reclassification, ensuring that the two avenues are sufficiently streamlined and complementary, and address overlaps in criteria between the two routes to promotion.

Evaluation and selection of candidates	
Achievement: There was a general consensus on the utility and effectiveness of the criteria adopted for selecting successful candidates.	
Challenge: The style, length and quality of recommendations formulated by supervisors varied significantly with many forms lacking factual information.	Provide guidelines for the completion of the recommendation forms to ensure that the information provided by supervisors is more comparable and fact-based. Elaborate a set of concrete examples for the different staff categories.
Challenge: The criteria are not equally relevant for all staff categories.	Improve the criteria and weightings system for General Service staff and staff with very specific functions in considering appropriate diversification of the criteria and clarify the difference between “substantial achievement” and “consistent outstanding performance”.
Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General	
HRM is reviewing the recommendations in the evaluation report and will, in collaboration with UNESCO management, take these into consideration.	

PART II – POSSIBLE PRELIMINARY SCENARIOS FOR A COMPREHENSIVE, EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF UNESCO

THE CURRENT EVALUATION STRATEGY

2. The current [evaluation strategy](#),² endorsed by the Executive Board,³ calls for, *inter alia*, strategic evaluations of UNESCO's work to "ensure provision for systematic evaluation of all programmes within the C/4 cycle taking a broader view of the Organization's impact and performance".⁴ To enact this strategy, the 34 C/4 Evaluation Plan, endorsed by the Executive Board, calls for all 14 UNESCO SPOs to be evaluated, staggered throughout the period with a concluding synthesis report in 2012. As of June 2009, [four SPO evaluations](#) had been completed with each addressing strategic issues such as the adequacy of funding levels, geographic spread, programme delivery mechanisms and modalities, capacities to meet expected outcomes and UNESCO's performance and comparative advantages.

3. In addition to the SPO evaluations, the Evaluation Plan foresees several thematic evaluations. The "[Risk-Based Evaluation of UNESCO's Capacity to Deliver](#)"⁵ identified the risks associated with the attainment of the SPOs and assessed these risks. Following prioritization of the risks, action plans are under development by a [Secretariat Risk Management Committee](#) across the range of areas that were addressed.

PRELIMINARY SCENARIOS

4. As an addition to the current evaluation plan, the Executive Board has requested preliminary scenarios for a comprehensive external evaluation. Building on the existing reform efforts, such an evaluation would be:

- strategically focused and high level;
- forward-looking; and
- conducted by independent, external evaluators.⁶

5. As a forward-looking exercise, a comprehensive evaluation would provide actionable and timely recommendations to position the Organization for meeting future needs and challenges. The evaluation would take into account the cumulative changes and reforms of the recent past, prospective issues and relevant trends. The overarching question of the evaluation would be:

"How should UNESCO position itself to address the challenges of the twenty-first century and make the most of prospective opportunities?"

6. A comprehensive external evaluation would encompass:

- impact of the Organization;
- governance;
- stakeholder relations;
- organizational structure;

² Please note that throughout the documents, underlined text indicates a hyperlink.

³ 177 EX/Decision 27.

⁴ 175 EX/Decision 26.

⁵ The change in title from the original plan was noted by the Executive Board at its 180th session.

⁶ External evaluation teams would be multicultural with appropriate gender balance and geographic representation.

- human resources;
- internal management systems and processes; and
- financial resources.

7. These seven components have formed the framework for other Organization-wide evaluations and have thus been used in the development of the scenarios set out in this paper. Three scenarios, summarized in Table 1, have been developed, following consultation across the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) network, a literature review on organizational development, a comparative analysis⁷ of comprehensive evaluations of other United Nations agencies and funds, and discussion within the Secretariat.

8. Among the comprehensive evaluations reviewed, the [independent external evaluation of FAO](#) features most prominently. While the evaluation was broadly accepted by FAO management, the exercise is now generally considered as rather intensive and wide-ranging, costly (up to \$4.5 million), and time-consuming. The scope and approach is arguably too wide for UNESCO to facilitate focused and progressive change management. The FAO approach is therefore not considered as a viable scenario for UNESCO given our time and cost constraints. Three alternative scenarios are presented below (refer to Tables 1 and 2) that are more suitable for UNESCO yet still meet the needs of the Executive Board.

9. A first approach (Scenario One) would be to supplement the previous and planned external evaluations, audit findings and the planned review of management and administration by the Joint Inspection Unit. Additional evaluations would be commissioned to fill gaps, such as governance and overall impact of the Organization. A second approach (Scenario Two) would address specific and focused questions across all seven components, beginning with a broad review of the impact of the Organization. Analysis of the remaining components would follow to identify adjustments necessary to support the positioning of the Organization. A third approach (Scenario Three) follows the same sequence, but addresses broader questions.

10. Each scenario addresses the key components in different ways. Scenario One is the most targeted and hence the least expensive and quickest option. Scenario Three, on the other hand, is the widest in coverage and most expensive and lengthy scenario. Scenario Two is a combination of the two. All scenarios would make use of a representative reference group to provide advice and inputs. Interim results would be reported to permanent delegations in informational meetings. In selecting a scenario, a key consideration is the capacity of the Organization to absorb and implement change in view of the existing organizational and governance structures. To ensure a manageable change process with minimal disruption to programme delivery, careful thought needs to be given to the present structures. Substantively different structures that might emanate from Scenario Three could be counter-productive, causing major disruption to the Organization's operation.

⁷ Go to the document "Comparative analysis of other comprehensive United Nations evaluations" at the [IOS Intranet](#) site.

Table 1 Possible scenarios

KEY COMPONENTS	Scenario One	Scenario Two	Scenario Three
Impact of the Organization	Broad	Broad	Broad
Governance	Focused	Focused	Broad
Stakeholder relations	Focused	Focused	Broad
Organizational structure	Reliance on IOS evaluations/audits ⁸ and work of the Decentralization Review Task Force and JIU	Focused	Broad
Human resources		Focused	Broad
Internal management systems and processes		Focused	Broad
Financial resources		Focused	Broad

	Scenario One	Scenario Two	Scenario Three
Estimated cost	\$350,000	\$950,000	\$1.5 million plus
Timeframe	6-9 months	9-12 months	18-24 months
Progress report	184th session (Spring 2010)	184th session (Spring 2010)	185th session (Autumn 2010)
Presentation to the Board	185th session (Autumn 2010)	185th session (Autumn 2010)	187th session (Autumn 2011)
Presentation to the General Conference	36th session of the General Conference (Autumn 2011)	36th session of the General Conference (Autumn 2011)	36th session of the General Conference (Autumn 2011) or 37th session of the General Conference (Autumn 2013)

Scenario One

11. Under Scenario One, UNESCO's current evaluation strategy and work plan for the C/4 period is complemented with an evaluation of the Organization's impact, governance and stakeholder relations. For the four other components, the scenario relies largely on secondary data from previous and planned evaluations, the Decentralization Review Task Force and a planned review by the JIU of management and administration systems. The outcome of the evaluation under Scenario One could be followed, if so required, by a second step to evaluate the other four components independently. One or two external evaluation teams would be used. Scenario One could be completed in six to nine months at approximately \$350,000.

Scenario Two

12. Under Scenario Two, all seven components are evaluated by answering focused questions, with the exception of the impact of the Organization which will be broader in scope. The evaluation includes an extensive desk study and also relies on previous evaluation reports and monitoring

⁸ Go to the document "Mapping of coverage vis-à-vis the seven components" at the [IOS Intranet](#) site.

information. The evaluation team would conduct a limited number of country visits, primarily to address issues of impact, comparative advantage, organizational structures and stakeholder relations issues. Benchmarking with United Nations agencies and other “suppliers” in UNESCO’s areas of competence would be a key part of the evaluation. Several specialized teams would be used. Scenario Two is anticipated to take up to 12 months at approximately \$950,000.

Scenario Three

13. Under Scenario Three, all seven components are evaluated from a broader angle. All broad and focused questions are addressed in this scenario. In addition to the breadth and perspective of coverage, the key difference with Scenarios One and Two is that the data collection methods are more expansive. This scenario relies more heavily on the collection and analysis of primary data, in large part through more extensive field visits and intensive interviewing and surveying. Like Scenario Two, benchmarking with United Nations agencies and other “suppliers” in UNESCO’s areas of competence would be a key part of the evaluation. Scenario Three is anticipated to take 18 to 24 months at a cost of at least \$1.5 million.

Special Account

14. To safeguard independence and transparency, a Special Account⁹ would be established for the funds raised for the evaluation. The account would contain the necessary firewalls ensuring, *inter alia*, that no conditions could be made by donors providing funds and that the funds would only be used for the comprehensive evaluation. In addition to the contributions received to the Special Account from external sources, the Secretariat could make available \$50,000 from the regular programme.

Reporting

15. As is the practice with evaluations, all reports would be made available publicly. Progress reports would be prepared for the 184th session of the Executive Board for Scenarios One and Two. Scenario Three would take longer with progress reports available at the 185th session (see Table 1). The outcome of the evaluations would be presented to the General Conference in 2011 (or possibly 2013 in the case of Scenario Three).

Table 2 Seven components and sample questions

Component	Sample questions
Impact of the Organization	<p>Questions are the same for all three scenarios.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the relevance of UNESCO’s policies and programmes to the needs and priorities of Member States and to what extent do they contribute to United Nations reforms? • What is UNESCO’s niche and what are other possible areas where UNESCO could add value in the medium and long term? • What are UNESCO’s current comparative advantages and which comparative advantages could UNESCO exploit considering longer-term trends? • How can UNESCO optimize National Commissions, category 1 and 2 institutes/centres and intergovernmental bodies to respond to future demands?

⁹ <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001450/145075e.pdf>
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001450/145082e.pdf>
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001450/145081e.pdf>
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001494/149451e.pdf>

	FOCUSED	BROAD
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments could be made to the existing governing structures and their working methods to improve efficiency and effectiveness? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the respective roles of the Secretariat, governing bodies and Member States optimal and balanced, and how can they be operationalized?
Stakeholder relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments could be made to existing approaches and structures to forge and to maintain strategic partnerships with UNESCO's wide range of constituencies, partners and networks to best meet the Organization's objectives and goals? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can UNESCO strategically leverage its wide range of constituencies, partners and networks to achieve its goals, in particular, National Commissions, United Nations system partners, the private sector and civil society?
Organizational structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments could be made to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the Organization, including field offices, category 1 and 2 institutes and centres and intergovernmental bodies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the decentralized, regional and sectoral structures of UNESCO optimal?
Human resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments would be needed to enhance staff capacities/profiles and ensure the Organization can meet its objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the current employment model, staff capacities, and HRM policies and practices adequate to meet strategic needs and are they in line with best practices?
Internal management systems and processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments could be made to UNESCO's planning and programming, results-based management and budgeting systems (including, post control mechanism) to enhance managerial accountability and to best support achievement of UNESCO's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How could UNESCO's administrative systems and processes and their management be designed to best support the Organization's objectives and goals and to be in line with best practices?
Financial resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments could be made to financing modalities, including the budget process and self-benefiting arrangements, to best support achievement of UNESCO's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the optimal funding model for UNESCO, especially in the light of global, regional and country-level responsibilities and the Organization's normative and operational actions?

Action to be taken by the Executive Board

16. The Executive Board may wish to adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 181 EX/Decision 19,
2. Having examined document 182 EX/24 which summarizes the evaluation reports that have been presented,
3. Taking note of the recommendations made by the evaluators as well as the report of the Director-General on the actions taken or to be taken to implement these recommendations,

4. Invites the Director-General to implement in a timely manner recommendations which improve the programmes and services to which they relate, and to continue to improve the quality of evaluations by implementing the UNESCO Evaluation Strategy;
5. Requests the Director-General to continue to report to it on evaluations conducted on the Organization's programme activities, on the progress made in strengthening programme management, in the follow-up to evaluation recommendations for each programme evaluated, and in strengthening the quality of the evaluations undertaken and their impact on the management culture of the Organization;
- [6. Requests the Director-General to initiate a comprehensive evaluation, to be conducted by external evaluators, following the scope and methodology of Scenario [X] as set out in 182 EX/24.]