



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

Organisation  
des Nations Unies  
pour l'éducation,  
la science et la culture

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

**Discours de M. Koïchiro Matsuura, Directeur général de l'UNESCO,  
à l'occasion de l'ouverture de la 175<sup>e</sup> Session du Conseil exécutif**

**Points 3, 4 et 5**

3. Rapport du Directeur général sur l'exécution  
du programme adopté par la Conférence générale
4. Rapport du Directeur général sur le suivi  
des décisions et résolutions adoptées  
par le Conseil exécutif et la Conférence générale  
à leurs sessions antérieures
5. Rapport du Directeur général sur la mise en œuvre  
du processus de réforme : Politique du personnel

**UNESCO, le 2 octobre 2006**

Monsieur le Président de la Conférence générale,  
Monsieur le Président du Conseil exécutif,  
Excellences, Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je souhaite aujourd'hui vous entretenir, au moment où nous commençons les travaux de la 175<sup>e</sup> session du Conseil exécutif, de deux sujets majeurs qui figurent non seulement au rang de nos priorités, mais aussi de celles de la communauté internationale tout entière. Ils vont profondément et durablement influencer la façon dont nous accomplirons et ferons évoluer notre mandat dans les années qui viennent. C'est la raison pour laquelle ils sont largement pris en compte dans les propositions de C/4 et de C/5 que vous aurez à examiner.

Il s'agit, d'une part, de la nécessaire évolution et du renforcement de nos activités en faveur du **dialogue** au sens le plus large : dialogue entre les civilisations, les cultures, les religions, les peuples. Des événements récents ont de nouveau mis en évidence, parfois de façon tragique, l'importance cruciale de cette question.

Il s'agit, d'autre part, de **la réforme du système des Nations Unies**, et de ses conséquences pour notre Organisation. Même si le Groupe de Haut niveau sur la cohérence du système des Nations Unies n'a pas encore remis son rapport final, je tiens à vous informer des développements importants intervenus à cet égard depuis notre session d'avril.

Nous n'avons cessé de le répéter : la prévention et la résolution de nombreux conflits ou crises reposent sur une **meilleure connaissance et compréhension de la culture, des valeurs, de la religion de l'Autre**. Elles reposent sur un dialogue constant, ouvert, sans *a priori*, où chacun apporte sa vision, son expérience, ses meilleures pratiques, non pas dans un esprit de conquête ou de supériorité, mais avec le désir profond de parvenir à l'enrichissement mutuel par les échanges réciproques et le partage des valeurs fondamentales.

Ce diagnostic, nous sommes nombreux à le poser, nombreux à y adhérer, sans toutefois toujours parvenir à créer les conditions optimales de sa réalisation concrète.

C'est pourquoi j'ai souhaité que le dialogue et la compréhension mutuelle constituent l'un des thèmes centraux inscrits dans mes propositions préliminaires

de stratégie à moyen terme, afin de mobiliser tout le potentiel de l'UNESCO, dans ses divers domaines de compétence, au service de cet objectif vital pour l'avenir de notre monde.

C'est également dans cet esprit que j'ai conçu le document 175 EX/5 Add soumis à votre attention, qui répond à votre demande de mieux mettre en valeur, dans le cadre du Plan d'action de l'UNESCO pour la promotion du dialogue entre les peuples, les liens entre les différentes activités proposées ; ce document souligne combien l'ensemble des disciplines dont nous avons la charge se mobilise afin de réaliser des progrès tangibles à cet égard :

**Premièrement** à travers **l'éducation**, bien sûr, qui doit renforcer la tolérance, la compréhension mutuelle, le respect des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie. Une éducation qui contredise les stéréotypes de toutes sortes, qui parle aux plus démunis à travers des matériels pédagogiques adaptés et en langues locales, qui favorise dans le même temps l'enseignement de langues de large diffusion afin d'offrir à chacun la possibilité de participer à la société planétaire d'aujourd'hui.

Je tiens à souligner le rôle très positif joué à cet égard par les nombreuses Chaires UNESCO consacrées au dialogue, qui constituent désormais un réseau très étendu permettant de toucher un nombre croissant d'étudiants à travers le monde. C'est là un aspect de notre action qui me paraît tout à fait essentiel. Nous adresser à la jeunesse est un impératif et une priorité si nous voulons parvenir à modifier en profondeur et durablement mentalités et comportements.

**Deuxièmement**, la valorisation de tous les **patrimoines culturels**, passés et contemporains, qui passe par une meilleure connaissance des valeurs, de l'histoire, des religions de l'Autre, est sans aucun doute un axe fort de notre contribution. C'est l'esprit des initiatives que j'ai prises dès avril 2002 pour l'Europe du Sud-Est, avec une Table ronde ministérielle qui s'est prolongée depuis par une rencontre annuelle des chefs d'Etat de la région, et qui se concrétisent par le développement de la notion de « corridors culturels ». C'est aussi tout le travail que notre Organisation réalise dans le cadre des « Routes » ou dans les programmes d'Histoires régionales.

**Troisièmement**, le **dialogue interreligieux**, parce qu'il est devenu le centre névralgique de nombreux enjeux, doit bénéficier d'une attention toute particulière.

Je me réjouis dans ce contexte de l'engagement récemment affirmé par de nombreux dirigeants politiques et religieux réunis à Asmara, Kazakhstan, en septembre dernier, à l'occasion du deuxième Congrès mondial des religions, à « intégrer les questions liées au dialogue entre les civilisations et les religions dans les curriculum à tous les niveaux d'enseignements, afin d'aider la jeunesse à respecter et comprendre les différences culturelles et religieuses sans hostilité ». J'ai quant à moi souligné lors de cette rencontre combien l'UNESCO se tenait prête à soutenir les efforts entrepris en ce sens. J'ai envoyé un message identique à la réunion organisée récemment à New York, dans le cadre de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies, par la Présidente des Philippines, sur le thème des relations entre les religions.

**Quatrièmement**, nul moyen de **communication** ne doit être épargné pour favoriser ce dialogue. Nous avons lancé avec succès des activités en faveur de la création de programmes mettant en avant une approche transculturelle, voire multiculturelle du journalisme. En faisant le plaidoyer de l'importance d'une couverture médiatique juste et impartiale, que ce soit par la voix des médias traditionnels ou celle des nouvelles technologies de l'information, si chères aux jeunes générations, ce sont en effet autant de portes que nous laissons ouvertes au dialogue. Il nous faut aussi exploiter le formidable potentiel de la télévision, de l'Internet et du multimédia dans la formation des esprits, et favoriser toutes les initiatives visant à développer des programmes porteurs de ces valeurs de dialogue et de tolérance.

Les débats engendrés dans la presse par la publication des caricatures du Prophète Mahomet en septembre 2005 nous ont rappelé l'importance et la sensibilité de cette dimension particulière du dialogue.

Cette polémique a également démontré l'importance des médias en la matière. La liberté d'expression et la liberté de la presse sont des principes inaliénables, nous en sommes tous ici les défenseurs engagés. Cependant, comme tous les droits, ils doivent s'exercer dans le respect des convictions individuelles, morales ou religieuses.

Le groupe intersectoriel que j'ai mis en place travaille à des propositions concrètes en vue de renforcer nos programmes et activités en matière de compréhension

mutuelle et de respect des valeurs religieuses et culturelles, ainsi que de liberté d'expression.

Notre réflexion se nourrit, bien évidemment, du travail effectué dans d'autres instances, en particulier au sein du système des Nations Unies. Il s'inscrit dans la logique des travaux de l'Alliance des civilisations, auxquels j'ai eu l'occasion de participer personnellement en mai dernier à Dakar, et avec laquelle nous entretenons une coopération régulière.

**Cinquièmement**, qu'il s'agisse de dialogue interculturel ou de dialogue interreligieux, la question des **partenaires** est une question essentielle à laquelle nous devons apporter des réponses nouvelles qui impliquent de nouveaux rôles pour de nouveaux acteurs, ou du moins des rôles repensés à la lumière de la nouvelle donne. Notre objectif est de rassembler toutes les forces vives : non seulement les Etats et le secteur public, mais aussi la société civile et le secteur privé. Le partenariat développé dans le cadre de Mondialogo est à cet égard un bon exemple de coopération en faveur de la promotion de la compréhension et du respect mutuels.

C'est cette approche qui a présidé à l'élaboration de la stratégie globale de lutte contre le terrorisme, adoptée à l'unanimité le 8 septembre dernier par l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies. L'UNESCO a participé activement à la conception de ce projet. Notre contribution est clairement reflétée par la référence explicite dans ce texte et le plan d'action qui en découle, au rôle clé que doit jouer l'UNESCO dans la promotion du dialogue, le respect des croyances, la culture de la paix, le dialogue interreligieux et entre les civilisations, comme moyens pour la communauté internationale de répondre au défi du terrorisme.

Il nous faut en effet agir sur plusieurs fronts. Le front politique et diplomatique en est un. Mais il nous faut également porter nos messages de paix et de tolérance auprès de la société civile, de la jeunesse, des dispensateurs du savoir, des différents acteurs du développement humain. Il est de plus en plus nécessaire en effet que les différents modes d'action, le mode politique et le mode culturel, le traitement des crises et le dialogue des cultures, soient conduits en parallèle.

Mr Chairman,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me now turn to the second theme of my address: namely, UN reform and its implications for UNESCO.

UN reform is a response to **an era of major world change**. It is imperative that at a time of growing global interdependence, there exists a global mechanism to ensure that the forces of change are inclusive and of benefit to all. It is increasingly recognized that the UN is uniquely well-placed to fulfil this important function. And I believe that within the UN system, UNESCO has a key role to play. However, I also believe that we cannot afford to be complacent. Our relevance in today's world brings heavy responsibilities and duties. UNESCO, and the UN system in general, must reform so that we can fulfil our vital mandate of promoting peace and security.

UN reform has gained considerable momentum since the 2005 World Summit, in particular through the work of the High-Level Panel on UN System-wide Coherence. The Secretary-General Kofi Annan established the Panel in February of this year to develop proposals for **a reinvigorated UN adapted to the needs of the 21st century**. The Panel's recommendations – expected within the next month – are likely to significantly change the environment in which we operate.

UNESCO itself is already well advanced in its own internal reforms. This places us in a good position to be an important actor within the new environment.

As you well know, when I joined UNESCO, I launched a major process to modernize, streamline and refocus the Organization's work. I believe that there have been significant improvements in the way we execute our mission. Further reform will certainly be needed – and I shall require your help to make it. However, I am pleased to see that UNESCO has anticipated much of the Panel's thinking, and that we are heading in the right direction.

Therefore, **while UN reform constitutes a challenge for UNESCO, it is also an opportunity**. Today's world increasingly values knowledge as the key to achieving peace and sustainable development. UNESCO is a specialized agency that has knowledge at the centre of its mission. I am convinced that the nature of UNESCO's

mandate, and the concentration of competencies we possess – in education, the sciences, culture and communication – makes UNESCO more relevant than ever before.

The messages that are coming out of the High-Level Panel – on the need for greater harmonization among UN bodies, for closer alignment with country-led development processes, and for more transparency and accountability across the board – these are all goals that UNESCO shares, and is already seeking to implement in its work.

When I spoke to you at the last session of the Executive Board in April, the High-Level Panel had just begun work. It remained unclear what direction its reflections would take. I had also stated that UNESCO needed to develop a clear position in relation to UN reform, and to contribute actively to the Panel's deliberations. This has been done.

After the last Board I set up a House-wide Working Group on UN Reform. I also mobilized UNESCO's field office network to identify viable models of UN cooperation at country level.

Through these processes, we have produced **two position papers that clarify UNESCO's strategic vision**. Some of this thinking is integrated in the document 175 EX/INF 9, on the "Future Role of UNESCO".

Our views were developed in consultation with our sister agencies. They reflect common concerns, especially about the potential dangers of a "one size fits all" approach to the consolidation of activities at country level.

In developing our position, we have interacted with the High-Level Panel at each stage of its deliberations, and been an active participant at many of its meetings. I myself have spoken directly with Panel members on key issues. Many Member States have also helped us to convey our views to the Panel, and I would like to thank you for your support.

On the substance, as you may recall, I had voiced concerns in April about certain reform proposals, notably with regard to the suggestions being made in some quarters that specialized agencies – UNESCO included – should become "centres

of excellence”, and no longer involve themselves in implementation on the ground. In response, I had insisted that in order to provide quality services to Member States, the feedback loop between theory and practice needed to remain direct.

Let me restate the rationale for the **inseparable linkage between global and field activities**: global policy and normative work responds to on-the-ground experiences, which are then reflected in universal principles or best practices. The latter can only prove their viability and impact once they are translated into concrete development action at the country level.

I am very pleased to see that my views have been seriously taken on board by the Panel. The Panel now fully acknowledges the important development roles exercised by specialized agencies. It is also increasingly clear that the quality of our global policy, advocacy and standard-setting roles is inextricably linked to our work in country.

Articulating our key interests and competencies should not be confused with a defensive position. Instead, our early interventions have helped the debate to progress, and avoided developments which might have been difficult to reverse later on.

**UNESCO is in the mainstream of UN reform**, and intends to continue its proactive engagement. Let me therefore highlight some of the central issues emerging from the High-Level Panel, and where UNESCO stands in relation to them.

The Panel’s deliberations address three main areas: development, humanitarian emergencies, and the environment – placing particular emphasis on the first issue, development. These are areas where UN leadership is recognized and judged to be essential. These are also the areas where UNESCO operates and can sharpen its contribution.

With regard to **development**, the main thrust of UN reform is to enable the UN to achieve greater coherence, efficiency and effectiveness at the country level. The present situation of fragmentation, duplication, and even outright competition, is unacceptable.



The framework that is being elaborated for greater coherence – of one programme, one leader, one budget and one office – expresses the need for unified strategies. It is in this spirit that I endorse the concept of **One UN** at country level, and strongly support the proposal to strengthen the Resident Coordinator (RC) system. However, given that the detail has yet to be developed, it is very hard to second-guess the modifications that will be required in our medium and short-term strategies.

I strongly advocate that in the context of One UN at the country level, we adopt the principle of “**managed pluralism**”. That is, the emphasis should be placed on unity of function not form. There exists a whole range of models of successful cooperation at country level, and we should be pragmatic and flexible as we move forward. This is particularly the case with regard to one Office. There are many examples of close collaboration when agencies are not based in one house.

The very strength of the UN system lies in its accumulated sectoral expertise. Therefore, in our drive for greater coherence, we must also be careful to draw on the full range of sectoral knowledge and resources available across the entire UN system. This is a position that our sister agencies strongly share.

One practical response to this concern would be to reinforce the “thematic leadership” approach to the UN country teams (UNCTs). This would highlight and strengthen specialized agencies’ contributions and also enhance coherence at country level.

For this proposal to be effective, it is important that specialized agencies maintain direct contact with line ministers in accordance with their mandates. While I understand the concern that there are currently too many voices at the table, I do not believe that the solution lies in making the Resident Coordinator the sole interlocutor between the UN and national governments. UNDP must obviously remain the conduit for dialogue with those ministries directly concerned with finance and development. However, with respect to specific sectors – such as education, science or culture – it is essential that the communication lines are open to specialized agencies.

UNESCO wants its field staff to have the capacities to be able to play a key role in these activities. This is why, as an initial response, I have earmarked 1% of our programme resources to enhance our input into country-level programming

exercises. Increasingly, UNESCO field office directors and staff are being asked to assume leadership positions within UN Country Teams, especially as chairs of thematic groups with emphasis on education.

Managed pluralism also means that new mechanisms will need to be developed to include specialized agencies in CCA/UNDAF processes when they do not have permanent staff or offices in country. Immediately after the Board, I propose to reactivate the Task Force on Decentralization in order to review UNESCO's decentralization strategy in light of these issues.

There are positive signs that the Panel is moving in the direction of harmonization rather than unification. This can be seen in the suggested changes to the Resident Coordinator's role. It has been proposed that UNDP will continue to manage the RC system, but withdraw from sectoral activities for which existing UN agencies have competencies.

Furthermore, the Panel recognizes the need for a mechanism to oversee One UN practices. UNESCO believes that this will be crucial to ensuring that country-level programming documents are fully reflective of the diversity of expertise and mandates within the UN system.

Such flexibility in structural terms is important. However, the extent to which UNESCO's sectoral expertise is included in country planning will also depend on our ability to advocate and demonstrate our added-value, and to interact effectively with other partners in the UN country team. These issues will be addressed in our internal reforms.

Already, it is clear that **the role of specialized agencies is set to grow within the new environment**. The renewed emphasis on country ownership, the drive for results-based management, the projected increases in bilateral aid: these factors are likely to lead to a growth in demands by countries for UN assistance in all areas of capacity-building – from planning, policy-advice, and policy-dialogue to monitoring, research and evaluation. These are areas where specialized agencies like UNESCO have a unique role to play – as strategic advisor, intellectual leader, standard-setter and honest broker.

UNESCO's **multidisciplinarity** is a further source of strength. The Panel is placing strong emphasis on the need for intersectoral responses to the cross-cutting challenges of today's world. UNESCO's broad-based competencies put us in an ideal position to play a key role in this context. The fact that UNESCO has been designated the lead agency for the World Water Assessment Programme (WWAP), the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD), the follow-up to the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, and six of the eleven WSIS Action Lines, underlines our strong capacity in this regard.

Through the new C4 and C5, I propose to strengthen UNESCO's potential for intersectoral action still further. I will present these two documents in detail on Thursday. Let me simply point out here that they provide for an unprecedented degree of intersectorality, from the very beginning of the programming process.

The C4 and C5 also provide a sharpened and more focused definition of what UNESCO can bring to the multilateral table. They directly align UNESCO's strategy with international development goals. And they are structured to concentrate the Organization's work on achieving monitorable results at the country level.

While continuing to strengthen UNESCO's global role, I realize that such strategic reforms must be accompanied by the development of **a more field-oriented Organization**. I have already established the structural framework for more effective field action. However, this pre-dates the One UN movement, and the increasingly harsh economic realities that will affect our capacity to act at country level. It is clear that in this new context we will have to build and strengthen the human and financial resources needed for UNESCO to engage in One UN activities in the field. We will also have to reexamine our modalities for achieving visibility in country and for delivering on our commitment to decentralization. These are issues to be addressed by the Task Force on decentralization.

But, I must alert you that the implications of One UN at country level may go way beyond decentralization. I anticipate a possible impact on the overall planning, budgeting and programming cycles and approaches of UNESCO.

The governing bodies of UNESCO and myself will have to work closely together to agree on a package of measures to enable us to respond to what will undoubtedly be a most complex set of proposals from the Panel.

In order to illustrate the new direction and commitment to change, let me refer to the current **Education Sector reform**. This reform represents a major attempt both to strengthen UNESCO's global work in Education for All (EFA), and to reinforce the Organization's capacity in the field. The new decentralized and results-based structure will provide greater control, discipline and focus to UNESCO's activities at field level. It will also streamline the feedback process between UNESCO's global work – in standard-setting, coordinating, monitoring and advocacy – and our work in country. The aim is to align our capacity much more effectively behind national development objectives. It is also to enhance our ability to work with UN partners at the country level and to influence development assistance strategies.

The Education Sector Reform has been closely informed by UNESCO's work in developing the Global Action Plan to achieve the EFA goals. We have taken the lead in an initiative to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the five EFA convening agencies. This process has established a platform for coherent multilateral support to country development efforts in EFA. It is another illustration of UNESCO putting into action the call for UN agencies to work in a more coordinated and coherent manner.

Our leadership, which was endorsed by the undg Principals, has been welcomed by the G8 Summit. But I want to reiterate: when you urge UNESCO to be collaborative, to avoid mission creep and duplication of effort – I would ask that you raise the same issues in the decision-making organs of other relevant organizations.

I now wish to turn to the area of **humanitarian emergencies**. In the recommendations emerging from the High-Level Panel, I see three areas where UNESCO has a contribution to make.

The first concerns the need to address the **root causes of conflict**. Sadly, our world is not a peaceful place. UNESCO's founding mission – to build the defences of peace in the minds of men – still remains today a global responsibility of the highest order.

The Panel has emphasized that a major weakness of the UN system is its inability to address these fundamental human causes of conflict. Roughly half of countries that emerge from war lapse back into violence within five years. To reverse this trend, recovery efforts need to deal not only with issues of immediate security and

stability, but also with underlying causes. Through our work and expertise in promoting dialogue – and drawing on our competencies in education, science, culture and communication – UNESCO has a strong comparative advantage vis-à-vis what other UN agencies have to offer in this area. What I am pleased to see emerging from the High-Level Panel's discussions, is the recognition that this work is not peripheral to reconstruction efforts. But, rather, that it provides the very basis for building lasting peace.

The second recommendation pertinent to UNESCO, regards the need to **improve risk reduction strategies**. As UNESCO's experience in developing early warning systems for Tsunamis has shown, we need to adopt a holistic, intersectoral approach. To be effective, risk strategies must integrate: measures for scientific detection, communication policies, emergency-preparedness plans, public-awareness raising strategies, cultural behaviour and knowledge, and education on methods of response and mitigation. Again, UNESCO's multidisciplinary mandate puts us in a strong position to provide leadership in this area.

The final recommendation concerns the need to ensure **better support in the transition from disaster and post-conflict relief to development**. There is general recognition that humanitarian assistance, recovery and reconstruction should not be seen as sequential phases, but viewed more holistically. In the first phase of our response to crisis, we cannot afford to address immediate physical needs alone. If we want to build stable foundations for sustainable peace and development, then we also need to address the social, psychological, educational and cultural aspects of recovery.

Therefore, even though UNESCO is not a humanitarian agency per se, we nevertheless have a major responsibility, within our areas of competence, to assist countries affected by conflict or disaster, and to accelerate their transition from early recovery toward reconstruction, reconciliation and development. The expanding demands on UNESCO for assistance in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan and, most recently, Lebanon, demonstrate the value that is given to our work.

The fact that UNESCO was solicited to intervene from the very beginning of the recent conflict in the Middle East, and the fact that we were immediately present on the ground when the fighting ended, are signs of the international community's

increasing recognition of the importance of education, culture and communication to humanitarian recovery.

Well before the Panel's reflections on these issues, I established an internal Task Team to refine UNESCO's role in post-conflict and post-disaster situations and to develop proposals for how UNESCO can build its capacity to act. I would be pleased to share these conclusions with you at the next Board.

Let me turn finally to the **environment**, and the Panel's call for greater coherence in this area.

I firmly agree with **the need to address the fragmentation and incoherence** that exists in much of the UN system's work on the environment. It is suggested that one solution to this problem may lie in empowering the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) to become some sort of overarching environmental policy umbrella. This is an interesting idea, though one that still requires careful elaboration.

The point that I would like to make here is that, in our efforts to improve coordination, we must be sure **to build on the mechanisms that already exist – and are working well** – to achieve harmony within the UN system.

I wish to refer here to such UN coordination networks as UN-Water and UN-Oceans. The success of UN-Water, which brings together 24 UN agencies and bodies, furnishes an excellent example of system-wide cooperation within the UN. Let me add that the existence of such a large number of bodies involved in freshwater issues reflects the importance of water to many aspects of human life, as well as the multifaceted challenge of securing sustainable freshwater management. It should not be read simply as a sign of division and duplication.

In our reform efforts, we must make sure that the work of such coordination networks is taken into account. It is likewise important that we **draw fully on the accumulated expertise of relevant specialized agencies**.

These issues directly concern UNESCO, which has been assigned lead roles in a number of UN inter-agency mechanisms, and which has built up considerable expertise in freshwater, oceans and other key areas.

For example, in the field of freshwater, **UNESCO now boasts the strongest and most wide-ranging freshwater programme of all UN entities**, with 200 freshwater experts across the Organization. This standing has been acquired as a result of the elevation of water as one of UNESCO's principal priorities over a period of three programmes and budgets, as well as through UNESCO's multidisciplinary approach to the question of freshwater management. This implies not only scientific assessment, but also, again, education, culture and communication, as well as social and political policy. The fact that UNESCO hosts the Secretariat of the UN-wide World Water Assessment Programme is an expression of our strength.

In its reform recommendations, I would hope that the High-Level Panel builds on such examples of effective leadership and coordination. And I would hope, too, that UNESCO, with its proven competencies in these areas, would continue to remain a central pillar of the reformed system.

To conclude, therefore: **UNESCO is contributing in an increasingly focused way to the global agenda and development goals**. Certainly, we need to intensify and consolidate our efforts. With the relevance of UNESCO's mandate comes great responsibility. We have an obligation to Member States to continue to strengthen our capacity, and to respond more effectively to their needs. This will require considerable reinvestment in UNESCO, in terms of resources, energy and commitment. These are challenges that the Secretariat and Member States must embrace together.