**Mali CPD Comments from Norway**

**28 November 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Nr | Comment | Response |
| 1 | We find generally that the four program priorities are relevant to the context in Mali. However, we would encourage the UNDP to expand the discussion on how the four main priorities for the program were chosen. | Possibly, some of the response could come from the below where they are questioning UNDP’s role in Health and Private Sector Development. |
| 2 | Moreover, we would like to see an improved discussion on how the UNDP has comparative advantage in the prioritized areas, and in particular for health issues and private sector development. | **Health issues**: this is under outcome 4 where UNDP has been selected as the PR for GFATM (not unlike what is happening in other countries and with a focus on procurement of ARVs”. In the CPD, it is stated that this will be done in close cooperation with UNICEF, with UNDP responsible for “supply of treatment to affected people and the reduction in prevalence” and “capacity-building of sub-recipients  and health services in terms of financial management, inventory management and monitoring and evaluation, the provision of drugs for the treatment of infected persons and raising awareness among target populations throughout the country”  **Private Sector development:** there are three references under outcome 2 on this – the first two seems clear and did not require a change in the CPD – the third one resulted in a change.   1. access to economic opportunities for small farmers, especially women and rural youth, will be facilitated, firstly through the diversification, processing and export of quality local produce, and secondly through improved access to innovative financial products, including by the promotion of the mango, shea butter, Arabic gum and sesame industries. This will be done in partnership with the Commission for Food Security, the Ministry of Commerce, professional organizations, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the United National Capital Development Fund (UNCDF).   Comment: Clear partnerships have been highlighted and it should be understood that UNDP is not doing this alone.   1. socioeconomic reintegration of 265,740 refugees and displaced people[[1]](#footnote-1)[1] and of young people, women and girls at risk through support to livelihood, stabilization and creation of long-term employment and income-generation opportunities   Comment: this is livelihood support as part of UNDP’s globally recognized role in early recovery   1. strengthen public-private dialogue by revitalizing the Presidential Investment Council, with the aim of boosting the reforms necessary to improve the business climate and promote investment, especially in agriculture and mining           Comment: as per the above, this is done in partnership with other DPs |
| 3 | We would like to see an expanded description on how the various activities are coordinated with other UN agencies, and in particular with bilateral donor programs. | UNDP is actively engaged in coordination and dialogue with the government as well as with bilateral and multilateral partners. The CPD has been revised as per the below:  UNDP supports the national Secretariat for Aid Harmonization and is a member of several sector-level working groups to facilitate coordination of UNDP interventions with other development partners. |
| 4 | We would like to encourage the UNDP to discuss how corruption in the Government of Mali impacts on the program. | Anti-corruption is part of regular discussions with the Government and assurance mechanisms to prevent fraud are put in place for resources related to UNDP supported programmatic interventions.  It is understood that this comment does not imply UNDP’s active programmatic involvement in anti-corruption. This latter was not considered based on a need to focus the programme and the fact that UNDP does not have a comparative advantage in this. |
| 5 | We note that the UNDP mentions the risk to program implementation that donor might shift their budgetary priorities and spend their money elsewhere. However, in light of the fact that the first review of the IMF ECF arrangement was delayed due to extra budgetary government purchases, we would also expect a discussion on how government priorities also affect the results of the prioritized areas in the UNDP program. This should include a discussion on how the UNDP plans to conduct a dialogue with the Government of Mali on budgetary priorities. | Noted – and language is revised in the CPD as per the below  A number of risks exist, including a possible shift in the priorities of Mali’s development partners or of the Government resulting in a drop of financial resources towards UNDP supported programmatic interventions. |
| 6 | Furthermore, whereas the discussion on risk include a brief sentence on the security situation, we would expect a much more in-depth analysis of how a deterioration of the security situation would affect the suggested programs. | It will be difficult to elaborate further on security scenarios as it could lead to sensitive language vis-a-vis the government. The CPD has already some mitigation languages (see below) and conflict related development analysis will be part of each programme and project, sharing this at the level of the CPD might be counterproductive.  Conflict-Related Development Analysis will be conducted as part of the formulation of new projects to better mitigate the risk of conflict. Another risk is the security situation in the country deteriorating, hence the need to establish a lasting peace. UNDP will adopt and share a strategy for mitigating these risks, based on the diversification of partners to ensure resource availability and enhanced programme management capacities |
| 7 | We question the realism of the targets in the results framework, such as (but not limited to) an elimination of IDP/ refugees by 2019, the achievement (in any economy) of an unemployment rate of 2%, a 22 percentage point reduction in poverty in five years. | The reduction of unemployment rate should read 2%/year (this has been corrected in the CPD):  Unemployment rate: Baseline: 13.5% (est)  Target: 2% reduction per annum  Important to note that, officially, unemployment rate is at 13.5 % but some recent studies suggest youth unemployment at 50%. Considering that youth is 60% of Malian population, unemployment rate is underestimated. So we need to deal with this carefully. |

1. [1]  OCHA, Humanitarian Bulletin: Mali, September 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)