**Tabulated Response to Comments on the Draft CPD Ethiopia (2016-2020)**

**30 November 2015**

| **Comments** | **Status** | **CO Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ownership** |
| The Country Programme builds to a large extent on Ethiopia’s new growth and development plan (Growth and Transformation Plan II, for 2016 – 2020), including the ambitious climate goals (from the previous Climate Resilient Green Economy-strategy, which is now integrated in GTPII) as well as the goal to become a middle income country by 2025.  | No need for specific reference in the CPD | Takes note  |
| **Relevance and Orientation** |
| The Country Programme is to a considerable extent relevant in view of Ethiopia’s main challenges related the sustainable, green development agenda including poverty reduction, industrialization, improved conditions for private sector development, strengthening of women’s rights (i.e. the two MDGs where Ethiopia still has some way to go), the need to create jobs, to strengthen democratic institutions, the need for climate change adaption especially in but not limited to agriculture and livestock-keeping and challenges related to «good governance» in the government system. It is positive that the Country Programme refers to UN’s National Human Development Report, which was published earlier this year, and emphasizes challenges related to uneven development in the country’s regions. The main pillars (1: Accelerating economic growth and poverty reduction; 2: Climate change and resilience-building; 3: Strengthening democratic governance and capacity development) are in line with the key challenges that Ethiopia currently faces. | No need for specific reference in the CPD | Takes note  |
| **Contribution to national capacity development** |
| Clear emphasis on capacity building of national institutions and actors within all main pillars. «Lessons learned» from the last Country Programme show a need to put greater emphasis on this aspect. Focus throughout the Country Programme. | No need for specific reference in the CPD | Capacity development will also be an overarching contribution of the projects to be developed under this new Country Programme  |
| **Human rights and gender equality** |
| The gender dimension is well taken care of. The human rights dimension is less visible. This point could be raised in the board meeting, i.e. if human rights are not explicitly addressed in the Country Programme, how does UNDP ensure that their approach is human rights based? It would also be worth challenging UNDP on their definition of «democratic governance» vs «good governance» or just «governance» - what do the various definitions imply? It is important that the focus on democratic development, participation and «accountability» is not replaced by efficiency improvements of the bureaucracy, administrative reforms etc. | Revisions in CPD completed | Noted on gender and the governance terms have been harmonized in the revision. The focus is actually on both, deepening democracy but at the same time ensuring efficiency of service delivery.Human Rights have been reflected in the text on para 20 “support to Human Rights commission based on institutional strengthening and integrity systems for feedback mechanisms by citizenry”. In addition, it is reflected in the Resources and Results Framework under output 2 (Enhanced capacity of human rights institutions and other stakeholders to implement/enforce the international/regional human rights obligations and standards). This falls under the UNDAF Outcome: Key government institutions and other stakeholders utilize enhanced capacities to ensure equitable, efficient, accountable, participatory and gender-responsive development. |
| **Climate Change** |
| Generally the Ethiopian priority given to managing and mitigating climate change through green development is well reflected in the proposal.  The linkages between pillar I economic development and II climate could be better emphasized.  The unique feature of the current Ethiopia development plan is its ambition to achieve both rapid, green and inclusive resulting in transformational economic growth. | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 16) |
| With regard to our experience of working with UNDP in the climate change area we find that UNDP could be more open to coordination with other partners providing advisory and financial support to the implementation of the CRGE, including its mainstreaming into the current overall development plan the GTP II. | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 16). Enhanced coordination with other partners also noted as part of the programme implementation approach. |
| **Detailed comments** |
| Para 1, 8 - Carbon neutral economy - The CRGE and INDC normally formulate the overall goal as reaching middle income status without increasing greenhouse gas emission above the 2010 level. | No need for specific reference in the CPD | Takes note  |
| Para 4 - Ethiopia’s vulnerability to climate change - Good description of the challenges facing Ethiopia | No need for specific reference in the CPD | Takes note  |
| Para 8 - UNDP supported the formulation of the CRGE strategy - Both Norway, UK/DfID and Germany/BMU also provided substantial support including trough GGGI. | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 8) |
| Para 8 - Reference to Norad supporting the CRGE facility - Should be changed to Norway.  Our contribution came from KLD via the EmbassyUNDP office was not the only partner supporting technically the establishment of the CRGE facility. Some of the advisory services provided by UNDP was not up to standards and had to redone with support from other partners. | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 8).Comment well noted and taken into account as part of the programme implementation approach. |
| Para 12-14 - Accelerating economic growth and poverty reduction - The mainstreaming of the Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) Strategy into the five year Government’s Growth & Transformation Plan phase 2, GTP II, could be made more visible also under pillar I.  This would better capture the ambition that the growth in the coming years shall be rapid, inclusive and green.The CRGE implementation will not be something separated but integrated in the GTP II. | Revisions in CPD completed | Comment is well noted and an explicit link is made to mainstreaming within economic and development planning.The outputs listed in para 16-18 all relate to the implementation of the CRGE strategy.  |
| Para 16 – 18 - Climate Change and Resilience building - There is no reference to the CRGE mainstreaming policy. | Revisions in CPD completed | Comment is well noted and an explicit link is made to mainstreaming within economic and development planning.The outputs listed in para 16-18 all relate to the implementation of the CRGE strategy.  |
| Para 16 - The effective functioning of the CRGE facility requires good coordination and synchronization of UNDP support with other partners support (Norway through GGGI and WB, CDKN, UK/DfID).  This has not been the case up to now. The Embassy has taken several initiatives to improve coordination of partner’s support.  In this context, UNDP could have been more forthcoming.MOFEC has recently taken the initiative to improve the coordination of partners support to improve its effectiveness and efficiency. UNDP should be encourage to give its full support to this initiative. | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 16)Comment on coordination is well noted and taken into account as part of the programme implementation approach. |
| Para 16 – Norad should be changed to Norway | Revisions in CPD completed | Change reflected in the revised Country Programme (para 16) |