**Tabulated Response to Norway: Comments on the Draft CPD Uganda (2016-2020)**

**20 March 2015**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment**  | **Status**  | **CO Remarks**  |
| 1. The CP is well aligned to Uganda’s Second National Development plan (draft) for 2016–20 that focuses on achieving the “Uganda Vision 2040” of transformation from a predominantly peasant and low income to a competitive upper middle income of approximately USD 9,500 by 2045. The CP could suggest more avenues to combat Uganda’s overarching problems of youth unemployment and high rate of  population growth, as well as addressing the need for more integration of cross cutting issues (especially gender, HIV and anti-corruption and transparency measures) in sectoral plans.
 | **Incorporated**  | **Refer to paragraph 12 and 17** |
| 1. On Programme priorities II, point 12, UNDP’s plan to enhance government effectiveness through institutional development, transparency and accountability, seems lacking in political analysis. Uganda has good institutions and a solid legal framework in this area, but rather lacks political will at the level of implementation.
 | **Incorporated**  | **Refer to paragraph 12** |
| 1. The document points out Uganda’s urgent and priority plans for national capacity development through upstream capacity development and scaling up funding development solutions. Mention of diversifying implementing partners is well thought out, but:
2. tthere could be a stronger emphasis on private sector partnership and development.
3. The CP should be more specific in its expressed intention in point 16, to support government in scaling up proven innovative approaches.
 | **Incorporated**  | 1. **Refer to paragraph 17 and 19**
2. **Refer to paragraph 16 – last sentence.**

 |
| 1. UNDP is represented in the Local Donor Partnership Group (LDPG) and in several development partners’ working groups under the LDPG but could be more forward leaning in engaging with partners and government. The option to engage and partner with the Democratic Governance Facility (DGF) is however a positive  signal of forward looking planning for pertinent partnerships (unfortunately, UNDP has previously displayed little willingness to cooperate with DGF, in spite of their partially overlapping remits). Despite the expressed risk factor of tainting its image in case of support to the country’s electoral cycle, UNDP needs to be seen more articulating Uganda’s need advance inclusive development and the promotion of the rule of law.
 | **Noted with thanks** | **It is UNDP’s intention to be more foreward leaning, active and visible in this next cycle in advancing inclusive development and promote rule of law.** |
| 1. The indicative country programme outputs are, on the whole, realistic and relevant. However, there is a seeming disconnect between these and the national goals/UNDAF outcomes. For example, “By end 2020, rule of law, separation of powers and constitutional democracy are entrenched in Uganda and all individuals are treated equally under the law and have equitable access to justice” seems unrealistic and it is doubtful that UNDP is capable of making a major impact on this (political) reality.
 | **Noted with thanks** | **In line with the CPD theory of change, the programme outputs are UNDP contributions to the broader national goals/UNDAF outcomes. This is based on UNDP comparative advantage and UNCT division in Uganda. Indeed if acting in silo, UNDP is unlikely to make any impact. However, the CPD contributions are planned in concert and syngergistically with other UNCT and development actors, to achieve progress towards the broader national goals/UNDAF outcomes.**  |
| 1. The CP integrates human rights and gender considerations in a satisfactory manner.
 | **Noted with thanks.** | **no comments** |

NB:

* We have made editorial changes to other paragraphs in order to accommodate the Norway comments within the 6000 word count.
* Under Natural Resources Management and resilience to climate change and disaster risk, the element on reduction of ozone depleting emissions, has been deleted because Uganda is no longer one of the priority countries.