**Responses to comments on the CPD for Iran**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Asia Pacific Country** | **Comment by Member State** | **Suggested response** |
| **Iran** | **France** - Axes prioritaires  Le nombre restreint de priorités retenues présente l’avantage d’éviter la dispersion, et semble conforme avec les besoins en matière de développement d’un pays à revenu intermédiaire comme l’Iran. Il est toutefois regrettable que certains domaines soient absents, et que le programme pays n’intègre pas de façon plus marquée les changements de paradigme induits notamment par l’adoption de l’agenda 2030 du développement durable et de l’accord de Paris sur le climat, et les évolutions induites par le plan stratégique du PNUD 2014-2017.  Les priorités sont demeurées sensiblement les mêmes d’un programme-pays à l’autre malgré l’adoption entre temps des objectifs du développement durable et de l’accord de Paris qui modifient substantiellement la coopération pour le développement (désormais durable) et n’ont été actualisées qu’à la marge ; par ailleurs les priorités retenues paraissent insuffisamment liées aux objectifs et surtout aux cibles de l’agenda 2030.  Modalités de programmation et suivi  Les indicateurs de résultats se limitent souvent au nombre de plans et de programmes, au soutien et à la promotion de politiques publiques dans tel ou tel domaine : les indicateurs de résultats mériteraient d’être affinés (ex. proportion des eaux usées recyclées, part des énergies renouvelables dans le mix énergétique iranien, nombre de bénéficiaires de tel ou tel projet).  Modalités de mise en œuvre  L'association d'un plus grand nombre d'agences onusiennes, comptabilisée parmi les résultats escomptés, est une bonne chose: de tels partenariats inter-agences étaient absents du précédent programme-pays. Des efforts additionnels pour associer davantage les organisations onusiennes autour de certaines thématiques seraient les bienvenus. | UNDP has taken note of the comments provide by France.  We appreciate the positive comments in regard to the limited number of selected priorities in the new CPD.  We would like to highlight the programmatic focus of the new CPD was developed through a rigorous analysis of UNDP’s value proposition in an upper middle-income context and clearly anchored on the UNDAF (2017 – 2021), the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the UNDP Strategic Plan (2014 – 2017). Furthermore, the CPD is aligned with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran’s 6th Five Year Plan (2016-2020)[[1]](#footnote-1) to achieve sustainable and inclusive development.  The CPD centers its support primarily on promoting a resilient economy through four key areas (CPD outcomes): 1) environmentally sustainable development; 2) health and development; 3) inclusive growth, poverty eradication and sustainable employment; and 4) disaster risk reduction and management.  Each of the 4 outcomes are linked to specific SDGs in the Results Framework. Many of the targets are in line with 2030 agenda targets.  In doing so, the CPD explicitly provides that UNDP’s contribution will focus to supporting initiatives that address the needs of the urban and rural poor, female-headed households, women and their economic empowerment, young men and women who need sustainable employment, people living with HIV/AIDS, those at high risk of contracting tuberculosis or malaria, most vulnerable to non-communicable diseases, and geographically disadvantaged and/or environmentally stressed areas. These underpin the 2030 agenda of “leaving no one behind” and the UNDAF (2017-2021).  UNDP Iran will continue to deepen the engagement with the government on the 2030 Agenda in the country in the implementation phase of the new CPD,  We take note of the comments in regard to outcome indicators. While many outcome indicators offer specific baselines and targets to be achieved and they are aligned with national targets, we acknowledge that there is a need for further strengthening of UNNP monitoring and reporting systems and tools. This will be an area UNDP will focus and invest to improve during the implementation of the new CPD.  The suggestion to put in place project-specific indicators is very useful. We will take this important issue on board in the process of designing and implementing specific projects.  We appreciate the positive comments in regard of collaboration and coordination with other UN agencies for development and implementation of the new CPD. |

***General comments from Canada on all UNDP CPDs***

* Canada would like to see more consultations with donor country missions in the field during the course of country program formulation to better coordinate and support country development priorities.

The request is well noted. UNDP will continue to make efforts towards greater consultation with development partners in the course of CPD formulation processes – as well as in the course of designing and implementing specific programmatic interventions.

* The inclusion and protection of the rights and health of women and girls are important in the implementation of Agenda 2030 and delivering development results. Canada encourages UNDP to further strengthen its programmes results and indicators so that they are gender-sensitive in Country Programme Documents.

The request is well noted. UNDP will continue to work to bolster the manner in which gender-mainstreaming and women’s empowerment priorities are reflected in country programmes, in line with UNDP’s Strategic Plan. Such efforts are already being reflected more explicitly in new CPDs. For instance, under the UNDP Mongolia Program, there is explicit reference to female-headed households as specific target groups. When challenges for gender-sensitive programming exist, these are also acknowledged: for instance the lack of national sex-disaggregated data in Mongolia has been noted in the draft CPD; in the course of the program implementation, UNDP intends to support the Mongolia government in overcoming the existing data gaps, which are critical for future gender-sensitive programming.

* Are theories of change being developed at the country level aligning country program results chains to UNDAF/One UN outcomes?

The theories of change are fully aligned and linked. Please see example of Mongolia and Vietnam.

1. UNDP CO have not actually cited the 6th Five Year Plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)