**Tabulated response to Comments on the Draft CPD for Haiti (2017-2021)**

**November 2016**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comments from Norway** | **Status** | **CO remarks** |
| The UNDP Country Programme is ambitious and presents a thorough and solid analysis of the situation in Haiti and points to the most important needs to be met in order to lay the ground for a sustainable and inclusive development. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Comment noted with thanks |
| The consequences of hurricane Matthew have made it even clearer that a sustainable development in Haiti is directly linked to one of the main programme components; Reducing vulnerability and strengthening resilience. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Comment noted with thanks |
| Norway has over the years had a good cooperation with UNDP in Haiti. UNDP has been active in the South and has built a good collaboration with local authorities. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Comment noted with thanks |
| The Country Programme intends to deal with a high number of challenges facing Haiti today, with activities in many sectors. Some of the interventions may risk to overlap with other UN agencies and other development partners’ activities, also geographically. More focused interventions in specific areas could make UNDP leave a more durable and positive footprint on the ground. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Though the CPD is broadly formulated, the programmes will be focused and formulated in close collaboration with other UN agencies as the UN in Haiti is transitioning and moving closer to a One UN approach. Examples are UNDP’s close collaboration with MINUSTAH, UNICEF and UN Women in a transitional law programme, with UN Women in its post Matthew activities, its collaboration with UN Habitat, its collaboration with UNEP in the development of a common NAP approach to name but a few. |
| We underline the importance of aligning the programme with the national priorities in the Haitian strategic development plan. We encourage UNDP to have an ongoing dialogue and a strong coordination with the national authorities. Solid discussions with the national authorities on substantive issues are essential to get long-lasting results. Lack of coordination and dialogue with national authorities could lead UNDP to duplicate initiatives such as studies and analysis- already developed. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | The CPD was developed in close collaboration with a wide number of national and local partners, as reflected in the results matrix, and is based on national priorities as expressed in the PSDH |
| UNDP’s cooperation with other UN agencies is, to our knowledge, challenging at times. UNDP’s efforts to secure funding should not reduce the possibility of other UN agencies with comparative advantages to get the necessary funds. UNDP should be strongly encouraged to work and coordinate more closely with in particular ILO og UNEP on the different programme priorities, in particular on poverty reduction and on reducing vulnerability/strengthening resilience. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Comments noted with thanks. UNDP collaborates closely with said agencies through thematic and sector groups. |
| We fully agree with UNDP that today, 6 years after the earthquake, it is important to move from a project focused approach to a more programmatic approach. | No need for additional reference in the CPD | Comment noted with thanks |