**COMMENTS ON THE UNDP DRAFT COUNTRY PROGRAMME DOCUMENT FOR MADAGASCAR (2021-2023)**

*Second regular session 2021*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Member State comments**  | **Change to CPD**  | **Country Office comments**  |
| **The United States of America** |
| * We welcome UNDP’s Country Program Document for Madagascar and appreciate UNDP Madagascar’s consultative and collaborative approach at the country-level. We encourage the country office to continue its engagement with stakeholders to provide additional information on the following questions related to the CPD:
* How is UNDP’s strategy taking into account issues of deep isolation and lack of infrastructure in the south, including roads, to better open and link up markets, reduce transportation/business costs, and create a more conducive investment climate?
 |  | * Kindly refer to Paragraph 26 (page 6) which clearly mentions that UNDP will support construction and rehabilitation of socioeconomics infrastructures and this will include sub-hydro-agricultural, rural roads, solar power plant, intercommunal market as per the need assessments.
 |
| * Will the budget be sufficient to support UNDP’s strategy, and its scaling and sustainability, when the strategy focuses on the most impoverished and challenging area of the country--the south of Madagascar--which has been further undermined by current humanitarian crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic?
 |   | * UNDP interventions in the south will not be carried out in isolation, but in close coordination and complementarity with other UN Agencies (including joint programmes) and development partner in accordance with the ToC of the UNSDCF. Furthermore, UNDP intends to strengthen its resource mobilization strategy in order to advance the scaling and sustainability of the Program.
 |
| * Indicator 1.3 Corruption Perception Index- It seems the baseline and target are identical. Is this by design?
 |   | Yes, this is the pragmatic design when we see the trend of the last couple of years (25/100 in 2020; 24/100 in 2019; 25/100 in 2018; 24/100 in 2017). The current CPD cycle planned for 2,5years is focusing on interventions aiming at laying the foundation and preparing robust baselines for reducing the Corruption by 2030. And this implies at least contributing to maintain the progress made in 2020 and ensuring the CPI is not going down during these 2,5 years cycle. |
| **Germany** |  |  |
| * Overall well-thought, well-rounded strategy that intervenes in some high priority areas for the development of the country. Its support to the electoral cycle was and is crucial. It should go on in the current “in-between-elections” period with regards to updating the voters’ register, ensuring technical feasibility of a fair, transparent vote, etc.
 |  | This is well noted, and UNDP will take into consideration these relevant observations during the implementation of the electoral cycle support chapter of this new program |
| * UNDP is and can be a natural partner for German development cooperation in the governance, anti-corruption and environment sector.
 |  | UNDP is very keen to strengthen its partnership with the German development cooperation in the governance, anti-corruption and environment sector |
| * Due to its broad, over-arching mandate, we encourage UNDP to take a more prominent role inside the UN system, encouraging the close collaboration and leveraging of synergies amongst different UN agencies.
 |  | UNDP will take into consideration these relevant observations during the implementation of this new program |
| * We encourage UNDP to further develop its transparency vis-à-vis other international donors and agencies. Needs in Madagascar are enormous, the donor landscape remains somewhat limited – there is no need to protecting one’s claim but we can all only benefit from information and access sharing.
 |  | This is very well noted, and UNDP will take into consideration these relevant observations during the implementation of this new program |
| * The proposal is in line with the national priorities in the sector of natural environment and response to climate change. Within the framework of the national coordination platform (*Plateforme de concertation sectorielle Environnement* / PCS-E) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the international donors, strategies and methodological concepts are discussed and a coordinated approach is called for. To ensure the efficiency and coherence of the UNDP program with the programs and projects of other donors, close coordination and joint development of instruments and approaches is required. Wherever possible, existing tools should be considered. Further strengthening of intersectoral coordination is welcomed.
 |  | Globally, UNDP interventions will not be carried out in isolation, but in close coordination and complementarity with other UN Agencies (including joint programmes) and development partner. Besides, UNPD is very open to any coordination mechanism and consultation with other development partner supporting the implementation of the national environment and climate change agenda. |
| * One should bear in mind the transversal aspect of corruption and potential consequences on UNDP’s achievement of objectives in SP3 and SP4. Potentially detrimental effects of corruption should be considered in the theory of change as well as in the risk management. Project approaches against corruption should not be conceded exclusively to SP1 measures, but also need to be integrated in private sector measures (SP3) and natural resource management (SP4).
 |  | This is very well noted and will be taken into account during the implementation of the program. |
| * Indicator 1.3: The CPI uses a number of sub-indices as source, including more general governance indices. This is one reason why the CPI does hardly change. For a time period of three years it is not recommendable to use the CPI as an indicator, because it will not show any progress. Particularly if baseline is chosen to be equal to the target. Instead one could choose for example one of the more specific corruption sub indicators of the Ibrahim Index of African Governance. Alternatively, one could consider the level/percentage of implementation of recommendations from the implementation review reports of the UNCAC. The first cycle review was conducted in 2015, the second cycle review in 2021. Following up on these recommendations would greatly interlink UN processes.
 |  | The CPI is a key indicator for the UN cooperation framework (UNSDCF June 2021-2023) as well as the SDG target for Madagascar regarding the fight against corruption to which the CPD is aligned as per the guidelines. the current CPD cycle planned for 2,5 years is focusing on interventions aiming at laying the foundation and preparing robust baselines for reducing the Corruption by 2030. And this implies at least contributing to maintain the progress made in 2020 and ensuring the CPI is not going down during these 2,5 years cycle. |
| * Indeed, if the CPI is chosen as a key indicator, level of ambition of a three year programme should be higher than to just maintain the (very low) baseline.
 |  |
| * Indicator 1.2.3: Maybe rather consider one or some of the national indicators of the national anti-corruption strategy, SNLCC (new version with indicators assisted by the EU). These should generally be considered more often throughout the result matrix, taking into account the transversal nature of corruption.
 |  | This is very well noted, and UNDP will look into these indicators while developing its support to the implementation of the national anti-corruption strategy. |
| * We encourage UNDP to format its next Country Strategy in a font size that is superior to 10.
 |  |  |