**COMMENTS ON THE UNDP DRAFT COUNTRY PROGRAMME DOCUMENT FOR ZIMBABWE (2022-2026)**

*Second regular session 2021*

| **Comments by Member States** | **Changes to CPD** | **Country Office remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sweden** |
| * **Theory of Change -** A ToC with a very positive view on the preconditions (the Ifs) - a lot of preconditions that need to be in place that are not there right now. Rather big risk that many of the basic preconditions will not be fulfilled - question around usefulness of the ToC and consequences for programming and set goals. Understand that it is a theory - but risk if too much theory and not realistic. Is there a Plan B?
 | No changes made | The ToC developed during the CPD preparation process was not limited to only areas of UNDP intervention noted in the CPD. Rather, a broader analysis of how change happens in the country was undertaken to better identify UNDP’s specific entry points for programming. This analysis encompasses the UN Common Country Assessment findings and is reflective of the UNSDCF upon which the CPD is aligned. The programmatic priorities defined build to a larger extent, on the work that the CO has been doing over the years and this framework also recognizes the emerging areas/issues, thus, a balance has been created and presented in the document.Indeed, the ToC’s ambition will require careful monitoring. The range of causality, assumptions, and risks in ToC will be revisited during regular programme review with national counterparts to consider any appropriate programmatic adjustments. |
| * **Gender equality -** incorporated gender aspects in many of the thematic areas of work. However lacking clarity on your overall approach to gender equality - that this is an integral part of all of your work. If that is the case, recommend to include in paragraph 10 on holistic development approach, describing HRBA among other things?
 | Para 10 has been revised as follows.‘UNDP will build deliberate cross-programme synergies across the UNSDCF priorities and engage an even wider network of partners to ensure the use of a human rights-based approach throughout the programme that emphasizes principles of leaving no one behind and doing no harm to ensure that all human rights, including political, economic, social and environmental rights, are upheld. UNDP will work with other UN partners to address gender equality and women’s empowerment with a focus on women’s representation in political, economic and social spaces, as well as addressing issues of sexual and gender-based violence.’ |  |
| * **Health** in focus - interesting and important. Here we would just stress the fact that this area is the priority domain for several other UN agencies, could be good to make that visible - refer to them and stress work of UN as a joint team. (Being aware that coordination is a key issue here)
 | Para 11 has been revised as follows‘Furthermore, UNDP, as part of the Joint United Nations Team on HIV/AIDS, will work jointly with the WHO, UNAIDS, UNFPA and others to advocate for policies that serve the rights of key populations by removing human rights barriers to access to HIV services and by creating more enabling environments to scale up HIV services.’ | UNDP working collaboratively as an integral part of the Joint UN Teams on HIV/AIDS was already mentioned in the document. However, this has been revised to mention few UN agencies, noting that we collaborate with ALL UNJT members but cannot list them all due to the word limit. |
| **Germany (BMZ)** |
| * The first 3 bullet points on the country context describe the situation well and in a factual manner (except the sentence on the progress regarding social wellbeing in the first decade after independence. This seems totally out of place).
 | Para 2 has been revised as follows.‘The United Nations (UN) Common Country Assessment notes the progress made in the first decade of Zimbabwe’s independence; however, recent decades have recorded modest improvements and some declining socio-economic development indicators.’  |  |
| * The theory of change is far too complex. And it already pre-empts the mass of priorities (which is a contradiction in itself) that follows. It is too ambitious in attempting to fix everything at once. The descriptions of the priority areas are very broad, not giving an indication of how the intended change will be achieved. Focus on a few of the priorities might also prove to be more effective.
 | No changes made | The Zimbabwean context and operating environment are indeed complex and very dynamic, and the proposed programmatic framework recognizes these complexities. However, the ToC developed during the CPD preparation process was not limited to only areas of UNDP intervention noted in the CPD. Rather, a broader analysis of how change happens in the country was undertaken to better identify UNDP’s specific entry points for programming. This analysis encompasses the UN Common Country Assessment findings and is reflective of the UNSDCF upon which the CPD is aligned. The programmatic priorities defined build to a larger extent, on the work that the CO has been doing over the years and this framework also recognizes the emerging areas/issues, thus, a balance has been created and presented in the document.Indeed, the ToC’s ambition will require careful monitoring. The range of causality, assumptions, and risks in ToC will be revisited during regular programme review with national counterparts to consider any appropriate programmatic adjustments. |
| * With regard to priority areas, some seem too ambitious and not likely to succeed. E.g.: “A phased approach towards formalization of the sector – while recognizing the need for protection and empowerment – will enhance social services and protection for informal workers and increase revenues from a largely untaxed sector, unleashing a self-reinforcing cycle of formalization.” Change within the informal sector is as long as formalising is so difficult (setting up a business is complicated but also taxes are very high)
 | The statement has been slightly revised in para 17. | Yes, we agree with the observation that full formalization of the informal sector in Zimbabwe is an ambitious undertaking given the broader economic environment, an unsupportive policy framework including taxation policies, and negative attitude and perception around formalization among informal sector players. That is why we aim for a *phased* approach to formalization which involves a series of small steps to facilitate that long-term transition as guided by the UNDP’s strategy for informal sector formalization and working collaboratively with ILO, WBG and others. Beginning somewhere with small steps to address the barriers and gaps, such as engaging in dialogue, understanding the needs and gaps for such an undertaking, and supporting individual and micro level initiatives towards business formalization is what UNDP aims for under the new CPD. Initial support in the current period around SACCOS registration and capitalization, supporting Youth entrepreneurs etc. has yielded some positive results upon which such work can be scaled up in this CPD period. It is important to note that Government has requested for support with the development of a Formalization Strategy, and this presents an opportunity for UNDP, ILO and partners to evaluate and begin to engage with Government and other stakeholders in this ambitious process. |
| * Point 21(“strengthen the investigative, monitoring and complaints handling mandate of the independent commissions that will facilitate the country’s reporting to human rights mechanisms and strengthen the rule of law) is very relevant for German Development Cooperation priorities. It will be important to continue close coordination especially with regards to the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission.
 | No changes made | UNDP is one of the lead UN agencies providing support to ZHRC as well as other chapter 12 institutions. Indeed, the support to the ZHRC is provided in full coordination with the GIZ as represented by both partners participation in the quarterly ZHRC project board meetings. Thus, this comment is well noted. |
| * While the focus on strengthening government, capacities is important the programme should focus on actual operationalization of legal and institutional frameworks and policies. Here more information as to how UNDP is able to positively influence GoZ to operationalize its Vision 2030 key priorities would be useful. Convening power alone will most likely not lead to change.
 | No changes made | NDS 1 (2021-2025) & 2 (2026-2030) are tools through which key priorities of Vision 2030 will be realised. UNDP is currently supporting the implementation of NDS1 through the development of an M&E framework and Key Performance Indicators, as well as promoting stronger alignment to the SDGs. Further, through its support to the Parliament and Justice sector agencies, UNDP has supported the alignment and harmonisation of laws to the Constitution. UNDP’s Parliament Support Project (PSP) directly contributed towards the passing of 32 pieces of legislation out of the 68 Acts enacted between 2013 and 2018. The convening power provides the platform to deliver the technical support. The ongoing support will continue into this CPD period.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **The United States of America** |
| * We note that the draft CPD describes the development challenges in Zimbabwe with a technical focus.
 | No changes made | noted |
| * We strongly encourage the country office to engage stakeholders on the ground, including our mission to discuss how the CPD can help address broader issues and constraints to achieve long-term sustainability and success of its development work.

  | No changes made | This comment is well noted. UNDP will continue to engage with partners in all areas of its work to ensure strong synergies that can lead to impactful results and sustainability of the investments made. |
| * The United States and other Executive Board members - in formal and informal meetings of the Executive Board and with UN leadership, including the Development Cooperation Office (DCO) – as well as OP74 of A/Res/75/233 have set clear expectations that the UN development system do a better job to sequence entity-specific country program documents and their underlying Frameworks and/or outcome matrices. We note that only a draft outcome matrix was provided, without indication that it had been agreed by the Government and UNCT. In the future, we encourage UNDP to ensure that finalized UNSDCFs and/or clearly marked ‘final’ or ‘approved’ outcome matrices are provided along with the draft Country Program Documents during the designated commenting period.
 | No changes made | The comment is well noted. However, we would like to confirm that the UNSDCF and the RF were developed in a highly consultative process within the UNCT, with Government, CSOs, Development Partners, Youth, Women, Private Sector, Media, Persons with Disability etc. The draft outcome matrix has since been updated with additional comments received following the consultative process and a final version is being uploaded online, including endorsement letters from the Gov and the RCO. The CPD builds on the UN Common Country Assessment for Zimbabwe and is strategically aligned to the UNSDCF priorities, outcomes, ToCs as well as the results matrix. |
| * In relation to Strategic Priority 1, currently written as “People-centred, equitable human development and wellbeing: “People-centered” has been used occasionally in the UN-system, including in relation to the SDGs as a complete whole along with far reaching and comprehensive; to economies, in combination with dynamic, sustainable, innovative; and to describe SDG follow-up and review process principles in combination with gender sensitivity, human rights, and vulnerable populations. However, its infrequent usage raises ambiguity about its meaning in every context, particularly without other concepts and principles. The lack of clear definition raises questions about what it means in this context. We recommend that UNDP amend the language in its CPD to reflect more well-understood language of the UN system and SDGs, such as “inclusive, equitable human development and wellbeing”, and work with other UNCT members to update the language in the UNSDCF and its outcome matrix prior to finalization with the government.
 | No changes made | UNDP takes note of this comment and the rationale provided. However, as this is a UNSDCF level priority, the UNCT held a discussion to consider this recommendation, but the consensus was to maintain the current wording of the priority statement. This decision was adopted taking into consideration that the priority areas as well as the outcome statements were adopted following a series of consultations within the UNCT, the Gov, development partners, Youth, Women, persons with disability as well as other stakeholders. Furthermore, the Gov and UNCT have already endorsed and signed off on these priority statements. Consequently, the UNSDCF Results Framework has been finalized and the main CF document is at an advanced stage. Thus, various agencies including UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA have finalized their country programme documents building on these endorsed priority statements, and these CPDs have been endorsed by the Gov. Having said that, individual agencies have the opportunity to elaborate more on the practical application of this priority statement as they develop their respective program workplans and specific project workplans to mainstream key principles of gender sensitive programming, HRBA, LNOB, innovation etc.  |