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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delegation’s comments</th>
<th>Response(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The number of sectors addressed and the CPD strategies described for each under “Program priorities” remain very wide-ranging. They seem to be less Syria-specific, but rather covering more or less everything that could be undertaken in any context within UNICEF mandates. This could lessen the usefulness and relevance of this CPD as a programming document. As a result, it seems questionable whether the ambition of the CPD for a 2.5 year period is not too high. It is understood that such a broad framework warrants flexibility and allows UNICEF to implement whatever it would have the funds for. A genuine and contextualised prioritisation of potential interventions, which would be all the more critical in a context of decreasing funding, seems necessary. - The elevated attention, in each sector covered, to systems strengthening and revisions or development of laws, policies or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
national plans, seems premature in the current context. It would go against the red lines of most UNICEF donors – hence, how realistic is it? Also here, references to conflict-sensitivity/do-no-harm approaches are necessary, which are essential and fundamental when aiming to address systemic issues, and legislative and policy matters.

- In general, it is important to make the CPD and UNICEF’s “strategies” more clearly inclusive and benefitting all children in a non-discriminatory way regardless of the geographical area they live in.

- The CPD could further benefit from tangible and concrete interventions. For example:
  
  * What about civil documentation for children e.g. birth certificates? It would make sense to, at least, include an indicator in the log-frame, which measures this basic right.
  * What is done concretely to help the young “lost generations”? – youth and adolescents.

- It should be considered to better describe the “integrated, multi-sectoral social and behaviour change communication strategy” (pt. 30). As it stands, it remains too vague. Modifications should include a reference to how this strategy would encompass different sectors. If carefully elaborated it could be a valuable approach to complement and supplement the current focus on delivery of basic services.
| Comments on specific aspects of the draft country programme document | - p. 5 theories of change. Which ones? (pt. 20). What is the difference with the vision of change mentioned on p. 6 (pt. 24)? Are they related to the 6 change strategies mentioned under pt. 27? Which changes are really aimed at? |