**Tabulated response to comments on the draft CPD for Ukraine**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Comment (United Kingdom – 1):**More specifically, we recognise the rationale for the focus on recovery and longer-term interests but would suggest that in Paragraph 2 (p.2) it may be worthwhile to add or note that while the “ongoing conflict undermines stability and economic recovery” there are persistent emergency needs in the eastern part of the country.  |
| Response from UNDP: Done |
| **2. Comment (UK – 2):**The combination of humanitarian demands alongside recovery-oriented ones that can co-exist in some localities may make the operating environment a challenging one for UNDP. Feedback therefore on operational or implementation challenges would be welcome as an elaboration of the comments in the Programme and risk management section (Paragraph 23a, p. 6).  |
| Response from UNDP:This is addressed in paragraph 23a. Overall, UNDP will work closely with other humanitarian and development actors to build synergies and ensure a smooth transition from emergency responses to recovery and development, hence strengthen humanitarian development nexus.  |
| **3. Comment (UK – 3):**In the same vein regarding Programme and risk management, as well as in the Programme priorities and partnerships section (p.4), there is no mention of the limited access UNDP and other organizations face in non-government controlled areas (NGCAs) of Ukraine. While there are undoubtedly many conflict-affected households and internally displaced persons in government-controlled areas, it would be good to know how UNDP plans to help those in NGCAs. |
| Response from UNDP:UNDP mandate envisions its close cooperation with the government of Ukraine. In areas, where it is not feasible, UNDP will operate as part of the wider UN-led humanitarian architecture. Presently, UNDP is not registered (accredited) to work in NGCA. Hence, it will work closely with other UN agencies, in particular the agencies (UNHCR and IOM) that lead pillar 4 of UNDAF on recovery and development.  |
| **4. Comment (UK – 4):**Although the Programme rationale highlights that “Sustainable development is constrained by environmental degradation” there’s no mention of the additional and widespread environmental damage that’s resulted from the conflict in eastern Ukraine. It would be helpful to see UNDP adopting more of a leadership position on environmental advocacy and response. |
| Response from UNDP:This is addressed in paragraph 15, 19 and 20.  |
| **5. Comment (UK – 5):**As a final point, it would be good to understand which actions UNDP is directly implementing and what’s being done through partners or other organisations.  |
| Response from UNDP:UNDP plans to utilize both direct and national implementation modality: the choice will be determined on a case by case basis, in consultations with government and other stakeholders, building on current engagements. The programme areas and partnerships included in the CPD follow discussions on the theory of change, multiple assessments and consultations.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Comment (Germany – 1):**At the same time, – in the view of donor coordination, comparative advantages, and significance and effectiveness – a more focused and concentrated selection of UNDP intervention areas might generate even more significant impacts. In this regard, a stronger concentration of UNDP engagement on anchoring the human development agenda, the realization of human rights, the improvement of access to justice, and recovery and peacebuilding efforts in Eastern Ukraine could be of special value. |
| Response from UNDP:All the areas proposed in the CPD are based on UNDP’s comparative advantage, technical expertise and multiple assessments. Human development agenda, human rights, access to justice and recovery and peacebuilding are key areas highlighted in the CPD and results frameworks. A comprehensive recovery and development approach is adopted for the programme in eastern Ukraine and will link up to the results achieved in the past years in these target areas. |