**Responses to comments on the CPD for Sri Lanka from Australia**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Asia Pacific Country** | **Comment by Member State** | **CO remarks** |
| **Sri Lanka** | **Australia-**  Australia appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback and input into the *UNDP Draft Country Programme for Sri Lanka (2018-22)*.  **Overall comments**   1. Australia does not have any concerns with the proposed thematic focus or UNDP’s analysis of the context and major risks. 2. The document positions UNDP as a policy adviser to the Government of Sri Lanka in some key areas - a relatively traditional role. Is it not also the case that UNDP aims to sell its policy services? At present, it reads more like UNDP will seek alternative ways to finance itself and its programs. 3. The document is almost silent on disability inclusion. Naturally, we think it is important to be more explicit about working with DPOs and addressing the specific needs of women and men with disability in all contexts, including Disaster Risk Reduction. 4. The document could be clearer about the approach to partnering with the private sector, if it is indeed the policy priority for UNDP that we understand it to be. | We would like to thank Australia for thoroughly reviewing the draft UNDP Country Programme Document for Sri Lanka (2018-2020). We note that Australia agrees with the proposed thematic focus or UNDP’s analysis of the context and major risks in the CPD.  As correctly noted in the comments, the CPD positions UNDP as a policy adviser to the Government of Sri Lanka, specifically in areas including climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and access to justice, with the overall aim of reducing vulnerability and improving inclusivity of development policies.  UNDP will continue to adjust its business model and ensure financial sustainability to sustain the initiatives outlined in the country programme document.  UNDP aims to scale up collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders, including the private sector, donor agencies, global development banks, the Government of Sri Lanka and other development partners to catalyze resources and financing to maximize progress on the SDGs.  We have noted the very valid comment on disability and have  disaggregated further the baseline and target information for several key indicators in the Results and Resources Framework to make clear which activities would have a more direct impact on persons with disabilities.  On the comments regarding private sector, whilst it is true that the mechanism or the ‘how’ of engaging with the private sector is not spelt out specifically in the CPD, we feel that reference to private sector has been amply covered in the document including also in specific areas of work, for instance the following to name a few:  •             *Pg. 6/Para 20 - UNDP will bring to scale a government co-financed pilot initiative to convert municipal waste to energy and other marketable products (through the promotion of public-private partnerships).*  *•             Pg.6/Para 22 - UNDP will facilitate engagement between the private sector and government to explore carbon-related taxes, penalties and incentives to promote low-emission development and increase investment in low-carbon development*  We would like to clarify that the means and mechanisms for engaging with the private sector will be actually determined when programmatic interventions are being designed and discussed with the private sector. |