**Tabulated Response to Comments on the Draft CPD Malawi (2019-2023)**

| **Comment by Member State** | **Changes to CPD** | **CO Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GERMANY** |  |  |
| German Development Cooperation (GDC) prefers to be recognized as one, even though we act through different implementing structures. | KfW and GIZ changed to GDC | Noted and amended. |
| GDC will also contribute to MICF as per commitment in November 2017 to the Malawian Government. | None | GDC is a valuable partner to the MICF with whom UNDP will continue engaging on this initiative.  GDC is already indicated in the RRF as a key partner for the MICF (MICF key partners are not mentioned in the text itself). |
| Will UNDP also support issues of regional integration (under SADC)? | None | UNDP will not support direct programming in regional integration under SADC as there are other partners already working in this space (World Bank and USAID) |
| GDC is supporting renewable energy and energy efficiency through a component of the global EnDev program in Malawi. Through the newly established Energy DP Group we will ensure good coordination of development partners in this field of action. | None | GDC and UNDP are active members of the Malawi Energy Partnership Group and will continue to explore areas for collaboration. |
| Development of an early warning system (EWS) by UNDP is a welcome addition to build a shock responsive social protection system.  As GDC Social Protection Programme (SPP) supports all government programmes in social protection, a request that UNDP collaborate with GDC SPP in integrating EWS across all social protection programmes. | None | UNDP welcomes the opportunity to integrate early warning systems into ongoing efforts to build a shock-sensitive social protection system in Malawi. A draft MOU to facilitate coordination with other development partners will be circulated in Q2 2018. |
| There is an opportunity for UNDP to connect to the Integrated Watershed Management Initiative led by the Government (MFEPD) so efforts on watershed management are properly coordinated.  For further information GDC SPP (GIZ) can be contacted. | None | As chair of the Development Cooperation Group on Environment, Resilience and Climate Change (DCERCC), UNDP is aware on ongoing efforts to improve the division of labour among development partners to improve catchment protection in high priority watersheds. UNDP is liaising with government accordingly to inform selection. |
| UNDP should collaborate with the UBR Task Force on this à (UNDP will leverage its investment in the biometric national identification cards to strengthen Malawi’s social registry) | WB and UN Agencies added to the RRF as key partners in ID card follow up | UNDP has initiated dialogue with UN and World Bank partners on the UBR and will engage the UBR Taskforce. |
| **DFID** |  |  |
| ***Overall comments*** | | |
| DFID have engaged with UNDP Malawi’s strategic direction shift towards this plan over the last few years and we broadly support the focus which puts UNDP as a key strategic partner – on the issues/agendas overall and on specific investment lines e.g. Malawi Innovation Challenge Fund (MICF) or projects e.g. National Registration and Identification System (NRIS) that we are key donors to. | None | Noted and UNDP appreciates the partnership with DFID on these key strategic initiatives. |
| We think there is a tendency in this programme to stretch into areas where others are leading players without much engagement (see below). This reflects our view that the UN is reasonably though not overwhelmingly coordinated in Malawi, and it depends in many places on the strength of the RC. | None | The areas are broad proposed areas and have as yet not been defined.  Discussions on decentralization are ongoing as a joint UN initiative and have been evolving in consultation with other partners, including DFID. |
| Overall, with the right people involved (and we recognise UNDP have some very good people), we feel UNDP should be aiming to be more effective – not only through the RC who has to represent the views of the whole family | None | It is not clear what changes are required here. |
| ***Governance*** | | |
| We are concerned that UNDP have had no conversations with us about support to the Anti-Corruption Bureau (ACB), where DFID plays a significant role.  UNDP have also not been engaged on this agenda in Malawi in the last few years | ACB removed from the text | This is put forward as a possible area of work which would be pursued only with full consultation with partners on the ground, including DFID. ACB was put forward as a possible partner (not beneficiary institution) but we have removed it from the text. |
| We are pleased that the document proposes investing in areas of UNDP comparative advantage e.g. elections, human rights, national peace architecture. However, the proposed investment in decentralisation risks duplicating large projects either underway (USAID with some UK funding) or planned (World Bank), especially without a clearer concept or significant resources behind it.  It is not clear from the document what value UNDP would add on support to ACB, given lack of technical engagement on this to date. | CPD reworded to focus on coordination | This refers to UN joint efforts to coordinate at the decentralized level to improve service delivery and efforts to improve coordination, which are not the focus of other large projects. |
| We welcome the areas of the plan which respond to local development needs - elections, human rights, national ID and related data improvements.  However, we feel other intervention areas - transparency and accountability; decentralisation; planning - are not tailored to the Malawi context.  They are overly focused on investing in development of more laws, policies and planning documents and “capacity building” of institutions.  This ignores the evidence that there is a relatively good normative framework in place, that planning documents are reasonable but disconnected from budgets.  It does not focus on the real challenge which is addressing the implementation gap and the related incentives. | Indicator 3.2.2 in the RRF changed to make clear intention is not to develop more laws. Some removal of references to capacity building to address this concern. | Our focus is indeed intended to be implementation not development of more laws or policies |
| ***Climate change and resilience*** | | |
| Whilst we have some concerns about the delays to implementation of the Green Climate Fund project, overall UNDP play an important convening role in the sector, and provide important support to national committees and processes, as well as playing an important role in preparing Malawi access wider sources of international Climate Finance. | None | Noted |
| We broadly support the proposed areas of focus, which are aligned with national priorities and plans.  There are areas of work proposed where UNDP clearly adds value e.g. Climate Information Services and Early Warning Systems. We welcome in particular the commitment to leverage their investment in ID systems by strengthening the links to social registries and efforts to monitor the impact of resilience building activities.  We also welcome the continued focus on women and other vulnerable groups and a shift to greater focus on strengthening district and local level Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) structures. | None | Noted |
| However, the document proposes a broad range of activities, spanning a number of sectors, including some areas such as Resilience of Urban Infrastructure where other partners (World Bank for example) are already active, and social protection where UNDP have not to date been very active (UNICEF and WFP playing a larger role in the sector).   We question whether the progamme is trying to cover too many areas, and whether it would be better to focus on those areas where UNDP adds greatest value.  Coordination with other UN agencies working on similar issues, e.g. watershed management which is also a priority for FAO and WFP, could also be enhanced. | Removal of reference to social protection | The aim is for UNDP to provide early warning information for other agencies to strengthen shock-sensitive social protection systems, rather than engage in direct implementation. We have removed the reference to avoid confusion. Leveraging the national ID card will also improve metrics about the efficiency and effectiveness of various resilience building interventions.  There is very close coordination with other UN agencies on all issues under the CPD, including catchment protection. |
| UNDP are well positioned to make the link from crisis prevention and resilience to poverty reduction and economic development. With stronger capacity they could provide greater strategic leadership on breaking the cycle of crises, building resilience and the overall humanitarian response – including with other UN agencies: helping them move on following crisis response. | None | Noted |
| ***Economic Development*** | | |
| We feel the document could benefit from removing jargon and provide more explanation of terms like “scale-up innovation to de-risk investment” which would help readers understand what the actions UNDP will take to achieve its objectives. | A footnote has been added for clarity | Noted |
| On MICF: |  |  |
| * 1. Whilst the Growth Accelerator is UNDP’s exciting new offer, which potentially speaks to broadening the number of investable companies in Malawi in the medium term, in the short term it will not have the economic impact of MICF. We would encourage UNDP to accord more significance to MICF in the narrative of this document and the associated work plan.   2. The “growth of start-ups” overpromises what it can realistically achieve. Whilst it will support the incubation of start-up businesses so that they can grow it is unlikely that this will generate a significant amount of jobs as these companies are too small to generate the levels of employment that a medium-sized firm would be able to generate.   3. It is very positive to see the new target on disability within the MICF and we would information more information on this. | Additional details respecting the MICF have been integrated. | UNDP will continue to prioritize the MICF as its principal platform for job creation in Malawi among medium size firms.  Recognizing the need to support young entrepreneurs and start-up businesses, UNDP will accelerate the growth of existing start-up businesses that have already been incubated and that require support to bring to market prototyped services and products that will ultimately benefit the poor (prioritizing affordability or accessibility of products at the ‘bottom of the pyramid’, or integration of these start-ups into supply chains as producers, suppliers or employees) |
| It is interesting that the Buy Malawi campaign isn’t mentioned here as UNDP is the main backer. Is UNDP moving away from this? | None | The BMS is designed to be self-sustained starting 2019 (which is the start of the new CPD), hence no further financial and technical support is envisaged. The BMS businesses and products being enrolled require payment of fees, with revenues generated to be allocated to sustain BMS implementation. |
| We would expect UNDP to hold a strong analytical base and overall narrative on the economy and what is needed. Overall, there seems to be a divergence between the analysis (which does not adequately address the underlying economic fundamentals and binding constraints) and the proposed actions. For example, the focus on supporting firms access domestic and external markets does not sufficiently address the issues of bringing down the cost of transportation which is one of the major constraints for firms to get their goods to markets – better adherence to quality standards and increased productivity will unlikely do enough to bring down the margins sufficiently for those firms to access markets. | None | UNDP has correlated only those binding constraints with actual programmatic interventions where UNDP has a comparative advantage. Accordingly, the CPD makes reference to improving quality standards as this reflects key interventions of UNDP, or promoting entrepreneurship (Growth Accelerator) and jobs (MICF). UNDP will not have a programme in its new CPD to address binding constraints such as high transaction costs in the transportation sector. |
| We welcome UNDP engaging on renewable energy and looking at off-grid solutions to providing energy, and would ask for more detail on how the programme will address the binding constraints. | Noted | UNDP would be pleased to provide additional details to the DFID country office, and other development partners, as coordinated is improved through the Malawi Energy Partnership Group. |