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# Guiding Principles

The Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) translates the Strategic Plan, 2018-21 (SP) into a set of development and organisational results. In pursuing its mandate, and in line with the provisions of the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) - UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/71/243, UNDP respects national ownership and is guided by national needs and priorities in all its programmes and projects.

The IRRF is meant to be strategic in nature, indicating the proposed trajectory of UNDP during 2018-21. The Framework, however, has been designed to allow for flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, including decisions by Member States and country demand. In developing the IRRF, UNDP was guided by the following principles, based on legislation and lessons learned:

* **Incorporate the 2030 Agenda and SDGs,** as well as associated international agreements such as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Istanbul Programme of Action, Paris Agreement, New Urban Agenda, SAMOA Pathway and Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction. The IRRF includes SDG indicators at impact and outcome levels. To better capture the principle of leaving no one behind (LNOB), UNDP has improved targeting, to ensure its contributions to development benefit those most in need such as the extreme poor, women, and persons with disabilities. To this end, outcome and output indicators target marginalized groups that include women, youth, people with disabilities, people living with HIV, indigenous groups and others, as relevant.
* **Harmonize with other funds and programmes.** UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and UN Women agreed on a harmonized structure of the IRRF in line with the UNDG RBM Handbook (now called UN Sustainable Development Group RBM Handbook) and UNDAF (now called United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework [UNSDCF]) Guidelines. In addition, the agencies identified a common set of SDG indicators to be incorporated at impact and outcome levels. Furthermore, common QCPR indicators are integrated in the organizational section of the IRRF.
* **Clarify and simplify.** While staying within the UNSDG RBM Handbook, and agreements reached with UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women, the IRRF continues to track a steady process of improvement in UNDP results architecture through successive SP cycles. Consequently, there has been a reduction in the number of outcomes and outputs compared to the IRRF for 2014-17: down to three development outcomes from seven, 27 development outputs from 38, and 57output indicators compared to 93. Similarly, organizational outcomes have been streamlined, and indicators from 48 to 39. In 2020, six outputs and 14 output indicators were added to measure UNDP COVID-19 response work.

The IRRF is structured to match the text of the draft SP, to tighten the ‘fit’ between concepts and results. This is evident from mirroring the three development contexts identified in the narrative across three outcomes. Contributions from each signature solution are also described as outputs under each outcome. In so doing, it becomes clear that outcomes can only be advanced through an integrated, multi-sectoral, approach that addresses connected causes of a development challenge.

In addition, alignment between the IRRF and results frameworks in country programme documents (CPDs) has been simplified. Monitoring and reporting are undertaken at the country programme (rather than individual project) level, thus saving time and effort, raising the quality of evidence and improving learning.

Overall, a simpler, ‘lighter’, IRRF combined with a reduction in reporting requirements, especially at country level, is helping shift the focus of RBM from compliance towards a results culture that enables management of UNDP work based on performance.

**Centre on country results.** The IRRF reflects country level results that UNDP enables through the implementation of country programmes and projects, in line with national priorities stemming from the 2030 Agenda and joint response from the UN System that is agreed upon with a government in the UNSDCF. While cumulative in nature, by collecting actual results achieved annually in each programme country, the IRRF allows for systematic analysis of progress made against annual milestones. As country programme results frameworks adopt UNSDCF outcomes while also aligning with the SP, country level progress in the implementation of the SP, as reported in the IRRF, also reflect UNDP work with UN country teams (UNCTs) towards achieving nationally defined annual and multi-year targets. This provides an opportunity to articulate the UNDP comparative and collaborative advantage in contexts where it matters the most: the country level. The approach taken, therefore, makes the IRRF an important monitoring mechanism for UNDP to track the relevance of the SP against a country’s efforts to achieve the SDGs. It also enables strategic management of the organization through planning, budgeting, and risk management from year-to-year.

* **Advance gender equality and women’s empowerment**. As an expression of UNDP commitment to promoting sustainable development that benefits all people and supports gender equality in all programmes, projects and development contexts, the IRRF includes gender responsive outputs and sex disaggregated indicators, and monitors progress through sex disaggregated data across outcomes and signature solutions.

* **Better connecting resources to results**. UNDP is advancing results-based budgeting by improving costing methods, reviewing project pipelines, analyzing demand by programme countries, using past spending patterns as a guide and income projections by sources of fund for 2018-21. During the SP period, around 125 CPDs (out of 142 or 88%) are expected to be renewed. As such, the amounts of the resource plan presented in the IRRF are indicative based on historical data. Actual expenditure will be analyzed every year in the Annual Report of the Administrator.
* **Build on what works**.Some aspects of the IRRF 2014-17 have been effective: the adoption of baselines, milestones and targets (BMTs), and use of scorecards with ‘traffic lights’ to capture output level performance. Similarly, the use of ‘markers’ for tracking progress on cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, has been a step forward. These aspects have been retained and expanded on in 2018-21 with a special emphasis on the SDGs, LNOB, joint programming, and South-South and Triangular Cooperation.

1. **Structure of the IRRF**

* **Tier 1: Impact Level (SP Vision)**

Impacts represent long-term development effects that benefit people. These are achieved through a wide range of development interventions. UNDP contributions to impact are monitored through a set of mostly SDG indicators that are closely related to the vision of the SP: five out of six impact indicators are drawn from the SDG indicator framework. Tracking of progress against impact indicators draw upon internationally recognized data sources. UNDP does not need to generate data for monitoring at this level.

* **Tier 2.a: Outcome Level (SP Outcomes)**

Outcomes represent medium-term changes in development conditions to which UNDP contributes, working with governments and other partners. Outcomes in the IRRF are framed according to the three main development contexts identified in the SP, namely advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions, accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development, and strengthen resilience to shocks and crises. UNDP contributions to outcomes will be monitored through indicators drawn mostly from the SDG indicator framework, including UN agency common SDG indicators: 23 out of 27 outcome indicators (85%) are drawn from this framework. As is the case with impact indicators, tracking of progress against outcome indicators utilizes data from internationally recognised sources and does not require additional effort from UNDP.

* **Tier 2.b: Output Level (SP Outputs – UNDP’s signature solutions)**

Outputs are changes in skills or abilities and capacities of individuals or institutions, or the availability of new products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention. They are achieved with resources provided to UNDP and within the timeframe of the SP. Outputs also reflect the UNDP comparative and collaborative advantage as outlined in commitments made in the Common Chapter and its Annex.

UNDP signature solutions are captured at the output level. The IRRF shows how different combinations of outputs drawn from each of the six signature solutions proposed in the SP contribute to an outcome. This avoids an *exclusive* connection between a particular signature solution and an outcome. In other words, outcomes in the IRRF can only be achieved through efforts *across* UNDP’s signature solutions. This embeds multi-dimensionality and complexity into the IRRF, reflecting the integrated and indivisible nature of the SDGs. The IRRF also incorporates flexibility and avoids a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach: combinations of outputs across signature solutions may vary according to country context.

Output and output indicator statements are gender-responsive and data collected is disaggregated by sex to ensure progress in gender equality and women’s empowerment is closely tracked in the implementation of all signature solutions. Output indicators also follow an agreed upon convention adopted by UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women whereby, depending on the nature of the issue, reference is made to ‘Number of countries with X or Y’. This convention naturally applies to those countries where, at the request of national governments, UNDP assists in the relevant area while working within the scope of the SP. Development results monitored using these indicators represent changes realized with support from UNDP.

* **Tier 3: Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency Level**

Organizational performance is monitored against a set of indicators aimed at assessing if UNDP is fit for purpose to deliver against the SP. This IRRF tier is structured in three major areas covering: accelerated delivery of top-quality programmatic results for the SDGs, organizational efficiency and effectiveness for programme delivery, and operational service arrangements for United Nations system-wide results, coordination and coherence. Outputs in each area are accompanied by indicators, including those relevant to track progress vis-à-vis QCPR mandates. Data reported against Tier 3 indicators comes from a variety of sources, primarily corporate systems, external reviews and surveys, and regular reporting by country offices.

**III. Planning, Monitoring, Results Analysis and Reporting**

The IRRF guides all business units to plan results and allocate resources, monitor progress, analyze and report on performance and lessons learned.

* **Planning:** At the onset of the SP, UNDP set baselines, annual milestones and targets (BMTs) for output indicators in the IRRF. BMTs were set by all business units based on analysis of data and evidence, lessons learned and available/forecasted resources. CPDs and regional programme documents (RPDs), and their associated results and resources frameworks (RRFs), have been and will continue to be aligned to the SP and IRRF so UNDP corporate-level commitments and strategies can be followed-through at all levels.
* **Monitoring:** UNDP monitors progress against planned results and resources through its annual planning, budgeting, and monitoring exercise. In addition, all business units monitor programme/project status and financial data. Reflecting its commitment to accountability and transparency, UNDP continues to publish project and financial information, including IRRF results, consistent with the standard set by the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).
* **Results Analysis and Reporting:** At the end of each year, UNDP conducts a results analysis and reporting exercise, with all units reviewing results achieved against annual milestones. Reporting against the IRRF comprises quantitative evidence, supplemented by qualitative analysis in Results Oriented Analysis Reports (ROARs). Data and analysis gathered through this process are presented in the Annual Report of the Administrator (ARA). The ARA and its annexes, including a populated IRRF with BMTs and actuals, serve as the basis for dialogue with the Executive Board at its Annual Sessions.

**IV. Population of Baselines, Milestones, Targets and Actuals**

In the Executive Board decision (DP/2017/30) it was requested that UNDP “provide baselines and targets for the integrated results and resources framework (DP/2017/38, annex 1)[…] at its annual session 2018, and in the lead-up to that annual session, requests that UNDP engage with the Executive Board on progress with the methodologies underpinning the indicators in the integrated results and resources framework (DP/2017/38, annex 1) and how the outputs in that framework will feed into the common chapter outcomes in the Strategic Plan, 2018-2021.” In response to the decision, UNDP developed methodologies to collect, aggregate and compute data for IRRF indicators and populated BMTs and actuals for the IRRF indicators at impact, outcome, output, and organizational levels.

* **Data collection for impact indicators:** Impact indicators are SDG indicators that rely on internationally published data sources. A baseline was provided for these indicators with the latest available data, but no targets were set since UNDP cannot establish these outside intergovernmental processes. Under each impact indicator the direction of progress towards the 2030 target is included.
* **Data collection for outcome indicators**: Similarly, most outcome indicators are SDG indicators or ones that rely on internationally published data sources. A baseline was provided for these indicators with the latest available data, but no targets were set since UNDP cannot establish them outside the scope of intergovernmental processes. Under each outcome indicator, direction of progress towards the 2030 target is included. For the SDG indicators, the Sustainable Development Goals Report and its Statistical Annex are used as the data source for reporting.
* **Data collection for output indicators:** The IRRF linking and BMT setting exercise was conducted from 18 April through 11 May 2018, where all country offices and regional bureaux linked country and regional programme outputs to IRRF outputs, selected relevant IRRF output indicators and set BMTs for the selected indicators. Unit level data was aggregated to the corporate level and presented in this report. The table shows the number of countries[[1]](#footnote-2) that have reported values to each output indicator during 2018-21. The IRRF linking milestones and targets will continue to be updated to reflect results to be achieved by new CPDs adopted during the SP period.

Data provided by country offices and regional bureaux was quality assured at regional and headquarters levels. Intensive efforts were made to verify incomplete or inconsistent data with the country offices and regional bureaux. The following assumptions were applied to a limited amount of reported data to enable calculation of a consistent time series of results expected over the SP period.

**Assumption 1 - Missing baselines**. If no valid baseline was reported, it was assumed to be equal to the first milestone (2018) reported as a conservative assumption that there were no additional reported results since the baseline was set.

**Assumption 2 - Missing milestones, actual or targets**. In cases where the baseline value was reported for an indicator, but the expected values were missing for one or more years, the missing milestone(s) and/or actual values were assumed to have the same value as previous one(s). For example, if a country does not provide a 2019 milestone, the 2018 milestone value will used for 2019. This approach was designed to provide a comparable time series in expected results across years while making conservative assumptions that do not overestimate the scale of changes over the SP period.

* **Adjustments to show results achieved under the SP.** For indicators designed to measure results achieved over the SP period of 2018-21, the baseline value was subtracted from each year in the time series to yield an effective baseline of zero and ensure milestones, actuals, and targets show only the results achieved during the SP period. Consequently, indicator descriptions were modified with the phrase “additional” to express the incremental nature of the indicator values. For indicators that are proportions, baseline values are not set to zero so the level of achievement can be analyzed across reporting years. This approach is applied to most IRRF output indicators unless the indicator has an annual nature, such that the baseline situation and those of the following years are not compatible and therefore not comparable. For example, countries may transition out of (or evolve into) crisis situations one year to another. These indicators are explicitly identified as “annual” indicators and baseline values have not been adjusted to zero.
* **Reporting challenges.** A few challenges remained after the completion of the April/May 2018 BMT setting exercise. BMTs of some indicators, particularly under Outcome 3, appear underestimated in a small number of reporting countries.
* **Challenges specific to output indicators using numbers and proportions.**

For the first time, UNDP introduced output level indicators with both numbers and proportions (output indicators 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.2., 1.5.1.1, 1.6.2.1, 2.2.3.2, 3.1.1.2, 3.3.2.1 and 3.6.1.2) with an aim to capture not only the number of people UNDP benefitted, but also the degree to which UNDP reached out to populations in need. A few challenges emerged while pursuing this attempt; for instance, some countries were unable to set sensible denominator values due to difficulty in estimating population in need in specific areas and target groups. Inconsistent approaches have also been observed in denominator values (e.g., capturing entire population of target groups in a country vs. a smaller populating group targeted by UNDP’s interventions). The methodologies and data for indicators that use proportions will continue to be improved as UNDP learns over the Strategic Plan period.

For indicators expressed as proportions, global aggregation is calculated using a weighted average approach (i.e., by dividing the sum of all numerator values by the sum of all denominator values to measure UNDP global performance). Alternatively, the global aggregate can be calculated using a non-weighted average by averaging the proportion values of each programme country. The non-weighted average shows the level of UNDP average performance at country level. The baseline, milestone, and target values of proportion indicators presented in the annual session in 2018 used “non-weighted average,” where applicable. After careful review, “weighted average” was adopted in this report to demonstrate UNDP global level performance. Performance data based on non-weighted average is available upon request.

When a programme is expanded to cover more populations, both numerator and denominator values may increase, potentially resulting in a performance rate lower than the baseline value, which is not necessarily an indication of negative performance.

* **Data collection for institutional results.** IRRF Tier 3 indicators are populated with data from three sources: a) data on UNDP performance collected on an on-going basis through systems such as Atlas or on-line monitoring and reporting systems, b) data self-reported on a regular basis by country offices or other units and validated by evidence and quality assurance processes, and c) data from periodic surveys.

**V. Data reviews and adjustments**

* In response to the Executive Board decision (2018/5) requesting “*UNDP to continue to refine and improve the IRRF as it continues to implement its Strategic Plan*”, an additional round of data quality review was conducted in July 2018. To better capture UNDP performance with clearer language or granular disaggregation, some modifications were introduced to a few indicators (Output indicators 1.1.1.2, 1.6.1.1 and 2.2.2.2) as reported in the 2018 Annual Report of the Administrator.
* Tier 2 output indicators. An additional round of data quality review was conducted between July and October 2019, giving country offices an opportunity to review and adjust their milestones and targets, particularly those offices that started a new country programme in 2019. The data review exercise resulted in an increase of the number of reporting countries and BMT values for many of the indicators, suggesting a higher level of alignment of country programmes to the SP, and increased level of ambition to contribute to the achievement of SDGs. In a few cases, offices requested to remove and/or adjust previously reported indicators due to reporting errors.

**2019**

**Number of output indicator components with increased countries reporting – 68 (out of 147[[2]](#footnote-3))**

Output components: 1.1.1.1.A, 1.1.1.2.B, 1.1.1.2.C, 1.1.1.3.A, 1.1.1.3.B, 1.1.2.1.A, 1.1.2.1.B, 1.1.2.1.C, 1.1.2.1.D, 1.1.2.1.E, 1.1.2.1.F, 1.1.2.2.A, 1.2.1.1.1, 1.2.1.2.A, 1.2.1.2.B, 1.2.2.2.B.2, 1.2.3.1.A, 1.3.1.1.1, 1.3.1.2.1, 1.4.1.2.A, 1.4.1.2.B, 1.5.1.1.A, 1.5.1.1.B, 1.5.1.1.C, 1.6.1.1.A, 1.6.1.1.B, 1.6.1.1.C, 1.6.1.1.D, 1.6.2.2.C, 2.1.1.1.A, 2.1.1.1.C, 2.1.1.2.1, 2.1.2.1.A, 2.1.2.1.B, 2.1.2.1.C, 2.1.2.1.E, 2.1.2.1.F, 2.1.2.2.A, 2.1.2.2.B, 2.2.2.1.1, 2.2.2.2.C, 2.2.2.3.1, 2.2.2.4.1, 2.2.2.5.B, 2.2.2.5.C, 2.2.3.1.A, 2.2.3.2.A, 2.2.3.2.B, 2.2.3.2.C, 2.2.3.2.D, 2.2.3.3.1, 2.3.1.1.1, 2.4.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.E, 2.6.1.1.F, 3.1.1.2.B, 3.1.1.3.A, 3.1.1.3.B, 3.1.1.3.C, 3.1.1.4.1, 3.2.1.1.1, 3.2.1.3.1, 3.2.2.1.D, 3.3.1.1.A, 3.3.2.2.1, 3.6.1.2.B

**Number of output indicator components with reduced countries reporting - 37 (out of 147)**

Output components: 1.1.1.3.C, 1.1.2.1.G, 1.1.2.2.D, 1.1.2.2.G, 1.1.2.2.H, 1.1.2.2.J, 1.1.2.2.K, 1.1.2.3.A.1, 1.1.2.3.B.1, 1.1.2.3.B.2, 1.1.2.3.C.1, 1.1.2.3.C.2, 1.2.1.2.C, 1.2.2.1.A, 1.2.3.1.B, 1.2.3.2.1, 1.4.1.2.D, 1.4.1.2.E, 1.4.1.2.F, 1.6.2.2.B, 2.1.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.C, 2.2.1.1.E, 2.2.3.1.B, 2.4.1.1.B, 2.4.1.1.C, 2.4.1.1.D, 2.6.1.1.A, 2.6.1.1.B, 2.6.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.D, 3.2.2.1.A, 3.3.1.1.B, 3.3.1.1.C, 3.3.1.1.D, 3.3.1.3.1

**Number of output indicator components with increased targets – 99 (out of 147)**

1.1.1.1.A, 1.1.1.1.B, 1.1.1.1.C, 1.1.1.2.A, 1.1.1.2.B, 1.1.1.2.C, 1.1.1.3.A, 1.1.1.3.B, 1.1.1.3.C, 1.1.2.1.A, 1.1.2.1.B, 1.1.2.1.C, 1.1.2.1.E, 1.1.2.1.F, 1.1.2.2.A, 1.1.2.2.C, 1.1.2.2.E, 1.1.2.3.B.1, 1.1.2.3.B.2, 1.1.2.3.C.1, 1.1.2.3.C.2, 1.2.1.1.1, 1.2.1.2.A, 1.2.1.2.B, 1.2.1.2.C, 1.2.3.1.B, 1.2.3.1.C, 1.3.1.1.1, 1.3.1.2.1, 1.4.1.1, 1.4.1.2.A, 1.4.1.2.B, 1.4.1.2.C, 1.4.1.2.D, 1.4.1.2.E, 1.4.1.2.F, 1.5.1.1.A, 1.5.1.1.B, 1.5.1.1.C, 1.5.1.1.D, 1.6.1.1.A, 1.6.1.1.B, 1.6.1.1.D, 1.6.2.2.A, 1.6.2.2.C, 2.1.1.1.A, 2.1.1.1.B, 2.1.1.1.C, 2.1.1.2.1, 2.1.2.1.C, 2.1.2.1.D, 2.1.2.2.A, 2.1.2.2.B, 2.2.1.1.A, 2.2.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.C, 2.2.1.1.D, 2.2.1.1.E, 2.2.1.1.F, 2.2.2.1.1, 2.2.2.2.C, 2.2.2.3.1, 2.2.2.4.1, 2.2.2.5.A, 2.2.2.5.B, 2.2.2.5.C, 2.2.3.1.A, 2.2.3.1.B, 2.2.3.2.A, 2.2.3.2.B, 2.2.3.2.C, 2.3.1.1.1, 2.3.1.2.1, 2.4.1.1.A, 2.4.1.1.B, 2.4.1.1.C, 2.4.1.1.D, 2.5.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.B, 2.5.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.A, 2.6.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.D, 2.6.1.1.E, 2.6.1.1.F, 2.6.1.2.1, 3.1.1.1.1, 3.1.1.2.B, 3.1.1.3.A, 3.1.1.3.B, 3.1.1.3.C, 3.2.1.1.1, 3.2.1.3.1, 3.2.2.1.D, 3.3.1.1.A, 3.3.2.2.1, 3.5.1.1.A, 3.5.1.1.B, 3.5.1.1.C

**Number of output indicator components with reduced targets –20 (out of 147)**

1.1.2.1.D, 1.1.2.1.G, 1.1.2.2.B, 1.1.2.2.D, 1.1.2.2.G, 1.1.2.2.H, 1.1.2.2.I, 1.1.2.2.J, 1.1.2.2.K, 1.2.1.3.A.1, 1.2.1.3.A.2, 1.2.1.3.A.3, 1.2.2.1.A, 1.2.2.2.A.1, 1.2.2.2.B.2, 2.1.2.1.E, 2.2.3.2.D, 3.1.1.2.A, 3.2.2.1.A, 3.6.1.2.B

* **Tier 2 proportion indicators**. During the 2019 data review exercise, country offices carefully reviewed denominator values of Tier 2 proportion indicators so all proportions are calculated using population-level estimates as the denominator. This caused previously reported BMT values for some indicators to decrease, making the values not comparable between this report and previous ones.
* In 2021, 26 offices started new country programme, during which they added new IRRF indicators according to the focus of the new CPDs, resulting in increase in 2021 targets. Some percentage targets have decreased where the denominators of new targets are big. Some country offices corrected the data reported in the previous years, which changed some of the early reported data. Detailed information on indicator changes is available on request.

**VI. Amendments to the IRRF outputs and indicators**

* **Tier 2 outcomes, outputs, and indicators.** During the MTR, it was determined that outcomes, outputs and indicators were properly designed to help UNDP measure the progress towards achieving the SP targets. Therefore, no amendments are proposed to the existing outcomes, outputs, and indicators.
* **UNDP response to the COVID-19 pandemic**. In 2020, six new and critical outputs and 14 new output indicators were introduced to capture UNDP COVID-19 response work according to Beyond Recovery - Towards 2030 (Offer 2.0) while existing outcomes, outputs and indicators remained unchanged. Out of 14 indicators, six are UNDP specific while eight are directly drawn from the UN Monitoring Framework for immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19.
* **Tier 3 indicators.** In light of the UNDS repositioning process, three indicators relating to UNDP hosting the Resident Coordinator function are no longer applicable and were removed from the table (3.1.1 Percentage of UN Country Teams presenting single annual report to programme country governments on progress implementing the UNDAF, 3.3.1 Percentage of Resident Coordinators that are female, from programme countries and with entity of origin other than UNDP, and 3.3.3 UNDP contribution to the backbone of Resident Coordinator system in US$ million.).
* **Amendment to Tier 3 indicator 1.1.2.** To better capture the degree to which UNDP reflects the development priorities of national government counterparts, the wording of the indicator was adjusted in line with the questionnaire of the Partnership Survey conducted in early 2020.
* **Improvement of Tier 3 indicator 1.2.6.** To better capture UNDP innovation work, the indicator has been enhanced through the design of three layers: 1) the degree to which UNDP uses innovative tools and methodologies in its development project outputs, 2) the degree to which innovative tools and methodologies are tested or piloted, and 3) the degree to which innovative tools and methodologies are scaled.
* **Amendments to the milestones and targets of Tier 3 indicator 2.2.1. a) and 2.3.2.** In line with the availability of core resources in relation to the delinking of the Resident Coordinator system, milestones, and targets for 2.2.1 (a) Percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities and 2.3.2 Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) have been revised.
* **Amendment to Tier 3 indicator 3.1.2**: In 2020, UNDP amended the indicator measuring the number of Standard Operating Procedure elements applied by the country offices due to the changes in reporting requirements and data collection in the Development Coordination Office’s information management system.

* **Removal of Tier 3 indicator 3.2.3.** Due to the difficulty in establishing proper data sources to measure clients’ satisfaction with UNDP provision of operational services, the indicator 3.2.3 has been removed.



**Note: Resources are in millions of US Dollars, RR-Regular Resources and OR-Other Resources.**

# Tier One: Impact

| **Impact: To help countries to achieve sustainable development by eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks.** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact indicators** | | **Baseline** | **Latest data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **1** | **a.** Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)  **b.** Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age | a. World: 10.9% (2013)  - Employed Population: 9.9% (2016)  - Employed Adults: 9.0% (2016)  - Employed Youth: 15.1% (2016)  - Employed Male: 9.8% (2016)  - Employed Female: 9.9% (2016)  b. 31.8% (2016) | a. World: 10.1% (2015)  - Employed Population: 6.6% (2019)  - Employed Adults: 5.8% (2019)  - Employed Youth: 12% (2019)  - Employed Male: 6.3% (2019)  - Employed Female: 7.1% (2019)  b. 30.1% (2020) | Decrease |
| **Note:**   1. Based on the International Poverty Line of US$1.90/day, adults refer to people over the age of 25 and youth refers to those between 15 and 24. For consistency, the baseline year for the world aggregate is 2013 and the latest year for disaggregation is 2019, as published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report” for 2021 (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2021/secretary-general-sdg-report-2021--EN.pdf> ) and “Statistical Annex” (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2021/secretary-general-sdg-report-2021--Statistical-Annex.pdf> ). Disaggregation by location is not available. 2. Based on World Bank data (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC>) and 110 UNDP programme countries where data is available. Disaggregation by sex or age is not available. Latest data year is 2020 with country-specific data ranging from 2011 to 2020. | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day 1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.1.1, 1.2.1 | | | |
| **2** | **a.** Human Development Index  **b.** Gender Inequality Index | a. 0.717 (2016)  b. 0.443 (2016) | a. 0.737 (2019)  b. 0.436 (2019) | a. Increase  b. Decrease |
| **Note**:  a. Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/HDI>. The world estimate is based on all countries with available data. Next update will be in June 2022.  b. Source: <https://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii>. The world estimate is based on all countries with available data. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicators | | | |
| **3** | Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 per cent of the population and total population | Total population: 2.5% (2015)  Bottom 40% population: 2.9% (2015) | Total population: 1.4% (2019)  Bottom 40% population: 1.9% (2019) | Increase |
| **Note**: Based on the data from the World Bank database (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.SPR.PCAP.ZG> ) and 53 UNDP programme countries where data is available. The baseline year is 2015 with country-specific data from 2009 to 2015. The year with latest data is 2019 with country-specific data from 2014 to 2019. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 10.1 By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 10.1.1 | | | |
| **4** | Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (disaggregated by sex to the extent possible) | Deaths/100,000: 5.71 (2016)  Missing persons/100,000: 2.78 (2016)  Directly affected persons/100,000: 1,204.37 (2016) | Deaths/100,000: 12.7 (2020)  Missing persons/100,000: 0.6 (2020)  Directly affected persons/100,000: 6,289.8 (2020) | Decrease |
| **Note**: Based on data from the SDG indicator database (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage> ). The baseline year is 2016 with country-specific data ranging from 2000 to 2016. Eighty countries had data for the number of deaths and directly affected persons while 56 countries had data for the number of missing persons. The year with the latest data is 2020, with country-specific data ranging from 2009 to 2020. Data from 117 countries detail number of deaths and 121 countries have data on the number of affected persons. Seventy-five countries have data for the number of missing persons. | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 13.1.1 | | | |
| **5** | CO2 emission per unit of value added | a. Total CO2 emissions – Fuel Combustion: 32,366 million tonnes (2015)  b. CO2 emission per GDP, PPP: 0.29 kg/constant 2017 US dollars (2015)  c. CO2 emission per unit of manufacturing value added: 0.5 kg/constant 2015 US dollars (2015) | a. Total CO2 emissions – Fuel Combustion: 33,513 million tonnes (2018)  b. CO2 emission per GDP, PPP: 0.27 kg/constant 2017 US dollars (2018)  c. CO2 emission per unit of manufacturing value added: 0.43 kg/constant 2015 US dollars (2018) | Decrease |
| **Note**: The baseline year is 2015. Values updated from last report, based on “The Secretary General’s Report on Sustainable Development Goals, Statistical Annex” (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2021/secretary-general-sdg-report-2021--Statistical-Annex.pdf> ). Previously published values for the 2015 baseline were updated in the 2021 report. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 9.4 By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 9.4.1 | | | |

# 

# Tier Two: Development Outcomes and Outputs

| **Outcome 1: ADVANCE POVERTY ERADICATION IN ALL ITS FORMS AND DIMENSIONS** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome indicators** | | **Baseline** | **Latest Data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **1.1** | 1. Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions, by selected measures of multidimensional poverty 2. Proportion of people sliding back into poverty | a. 31.5% (2016)  b. Data not available | a. 21.7% (2021)  b. Data not available | Decrease |
| **Note:**   1. Latest data from “Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2021: Unmasking disparities by ethnicity, caste and gender” (<https://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/2021_mpi_report_en.pdf> ), based on data from 109 developing countries. 2. Methodology for this indicator is under development. | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) Adapted from 1.2.2 (SDG is based on national definitions); (b) Non-SDG indicator | | | |
| **1.2** | Proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health and social protection) | Education: 4.7% GDP (2000 – 2016)  Health: 2.9% GDP (2015)  Social Protection: 4.6% GDP (2000 – 2015) | Education: 4.4% GDP (2004 – 2020)  Health: 5.9% GDP (2019)  Social Protection: Update not available | Increase |
| **Note:** Calculation based on data from World Bank (education), WHO (health), and ILO (social protection) databases. Social protection expenditure excludes health expenditure. Percentage of GDP is the simple average of country percentages from 139 (education), 145 (health), and 103 (social protection) UNDP programme countries where data is available. Baseline year varies according to country data availability. There is no update on social protection expenditure data from ILO. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.a.2 | | | |
| **1.3** | Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries | Total ODA 34,203.9 (2015) million constant 2019 US$ | Total ODA 35,925.3 (2019) million constant 2019 US$ | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” from 2021, also known as the “Statistical Annex*.*” Baseline year is 2015. Baseline value was updated in the 2021 report. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the Sustainable Development Goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.9.1 | | | |
| **1.4** | Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months | 12% (2017) | 11.7% (2018) | Decrease |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.5.1 | | | |
| **Note:** Estimates based on newly available data from the SDG database. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage>. Baseline estimate is averaged from 30 UNDP programme countries with data between 2004 and 2017. Latest estimate was averaged from 31 UNDP programme countries with data between 2006 and 2018. There is no update for 2021. | | | |
| **1.5** | Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population, by sex, age and key populations | World: 0.27 (2015)  Male: 0.31 (2015)  Female: 0.28 (2015)  Adults (15+): 0.37 (2015)  Children (0-14): 0.08 (2015) | World: 0.22 (2019)  Male: 0.23 (2019)  Female: 0.21 (2019)  Adults (15+): 0.37 (2019)  Children (0-14): 0.08 (2019) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information, also known as the “Statistical Annex”. The baseline year is 2015. Baseline value was updated in the 2021 report. | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UN WOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target**: 3.3 By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 3.3.1 | | | |
| **1.6** | Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure | a. With legally recognized documentation: 42.1% (2015)  b. With perceived rights: 88.6% (2015) | a. With legally recognized documentation: 24.3% (2018)  b. With perceived rights: 92.1% (2018) | Increase |
| **Note**: Estimates based on newly available data from the SDG database. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage> . A. Baseline estimate is averaged from 9 UNDP programme countries with data between 2011 and 2015. Latest estimate is averaged from 14 UNDP programme countries with data between 2013 and 2018; B. Baseline estimate is averaged from 10 UNDP programme countries with data between 2011 and 2015. Latest estimate is averaged from 25 UNDP programme countries with data between 2013 and 2018. There is no update in 2021. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.4.2 | | | |
| **1.7** | 1. Proportion of population with access to electricity (disaggregated by urban/rural areas to the extent possible) 2. Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology | a. Total: 85% (2014)  Urban: 96% (2014)  Rural 73% (2014)  b. 57% (2014) | a. Total: 90.1% (2019)  Urban: 97.3% (2019)  Rural 81.1% (2019)  b. 66% (2019) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex”. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 7.1.1, with additional disaggregation, (b) 7.1.2 | | | |
| **1.8** | 1. Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and age 2. Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence | a. 19%(2016)  b. Data not available | a. 12.5% (2018)  b. Data not available | Decrease |
| **Note:** As published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017” for the world aggregated estimate and in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” for latest data, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target**: 5.2 Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 | | | |
| **1.9** | Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals | 34 (2017) | 35 (2018) | Increase |
| **Note:** Estimates based on count of UNDP programme countries reported in the SDG database: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage>. There is no update for 2021. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.16.1 | | | |
| **1.10** | Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target:** 17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.18.1 | | | |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. Countries** | **2017**  **Baseline** | **2018**  **Milestone** | **2018**  **Actual** | **2019 Milestone** | **2019**  **Actual** | **2020**  **Milestone** | **2020**  **Actual** | **2021**  **Target** | **2021**  **Actual** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1  **POVERTY** | 1.1.1 Capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other international agreements[[3]](#footnote-4) in development plans and budgets, and to analyse progress towards the SDGs, using innovative and data-driven solutions | **1.1.1.1 Number of *additional* countries that have development plans and budgets that integrate international agreements across the whole-of-government**2**:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development | 76 | 0 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 23 | 30 | 29 | 35 | **30** |
| 1. Paris Agreement | 64 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 28 | **26** |
| 1. Other international agreements**[[4]](#footnote-5)** | 53 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 15 | 22 | **18** |
| **1.1.1.2 Number of *additional* national and sub-national governments and other partners sharing innovative and data-driven solutions:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. National governments | 15 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 18 | 12 | 27 | 22 | 45 | **48** |
| 1. Sub-national governments | 10 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 14 | 13 | 26 | **30** |
| 1. Other partners | 8 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 16 | 15 | 32 | **60** |
| **Note:** This indicator has been modified to better capture UNDP performance. (Original indicator: Number of national and sub-national governments and other partners applying innovative and data-driven solutions from the Global South accessed through SSMART**[[5]](#footnote-6)**.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1.1.3 Number of *additional* countries with data collection/analysis mechanisms providing disaggregated data to monitor progress towards the SDGs:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Conventional data collection methods (e.g. surveys) | 82 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 18 | 19 | 25 | 21 | 30 | **26** |
| 1. Administrative reporting systems | 76 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 19 | 20 | 27 | 22 | 32 | **26** |
| 1. New data sources (e.g. big data) | 56 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 22 | 20 | 31 | 27 | 42 | **36** |
| 1.1.2 Marginalised groups, particularly the poor, women, people with disabilities and displaced are empowered to gain universal access to basic services[[6]](#footnote-7) and financial and non-financial assets to build productive capacities and benefit from sustainable livelihoods and jobs | **1.1.2.1 Number and proportion[[7]](#footnote-8) of *additional* people accessing basic services, disaggregated by target groups** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportions: | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total | 23 | 42% | 45% | 47% | 50% | 53% | 54% | 58% | 51% | **63%** |
| 1. Poor[[8]](#footnote-9) | 13 | 53% | 54% | 60% | 57% | 60% | 58% | 61% | 61% | **61%** |
| 1. Women | 22 | 42% | 44% | 44% | 48% | 55% | 52% | 76% | 50% | **85%** |
| 1. People with disabilities | 10 | 51% | 51% | 51% | 51% | 51% | 50% | 51% | 50% | **51%** |
| 1. Youth8 | 17 | 40% | 46% | 44% | 52% | 45% | 62% | 46% | 48% | **42%** |
| 1. Displaced populations | 6 | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 30% | 31% | 30% | **31%** |
| 1. Other marginalised groups | 4 | 8% | 7% | 7% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 4% | **10%** |
| Numbers: | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Total | 36 | 0 | 6,078,966 | 9,365,166 | 13,213,549 | 22,960,116 | 22,244,117 | 34,800,779 | 46,628,329 | **71,154,570** |
| b) Poor | 20 | 0 | 3,996,878 | 3,665,502 | 7,299,157 | 10,168,568 | 12,578,161 | 15,160,607 | 16,676,101 | **26,105,765** |
| c) Women | 33 | 0 | 5,311,859 | 3,219,909 | 11,242,891 | 17,788,905 | 19,291,653 | 35,906,361 | 38,585,100 | **65,497,229** |
| d) People with disabilities | 16 | 0 | 125,101 | 17,376 | 280,498 | 396,644 | 546,848 | 809,955 | 809,339 | **1,391,461** |
| e) Youth | 24 | 0 | 1,516,914 | 1,159,991 | 3,285,680 | 1,884,870 | 5,679,864 | 2,260,396 | 6,267,653 | **4,083,072** |
| f) Displaced | 6 | 0 | 70,345 | 76,335 | 140,365 | 142,204 | 210,903 | 240,931 | 281,425 | **338,971** |
| g) Other | 10 | 0 | 143,393 | 163,203 | 322,609 | 353,685 | 512,419 | 393,425 | 613,523 | **832,808** |
| **Note**:   * Although most countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs some were unable to set BMT proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values and/or did not use a consistent approach to populating denominators. * Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21. Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results. * Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.   “Other” marginalized group components are not elaborated here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1.2.2 Number and proportion of *additional* people accessing financial services and non-financial assets, disaggregated by target groups:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accessing *financial services*, proportions | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Total | 19 | 69% | 67% | 69% | 68% | 73% | 69% | 73% | 69% | **76%** |
| b) Poor | 17 | 30% | 31% | 30% | 34% | 30% | 34% | 30% | 35% | **34%** |
| c) Women | 18 | 64% | 68% | 64% | 68% | 66% | 69% | 66% | 81% | **68%** |
| d) People with disabilities | 9 | 80% | 90% | 90% | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% | 92% | **92%** |
| e) Youth | 15 | 86% | 86% | 86% | 89% | 86% | 89% | 89% | 90% | **90%** |
| f) Other | 5 | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 7% | 9% | **8%** |
| Accessing *financial services*, numbers | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Total | 25 | 0 | 17,532,935 | 20,889,299 | 22,149,544 | 24,331,882 | 27,103,640 | 26,569,489 | 32,602,963 | **40,309,412** |
| b) Poor | 19 | 0 | 1,273,389 | 367,425 | 4,173,748 | 5,468,622 | 4,520,612 | 5,880,881 | 4,857,034 | **10,823,962** |
| c) Women | 24 | 0 | 6,226,912 | 1,906,741 | 7,863,806 | 5,326,451 | 9,429,426 | 6,617,146 | 25,980,376 | **9,172,363** |
| d) People with disabilities | 12 | 0 | 8,382,456 | 8,382,547 | 8,858,063 | 8,858,073 | 9,029,590 | 9,031,315 | 9,202,624 | **10,144,290** |
| e) Youth | 20 | 0 | 157,603 | 163,950 | 2,133,433 | 171,383 | 2,215,263 | 2,162,159 | 2,308,299 | **4,700,875** |
| f) Other | 5 | 0 | 101 | 101 | 209 | 209 | 1,358 | 535 | 1,967 | **2,676** |
| Accessing *non-financial assets*, proportions | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Total | 10 | 34% | 33% | 37% | 38% | 38% | 39% | 40% | 41% | **40%** |
| b) Poor | 9 | 62% | 70% | 67% | 69% | 69% | 71% | 70% | 69% | **66%** |
| c) Women | 12 | 28% | 28% | 32% | 33% | 33% | 34% | 35% | 33% | **33%** |
| d) People with disabilities | 3 | 33% | 34% | 55% | 61% | 55% | 61% | 55% | 61% | **55%** |
| e) Youth | 8 | 49% | 50% | 65% | 63% | 63% | 65% | 64% | 67% | **63%** |
| f) Other | 1 | 15% | 15% | 15% | 27% | 15% | 27% | 27% | 27% | **27%** |
| Accessing *non-financial assets*, numbers | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Total | 13 | 0 | 21,726 | 853,410 | 1,244,159 | 1,290,268 | 1,556,899 | 1,688,262 | 1,923,969 | **1,917,941** |
| b) Poor | 10 | 0 | 827,441 | 477,115 | 885,610 | 881,848 | 1,175,550 | 1,167,071 | 1,497,150 | **1,179,509** |
| c) Women | 16 | 0 | 28,630 | 434,202 | 639,687 | 665,672 | 810,678 | 881,269 | 994,242 | **995,889** |
| d) People with disabilities | 6 | 0 | 726 | 18,243 | 22,015 | 18,243 | 22,040 | 18,393 | 22,117 | **19,164** |
| e) Youth | 13 | 0 | 14,909 | 241,411 | 251,126 | 261,079 | 262,886 | 265,552 | 275,821 | **282,483** |
| f) Other | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,817 | 0 | 8,817 | 8,817 | 8,817 | **8,817** |
| **Note**:   * Although most countries selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators. * Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21. Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results. * Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.   “Other” marginalized group components are not elaborated here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1.2.3 Number of *additional* countries with an improved enabling environment for expansion of decent work and livelihoods:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks | 67 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 21 | 23 | 26 | 25 | 29 | **28** |
| b) Direct creation of employment in | | | | | | | | | | |
| b1) Public sector | 29 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | **13** |
| b2) Private sector | 51 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 15 | **19** |
| c) Supporting livelihood | | | | | | | | | | |
| c1) Public sector | 30 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 10 | **13** |
| c2) Private sector | 58 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 23 | **26** |
| **Note:** Further disaggregation (c) was added to capture employment creation and livelihood support separately. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **[NEW]**  1.1.3 Inequalities that permeated societies before and are more starkly visible after the COVID-19 pandemic uprooted by social protection schemes | **1.1.3.1 Number of *additional* people whose jobs are protected by economic or other labour market measures, disaggregated by sex and locations:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 26 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 257,864 | 261,246 | 374,099 | **271,806** |
| 1. Male | 23 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 261,115 | 275,563 | 388,486 | **293,442** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 361,908 | 362,637 | 428,029 | **428,369** |
| 1. Urban | 13 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6,694 | 2,998 | 8,054 | **11,428** |
| 1. Rural | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3,605 | 3,840 | 9,438 | **8,719** |
| 1. Location disaggregation unavailable | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 782 | 962 | 1,800 | **980** |
| **1.1.3.2 Number of private sector companies and formal and informal sector workers supported during and after the COVID-19 pandemic[[9]](#footnote-10):** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Micro, small, medium enterprises (MSMEs) | 53 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 27,484 | 36,396 | 38,565 | **55,710** |
| 1. Private sector companies, excluding MSMEs | 19 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 20,514 | 20,504 | 20,666 | **20,519** |
| 1. Formal sector workers | 30 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 489,833 | 533,476 | 514,420 | **564,538** |
| 1. Informal sector workers | 38 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,352,400 | 1,180,576 | 2,080,736 | **1,237,495** |
| **1.1.3.3 Number of beneficiaries of social protection schemes and services related to the COVID-19 pandemic, disaggregated by type of programme and sex[[10]](#footnote-11):** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cash transfer programmes | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 15 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 289,559 | 275,234 | 297,124 | **282,296** |
| 1. Male | 13 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 122,460 | 121,815 | 125,323 | **124,194** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,588,682 | 1,470,713 | 1,706,310 | **1,486,811** |
| Cash for work (productivity) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 15 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 20,403 | 17,139 | 22,707 | **18,359** |
| 1. Male | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 23,245 | 20,701 | 26,844 | **23,988** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 9 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 349,847 | 294,417 | 373,886 | **294,417** |
| Water and sanitation services | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 11 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,227,353 | 1,227,501 | 1,246,555 | **1,227,501** |
| 1. Male | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,216,713 | 1,223,882 | 1,222,026 | **1,223,698** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 430,103 | 584,883 | 816,603 | **590,448** |
| Food and nutrition schemes | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 253,090 | 424,720 | 432,594 | **426,448** |
| 1. Male | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 108,541 | 102,303 | 114,425 | **103,150** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 11 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 29,838 | 188,843 | 96,531 | **245,936** |
| Legal aid services | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 16 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 15,312 | 20,530 | 23,673 | **26,297** |
| 1. Male | 12 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 13,649 | 16,977 | 18,636 | **20,553** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 5,229 | 39,623 | 10,422 | **60,256** |
| Human right protection services | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 4,075 | 4,075 | 6,923 | **6,856** |
| 1. Male | 4 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2,649 | 2,699 | 2,801 | **2,699** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 192,754 | 135,005 | 330,071 | **330,307** |
| Psychosocial support services | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 16 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 382,755 | 426,533 | 387,515 | **430,103** |
| 1. Male | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 4,921 | 5,194 | 7,707 | **6,442** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 332,791 | 356,703 | 361,781 | **356,932** |
| **1.1.3.4 Number ofcountries that undertook socio-economic impact assessments in response to the COVID-19 crisis, with a focus on vulnerable groups, directed at-risk populations[[11]](#footnote-12):** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Macro-meso economic needs assessment | 60 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 55 | 54 | 59 | **57** |
| 1. Labour market impact assessment | 47 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 39 | 37 | 44 | **39** |
| 1. Multi-sectoral and sectoral needs assessment | 54 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 46 | 45 | 52 | **49** |
| 1. Fiscal and public debt assessment | 28 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 20 | 26 | **24** |
| 1. Human impact needs assessment for at risk populations | 54 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 43 | 42 | 50 | **47** |
| 1. Gender sensitive impact assessments | 50 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 43 | 39 | 48 | **41** |
| **1.1.3.5 Number of countries implementing policies informed by socio-economic impact assessment, directed at-risk populations[[12]](#footnote-13):** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Socio-economic policy including employment | 37 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 35 | 31 | 37 | **33** |
| 1. Labour market policies, including food security assessment | 19 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 14 | 19 | **16** |
| 1. Fiscal Policy | 25 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 18 | 25 | **21** |
| 1. Social Protection Policy | 28 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 25 | 22 | 28 | **25** |
| 1. Women’s empowerment policy | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 17 | 11 | 19 | **12** |
| **1.1.3.6 Number of countries that have increased investments to strengthen social protection systems to safeguard the most vulnerable population groups with a direct effect on income or access to services** | 27 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 24 | 24 | 27 | **27** |
| #2  **GOVERNANCE** | 1.2.1 Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic development and deliver basic services4 including HIV and related services | **1.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries where national and sub-national governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage and monitor basic services4** | 88 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 27 | 32 | 40 | 40 | 44 | **43** |
| **1.2.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with inclusive local economic development (LED) strategies and plans in place:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. With institutional frameworks for implementation in local and regional governments | 45 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 14 | 21 | 16 | 26 | **20** |
| 1. With public-private partnerships at scale for accelerating catalytic LED initiatives | 36 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 11 | 7 | 15 | 11 | 23 | **16** |
| 1. With urban development plans and strategies in line with the New Urban Agenda under implementation | 26 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 13 | 19 | **17** |
| **1.2.1.3 Number of people who have access to HIV and related services, disaggregated by sex and type of service:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Behavioural change communication | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 23 | 4,348,313 | 5,097,914 | 5,958,009 | 5,396,446 | 9,354,630 | 4,785,560 | 7,051,438 | 4,897,630 | **6,679,936** |
| a1) Number of males reached | 24 | 1,870,021 | 1,936,631 | 2,300,347 | 2,037,871 | 5,742,847 | 1,918,172 | 2,962,981 | 1,964,526 | **2,912,457** |
| a2) Number of females reached | 24 | 2,369,869 | 2,728,394 | 3,469,778 | 2,854,558 | 3,382,031 | 2,293,744 | 3,799,562 | 2,344,091 | **3,705,358** |
| b) Antiretroviral (ARV) treatment | n/a | 2.2 million | 1.4  million | 1.4  million | 1.4  million | 1.4  million | 1.4  million | 1.4 million | 1.5  million | **1.5**  **million** |
| **Note**:   * Not all countries reported sex-disaggregated numbers; therefore, males and females reached may not add up to total. * This indicator is reported on an annual basis and is not cumulative. * For component (b) UNDP work output is based on numbers reported from countries where UNDP is the Principal Recipient of Global Fund grants. When the government can take over responsibility for the management of a grant, UNDP will hand over and cease to claim the number of people accessing ARV treatment as a “UNDP result.” Milestones are therefore based on the assumption that UNDP will continue to act as the Principal Recipient for these countries throughout the SP period. * ARV treatment numbers are based on the harmonized reporting mechanism managed by UNDP and the Global Fund. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2.2 Enabling environment strengthened to expand public and private financing for the achievement of the SDGs | **1.2.2.1 Number of *additional* countries with an enabling environment in place leveraging additional resources from public and private sources[[13]](#footnote-14) for the SDGs:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks | 28 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 12 | 10 | 17 | **15** |
| 1. Institutional mechanisms | 35 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 15 | 25 | **22** |
| **1.2.2.2 Volume[[14]](#footnote-15) of *additional* resources leveraged through public and private financing8 for the SDGs with UNDP support:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| At national level | | | | | | | | | | |
| a1) Public | 14 | 0 | 52,247,904 | 61,305,812 | 121,675,526 | 107,205,189 | 195,179,549 | 189,483,660 | 779,550,126 | **2,017,820,861** |
| a2) Private | 13 | 0 | 3,301,006 | 4,227,018 | 36,726,649 | 21,384,370 | 77,326,650 | 34,397,173 | 135,262,437 | **55,379,167** |
| At sub-national level | | | | | | | | | | |
| b1) Public | 5 | 0 | 21,500,000 | 18,485,294 | 41,610,000 | 34,009,780 | 79,830,000 | 46,692,007 | 91,840,000 | **52,607,927** |
| b2) Private | 5 | 0 | 2,530,000 | 20,800,093 | 14,745,000 | 33,228,229 | 26,525,000 | 35,554,221 | 42,825,000 | **52,223,466** |
| 1.2.3 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication | **1.2.3.1 Number of *additional* countries with effective measures adopted to mitigate and remedy corruption risks at:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. National level | 46 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 17 | **14** |
| 1. Sub-national level | 39 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 17 | **20** |
| 1. Sector level | 39 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 16 | 21 | 23 | **26** |
| **1.2.3.2 Number of *additional* countries that adopt and implement with UNDP assistance, upon request, constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information** | 14 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | **5** |
| #3  **RESILIENCE** | 1.3.1 National capacities and evidence-based assessment and planning tools enable gender-responsive and risk-informed development investments, including for response to and recovery from crisis | **1.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with recovery plans and systems in place utilizing sex, age and disability disaggregated data and gender analysis[[15]](#footnote-16)** | 23 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 15 | **12** |
| **1.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with development, risk reduction and recovery interventions informed by multi-hazard and other risk assessments** | 36 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 17 | **12** |
| #4  **SUSTAINABLE**  **PLANET** | 1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains | **1.4.1.1 Number of *additional* micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises utilizing supplier development platforms for inclusive and sustainable value chains** | 45 | 0 | 153,365 | 71,097 | 214,699 | 80,399 | 228,763 | 97,427 | 237,776 | **129,135** |
| **1.4.1.2 *Additional* natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Area of land and marine habitat under protection (hectares) | 37 | 0 | 6,337,562 | 6,049,241 | 9,430,348 | 6,553,326 | 10,784,656 | 8,664,454 | 18,742,730 | **10,955,199** |
| 1. Area of existing protected area under improved management (hectares) | 59 | 0 | 29,847,477 | 27,244,602 | 43,064,867 | 43,056,940 | 47,991,302 | 72,884,346 | 103,619,896 | **83,739,890** |
| 1. Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under cooperative management | 30 | 0 | 66 | 13 | 166 | 5,505 | 5,610 | 5,533 | 14,454 | **179,395** |
| 1. Area under sustainable forest management (hectares) | 62 | 0 | 1,747,154 | 3,936,155 | 5,767,006 | 5,048,423 | 9,679,941 | 21,615,011 | 13,619,978 | **29,803,436** |
| 1. Area of land under improved sustainable land management regime (hectares) | 52 | 0 | 1,567,457 | 11,722,602 | 5,084,355 | 14,151,054 | 74,582,441 | 35,091,917 | 81,595,186 | **50,997,603** |
| 1. Amount of chemicals reduced or disposed (metric tons) | 31 | 0 | 2,713 | 3,962 | 1,039,186 | 7,996 | 3,096,618 | 54,474 | 3,111,460 | **427,965** |
| #5  **ENERGY** | 1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy[[16]](#footnote-17) | **1.5.1.1 Number and proportion of *additional* households benefitting from clean, affordable and sustainable energy access:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportions: | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total households | 30 | 46% | 46% | 46% | 47% | 46% | 47% | 48% | 47% | **73%** |
| 1. Women-headed | 19 | 77% | 78% | 78% | 79% | 79% | 79% | 81% | 80% | **82%** |
| 1. In rural areas | 28 | 27% | 26% | 27% | 27% | 24% | 28% | 25% | 28% | **26%** |
| 1. In urban and peri-urban areas | 14 | 95% | 95% | 96% | 96% | 95% | 96% | 96% | 96% | **96%** |
| Numbers: | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total households | 36 | 0 | 1,640,331 | 1,655,516 | 3,465,130 | 2,695,426 | 4,586,524 | 5,199,636 | 5,678,205 | **15,613,410** |
| 1. Women-headed | 27 | 0 | 594,429 | 611,639 | 1,388,823 | 1,430,872 | 1,890,583 | 2,585,305 | 3,628,118 | **4,445,680** |
| 1. In rural areas | 33 | 0 | 482,703 | 375,454 | 1,023,431 | 1,189,501 | 1,588,687 | 2,188,950 | 2,040,223 | **2,426,685** |
| 1. In urban and peri-urban areas | 15 | 0 | 1,227,048 | 1,338,724 | 1,953,315 | 1,586,567 | 2,651,179 | 2,824,346 | 3,337,343 | **3,354,225** |
| **Note**:   * Although most countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators. * Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21. Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results.   Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP-supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive. | | | | | | | | | | |
| #6  **GENDER** | 1.6.1 Country-led measures accelerated to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment | **1.6.1.1 Number of *additional* key measures[[17]](#footnote-18) in place that set and monitor progress towards numeric targets for women's leadership in the:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Public sector | 31 | 0 | 30 | 48 | 74 | 69 | 255 | 92 | 419 | **121** |
| 1. Elected positions, including parliament | 13 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 51 | 49 | 52 | 51 | 61 | **162** |
| 1. Judiciary | 10 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 18 | 10 | 23 | **16** |
| 1. Private sector | 22 | 0 | 23 | 25 | 39 | 38 | 55 | 56 | 91 | **85** |
| **Note:** Indicator component (b) Elected positions and (c) Judiciary were added after the Executive Board (2018 June) to better capture UNDP performance. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.6.2 Measures in place and implemented across sectors to prevent and respond to Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) | **1.6.2.1 Proportion of GBV cases reported to authorities receiving judgment in the formal justice system** | 17 | 34% | 34% | 34% | 37% | 35% | 39% | 39% | 50% | **45%** |
| **Note:** The baseline is kept as reported to indicate intended and actual status under each reporting year. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.6.2.2 Number of *additional* countries with frameworks in place to prevent and respond to SGBV:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Multi-sectoral policy and legislation | 37 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 11 | **9** |
| 1. Multi-sectoral services including justice and security | 35 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 13 | **12** |
| 1. Platforms for raising awareness and social mobilisation | 35 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 11 | **10** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2: ACCELERATE STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators** | | | **Baseline** | **Latest data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **2.1** | | Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, new-borns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable | Childrena: 35% (2016)  Mothers with newbornsb: 41% (2016)  Older personsc: 68% (2016)  Unemployedd: 22% (2016)  Persons with severe disabilitye: 28% (2016)  Vulnerablef: 25% (2016) | Children: 26.4% (2020)  Mothers with newborns: 44.9% (2020)  Older persons: 77.5% (2020)  Unemployed: 21.8% (2020)  Persons with severe disability: 33.5% (2020)  Vulnerable: 28.9% (2020) | Increase |
| **Note**:  As published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2018” and “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” 2018, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Disaggregation by sex is not available. The baseline year is 2016; latest data was published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Social protection for different groups refers to:  a Proportion of children covered by social protection, which has been updated to ‘proportion of children/households receiving child/family cash benefit’ in the 2021 report.  c Proportion of population above the retirement age receiving a pension.  d Proportion of population with severe disabilities collecting disability social protection benefits.  e Proportion of unemployed population receiving unemployment benefits.  f Proportion of vulnerable population covered by social assistance. It was updated to ‘proportion of the vulnerable population receiving social assistance cash benefit’ in the 2021 report. | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target**: 1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.3.1 | | | |
| **2.2** | | 1. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments 2. Proportion of women in managerial positions | a.1. parliament: 23% (2017)  a.2. local government: not available  b. 30% (2015) | a.1. parliament: 25.6% (2021)  a.2. local government: 36.3% (2020)  b. 28.3% (2019) | Increase |
| **Note:** Baseline published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2017 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information;” latest data was published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” | | | |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNICEF, UNWOMEN)**  **Corresponding SDG target**: 5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 5.5.1 (b) 5.5.2 | | | |
| **2.3** | | Voter turnout, disaggregated by sex, age, and excluded groups | 66% (2017) | 63% (2021) | Increase |
| **Note**: Estimate based on data from International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA) database (<https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/voter-turnout>) where 144 UNDP programme countries reported most recent election data. Baseline year ranged from 2003 to 2017. Latest data year ranged from 2007 to 2021. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator | | | |
| **2.4** | | Percentage of people who experienced a dispute and had access to a formal or informal dispute mechanism, considered affordable and just (disaggregated by sex) | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator | | | |
| **2.5** | | Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding** **SDG target**: 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.7.2 | | | |
| **2.6** | | Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience with public services | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.6.2 | | | |
| **2.7** | | Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production | Data not available | (a) Number of countries with national communications, non-Annex I Parties  a.1 First national communication: 154  a.2 Second national communication: 142  a3 Third national communication: 84  a.4 Fourth national communication: 11  a.5 Fifth national communication: 2  a.6 Sixth national communication: 1  (b) Number of countries with biennial update reports, non-Annex I Parties  b.1 First biennial update report: 63  b.2 Second biennial update report: 31  b.3 Third biennial update report: 12  b.4 Fourth biennial update report: 3  (c) Number of countries with nationally determined contributions  c.1 First nationally determined contribution: 190  c.2 Second nationally determined contribution: 8  c.3 Enhanced nationally determined contribution: 116  (d) Number of countries with national adaptation plans: 22 | Increase |
|  | **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Baseline is not available. Latest year 2021. C.3 is based on the new and updated NDCs from [NDC Synthesis Report](https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs/ndc-synthesis-report#eq-2). | | | | |
|  | | **Corresponding SDG target**: 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 13.2.1 | | | |
| **2.8** | | Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement | Basel Convention: 58% (2015)  Montreal Protocol: 100% (2015)  Rotterdam Convention: 71% (2015)  Stockholm Convention: 51% (2015) | Basel Convention: 60.7% (2020)  Montreal Protocol: 100% (2020)  Rotterdam Convention: 75.2% (2020)  Stockholm Convention: 50.3% (2020) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Baseline year 2015. Latest year 2020. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 12.4.1 | | | |
| **2.9** | | 1. Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type 2. Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas | a.1. Territorial: 42.1% (2015)  a.2. Freshwater: 41.2% (2015)  b. 9.71% (2015) | a.1. 43.2% (2020)  a.2. 42.2% (2020)  b. 17.66% (2019) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Baseline was revised in 2021 report. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements; 14.5 By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information.  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 15.1.2, (b) 14.5.1 | | | |
| **2.10** | | Progress towards sustainable forest management | 1. Forest area net change rate: -0.11% (2010 – 2015) 2. Above-ground biomass density in forest (tonnes/hectare) 117.7 (2015) 3. Proportion of forest area within protected areas: 17.5% (2015) 4. Proportion of forest area with a long-term management plan: 56.2% (2015) 5. Thousands of hectares of forest area certified under an independently verified certification scheme: 397,541.4 (2015) | a. -0.12% (2015-2020)  b. 118.3 (2020)  c. 17.81% (2020)  d. 58.26% (2020)  e. 435,401.9 (2020) | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Some baseline and latest data values are revised where available in the report. Unit of Indicator (e) was revised to thousands of hectares. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 15.2.1 | | | |
| **2.11** | | Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology | 57% (2014) | 66% (2019) | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 7.1.2 | | | |
| **2.12** | | Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location | Unpaid care work: 1.1% (male) 3.3% (female)  Domestic chore: 5.1% (male) 15.7% (female) | Unpaid care work: 1.3% (male) 3.6% (female)  Domestic chore: 4.8% (male) 14.4% (female) | Equality for female and male |
| **Note:** Based on data from the Global SDG Indicator Database (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage>) with available data points for 37 (baseline) and 44 (latest) UNDP programme countries. Disaggregation by age and location is not available. The baseline year is 2015 with country data points from 2000 to 2015. The latest year with data is 2020 with country data points from 2007 to 2020. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 5.4.1 | | | |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. countries reporting** | **2017**  **Baseline** | **2018**  **Milestone** | **2018 Actual** | **2019**  **Milestone** | **2019 Actual** | **2020**  **Milestone** | **2020**  **Actual** | | **2021**  **Target** | **2021**  **Actual** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1  **POVERTY** | 2.1.1 Low emission and climate resilient objectives addressed in national, sub-national and sectoral development plans and policies to promote economic diversification and green growth[[18]](#footnote-19) | **2.1.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with targets[[19]](#footnote-20) for low emission and climate-resilient development in:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Development plans and strategies | 77 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 18 | | 25 | **24** |
| b) Budgets | 55 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 13 | | 24 | **20** |
| c) Private sector business plans and strategies | 47 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 14 | 15 | 21 | 22 | | 28 | **28** |
| **2.1.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with public-private partnerships at national level to improve the enabling framework[[20]](#footnote-21) for economic diversification and green growth** | 35 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 9 | | 20 | **14** |
| 2.1.2 Capacities developed for progressive expansion of inclusive social protection systems | **2.1.2.1 Number of *additional* countries with policy measures and institutional capacities in place to increase access to social protection schemes, disaggregated by target groups:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Sex | 21 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 5 | | 8 | **5** |
| 1. Age | 23 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 6 | | 10 | **7** |
| 1. Persons with disabilities | 21 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | | 10 | **8** |
| 1. Marginalised groups[[21]](#footnote-22) | 22 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | | 9 | **7** |
| 1. Urban poor | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | | 7 | **4** |
| 1. Rural populations | 19 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | | 8 | **5** |
| **2.1.2.2 Number of *additional* countries that have improved the range of services provided through their social protection systems to reach marginalised groups:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Types of services | 31 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 11 | 11 | | 14 | **12** |
| 1. Quality of services (as determined nationally) | 26 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 9 | | 13 | **11** |
| #2  **GOVERNANCE** | 2.2.1 Use of digital technologies and big data enabled for improved public services and other government functions | **2.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries using frameworks[[22]](#footnote-23) that leverage digital technologies and big data for:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Delivery and monitoring of services | 39 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 11 | | 14 | **14** |
| 1. Public engagement | 29 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 12 | | 12 | **15** |
| 1. Access to and protection of information | 23 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 9 | | 12 | **12** |
| 1. Legal identity and civil registration | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 | | 9 | **10** |
| 1. Urban development using smart technologies | 18 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | 14 | **13** |
| 1. Other critical public services (e.g., public procurement) | 26 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | | 11 | **11** |
| 2.2.2 Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability | **2.2.2.1 Number of *additional* Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) with strengthened capacity to conduct inclusive and credible elections** | 54 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 37 | 40 | 48 | 57 | | 69 | **64** |
| **2.2.2.2 Women's participation in elections:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Proportion of women in the voter registry | 42 | 47% | 49% | 49% | 47% | 49% | 49% | 50% | | 50% | **50%** |
| 1. Proportion of women on the governing mechanism of the electoral management body | 40 | 18% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 20% | 19% | | 21% | **20%** |
| 1. Number of *additional* countries benefitting from Temporary Special Measures (TSMs) to ensure women’s participation and representation[[23]](#footnote-24) | 38 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | | 13 | **11** |
| Note:   * The baselines of components (a) and (b) are kept as reported to indicate intended and actual status under each reporting year.   Component (c) was converted in July 2018 from “Number of women benefitting from TSM” to “Number of countries benefiting from TSM,” turning this component into a “Yes/No” type for the country level. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.2.2.3 Number of *additional* parliaments with improved capacities to undertake inclusive, effective and accountable law-making, oversight and representation** | 55 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 15 | 17 | 24 | 20 | | 27 | **23** |
| **2.2.2.4 Number of *additional* constitution-making bodies (CMBs) with mechanisms for civic engagement, including the participation of women and other marginalised groups** | 23 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 13 | 24 | 19 | 38 | | 26 | **46** |
| **2.2.2.5 Number of *additional* countries that adopt and implement, with UNDP assistance, legal and regulatory frameworks that enable civil society to function in the public sphere and contribute to sustainable development:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 1. Whole of society | 22 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 11 | | 12 | **14** |
| 1. Women’s groups | 32 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 14 | 12 | | 17 | **15** |
| 1. Youth groups | 32 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 12 | | 17 | **14** |
| 1. Groups representing other marginalised populations | 32 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 9 | | 15 | **14** |
| Note: component (a) Whole of society was added to better capture UNDP performance. This change took place in July 2018. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.3 Capacities, functions and financing of rule of law and national human rights institutions and systems strengthened to expand access to justice and combat discrimination, with a focus on women and other marginalised groups[[24]](#footnote-25) | **2.2.3.1 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened institutions and systems supporting fulfilment of nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Rule of law and justice[[25]](#footnote-26) | 76 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 24 | 25 | | 30 | **28** |
| 1. Human rights[[26]](#footnote-27) | 75 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 23 | 26 | | 31 | **30** |
| **2.2.3.2 Number and proportion of *additional* population who have access to justice, disaggregated by sex and marginalised groups:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportions | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total | 30 | 6% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 8% | | 10% | **10%** |
| 1. Female | 30 | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 7% | 9% | 8% | | 9% | **9%** |
| 1. Male | 29 | 7% | 7% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 8% | | 10% | 10% |
| 1. Other marginalised group | 20 | 11% | 17% | 17% | 20% | 18% | 22% | 18% | | 25% | **26%** |
| Numbers | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total | 41 | 0 | 3,727,105 | 3,869,764 | 8,817,101 | 8,542,639 | 18,813,955 | | 15,952,523 | 25,208,535 | **31,642,939** |
| 1. Female | 38 | 0 | 1,695,343 | 1,786,916 | 4,009,400 | 3,970,249 | 10,355,390 | | 8,143,750 | 12,474,931 | **12,730,026** |
| 1. Male | 37 | 0 | 1,994,969 | 2,685,322 | 4,622,684 | 4,388,193 | 9,388,624 | | 6,782,681 | 12,847,915 | **12,268,058** |
| 1. Other marginalised groups | 26 | 0 | 1,169,581 | 1,380,472 | 1,849,749 | 1,477,283 | 2,486,835 | | 1,886,510 | 3,148,597 | **3,825,391** |
| **Note**:   * Although most countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportion due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators. * Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21. Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results. * Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive. * “Other” marginalized group components are not described here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.   The original indicator was adjusted to remove “access to informal justice” since no credible data is available at the country level. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.2.3.3 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened capacities for governance and oversight of rule of law institutions20** | 58 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 20 | 23 | 24 | | 33 | **29** |
| #3  **RESILIENCE** | 2.3.1 Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent risk of conflict[[27]](#footnote-28) | **2.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with data-informed[[28]](#footnote-29) development and investment plans that incorporate integrated solutions to reduce disaster risks and enable climate change adaptation and mitigation** | 85 | 0 | 15 | 13 | 27 | 25 | 44 | 32 | | 51 | **40** |
| **2.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with data-informed[[29]](#footnote-30) development policies, plans and institutions[[30]](#footnote-31) in place to strengthen social cohesion and prevent risk of conflict** | 21 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 | **7** | | 10 | **8** |
| **[NEW]**  2.3.2 Governments and civil societies empowered to navigate crisis and uncertainty caused by the COVID-19 pandemic to deliver uninterrupted and inclusive services and to build social capital and open civic space for response and recovery efforts | **2.3.2.1 Number of community-based organisations capacitated to respond to and mitigate the pandemic, fight against COVID-19 related domestic violence, racism, xenophobia, stigma, and other forms of discrimination, prevent and remedy human rights abuses and ensure longer-term recovery - including livelihoods support and basis service delivery - disaggregated by type of community-based organization[[31]](#footnote-32):** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Women’s organizations | 34 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 123 | 110 | | 173 | **128** |
| 1. Youth organizations | 31 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 440 | 446 | | 485 | **459** |
| 1. Urban community-based organizations, networks, associations and slum federations | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3,509 | 3,706 | | 3,561 | **3,728** |
| 1. National human rights institutions (NHRIs) | 18 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 32 | 30 | | 58 | **32** |
| 1. Religious community organizations | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 47 | 44 | | 57 | **49** |
| 1. Indigenous community | 10 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 461 | 453 | | 2,724 | **2,651** |
| 1. Community-based organisations in fragile and conflict-affected countries | 15 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 179 | 162 | | 274 | **325** |
| 1. Community-based organization representing other at-risk population | 23 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 277 | 267 | | 792 | **759** |
| 1. Community-based organisations providing livelihoods support and basic services delivery | 29 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 209 | 163 | | 312 | **174** |
| **2.3.2.2 Number of countries that have measures in place to address gender-based violence (GBV) during the COVID-19 pandemic, which[[32]](#footnote-33):** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. integrate violence prevention and response into COVID-19 response plans | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 31 | 30 | | 33 | **31** |
| 1. raise awareness through advocacy and campaigns, with targeted messages to both women and men | 43 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 42 | 40 | | 43 | **41** |
| 1. provide options for women to report abuse and seek help without alerting perpetrators | 31 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 30 | 27 | | 31 | **29** |
| 1. ensure continued functioning of shelters for victims of violence and expand their capacity | 27 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 26 | 26 | | 27 | **26** |
| 1. ensure women’s access to justice through police and justice responses to address impunity of perpetrators and protect women and their children | 28 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 26 | 23 | | 28 | **25** |
| **2.3.2.3 Number ofsocial dialogue, advocacy and political engagement spaces facilitated with participation of at-risk populations and groups:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Social dialogue spaces at national level | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 122 | 131 | | 181 | **154** |
| 1. Social dialogue spaces at sub-national level | 32 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,581 | 1,604 | | 1,958 | **1,637** |
| 1. Advocacy and political engagement spaces at national level | 23 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 93 | 95 | | 101 | **104** |
| 1. Advocacy and political engagement spaces at sub-national level | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6,943 | 6,074 | | 7,905 | **6,083** |
| **[NEW]**  2.3.3 Digital and innovative solutions applied to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and to set the path for accelerated recovery | **2.3.3.1 Number of digital solutions adopted to address the COVID-19 pandemic:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. E-governance systems | 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 95 | 120 | | 132 | **149** |
| 1. Digital health systems | 38 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 51 | 52 | | 71 | **70** |
| 1. Data collection systems | 42 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 85 | 87 | | 102 | **96** |
| 1. Digital payment platforms | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16 | 15 | | 20 | **19** |
| 1. Digital e-commerce systems | 26 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 76 | 68 | | 88 | **71** |
| 1. Learning platforms | 38 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 62 | 52 | | 82 | **61** |
| 1. Other | 30 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 105 | 104 | | 121 | **115** |
| #4  **SUSTAINABLE PLANET** | 2.4.1 Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources[[33]](#footnote-34), in line with international conventions and national legislation | **2.4.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Policy frameworks | 64 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 15 | 27 | 23 | | 38 | **35** |
| 1. Legal and regulatory frameworks | 55 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 24 | 19 | | 36 | **26** |
| 1. Institutional frameworks | 57 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 25 | 18 | | 36 | **26** |
| 1. Financing frameworks | 47 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 7 | 23 | 13 | | 33 | **24** |
| **[NEW]**  2.4.2 Nature-based solutions to the COVID-19 pandemic and green economy advanced, rebalancing nature, climate and economy | **2.4.2.1 Number of countries that are adopting fiscal, monetary and legislative stimulus packages for COVID19 economic response and recovery that are:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. climate and environmentally sensitive | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 10 | 10 | | 14 | **13** |
| 1. inclusive and gender responsive | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 16 | 13 | | 21 | **17** |
| #5  **ENERGY** | 2.5.1 Solutions developed, financed and applied at scale for energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy and zero-carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation | **2.5.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened capacities for achieving energy transformation at scale:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Volume of investment leveraged from public and private sources through UNDP support for national programmes/initiatives | 42 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 13 | 10 | 20 | 12 | | 21 | **15** |
| 1. Solutions applied at scale to accelerate transition to improved energy efficiency and clean energy | 47 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 15 | | 21 | **18** |
| 1. Growth in installed base of power generation from clean and/or renewable energy sources | 41 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 17 | 17 | 21 | 17 | | 23 | **21** |
| #6  **GENDER** | 2.6.1 Capacities strengthened to raise awareness on and undertake legal, policy and institutional reforms to fight structural barriers to women’s empowerment | **2.6.1.1 Number of *additional* countries that have adopted, with UNDP support, legal, policy and institutional reforms to remove structural barriers to women’s empowerment:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Discrimination in labour markets (formal and informal sectors) | 25 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 6 | | 12 | **7** |
| 1. Access to and control over assets and services | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | | 7 | **5** |
| 1. Regulation of identity, tenancy rights, inheritance, marital status | 14 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 9 | | 10 | **8** |
| 1. Reduction or redistribution of unpaid care work | 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | | 7 | **6** |
| 1. SGBV | 25 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 | | 13 | **8** |
| 1. Others | 17 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 11 | **9** |
| **Note:** This indicator has been slightly modified to better capture UNDP performance. (Original indicator: ‘Number of countries that have been supported to adopt legal, policy and institutional reforms to remove structural barriers to women’s empowerment’.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.6.1.2 Number of *additional* partnerships across the whole-of-society[[34]](#footnote-35) raising awareness to eliminate discriminatory gender and social norms** | 15 | 0 | 34 | 58 | 83 | 90 | 125 | 116 | | 210 | **241** |

| **Outcome 3: STRENGTHEN RESILIENCE TO SHOCKS AND CRISES** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | **Baseline** | **Latest data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **3.1** | Number of people per 100,000 that are covered by early warning information through local governments or through national dissemination mechanisms (disaggregated by sex) | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters; 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator | | | | |
| **3.2** | Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP), disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, attributed to disasters | 1. Average Annual Loss (AAL) attributed to disasters in relation to GDP: 0.38% (2016) 2. Average Annual Loss attributed to disasters: 293,995 million US dollars (2016) 3. Damaged critical infrastructure, health: 110 (2014) 4. Damaged critical infrastructure, education: 579 (2014) | 1. Average Annual Loss (AAL) attributed to disasters in relation to GDP: 0.68% (2020) 2. Average Annual Loss attributed to disasters: 197,320 million US dollars (2020) 3. Damaged critical infrastructure, health: 367 (2020) 4. Damaged critical infrastructure, education: 1,835 (2020) | Decrease |
| **Note**: Baseline estimates of component (a) and (b) were published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017” and in “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” 2017, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Latest estimates are not published in the progress report or annex. Together with components (c) and (d), they are calculated using data from the Global SDG Indicator Database <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/UNSDG/IndDatabasePage> where 97 UNDP programme countries was included in calculations for component (a) and component (b) (past eight years of data is included). For component (c) there were nine and eight (baseline and latest year) UNDP programme countries, and 10 and nine (baseline and latest year) UNDP programme countries for (d). Disaggregation by age and location is not available. | | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG targets**: 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters; 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.5.2/11.5.2 | | | | |
| **3.3** | Number of forcibly displaced people (millions), disaggregated by type (refugees, asylum seekers, internally displaced persons) and by sex and age to the extent possible | World: 65.6 million (2016)  Refugees: 22.5 million (2016)  Asylum seekers: 2.8 million (2016)  Internally displaced persons: 40.3 million (2016)  Children: 51% (2016) | World: 82.4 million (2020)  Refugees: 26.4 million (2020)  Asylum seekers: 4.1 million (2020)  Internally displaced persons: 48 million (2020)  Children: 42% (2020) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in “Global Trends – Forced Displacement in 2016” (see <http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2016/> for baseline) and “Global Trends – Forced Displacement in 2020” (<https://www.unhcr.org/60b638e37/unhcr-global-trends-2020> for latest year) by UNHCR. Disaggregation by sex is not available. | | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator. | | | | |
| **3.4** | Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause | 8.5% (2017) | 5% (2020) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Disaggregation by sex, age and cause is not available. Baseline is revised. | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere  **Corresponding SDG Indicator:** 16.1.2 | | | | |
| **3.5** | Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age | Total: 5.9 per 100,000 population (2015)  Male: 9.7 per 100,000 population (2015)  Female: 2.2 per 100,000 population (2015) | Total: 5.7 per 100,000 population (2019)  Male: 10.2 per 100,000 population (2018)  Female: 2.3 per 100,000 population (2018) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2021 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information,” also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Disaggregation by age and sex is not available. Baseline estimate was revised in the report. | | | | |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere  **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.1.1 | | | | |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. countries reporting** | **2017**  **Baseline** | **2018**  **Milestone** | **2018 Actual** | **2019**  **Milestone** | **2019 Actual** | **2020**  **Milestone** | **2020 Actual** | **2021**  **Target** | **2021 Actual** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1  **POVERTY** | 3.1.1 Core government functions and inclusive basic services4 restored post-crisis for stabilisation, durable solutions to displacement and return to sustainable development pathways within the framework of national policies and priorities | **3.1.1.1 Number of crisis affected countries supported by UNDP, upon request, with targeted interventions to strengthen core government functions[[35]](#footnote-36) for sustainable recovery and improved service delivery** | 17 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 17 | **16** |
| **Note:** This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1.1.2 Proportion of displaced populations benefitting from durable solutions, disaggregated by target groups** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportions | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total population | 12 | 34% | 26% | 23% | 22% | 19% | 19% | 8% | 27% | **13%** |
| 1. Target group | 6 | 59% | 69% | 52% | 72% | 66% | 76% | 56% | 85% | **76%** |
| Numbers | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total population | 15 | 5,697,728 | 4,296,405 | 4,015,278 | 3,857,953 | 2,884,445 | 2,942,480 | 1,402,549 | 4,994,746 | **2,901,688** |
| 1. Target group | 7 | 305,600 | 551,800 | 415,038 | 652,500 | 538,586 | 786,025 | 406,781 | 1,529,361 | **1,349,823** |
| **Note**:   * Although most countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators. * Number of displaced populations fluctuated within reporting countries over the IRRF period. The total does not reflect a stable upward or downward trend. “Target groups” varied across reporting countries and not described here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.   This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1.1.3 Number of people benefitting from jobs and improved livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings, disaggregated by sex and other characteristics** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total | 30 | 1,564,744 | 2,047,931 | 3,856,092 | 4,108,796 | 5,099,689 | 4,692,561 | 2,923,366 | 5,787,369 | **2,857,706** |
| 1. Female | 28 | 620,035 | 799,252 | 1,208,953 | 1,349,710 | 1,723,693 | 1,555,000 | 1,257,348 | 1,908,494 | **1,351,269** |
| 1. Male | 29 | 931,014 | 1,228,444 | 2,608,692 | 2,728,701 | 3,291,838 | 3,105,231 | 1,190,813 | 3,856,465 | **1,163,661** |
| **Note**:   * Not all countries reported sex-disaggregated numbers; therefore, the number of males and females may not add up.   This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1.1.4 Number of crisis-affected countries where critical benchmarks for local economic revitalisation (LER)[[36]](#footnote-37) are met** | 9 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 | **8** |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **[NEW]**  3.1.2 Inclusive and integrated crisis management enabled for agile and effective responses to COVID-19 | **3.1.2.1 Number of government entities supported to ensure business continuity and provision of basic and social services during the COVID-19 pandemic:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. National government entities | 89 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,259 | 1,259 | 1,447 | **1,408** |
| 1. Sub-national government entities | 63 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 6,528 | 5,488 | 7,204 | **6,891** |
| #2  **GOVERNANCE** | 3.2.1. National capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities | **3.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with national plans of action for prevention of violent extremism (PVE) under implementation** | 23 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 14 | **11** |
| **3.2.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with plans and strategies under implementation for the reintegration of displaced persons and/or former combatants** | 13 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | **8** |
| **3.2.1.3 Number of *additional* countries supported by UNDP, upon request, to establish or strengthen national infrastructures for peace** | 37 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 11 | **9** |
| 3.2.2 National and local systems enabled and communities empowered to ensure the restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security | **3.2.2.1 Number of countries with national and local systems restored or adopted following crises:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Functional justice systems | 14 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 11 | 7 | 9 | 13 | **14** |
| 1. Victim redress mechanisms including transitional justice | 15 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 14 | **14** |
| 1. Community-oriented security services and oversight mechanisms | 19 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 18 | **19** |
| 1. Across a) – c) utilizing joint UN approaches to rebuilding rule of law and justice sector institutions and services | 17 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 17 | **17** |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| #3  **RESILIENCE** | 3.3.1. Evidence-based assessment and planning tools and mechanisms applied to enable implementation of gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention and preparedness to limit the impact of natural hazards and pandemics and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies | **3.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with operational end-to-end multi-sectoral early warning systems (EWS) to limit the gender-differentiated impact of:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Natural hazards | 35 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 23 | 12 | 24 | **13** |
| 1. Health shocks (e.g., pandemics) | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **5** |
| 1. Economic crises | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | **6** |
| 1. Other risk factors | 10 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | **3** |
| **3.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries requesting the application of tools such as the UNDG conflict and development analysis (CDAs) to inform planning and programming in key sectors** | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | **2** |
| **3.3.1.3 Number of *additional* countries with sub-national mechanisms for mitigating risks to urban centres[[37]](#footnote-38)** | 20 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 9 | **7** |
| 3.3.2 Gender-responsive and risk-informed mechanisms supported to build consensus, improve social dialogue and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies | **3.3.2.1 Proportion of women in leadership positions within social dialogue and reconciliation mechanisms that promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies** | 17 | 21% | 23% | 23% | 24% | 30% | 27% | 33% | 33% | **34%** |
| **Note**: The baseline is kept as reported to indicate intended and actual status for each reporting year. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.3.2.2 Number of *additional* countries with improved capacities for dialogue, consensus-building and reconciliation around contested issues, with equal participation of women and men** | 35 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 21 | **20** |
| **[NEW]**  3.3.3 Health systems and capacities enhanced for agile and effective responses to COVID-19 | **3.3.3.1 Number of health facilities newly established:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Public health centres | 20 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 135 | 109 | 12,496 | **12,469** |
| 1. Quarantine / isolation centres | 16 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 61 | 55 | 74 | **62** |
| 1. Test centres | 14 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 26 | 30 | 41 | **99** |
| **3.3.3.2 Number ofhealth care workers hired or trained for COVID-19 response, disaggregated by sex:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hired | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1,496 | 837 | 1,504 | **845** |
| 1. Male | 8 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2,177 | 1,290 | 2,185 | **1,298** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 5 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 30,290 | 30,265 | 30,310 | **30,265** |
| Trained | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Female | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 7,676 | 5,328 | 8,147 | **5,644** |
| 1. Male | 21 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 5,836 | 3,268 | 6,724 | **4,086** |
| 1. Sex disaggregation unavailable | 15 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 293,295 | 270,374 | 369,315 | **270,374** |
| #4  **SUSTAINABLE PLANET** | 3.4.1 Innovative nature-based and gender-responsive solutions developed, financed and applied for sustainable recovery | **3.4.1.1 Number of countries in special situations implementing innovative solutions at scale for sustainable recovery:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Nature-based | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** |
| 1. Gender-responsive | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** |
| **Note**:   * No country reported on component (a).   This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| #5  **ENERGY** | 3.5.1 Energy access re-established for crisis-affected populations, with a focus on gender-sensitive, risk-informed and sustainable recovery | **3.5.1.1 Number of crisis-affected people with energy access restored, disaggregated by sex of head of household and other relevant characteristics** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Total | 2 | 4,800 | 13,000 | 182,000 | 262,000 | 549,656 | 502,000 | 349,230 | 103,146 | **165,679** |
| 1. People in women-headed households | 2 | 1,920 | 4,600 | 35,515 | 78,600 | 188,333 | 150,600 | 100,771 | 43,944 | **52,683** |
| 1. People in men-headed households | 2 | 2,880 | 8,400 | 134,385 | 183,400 | 352,998 | 351,400 | 211,298 | 59,202 | **112,996** |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| #6  **GENDER** | 3.6.1 Women’s leadership and participation ensured in crisis prevention22 and recovery planning and action | **3.6.1.1 Percentage of women in leadership positions within prevention and recovery mechanisms** | 4 | 3% | 13% | 3% | 22% | 3% | 48% | 27% | 50% | **41%** |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.6.1.2 Number and proportion of women among beneficiaries of recovery programmes** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion | 16 | 53% | 54% | 54% | 53% | 50% | 52% | 55% | 50% | **54%** |
| Number | 18 | 827,715 | 798,712 | 1,380,040 | 842,199 | 1,283,110 | 776,267 | 445,637 | 802,532 | **762,685** |
| **Note***:* This indicator is reported on an annual basis. | | | | | | | | | | |

# Tier Three: Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency Performance

| **Results Statement** | **Indicator** | | **2017** | **2018** | **2018** | **2019** | **2019** | **2020** | **2020** | **2021** | **2021** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
|  | **Outcome 1: Accelerated delivery of top quality programmatic results for the SDGs** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 1.1 Evidence based performance analysis and decision making at all levels | **1.1.1** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track. | 91.8% | N/A | N/A | 92% | **92%** | N/A | **N/A** | 93% | **94%** |
| **Note:** Data is collected through the Project Quality Assurance exercise every other year. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1.2** | Percentage of programme governments who perceive that UNDP: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) plays a relevant role in the development of countries, and reflects the development priorities of its partners | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **81%** | N/A | **N/A** | 83% | **N/A** |
| b) tailors its activities and capacities to national context and needs | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **76%** | N/A | **N/A** | 78% | **N/A** |
| **Note:** UNDP conducted the Partnership Survey in January and February 2020, capturing data on perceived levels of collaboration and support to UNDP partners in 2019. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1.3** | IATI Publishing Statistics Score **[QCPR related]** | [T] Very Strong (88)  [C] Very Strong (87) | [T] Very Strong  [C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)**  **[C] Very Strong (87)** | [T] Very Strong  [C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)**  **[C] Very Strong (87)** | [T] Very Strong  [C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)**  **[C] Very Strong (87)** | [T] Very Strong  [C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)**  **[C] Very Strong (88)** |
| **Note:** The data source of this indicator has been adjusted to IATI Publishing Statistics for the stability of methodology and comparability with other development agencies. It measures two components of the IATI Standard: Timeliness [T] and Comprehensiveness [C]. The 0-100 scale for the IATI Statistics Score is converted into four performance ratings: ‘Very strong’ (75-100), ‘Strong’ (50-74), ‘Weak’ (25-49) and ‘Very weak’ (0-24). | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 Cross-cutting approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects | **1.2.1** | Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective **[QCPR related]** | 48% | 50% | **55%** | 55% | **59%** | 58% | **64%** | 60% | **65%** |
| **Note:** The indicator is based on Gender Marker ratings and measures the percentage of project expenditures that are rated either GEN2 (significant contributions to gender equality) or GEN3 (gender equality as a principal objective). In 2021, out of the total programme expenditure of $4,802.2 million US dollars, $2,756.4 million (or 57,4%%) was for GEN2 and $362.6 million (or 7.5%) was for GEN3. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.2.2** | Percentage of UNSWAP minimum standards met or exceeded **[QCPR related]** | 80%  (SWAP 1.0) | 70% | **88%** | 72% | **88%** | 72% | **88%** | 75% | **88%** |
| **Note:** Baseline data is based on the United Nations System-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) 1.0 and included for information only; hence, it is not comparable to indicator data for 2018 and onwards, which is based on UN-SWAP 2.0. In 2021, 14 performance indicators exceeded, and one performance indicator met, the SWAP minimum standard out 16 applicable to UNDP. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.2.3** | Percentage of new country programme planning documents that address the needs and rights of people with disabilities [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) At least one output statement that aims to address the needs and rights of Persons with Disabilities | 11%  (3 out of 27 CPDs) | 13% | **13%**  **(3 out of 23 CPDs)** | 15% | **50%**  **(5 out of 10 CPDs)** | 17% | **20%**  **(4 out 20**  **CPDs)** | 20% | **26%**  **(6 out of** **23 CPDs)** |
| b) At least one output indicator disaggregated by Persons with Disabilities or is sensitive to the needs and rights of Persons with Disabilities | 7%  (2 out of 27 CPDs) | 7% | **48%**  **(11 out of 23 CPDs)** | 8% | **60%**  **(6 out 10 CPDs)** | 9% | **60 %**  **(12 out 20 CPDs)** | 10% | **70%**  **(16 out of 23 CPDs)** |
| **1.2.4** | Percentage of project outputs that use south-south or triangular cooperation to achieve results [**QCPR related]** | 8% | 8% | **13%** | 10% | **12%** | 12% | **13 %** | 15% | **12%** |
| **Note:** Baseline data is based on 2017 ROAR reporting. The newly introduced South-South and Triangular (SSC/TrC) Cooperation Maker has been used for sourcing data starting in 2018. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.2.5** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards | 87% | N/A | N/A | 88% | **85%** | N/A | **N/A** | 90% | **89%** |
| **Note:** Data is collected through the Project Quality Assurance exercise every other year. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.2.6** | Percentage of project outputs that use innovative tools and methodologies, of which: | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **13%** | 14% | **14%** | 16% | **15%** |
| a) innovative tools and methodologies are tested or piloted | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **84%** | 92% | **86%** | 95% | **87%** |
| b) innovative tools and methodologies are scaled | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **11%** | 12% | **14%** | 13% | **13%** |
| **Note**: The indicator has three layers. The first measures the degree to which UNDP uses innovative tools and methodologies in its development project outputs. Subcomponents (a) and (b) measure the degree to which innovative tools and methodologies are tested or piloted, and scaled. In 2021, 15% of project outputs (1,157 out of 7,906) applied innovative tools and methodologies out of which 146 outputs (13%) are in the scaling stage and 1,012 outputs (87%) are being tested and piloted. | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.3 High quality audits and evaluations producing implementable solutions | **1.3.1** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated (including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards) of: **(SWAP-related indicator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Satisfactory quality | 21% | 23% | **25%** | 25% | **20%** | 27% | **34%** | 30% | **42%** |
| b) Moderately satisfactory quality | 53% | 55% | **50%** | 58% | **53%** | 58% | **55%** | 60% | **48%** |
| **Note:** Disaggregation components were adjusted to align with terminology used in the quality assessment process conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office. The sum of ‘highly satisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory’ ratings are considered to calculate satisfactory quality (a). IEO quality assessed 272 out of 352 completed decentralized evaluation reports in 2021. Quality assessment scores showed an overall improvement, with 42 % of 2021 reports considered ‘satisfactory’ compared to 34 % in 2020. This shows a reduction in moderately satisfactory ratings from 55 % to 48 %. A total of 90 % of evaluations reports rated solutions as “satisfactory” and “moderately satisfactory,” while 10% were rated as ‘moderately unsatisfactory’ or ‘unsatisfactory’, which is 2% lower than in 2020. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.3.2** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Satisfactory | 37% | >30% | **23%** | >30% | **30%** | >30% | **23%** | >30% | **43%** |
| b) Partially satisfactory with some improvement needed | 61% | >30% | **45%** | >30% | **40%** | >30% | **57%** | >30% | **42%** |
| c) Partially satisfactory with major improvement needed | <35% | **26%** | <35% | **26%** | <35% | **19%** | <35% | **13%** |
| d) Unsatisfactory | 2% | <15% | **6%** | <15% | **4%** | <15% | **0%** | <15% | **2%** |
| **Note:** Sub-components have been further disaggregated to align with new audit categories. The baseline for (b) and (c) were combined as they were not separated in previous categories. Adjustments were made in 2018 to the methodology to ensure better alignment with the approach in the UNDP report on internal audit and investigation, which excludes inter-agency audits. This led to revised baselines for (b), (c) and (d). In 2021, the percentage of audit reports with ‘satisfactory’ ratings was 43% - 13% higher than the percentage target, and 20% higher than the rating in 2020. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.3.3** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified | 100% | ≥98% | **91%** | ≥98% | **82%** | ≥98% | **95%** | ≥98% | **88%** |
| **Note**: In 2021, the percentage of unqualified Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) reports reached 88.4%, approximately 10% below the target due to and increase of reports with qualified opinions mainly from national implementation (NIM) projects expenditures under the Yemen country office ($65.8 million US dollars) that represented 70% of total qualified expenditures. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.3.4** | Implementation rate of agreed Joint Inspection Unit Report recommendations | 73% | 73% | **62%** | 73% | **80%** | 73% | **82%** | 73% | **96%** |
| **Note**: To align with the Annual Report of the Administrator–the UNDP report the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit, this indicator was modified to reflect the cumulative UNDP three-year performance of the implementation of Joint Inspection Unit report recommendations in 2018. Baseline, milestones, and target have been adjusted accordingly. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.3.5** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Decentralized evaluations | 78% | 80% | **86%** | 82% | **86%** | 84% | **86%** | 86% | **92%** |
| b) Independent evaluations | 91% | 93% | **84%** | 95% | **85%** | 95% | **87%** | 95% | **91%** |
| **Note:** This indicator measures the number of management response key actions completed or ongoing, divided by the total number of actions planned, excluding key actions that are “no longer applicable” over a period of five years. | | | | | | | | | |
| **1.3.6** | Implementation rate of agreed upon: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Internal audit recommendations | 92% | ≥85% | **95%** | ≥85% | **91%** | ≥85% | **95%** | ≥85% | **94%** |
| b) External audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 96% | ≥85% | **90%** | ≥85% | **88**% | ≥85% | **86%** | ≥85% | **89%** |
|  | **Outcome 2. Organisational efficiency and effectiveness for programme delivery** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 2.1UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice | **2.1.1** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organisation | 89% | N/A | N/A | N/A | **80%** | N/A | **N/A** | 82% | **N/A** |
| **Note:** The baseline is based on results reported through the 2017 Partnership Survey. The last Partnership Survey was conducted in January and February 2020, reflecting 2019 perceptions. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.2** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by funding stream: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Total | $4,822 | $4,950 | **$5,093** | $5,151 | **$4,723** | $5,325 | **$5,480** | $5,483 | **$5,426** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +6% |  | **-7%** |  | **+16%** |  | **-1%** |
| b) Regular resources | $612 | $630 | **$624** | $680 | **$617** | $700 | **$696** | $700 | **$647** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +2% |  | **-1%** |  | **+13%** |  | **-7%** |
| c) Other Resources (government and non-government partners, excluding government cost sharing): | $3,204 | $3,370 | **$3,439** | $3,471 | **$3,313** | $3,575 | **$3,659** | $3,683 | **$3,477** |
| c.1) Third party cost-sharing | $1,939 | $2,162 | **$2,101** | $2,148 | **$1,888** | $2,204 | **$2,115** | $2,234 | **$1,859** |
| c.2) Vertical funds | $858 | $755 | **$914** | $804 | **$859** | $783 | **$992** | $788 | **$1,178** |
| c.3) Funding Windows (thematic funding) | $65 | $65 | **$67** | $72 | **$103** | $79 | **$125** | $87 | **$84** |
| c.4.) UN Pooled Funding | $341 | $388 | **$357** | $447 | **$464** | $509 | **$427** | $574 | **$356** |
| d) Other Resources (programme country government cost-sharing) | $1,006 | $950 | **$1,030** | $1,000 | **$790** | $1,050 | **$1,126** | $1,100 | **$1,302** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +6% |  | **-8%** |  | **+17%** |  | **-0.1%** |
| **Note 1:** The indicator has been clarified so other resources in (c) do not include government cost-sharing, which is presented separately in (d) Reimbursable Support Services (RSS), which are not included here. RSS are non-UNDP programme funds for management and support services, including UN Volunteers and the Junior Professional Officer (JPO) Programme.  **Note 2**: All 2021 financials are preliminary as of 2 February 2022.  **Note 3**: The 2020 actuals were adjusted to reflect final figures for the year. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.3** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by partner: | $4,822 | $4,950 | **$5,093** | $5,151 | **$4,723** | $5,325 | **$5,480** | $5,483 | **$5,426** |
| a) Governments | $3,074 | $3,295 | **$3,194** | $3,367 | **$2,871** | $3,478 | **$3,344** | $3,543 | **$3,401** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +4% |  | **-10%** |  | **+16%** |  | **+2%** |
| b) Private sector (including Foundations, NGOs etc.) | $71 | $78 | **$47** | $86 | **$39** | $95 | **$70** | $104 | **$58** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | -34% |  | **-17%** |  | **+79%** |  | **-17%** |
| c) Multilaterals (EU, IFI, and other multilaterals) | $1,677 | $1,577 | **$1,852** | $1,698 | **$1,813** | $1,752 | **$2,066** | $1,836 | **$1,968** |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +10% |  | **-2%** |  | **+14%** |  | **-5%** |
| **Note1:** 2020 actuals were adjusted to reflect the final figures for the year.  **Note 2**: All 2021 financials are preliminary as of 2 February 2022. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.4** | Percentage of Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) performance indicator where UNDP scores at least ‘satisfactory’ | 83%  (2015/16) | N/A | N/A | N/A | **N/A** | N/A | **N/A** | 85% | **83%** |
| **Note:** The indicator has been modified to provide a numerical rating. The 2017 baseline is based on the 2015/16 MOPAN Assessment where 10 of 12 key performance indicators (KPIs) were scored ‘highly satisfactory’ or ‘satisfactory’. In the 2020-2021 cycle, UNDP again scored ‘highly satisfactory’ or ‘satisfactory’ in 10 out of 12 KPIs. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.2. Cost-sharing agreements and projects ensure full cost recovery | **2.2.1** | Use of core and non-core for programme activities: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities | 82% | 80% | **81%** | 75% | **75%** | 78% | **77%** | 78% | **78%** |
| b) Percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities | 95% | 95% | **95%** | 95% | **95%** | 95% | **95%** | 95% | **95%** |
| **Note:** Milestones and targets for (a) have been revised from 82% (2019), 85% (2020) and 85% (2021) to 75% (2019), 78% (2020) and 78% (2021) during the MTR and in line with availability of core resources in relation to the delinking of the Resident Coordinator system, emanating from the UNDS repositioning process. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 Quality and efficient management services to support programme delivery | **2.3.1** | Percentage of country offices meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 94% | 95% | **87%** | 95% | **87%** | 95% | **85%** | 95% | **79%** |
| **Note:** The data is based on the Comptroller’s Performance Index (CPI). The overall scoring of 79% in 2021 was mainly due to lapses on IPSAS-related indicators on procurement processes. The baseline and milestones for the indicator were set and reported against the CPI, a platform that was mainly around compliance and no longer applicable. Further, since 2020, country offices' financial performance has been managed under the integrated finance dashboard (IFD), a platform that incorporates financials controls, programme performance, financial sustainability, implementing partners' risks, and audit in addition to traditional finance data quality indicators. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.3.2** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 6.93% | 6.90% | **6.69%** | 7.65% | **7.55%** | 7.50% | **7.48%** | 7.40% | **7.39%** |
| **Note:** Changes in milestones and targets from 6.90% (2019), 6.80% (2020 and 6.60% (2021) to 7.65% (2019), 7.50% (2020) and 7.40% (2021) introduced during the MTR relate to revised core expenditures due to the Resident Coordinator delinking. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.4 Efficient, professional and transparent procurement and value for money | **2.4.1** | Heads of country office procurement units with relevant procurement certification | 57.7% | 64% | **80%** | 71% | **73%** | 78% | **71%** | 85% | **70%** |
| **2.4.2** | a) Percentage of procurement volume spend through LTAs | 17% | 22% | **27%** | 27% | **25%** | 32% | **26%** | 37% | **27%** |
| b) Percentage of global procurement value in collaboration with UN and other development partners [**QCPR related]** | 9% | 14% | **19%** | 19% | **20%** | 23% | **18%** | 28% | **17%** |
| **Note**: Collaboration with the UN includes procurement services provided to and from UN agencies, as well as using UN agency LTAs. UNDP total annual procurement volume increased by 6% from US$2.28b in 2020 to US$2.43b in 2021. While the actual volume of collaborative procurement and LTAs increased by 7% (from $400 million to $428 million) and by 16% (from $592m to $690m) respectively, the indicator did not reach the target. The main reason is the cyclical nature of procurement, which depends on ongoing programmes and projects impacting procurement categories and type of goods and services being procured annually. The Certification of Heads of Procurement Unit was impacted by staff turnover/movements. | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 UNDP equipped with talented and diverse workforce | **2.5.1** | Staff satisfaction: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Leadership/direction index (percentage of all employees surveyed who express confidence in leadership and direction) | 71%  (2016) | 75% | **69%** | N/A | **N/A** | 85% | **74%** | 85% | **N/A** |
| b) Engagement index | 79%  (2016) | 82% | **80%** | N/A | **N/A** | 85% | **83%** | 85% | **N/A** |
| **Note:** Baseline data comes from 2016 reported actuals through the Global Staff Survey conducted in 2017. The last survey was conducted in 2020. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.5.2** | Percentage of relevant staff who completed: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Informal and formal senior leadership/management programme/activities (P5 and above) | 6.2% | 10% | **16%** | 20% | **32%** | 25% | **23%** | 30% | **31%** |
| b) Virtual career management activities | 9% | 10% | **9%** | 20% | **6%** | 25% | **12%** | 30% | **32%** |
| c) UNDP Mandatory Course-Learning Plan | 36% | 70% | **71%** | 80% | **42%** | 85% | **70%** | 90% | **66%** |
| **Note**: UNDP learning courses went through a technical upgrade and often accompanied by a substantive update, which was almost completed by end of 2021. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.5.3** | Percentage of staff/personnel who are female: [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) All staff | 51% | 50% | **51%** | 50% | **50%** | 50% | **50%** | 50% | **50%** |
| b) All workforce (staff, SC holders, UNV) | 44% | 44% | **45%** | 45% | **45%** | 46% | **46%** | 46% | **46%** |
| c) General Service Staff | 56% | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **52%** |
| d) National Officers (NOA-NOE) | 48% | 49% | **49%** | 50% | **49%** | 50% | **48%** | 50% | **50%** |
| e) International professional staff P1-P3 | 52% | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **55%** |
| f) International professional staff P4 | 44% | 46% | **42%** | 48% | **42%** | 50% | **43%** | 50% | **45%** |
| g) International professional staff P5 | 38% | 41% | **39%** | 44% | **41%** | 47% | **42%** | 50% | **41%** |
| h) Senior managers (D1 and above) | 39% | 42% | **40%** | 45% | **43%** | 48% | **45%** | 50% | **48%** |
| **Note:** The indicator has been further disaggregated to reflect the new People Management Strategy.A specification was included for (b) to provide further clarification. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.5.4** | Percentage of staff from programme countries [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) All International Professional staff | 51% | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **56%** |
| b) International Professional staff P1-P3 | 59% | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **60%** |
| c) International Professional staff P4 and P5 | 67% | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **55%** |
| d) Senior managers (D1 and above) | 63% | 50% | **45%** | 50% | **45%** | 50% | **47%** | 50% | **46%** |
| **2.5.5** | Percentage of offices with in-house gender equality expertise: | 52% | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **55%** |
| a) Country offices | 55% | 56% | **57%** | 57% | **61%** | 58% | **63%** | 60% | **67%** |
| b) Regional and Central Bureaux | 80% | 80% | **67%** | 80% | **67%** | 85% | **89%** | 85% | **89%** |
| **Note**: Country office[[38]](#footnote-39) 88/131 = 67%, while regional and central bureaux: 8/9 =89%. | | | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Outcome 3. Operational Service Arrangements for United Nations system-wide results, coordination and coherence** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| 3.1 Common UN approaches facilitate efficient and accelerated joint delivery against sustainable development objectives | **3.1.2** | Percentage of country offices that are applying at least seven elements of the Standard Operating Procedures (Out of 13) **[QCPR related]** | 85% | 88% | **91%** | 90% | **91%** | 92% | **93%** | 95% | **99%** |
| **Note**: This indicator was clarified by including the minimum number of elements to be applied by country offices. As part of the UN reform, the foundation and tools of the Delivering as One (DaO) approach have been expanded and are now universal for the system. UNDCO no longer distinguishes between DaO and non-DaO countries as of 2020. Since the SOPs reflected an aspect of the DaO approach, they are no longer tracked in their original form. While most SOPs remain an integral element of UNCT work, some have been adjusted and others discontinued. Two out of 15 SOP elements are no longer tracked in the IMS. As a result of DCO revisions to their data collection methodology and database, 13 elements can still be reported in new and adjusted implementation forms. Since only 13 elements are being tracked, UNDP revised the indicator to reflect a minimum of **seven out of 13 elements**, instead of eight out of 15. In 2021, 128 out of 129 offices implemented at least seven SOP (99%) elements. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1.3** | Percentage of country offices which have adopted the following common service lines: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Common procurement services | 50% | 51% | **60%** | 53% | **64%** | 55% | **68%** | 57% | **76%** |
| b) Common finance services | 37% | 38% | **48%** | 40% | **50%** | 42% | **58%** | 44% | **60%** |
| c) Common information and communication technology services | 63% | 64% | **65%** | 66% | **72%** | 68% | **72%** | 70% | **74%** |
| d) Common logistics services | N/A | N/A | **43%** | 45% | **43%** | 47% | **45%** | 49% | **49%** |
| e) Common human resources | 40% | 41% | **42%** | 43% | **47%** | 45% | **57%** | 47% | **59%** |
| f) Common facility services, including common premises | N/A | N/A | **87%** | 89% | **83%** | 91% | **87%** | 93% | **93%** |
| g) Common long-term agreements | 76% | 77% | **86%** | 79% | **84%** | 81% | **79%** | 83% | **83%** |
| **Note**: The indicator has been slightly revised by removing references to the business operations strategy in 2018. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1.4** | Percentage of country offices, which have performed joint analysis and planning with the UN Country Teams in countries affected by disasters or conflicts, including in mission settings | 12% | 13% | **28%**  **(14/50 countries)** | 14% | **66%**  **(33/50 countries)** | 15% | **64%**  **(32 out 50 countries)** | 15% | **84%**  **(42 out of 50 countries** |
| **Note:** The language of the indicator has been modified to provide clarity of measurement. In 2021, the indicator continued to include joint analysis and planning conducted by Peace and Development Advisors in counties affected by disasters or conflicts. | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 UNDP support to integrated SDG delivery | **3.2.1** | Number and percentage of country offices providing a country support platform for integrated solutions | 0  (0%) | 10  (8%) | **46**  **(36%)** | 25  (19%) | **55**  **(43%)** | 45  (34%) | **46**  **(36%**) | 70  (53%) | **42**  **(33%)** |
| **Note**: In 2018, 46 country offices out of 127 provided country support platform(s) using a methodology that included nascent or emerging platforms. The 2019 methodology identified 16 country offices with nascent platforms but using a methodology that was not included in the total qualified in terms of providing country support platforms. A strictly comparable figure to compare 2018 reporting would be a total of 55 country offices. In 2021, 42 country offices fully qualified and nine additional country offices were considered ‘nascent’ or ’emerging’. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.2** | Percentage of UNDP country offices providing common services to non-resident agencies | 97%  (2018) | 97% | **97%** | 97% | **96%** | 97% | **96%** | 97% | **93%** |
| **Note**: Indicator language has been modified with the change of ‘hosting’ to ‘providing’ common services. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.3** | Percentage of UNDP clients satisfied with UNDP provision of operational services (removed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Note**: Due to the difficulty in establishing a data source to properly measure client’ satisfaction with UNDP provision of operational services, this indicator was removed. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.4** | UNDP non-core resources received from inter-agency pooled funds [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Amount (US dollar millions) | $341 | $388 | **$357** | $447 | **$464** | $509 | **$404** | $574 | **$356** |
| b) Percentage of total UNDP non-core resources | 8% | 9% | **8%** | 10% | **11%** | 11% | **8%** | 12% | **7%** |
| **Note 1:** The baseline has been revised to be in sync with 2017 actuals reported under 2.1.2 c.4 (pooled funding).  **Note 2**: 2020 actuals were adjusted to reflect final figures for the year.  **Note 3**: All 2021 financials are preliminary as of 2 February 2022.  **Note 4**: In previous years, a significant portion of pooled funding came through UNDP as the organization acted a management agent for humanitarian funds. This function shifted to OCHA in 2020, resulting in a dip in the amount of pooled funding received compared to previous years. The largest decline came from the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Law and Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOTFA). | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.5** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditures from joint programmes **[QCPR related]** | N/A | 15% | **8.4%** | 10% | **8.4%** | 12% | **10%** | 15% | **10%** |
| **Note 1:** The target was determined in line with General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/72/279), paragraph 28e, “[…] requests the United Nations development system […] to allocate, where applicable, at least 15 per cent of non-core resources for development to joint activities.” The milestones for 2019 and 2020, and target for 2021, were adjusted to show incremental improvements towards achieving 15% by the end of 2021.  **Note 2:** The indicator captures the portion of programme expenditure based on the definition in the 2014 Joint Programme guidance note where, “A Joint Programme is a set of activities contained in a joint work plan and related common budgetary framework, involving two or more UN organizations and (sub-) national governmental partners, intended to achieve results aligned with national priorities as reflected in UNDAF/One Programme or an equivalent programming instrument or development framework.” It is important to note that the UN system, through the DCO, is in the process of establishing a common definition for joint activities that captures the full range of collaborative efforts that allow for comparison across the system. Besides 10% expenditures from joint programmes, the portion of programme expenditure involving UNDP partners and UN organizations was 11% of the total expenditure of $4.8 billion US dollars in 2021. The portion of programme expenditure where UNDP partnered with international financial institutions was 4% of the same amount. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.6** | UNCDF: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Number of LDCs where UNCDF has a strategic country presence | 25 | 26 | **27** | 28 | **28** | 30 | **32** | 32 | **33** |
| b) Number of joint UNDP-UNCDF programmes/projects | 24 | 25 | **26** | 26 | **27** | 27 | **28** | 28 | **39** |
| **3.2.7** | UNV: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Number of people volunteered per year through UNV | 6,501 | 6,750 | **7,201** | 7,000 | **8,282** | 7,250 | **9,458** | 8,500 | **10,921** |
| b) Number of UN partners engaging UN Volunteers | 34 | 35 | **38** | 37 | **54** | 39 | **60** | 55 | **55** |
| **Note**: Disaggregation for indicator 3.2.7. a) in 2021: 53% female, 47% male UN volunteers, 41% international UN volunteers, and 59% national UN volunteers. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2.8** | UNOSSC: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Number of partnership compacts established with relevant United Nations organisations, other intergovernmental organisations, partner countries and other relevant stakeholders. | 20 | 30 | **57** | 40 | **78** | 50 | **88** | 60 | **91** |
| b) Number of volumes of South-South in Action and other publications launched. | 12 | 20 | **36** | 28 | **63** | 36 | **68** | 44 | **96** |
| **Note:** A new indicator relating to the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation was added as per the discussion with the Executive Board during an informal session on 16 August 2018. The 2021 data reflects aggregated numbers from previous years. | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.3.2** | Total contribution in cash paid by UNDP to the UNDP Resident Coordinator system cost-sharing arrangement **[QCPR related]** | $5.15m | $5.15m | **$5.15m** | $10.3m | **$10.3m** | $10.3m | **$10.3m** | $10.3m | **$10.3m** |
| **Note:** Milestones and targets are aligned with draft General Assembly resolution A/72/L.52 (9 May 2018) regarding “Repositioning of the United Nations development system in the context of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.”  Milestones for 2019-2021 have been revised based on the 2019 contributions level of $10.3 million US dollars (instead of $10.2 million). | | | | | | | | | |

**SECTION II: Report Cards**

SECTION II presents report cards that summarize UNDP performance against milestones and targets for development results and organizational effectiveness and efficiency indicators, including a description of the methodology used to generate these metrics.

**Methodology used for assessing performance for development results**

As in previous years, an assessment of development performance was conducted at the output level. First, data under each output indicator were aggregated based on milestones and actuals presented in SECTION I of this report. Second, aggregated data for each indicator were compared with milestones from a reporting year by calculating the percentage of milestones achieved. Finally, a non-weighted average of resulting percentages was taken across all indicators for an output to calculate the average percentage achievement for that output. This calculation was translated into a “traffic light” for the report card. Coding is in line with harmonized standards agreed upon by UNFPA, UNICEF, and UN Women for SP reporting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** **90%** of the milestone. |
| **Amber** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **between 60% and 89%** of the milestone. |
| **Red** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **less than 60%** of the milestone. |

For output indicators presenting cumulative results over the SP cycle, the progress rate was calculated by comparing actual progress from the baseline (i.e., cumulative actual results minus the baseline value) with expected progress since the baseline (i.e., cumulative milestone value minus the baseline value). For output indicators showing non-cumulative results, the progress rate was calculated by comparing overall results achieved in the reporting year with overall results expected in the same year without subtracting the baseline. For indicators with both “number and proportion,” the achievement rate was calculated using indicators with numbers only.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicators showing cumulative results** | **Indicators showing non-cumulative results** |
|  |  |

Output level achievement rate is an average of indicator component achievement rate under the output number. For components where achievement is above 150%, the ceiling of 150% is applied.

In addition to the summary measure of performance against milestones, the report card presents the number of countries reporting on any IRRF indicator values (a baseline, milestones and/or a target) under each output.

**Methodology used for assessing performance for organisational effectiveness and efficiency indicators**

The report card for organizational effectiveness and efficiency results assists readers in understanding achievements against annual milestones as measured by Tier 3 IRRF indicators.

Assessment of organizational effectiveness and efficiency performance is presented at indicator level rather than output level. As organizational results are determined by a range of processes, assessing progress against indicator level provides a more meaningful picture of UNDP performance.

Performance against each indicator is calculated based on milestones and actual results in the reporting year as presented in SECTION I, which are converted into a “traffic light” for the report card. Thresholds for traffic light coding are aligned with those for the development results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** **90%** of the milestone. |
| **Amber** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **between 60% and 89%** of the milestone. |
| **Red** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **less than 60%** of the milestone. |

The progress rate is calculated on an annual basis. Differentiated formulae are applied to measure the progress rate of two types of indicators, where: 1) success is defined as the actual value equal to or higher than the milestone, and 2) success is defined as the actual value equal to or below the milestone (e.g., management efficiency ratio). The formula for the second type yields a percentage achievement above 100% when the actual is lower than the milestone (performance above expectations) and a percentage achievement below 100% when the actual is higher than the milestone (under performance).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Success is defined as the actual equal to or higher than the milestone** | **Success is defined as the actual equal to or below the milestone** |
|  |  |

Where UNDP strives to achieve a parity, such as the percentage of staff/personnel who are female (2.5.3) and the percentage of staff from programme countries (2.5.4), the performance threshold is applied to both low achievement and over achievement. In the case where milestones are lower than 50% (e.g., 42%), performance threshold for low performance set against 42% is (green = 38% and above, amber = 25% to 37%, and red 0% to 24%) and 50% for over achievement (green 50% to 55%, amber = 56%-70%, and red = 71%-100%).

As for indicators with sub-components, a non-weighted average of the performance rate is applied to calculate the average percentage achievement. Component achievements above 150% are kept at the 150% ceiling for aggregation. Where an indicator has only one component and achievement is above 150%, it is displayed as “>150%” in this table.

For indicators where data is not available, progress is coloured in grey and marked as ‘No data’.

**2018-2021 Development Report Card**

At the end of the Strategic Plan, and out of 33 development outputs, UNDP achieved 90% or higher of targets under 16 (marked in green), and achievements on 17 outputs were between 60% to 89% (amber). For the latter, UNDP achieved higher than 80% for 14. One output, on women’s leadership and participation in crisis prevention and recovery, fell below 70%.

In the cases where UNDP performance was constrained in 2021, two patterns became evident. In the first, complex conflict and development emergencies caused some country offices with large programmes to significantly miss 2021 targets, pulling down organizational performance overall. In Yemen, for instance, sanctions, flash floods, multiple disease outbreaks, and worsening insecurity cut into support for restoring basic services and broader stabilization. A coup in Myanmar shifted parameters for engagement, resulting in the suspension of projects expected to contribute to women’s empowerment. Outputs where this pattern was seen include: 1.4.1, 1.6.1, 2.3.2, 3.1.1, 3.3.3, and 3.6.1.

Ongoing upheaval caused by the COVID-19 pandemic shaped a second pattern of slower delivery experienced by multiple country offices. Economic downturn decimated women’s work given their concentration in vulnerable jobs and industries, also leading to constrained progress on targets to dismantle barriers to women in the workplace. Slow progress on removing structural barriers to women’s empowerment is an issue that UNDP will work to rectify through its 2022-2025 Gender Equality Strategy. Outputs where this pattern can be seen: 1.3.1, 1.6.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.3.1, 2.4.1, 2.4.2, 2.5.1, 2.6.1, 3.2.1, and 3.3.1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic Plan Output** | | **Performance against milestones (# of countries)** | | | |
| **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **OUTCOME 1: Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions** | | | | | |
| **1.1.1** | Integration of the 2030 Agenda and other international agreements in development plans and budgets | 118% (99) | 97% (103) | 93% (104) | 99% (107) |
| **1.1.2** | Universal access to basic services and financial and non-financial assets for sustainable livelihoods and jobs | 92% (86) | 108% (88) | 104% (90) | 117% (95) |
| **1.1.3** | **[NEW]** Inequalities that permeated societies before and are more starkly visible after the COVID-19 pandemic uprooted by social protection schemes |  |  | 102% (95) | 96% (100) |
| **1.2.1** | Local economic development and delivery of basic services, including HIV related services | 121% (98) | 111% (99) | 112% (99) | 110% (102) |
| **1.2.2** | Public and private financing for the SDGs | 125% (39) | 89% (39) | 83% (39) | 91% (42) |
| **1.2.3** | Awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures | 144% (47) | 136% (48) | 117% (51) | 99% (51) |
| **1.3.1** | National capacities, evidence-based assessment and investments for crisis response and recovery | 125% (37) | 93% (44) | 81% (45) | 80%[[39]](#footnote-40) (46) |
| **1.4.1** | Sustainable management of natural resources | 99% (92) | 88% (95) | 87% (95) | 81% (96) |
| **1.5.1** | Universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy | 98% (41) | 89% (40) | 124% (43) | 123% (47) |
| **1.6.1** | Country-led measures for gender equality and women’s empowerment | 98% (31) | 85% (32) | 73% (32) | 85% (33) |
| **1.6.2** | Prevention of Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) | 101% (39) | 115% (40) | 102% (42) | 90% (44)[[40]](#footnote-41) |
| **OUTCOME 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development** | | | | | |
| **2.1.1** | Integration of low emission and climate resilient objectives in development plans and policies | 117% (78) | 98% (80) | 87% (81) | 87% (85) |
| **2.1.2** | Inclusive social protection systems | 58% (39) | 77% (43) | 101% (43) | 73% (45) |
| **2.2.1** | Digital technologies for public services | 107% (29) | 108% (31) | 116% (33) | 105% (43) |
| **2.2.2** | Strong constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions | 128% (86) | 120% (89) | 102% (90) | 101% (91) |
| **2.2.3** | Strong rule of law and human rights institutions and systems | 125% (100) | 104% (100) | 90% (101) | 103% (101) |
| **2.3.1** | Policies, systems and financing for disaster risk reduction, climate change mitigation and conflict prevention | 84% (82) | 113% (88) | 83% (88) | 82% (89) |
| **2.3.2** | **[NEW]** Governments and civil societies empowered to navigate crisis and uncertainty caused by the COVID-19 pandemic to deliver uninterrupted and inclusive services and to build social capital and open civic space for response and recovery efforts |  |  | 95% (75) | 89% (81) |
| **2.3.3** | **[NEW]** Digital and innovative solutions applied to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and to set the path for accelerated recovery |  |  | 100% (75) | 93% (82) |
| **2.4.1** | Sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources | 120% (58) | 92% (65) | 80% (65) | 81% (69) |
| **2.4.2** | **[New]** Nature-based solutions to the COVID-19 pandemic and green economy advanced, rebalancing nature, climate and economy |  |  | 91% (17) | 87% (25) |
| **2.5.1** | Energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy | 105% (48) | 95% (53) | 80% (53) | 90% (54)[[41]](#footnote-42) |
| **2.6.1** | Fight against structural barriers to women’s empowerment | 143% (34) | 109% (40) | 108% (40) | 79% (40) |
| **OUTCOME 3: Strengthen resilience to shocks and crisis** | | | | | |
| **3.1.1** | Restoration of core government functions and basic services in post-crisis situations | 126% (35) | 110% (36) | 66% (36) | 80% (38) |
| **3.1.2** | **[NEW]** Inclusive and integrated crisis management enabled for agile and effective responses to COVID-19 |  |  | 92% (84) | 96% (91) |
| **3.2.1** | Reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism (PVE) | 142% (50) | 115% (53) | 102% (53) | 83% (55) |
| **3.2.2** | Restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security | 113% (19) | 113% (19) | 114% (19) | 103% (19) |
| **3.3.1** | Gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention of and preparedness for natural hazards and peaceful societies | 70% (54) | 63% (56) | 96% (56) | 81% (56) |
| **3.3.2** | Consensus building and dialogue for peaceful societies | 138% (33) | 125% (37) | 125% (38) | 123% (41) |
| **3.3.3** | **[NEW]** Health systems and capacities enhanced for agile and effective responses to COVID-19 |  |  | 80% (49) | 84% (54) |
| **3.4.1** | Nature-based solutions for sustainable recovery | 100% (2) | 100% (2) | 100% (2) | 100% (2) |
| **3.5.1** | Energy access for crisis-affected populations | 150% (2) | 138% (2) | 69% (2) | 140% (2) |
| **3.6.1** | Women’s leadership and participation for crisis prevention and recovery | 83% (17) | 82% (19) | 58% (19) | 66% (22) |

**2018 - 2021 Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Report Card**

Asterisks (\*) in the Report Card indicate carryover of previous year performance where no new data was available in the reporting year.

At the end of the Strategic Plan, out of 34 Tier 3 indicators, UNDP achieved 90% or higher of the targets under 27 (marked in green) and 7 indicators between 60% to 89% (amber). No Tier 3 indicator was below 60% of the targets or coded as red.

Some institutional performance was affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and other crises. For instance, UNDP slightly missed the funding contribution target, particularly from bilateral and multilateral donor resources. The application of South-South and triangular cooperation was challenged by travel and other pandemic-related restrictions.

Several structural and conceptual shifts during the Strategic Plan period impacted the achievement of certain targets. Due to the shift in a management agent function for humanitarian funds, from UNDP to OCHA, the portion of pooled funding declined since 2020. The scope of Country Support Platforms shifted beyond the original concept envisaged in 2018, evolving into Accelerator Labs and other initiatives. The target of allocating 15% of non-core resources for development to joint activities was determined in line with a GA Resolution (A/RES/72/279)[[42]](#footnote-43). Measurement against the joint programme indicator was based on the narrow definition of ‘joint programme’ from the UNSDG RBM handbook issued in 2014, which is being updated. Nonetheless, UNDP achieved its ambitious 15% target for global projects managed by headquarters.

| **Results**  **Statement** | **Indicator** | | **Performance against milestones** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **1.1** Evidence based performance analysis and decision making at all levels | **1.1.1** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track | No data | 100% | No data | **101%** |
| **1.1.2** | Percentage of programme governments who perceive that UNDP:   1. plays a relevant role in the development of countries, and reflects the development priorities of its partners and 2. tailors its activities and capacities to national context and needs   **[QCPR related]** | No data | No 2019 milestone | No data | **No data** |
| **1.1.3** | IATI Publishing Statistics Score **[QCPR related]** | 100% | 100% | 100% | **100%** |
| **1.2** Cross-cutting approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects | **1.2.1** | Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective **[QCPR related]** | 111% | 107% | 110% | **108%** |
| **1.2.2** | Percentage of UNSWAP minimum standards met or exceeded **[QCPR related]** | 125% | 122% | 122% | **117%** |
| **1.2.3** | Percentage of new country programme planning documents that address the needs and rights of people with disabilities [**QCPR related]** | 125% | >150% | 134% | **140%** |
| **1.2.4** | Percentage of project outputs that use south-south or triangular cooperation to achieve results [**QCPR related]** | >150% | 120% | 108% | **80%** |
| **1.2.5** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards | No data | 97% | No data | **99%** |
| **1.2.6** | Percentage of project outputs that use innovative tools and methodologies, of which:   1. innovative tools and methodologies are piloted 2. innovative tools and methodologies are scaled | No data | No 2019 milestone | 105% | **96%** |
| **1.3** High quality audits and evaluations producing implementable solutions | **1.3.1** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated (including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards) of: **(SWAP-related indicator)**  a) Satisfactory quality  b) Moderately satisfactory quality | 100% | 86% | 110% | **110%** |
| **1.3.2** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as:   1. Satisfactory 2. Partially satisfactory with some improvements needed 3. Partially satisfactory with major improvements needed 4. Unsatisfactory | 126% | 127% | 131% | **146%** |
| **1.3.3** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified | 93% | 84% | 97% | **90%** |
| **1.3.4** | Implementation rate of agreed Joint Inspection Unit Report recommendations | 85% | 110% | 112% | **132%** |
| **1.3.5** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses:  a) Decentralized evaluations  b) Independent evaluations | 99% | 97% | 97% | **101%** |
| **1.3.6** | Implementation rate of agreed upon  a) Internal audit recommendations  b) External audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 109% | 105% | 107% | **108%** |
| **2.1** UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice | **2.1.1** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organisation | No data | No 2019 milestone | No data | No data |
| **2.1.2** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by funding stream **[QCPR related]** | 104% | 100% | 108% | **99%** |
| **2.1.3** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by partner | 95% | 82% | 97% | **89%** |
| **2.1.4** | Percentage of Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) performance indicator where UNDP scores at least ‘satisfactory’ | No data | No data | No data | **98%** |
| **2.2.** Cost-sharing agreements and projects ensure full cost recovery | **2.2.1** | Use of core and non-core for programme activities **[QCPR related]** | 101% | 100% | 99% | **100%** |
| **2.3** Quality and efficient management services to support programme delivery | **2.3.1** | Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 92% | 92% | 89% | **83%** |
| **2.3.2** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 103% | 101% | 100% | **100%** |
| **2.4** Efficient, professional and transparent procurement and value for money | **2.4.1** | Heads of country office procurement units with relevant procurement certification | 124% | 103% | 91% | **82%** |
| **2.4.2** | a) Percentage of procurement volume spend through LTAs  b) Percentage of global procurement value in collaboration with UN and other  development partners [**QCPR related]** | 129% | 99% | 80% | **67%** |
| **2.5** UNDP equipped with talented and diverse workforce | **2.5.1** | Staff satisfaction:  a) Leadership/direction index  b) Engagement index | 95% | 95%\* | 92% | No data |
| **2.5.2** | Percentage of relevant staff who completed:  a) Informal and formal senior leadership/management programme/activities  b) Virtual career management activities  c) UNDP Mandatory Course Learning Plan | 115% | 78% | 74% | **94%** |
| **2.5.3** | Percentage of staff/personnel who are female [**QCPR related]** | 95% | 95% | 98% | **98%** |
| **2.5.4** | Percentage of staff from programme countries [**QCPR related]** | 93% | 92% | 105% | **109%** |
| **2.5.5** | Percentage of offices with in-house gender equality expertise | 93% | 95% | 107% | **108%** |
| **3.1** Common UN approaches facilitate efficient and accelerated joint delivery against sustainable development objectives | **3.1.2** | Percentage of country offices that are applying at least eight elements of the Standard Operating Procedures (Out of 15) **[QCPR related]** | 103% | 101% | 101% | **104%** |
| **3.1.3** | Percentage of country offices which have adopted the common service lines **[QCPR related]** | 112% | 108% | 112% | **114%** |
| **3.1.4** | Percentage of country offices, which have performed joint analysis and planning with the UN Country Teams in countries affected by disasters or conflicts, including in mission settings | >150% | >150% | >150% | **>150%** |
| **3.2** UNDP support to integrated SDG delivery | **3.2.1** | Number and percentage of country offices providing a country support platform for integrated solutions | >150% | >150% | 104% | **61%** |
| **3.2.2** | Percentage of UNDP Country Offices providing common services to non-resident agencies | 100% | 99% | 99% | **96%** |
| **3.2.3** | Percentage of UNDP clients satisfied with UNDP provision of operational services | No data | No data | No data | No data |
| **3.2.4** | UNDP non-core resources received from inter-agency pooled funds [**QCPR related]** | 90% | 106% | 76% | **60%** |
| **3.2.5** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditures from joint programmes **[QCPR related]** | 56% | 84% | 83% | **67%** |
| **3.2.6** | UNCDF:   1. Number of LDCs where UNCDF has a strategic country presence 2. Number of joint UNDP-UNCDF programmes/projects | 104% | 102% | 105% | **121%** |
| **3.2.7** | UNV:   1. Number of people volunteered per year through UNV 2. Number of UN partners engaging UN Volunteers | 108% | 132% | 140% | **114%** |
| **3.2.8** | UNOSSC:   1. Number of partnership compacts established with relevant United Nations organisations, other intergovernmental organisations, partner countries and other relevant stakeholders. 2. Number of volumes of South-South in Action and other publications launched. | >150% | >150% | 150% | **150%** |
| **3.3** UNDP contributes fully to the Resident Coordinator function | **3.3.2** | Total contribution in cash paid by UNDP to the UNDP Resident Coordinator system cost-sharing arrangement **[QCPR related]** | 100% | 100% | 100% | **100%** |

1. Refers to both countries and territories that receive UNDP programme resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Excludes proportion indicators. More detailed information on the changes to the number of reporting countries and 2021 targets is available upon request. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Includes all parts of national government such as ministries, various commissions, agencies and authorities as well as other state bodies. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Includes Addis, Beijing, Istanbul, Quito, SAMOA and Sendai. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. SSMART stands for South-South Marketplace. This is the same as the global development solutions exchange referred to in UNDP’s corporate strategy on South-South and Triangular Cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Basic services include social services (e.g., health and nutrition, education, water and sanitation, social housing, vocational training), economic services (including finance), environmental and energy services (e.g. renewables, clean fuels and technology, use of natural resources), and other services (e.g. rule of law and justice). Please note that UNDP focuses primarily on policies and capacities that improve the enabling environment for provision of basic services. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Proportions can be calculated using estimates of coverage populations that are available in many countries using surveys and administrative reporting systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. As defined nationally. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Indicator 3.2 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Indicator 2.5 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Indicator 4.1 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Indicator 4.2 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Includes alternative modes of financing such as Islamic finance, social impact investing, and socially responsible investments. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Where relevant, IATI data will be used to inform public financing, among other sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Includes Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBA) and Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Includes renewable energy as well as clean fuels and technology. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Includes development policies, plans, legislation, regulations and programmes and initiatives that specifically address the issue of women’s leadership. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Includes oceans and marine ecosystems, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, land, and chemicals and waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Includes nationally determined contributions (NDCs). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Includes dialogue with the private sector on policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, as well as measures to boost investment and sustainable development. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Includes youth, people living with HIV, indigenous groups, and other traditionally marginalized groups, as per each national context. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Includes policy, legal and regulatory frameworks, and funded programmes/initiatives. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Includes TSMs aiming to create a conducive environment for women’s participation through the existence of funding or training programmes, as well as incentives for political parties to place women in electable positions, quotas, reserved seats and targeted voter education programmes. Based on country responses, it will be possible to estimate and report on the number of countries that have such measures in place. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Includes youth, people with disabilities, people living with HIV, and other traditionally marginalized groups, according to national context. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. As articulated in the ‘Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels,’ (A/RES/67/1) which states, *inter alia*, that “[...] We recognize the importance of national ownership in rule of law activities, strengthening justice and security institutions that are accessible and responsive to the needs and rights of all individuals and which build trust and promote social cohesion and economic prosperity” (paragraph 11). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. As per inter-governmentally agreed norms and standards (e.g., Paris Principles and UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/48/134 of December 1993). [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. QCPR (GA/RES/71/243) paragraph 24 “[…] calls upon the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, and in this regard: (a) Emphasizes that in countries facing humanitarian emergencies there is a need to work collaboratively to move beyond short-term assistance towards contributing to longer - term development gains, including by engaging, as appropriate, in joint risk analysis, needs assessments, practice response and a coherent multi - year timeframe, with the aim of reducing need, vulnerability and risk over time, in compliance with international law and in line with resolution 46/182 of 19 December 1991 and the annex thereto and in accordance with national plans and priorities, stressing that this should not adversely affect resources for development; (b) Emphasizes that development is a central goal in itself, and that in countries in conflict and post - conflict situations, the development work of the entities of the United Nations development system can contribute to peacebuilding and sustaining peace, in accordance with national plans, needs and priorities and respecting national ownership, and stresses in this regard the need to improve coordination and synergy to maximize the impacts, results and effectiveness of support for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, stressing that this should not adversely affect resources for development.” UNDP supports, upon request, national measures on crisis, whether caused by natural or man-made factors, taking a development approach in all its programmatic interventions on prevention and response. An important partnership in this regard is the Joint UNDP-DPA Project on Strengthening National Capacities for Conflict Prevention, implemented since 2004, which includes the deployment of Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs) to Resident Coordinator Offices (RCOs). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Refers to available evidence regarding disaster prone areas and communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Refers to availability of relevant data regarding the most affected groups that will be used, upon request, to support national policymaking and action. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Includes, upon request, nationally established infrastructures for peace. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Indicator 5.2 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Indicator 2.4 of the Monitoring Framework of the UN framework for the immediate Socio-Economic Response to COVID-19. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Includes ocean, marine, and freshwater ecosystems, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, land rights, and management of chemicals and waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. Including government, civil society, private sector, philanthropies, academic institutions, faith-based organizations, and others. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. Includes institutional capacities and processes for national and local planning, management and coordination (e.g., executive office management, aid management, human resource management and financial management). [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. Local economic revitalization (LER) benchmarks relate to infrastructure (e.g., houses, schools, public buildings, power grids, hospitals, health and water facilities), market development, income generation and employment, new and existing enterprises and private sector recovery to address the needs of affected populations. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. Includes, for example, risks from environmental degradation, climate change, natural disasters, violence, breakdown of social cohesion and rule of law, economic distress, and rapid urbanisation, among other factors. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. Lack of credible, standardized, and up-to-date data at both national and sub-national levels was a major hindrance to achieving Output 1.3.1 and 2.3.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. Rounded to 90%, the actual achievement is 89.7%. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Rounded to 90%, the actual achievement is 89.8%. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/72/279), paragraph 28e, “[…] requests the United Nations development system […] to allocate, where applicable, at least 15 per cent of non-core resources for development to joint activities.”    [↑](#footnote-ref-43)