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## Annex 2 – Integrated Results and Resources Framework: Methodology and 2017 Results

1. Annex 2 responds to Executive Board decisions regarding the integrated results and resources framework (IRRF) presented as Annex II of the UNDP Strategic Plan (document DP/2013/40) approved in September 2013. It provides details on the process of IRRF population for development and institutional results presented in the *Annual Report of the Administrator 2017*. The fully populated IRRF template is presented with 2013 baselines, 2017 targets, and achieved results for 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Decision no.** | **Relevant paragraphs** |
| 2013/27 | 3. Approvesthe UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017, as outlined in **document DP/2013/40**. |
| 12. RequestsUNDP to implement the strategic plan while developing and refining complementary, publicly available documentation in consultation with Member States and other stakeholders, including: (a) **refinement of indicators and development of baselines, targets and annual milestones in Annex II of DP/2013/40,** appropriately disaggregated, including by sex and age, where relevant, to be finalized by the annual session 2014, as well as developing capacity throughout UNDP for data collection and reporting on the indicators; and (b) refinement of informal ‘theory of change’ documents for the seven development outcomes of the 2014 annual session. |
| 2014/11 | 3. Recognizesthat the integrated results and resources framework should effectively demonstrate the linkages between results and resources, and in this regard **encouragesreporting of** **resources allocated to different outcomes in the integrated results and resources framework, as well as reporting on resources against respective outputs upon completion of the reporting cycle**, and in accordance with the priorities and areas of work of the strategic plan. |
| 4. RequestsUNDP to **make any necessary adjustments to the integrated results and resources framework before the end of 2014, incorporating the views of Member States, as appropriate.** |
| 5. Further requestsUNDP to finalize the maximum number of first and second year milestones and 2017 targets for **an update on the** **final version of the integrated results and resources framework to the Executive Board at an informal session during its first regular session in 2015** to support preparation of the annual report of the Administrator in 2015. |
| 10. RequestsUNDP to ensure that any relevant **indicators and targets of the integrated results and resources framework are consistent with the sustainable development goals in the context of the post-2015 development agenda, when appropriate**. |
| 11. Calls onUNDP to **apply the integrated results and resources framework as soon as possible** and to keep the Executive Board informed on progress and challenges encountered throughout the process. |

**Population of the IRRF 2017: “Actual” results**

1. **Data collection for impact indicators.** All impact indicators rely on international published data sources, as outlined in the populated IRRF template. A baseline was provided for these indicators but no targets were set since UNDP cannot establish them outside the scope of intergovernmental processes. In this report, baselines for some indicators were updated utilizing the most current data (March 2018), as stated in respective indicator reporting notes. The latest progress data has been provided for 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2014, according to availability.
2. **Data collection for outcome indicators derived from international data sources**. Similarly, most outcome indicators, except for 4.4.c, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4 rely on international published data sources, as stated in the populated IRRF template. For these indicators, UNDP includes 2017 targets categorized as “direction of travel” on the basis of trend analysis. In this Annual Report, baselines for several indicators were updated utilizing the most current data (March 2018), as stated in respective indicator reporting notes. Latest progress data has been provided for 2017, 2016, 2015 or 2014, according to availability. For some outcome indicators no progress update is available due to time lags in data collection and reporting requirements at the international level. Progress updates for these indicators will be included in results reporting in coming years.
3. **Data collection for UNDP-reported outcome indicators and all output indicators.** Outcome indicators 4.4.c, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4, and all output indicators in the IRRF, rely on data from UNDP country offices through the online corporate planning system.
4. The annual reporting exercise was undertaken between mid-November 2017 and January 2018 where country offices reported on results achieved in 2017 for all relevant IRRF indicators. 2017 actual result values were provided by country offices for 99.8 per cent of the indicators with a 2017 target stated (i.e. only 0.2 per cent of data was missing). Data provided by country offices was quality assured at regional and headquarters levels. Intensive efforts were made to verify incomplete or inconsistent data with country offices, which resulted in almost all data issues being resolved and corrected without the need for assumptions to be applied. The following assumptions were applied to country-level data to enable calculation of a consistent time series of results expected over the Strategic Plan period, and to ensure conservative and robust reporting on results. These assumptions are consistent with those applied in previous reporting years.

**Missing baselines**. If no valid baseline was reported, it was assumed to be equal to the first actual result reported, as a conservative assumption that there were no additional reported results since the baseline was set. If no actual was reported the baseline was assumed to be equal to the first milestone reported. Exceptions to this conservative assumption were made only if there was a comment that these were new results, in which case the baseline was set at zero. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)

**Missing milestones or targets**. For countries that reported expected results for an indicator with expected values missing for one or more years, the missing milestone was assumed to match the actual result for that year, if provided, (e.g. the 2017 target was assumed to match 2017 actual if provided), as a conservative assumption that achieved results were no better or worse than expected. If no actual result was reported for that year the missing milestone was assumed to match the previous milestone reported (e.g. the 2016 milestone was assumed to be the same as the 2015 milestone). This approach provides a comparable time series in expected results across years, while making conservative assumptions that do not overestimate the scale of change over the Strategic Plan period. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)

**Missing actuals***.* For cumulative indicators only, where countries reported expected results but were missing actual values for one or more years, a minimum assumption was made that the cumulative actual result was as high as the cumulative actual result reported for the previous year (i.e. the cumulative 2017 actual was assumed to match the cumulative 2017 actual result). No assumptions were made about missing actual values for indicators defined on an annual (non-cumulative) basis. This conservative approach ensures reporting on 2017 actuals was as complete as possible without making assumptions about actual results beyond those confirmed by country programmes. (Three cases required this assumption in 2017.)

**Countries adding reporting on additional IRRF indicators for 2017**. Countries were permitted to add reporting components against additional IRRF indicators to reflect new programmes initiated in 2017. In these instances, countries were required only to report a baseline value, a 2017 target, and 2017 actual. (Due to new projects, seven country offices required this assumption in 2017.)

**Adjustments to ensure a meaningful cumulative time series**:

* 1. If any reported milestones or the target were lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator it was assumed that the baseline was not included in any of the reported time series for that indicator, and the baseline was adjusted to zero. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)
  2. If all reported actuals were lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator, but the milestones and target were not lower than the baseline, it was assumed that the baseline was included in the expected results but not in the reported actuals. In such cases the baseline was adjusted to zero and the reported baseline value was subtracted from the milestone and target values only. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)
  3. If the reported 2017 actual was lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator, but no other expected or actual results were lower than the baseline, it was assumed that the 2017 actual was accidentally reported on an annual basis, and the cumulative 2016 actual was added to the 2017 actual. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)
  4. If the reported 2017 actual was lower than the reported 2016 actual for a cumulative indicator it was assumed that the 2017 actual was incorrectly reported and the cumulative 2017 actual was adjusted to be as high as the 2016 actual if the country office did not provide a corrected figure. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)
  5. If any reported milestone was lower than a previous milestone it was assumed that the later milestone was accidentally reported on an annual basis, and the previous cumulative milestone was added to the later milestone. An exception was made if this produced a value greater than the final 2017 target (which experience has shown is much more reliably reported on a cumulative basis). In such cases, the previous cumulative milestone was used to replace the later milestone, without adding values. Exceptions were made if the country had reported underperformance in the previous year (where the actual was below the milestone), and in these cases the lower milestone was retained as it was assumed to be an intentional revision downwards, unless the milestone was lower than the previous actual, in which case the previous actual was added to the milestone. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)

**Adjustments to total results for disaggregated indicators**. Where countries reported sex disaggregated results but did not provide a total, or where the total was less than the sum of component male and female results, the total was corrected to match the sum of male and female values (for baseline, milestone, actual and target as needed). If the total exceeded the sum of male and female values, no adjustment was made as this typically reflects a portion of results where sex disaggregation is not available. Similarly, for results where other types of disaggregation were used, if a valid total was not provided it was assumed to be as high as the sum of reported components. (No new cases required this assumption in 2017.)

**Adjustments to show additional results**.For indicators designed to measure additional results achieved over the Strategic Plan period, country level results were adjusted as described above. The baseline value was subtracted from each year in the time series to yield a baseline of zero and ensure milestones, actuals and targets showed only the “additionality” generated (extra results beyond what existed in the baseline year). These additional country level results were added together to calculate the overall additional results for each year.

1. **Updated baselines, milestones, targets and actual results from previous years.** As agreed during the Midterm Review, no further changes have been permitted to baselines, milestones, targets or actual results from previous years unless, (a) a change was required to correct factual inaccuracies identified in a country office’s reporting in previous years (e.g. if a country reported results on an annual instead of cumulative basis), or (b) a country began reporting on an additional IRRF indicator for the first time to reflect new programmes. For indicators where either of these situations applied, updated figures are shown for applicable years in this Annual Report. Previously published baselines, milestones, actuals or targets from the Midterm Review and 2015 Annual Report of the Administrator are shown for reference under the respective indicator reporting notes.
2. **Number of countries linked and number of countries reporting on results.** The populated IRRF shows the number of countries linked to each output and a more specific count of the number of countries expected to contribute to results under each output indicator during the Strategic Plan cycle for 2014-2017. ‘Country’ refers to both countries and territories that receive UNDP programme resources.
3. **Data collection for Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency (OEE) results.** IRRF Tier III indicators are populated with data from three types of sources: a) data on UNDP performance collected on an on-going basis through systems such as Atlas or tools for on-line analytics (indicators 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 47); b) data self-reported on a regular basis by country offices or other units, validated by evidence and quality assurance processes (indicators 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23, 41, 43, 45, 46), and c) data from periodic surveys capturing perceptions on UNDP performance (indicators 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 28, 34, 36, 37, 42). Two indicators (44 and 48) cannot be included in 2017 reporting because methodologies are still being developed.
4. **Adjustment to IRRF Tier III indicators.** Upon the new decentralized evaluations’ assessment performed by the Independent Evaluation Office (as mandated by the evaluation policy adopted by the Executive Board in 2016), Indicator 19 on “percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory quality,” was adjusted to include evaluations that were rated ‘satisfactory’ and ‘partially satisfactory’. The change is to ensure consistency with the Independent Evaluation Office report. Disaggregated values for satisfactory and partially satisfactory decentralized evaluations are reported in the note. Milestones and targets have been revised to reflect the new methodology.
5. **Use of IRRF data in the narrative sections of the annual report.** Results presented in the annual report narrative are based primarily on country office reporting of cumulative actual 2017 results achieved against the streamlined set of IRRF indicators—with the exception of figures related to total jobs and livelihoods, which show aggregate performance under three related indicators (see paragraph 13 below for description of methodology). IRRF-derived results are complemented by examples of results delivered through country, regional and global programmes that draw on reporting by country offices and headquarter units through 2017 Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); an internal report on project monitoring; national statistics; independent and decentralized evaluations; partner assessments, and other qualitative and quantitative evidence.
6. **Calculation of the total number people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods and total jobs created.** Box 1 of the midterm review includes figures on the total number of new jobs created and the total number of people benefitting from improved livelihoods by the end of 2017, via direct UNDP support. Unlike other IRRF figures cited in, these figures were calculated drawing on more than one IRRF indicator*.* The methodology for the calculation is outlined below.

The figure on total new jobs created is based on country office reporting on the three IRRF output indicators relating to jobs: 1.1.1.a-b (number of new jobs created), 1.3.2.a-b (number of people who acquired new jobs through a UNDP-supported project on management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste), and 6.1.1.a-b (number of new emergency jobs created through UNDP projects in crisis or post-crisis settings). For each indicator, the calculation takes into account the reported number of jobs created for males and females, and jobs created where sex disaggregation was not available (as shown in reporting notes below each indicator in the populated IRRF). While country offices usually report results of specific projects under only one relevant output indicator, the definition of Indicator 1.1.1 is broad and allows for potential for overlap with results reported under categories 1.3.2 and 6.1.1. Therefore, a conservative approach was taken to include, for each programme country, results reported under 1.1.1 or, if higher*,* the sum of results under 1.3.2 and 6.1.1 (as there is not usually an overlap between results delivered through natural resources management and/or emergency projects). The resulting total is likely to be an underestimate of the total number of jobs created by UNDP across all three areas.

Similarly, the figure on the total number of people benefitting from improved livelihoods is based on country office reporting on the three IRRF output indicators relating to livelihoods: 1.1.1.c-d (number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods), 1.3.2.c-d (number of additional people benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste), and 6.1.1.B (number of additional people benefitting from diversified livelihoods opportunities through UNDP emergency projects). For each indicator, the calculation takes into account the reported number of males and females benefitting, and people benefitting where sex disaggregation was not available (as shown in reporting notes below each indicator in the populated IRRF). For each programme country, results reported under 1.1.1 or, if higher*,* the sum of results reported under 1.3.2 and 6.1.1 were included. The resulting total is likely to be an underestimate of the total number of people who benefitted from improved livelihoods across all three areas.

# Tier One: Impact

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact: Eradication of poverty and a significant reduction of inequality and exclusion** | | | |
| **Impact indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **Baseline** | **Latest Data** |
| **1** | Number and proportion of people living below   1. 1.25 US Dollars a day (PPP 2005)   b) 1.90 US Dollars a day (PPP 2011) | a) 1 billion, 18% of population (2013)  b) 0.9 billion, 15% of population (2012) | a) 0.83 billion, 14% of population (2015)  b) 0.70 billion, 12% of population (2015) |
| **Source**: a) Based on the Millennium Development Goals Report 2015, United Nations. Estimates for Developing Regions (pp. 14-15); b) Based on World Bank revision of international poverty lines in Cruz, M, J. Foster, B. Quillin, and P. Schellekens (2015), “Ending Extreme Poverty and Sharing Prosperity: Progress and Policies,” World Bank (p.6). Estimates for Developing World. Global standards were revised by the World Bank in 2015: the $1.25 dollars (PPP2005)/day poverty line was replaced by $1.90 dollars (PPP2011)/day poverty line. Statistics based on PPP2005 poverty lines will not be further updated.  **2017 Reporting note**: b) The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017 (<http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2017/07/pace-of-progress-must-accelerate-to-achieve-the-sdgs-finds-latest-un-progress-report/>) used 2013 as the latest data year and therefore is not used to update this indicator. | | |
| **2** | Poverty gap (%)  a) at 1.25 US Dollars a day (PPP 2005)  b) at 1.90 US Dollars a day (PPP 2011)  c) at National Poverty Lines | a) 7.9% (2013\*)  b) 7.7% (2013\*)  c) 13.2% (2013\*) | a) n/a  b) 6.9% (2016\*)  c) 12.5% (2016\*) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on World Bank data (World Development Indicators and Poverty and Inequality Database). Simple average is based on: a) 104 programme countries, b) 113 (123) programme countries in 2013 (2016), and (c) 93 (88) programme countries in 2013 (2016). As no new data was reported for PPP2005 poverty lines, a) is kept as a reference, b) replaces the poverty gap based on the $2.50 dollars/day (PPP 2005) by the $1.90 dollar/day (PPP 2011). | | |
| **3** | Multi-dimensional poverty index (MPI), adjusted to reflect national data, standards and definitions | 0.171 (2013\*) | 0.164 (2016\*) |
| **Source**: UNDP Human Development Report 2016, Table 2 (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/MPI> ). Simple average, based on 102 programme countries. The baseline is consistent with a poverty rate of 29.5% of the population. The latest value for 2016 is consistent with a poverty rate of 31.5% of the population. | | |
| **4** | 1. Human Development Index (HDI) 2. Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI) | a) 0.636 (2013)  b) 0.481 (2013) | a) 0.642 (2016)  b) 0.486 (2016) |
| **Source**: based on UNDP Human Development Report 2016, Table 3 (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/IHDI> ). Simple average based on 144 UNDP programme countries for HDI (2016). Simple average based on 111 (116) UNDP programme countries for IHDI in year 2013 (2016). | | |

# 

# Tier Two: Development Outcomes and Outputs

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 1: **Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data, up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data** | **2017 Target** |
| **1.1** | Employment rate, disaggregated by sex  a.1) Female employment rate (employment as a share of labour force)  a.2) Male employment rate (employment as a share of labour force)  b.1) Female employment-to-population ratio (employment as a share of working-age population)  b.2) Male employment-to-population ratio (employment as a share of working-age population) | a.1) 89.94% (2013)  a.2) 92.70% (2013)  b.1) 46.67% (2013)  b.2) 69.31% (2013) | a.1) 90.11% (2017)  a.2) 92.78% (2017)  b.1) 46.89% (2017)  b.2) 69.13% (2017) | Direction of travel:  **Increase** by 0.5% (2012-2017) |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from the International Labour Organization (ILO). Baseline is the simple average calculated from 140 programme countries with available data. The number of countries that experienced progress (regression) are as follows: a.1) 75 (65), a.2) 67 (73), b.1) 80 (60) b.2) 53 (87). There is no numeric internationally-agreed target for employment rate. For monitoring purposes, UNDP used the direction of travel (increase) and country projections by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (World Economic Outlook October 2013) to generate an overall employment rate estimate of programme countries according to a 0.5 point (total) increase between 2012 and 2017. Estimate is based on the simple average from 70 programme countries with available data.  **2017 reporting note**: Baseline updated with new data. Previous baseline values were: a.1) 88.61%, a.2) 91.85%, b.1) 46.77% and b.2) 69.41%. | | | |
| **1.2** | Coverage of social protection systems, disaggregated by at-risk groups   1. Percentage of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension 2. Percentage of working-age population actively contributing to a pension scheme 3. Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits 4. Contributors to employment injury benefits (as percentage of total labour force) 5. Maternity benefits by type: 6. Number of countries that have both statutory and employer-granted maternity benefits 7. Number of countries that have statutory maternity benefits only 8. Number of countries that have employer-granted maternity benefits only 9. Number of countries that have neither statutory nor employer-granted maternity benefits | 1. 42.4%[[1]](#footnote-2) (2012) 2. 21.8% (2012) 3. 95.5% (2013) 4. 28.7% (2013) 6. 15 (2013\*) 7. 82 (2013\*) 8. 40 (2013\*) 9. 2 (2013\*) | Not yet available | Direction of travel: **Increase** |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from ILO from 134 (a), 128 (b), 147 (c) and 106 (d), and 139 UNDP programme countries, respectively. There is no numeric internationally agreed target for social protection. For monitoring purposes, UNDP uses the direction of travel (increase in social protection coverage).  **2017 reporting note**: No update available on latest data from data production agency (ILO). | | | |
| **1.3** | Annual emissions of carbon dioxide (million tons CO2 equivalent) | 32,525 Million tons CO2 equivalent (2013) | Not yet available | **Direction of Travel:** Decrease (\*). |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from World Resource Institute for 145 UNDP programme countries. Target consistent with conditional and unconditional country pledges set to be achieved after 2020. The Paris Agreement (signed by 175 countries on 22 April 2016) outlines a global action plan to limit global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius (with respect to pre-industrial levels), while pursuing efforts to keep rising temperatures to 1.5 degree. The agreement entered into force on October 2016. | | | |
| **1.4** | Coverage of cost-efficient and sustainable energy, disaggregated by rural/urban  a) Percentage of population with connection to electricity (total)  i) Urban  ii) Rural  b) Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels (total)  i) Urban  ii) Rural | a) 82.0% (2013)  i) 94.9% (2013)  ii) 70.2% (2013)  b) 51.3% (2012\*)  i) 83.3% (2012\*)  ii) 22.3% (2012\*) | a) 82.8% (2014)  i) 95.1% (2014)  ii) 71.3% (2014)  b) Not yet available | Direction of travel based on past trend:   1. Increase, 89%   b) Increase, 56% |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on Global SE4ALL data, managed by the World Bank. a) Weighted average using population data from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (World Urbanization Prospects, the 2011 Revision), and based on data from 146 UNDP programme countries (urban: 142 countries, rural: 143 countries), b) Weighted average using UNDESA population data and based on 144 UNDP programme countries. There is no numeric internationally agreed target. Direction of travel/trends estimated by UNDP using historical trends.  **2017 reporting note**: a) Latest data year is 2014 with no new updates from the last reporting year, b) latest data year is 2012 with no new updates from the last reporting year. | | | |
| **1.5** | Hectares of land that are managed sustainably under an *in-situ* conservation regime, a sustainable use regime and an access and benefits sharing (ABS) regime   1. Number of hectares of land managed under an *in-situ* conservation regime 2. Number of hectares of land managed under a sustainable use regime 3. Number of hectares of land managed under an access and benefits sharing (ABS) regime | 1. 1.46 billion ha (2013) 2. 92.6 million ha (2013) 3. 0 ha (2013) | 1. 1.53 billion ha (2017) 2. 111.9 million ha (2017) 3. 30 ha (2017) | Direction of travel based on past trend:   1. **Increase** in area 2. **Increase** in area 3. **Increase** in area |
| a) **Source**: UNDP estimate based on World Database on Protected Areas for 144 UNDP programme countries. Based on GIS estimates. Reference target: Aichi Target 11. (By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas) and information from the Convention on Biological Diversity.)  b) **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from Organic World Net (2016) and Forest Stewardship Council (2018) for 120 UNDP programme countries. UNDP monitors this indicator on the basis of the direction a target travels (increase) as there is no internationally agreed spatial target for sustainable use. The relevant Aichi Target (7) focuses only on sustainable management, without a numerical target.  c) **Source**: UNDP estimate based on the Global Environment Facility (GEF)-UNDP portfolio. Baseline reflects that ABS work was in its early stages in 2013 and, therefore, 2013 coverage could be conservatively estimated as 0 ha. Latest data (2017) reflects nine out of 45 relevant projects in 40 countries. Direction of travel is used for monitoring (increase) since there is no internationally agreed spatial target for ABS. The relevant Aichi Target (#16) focuses on the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol, without a numerical target. | | | |

| **Output** (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are **specifically supported** by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 1.1.** National and sub-national systems and institutions enabled to achieve structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable and employment - and livelihoods-intensive  **Number of countries linked: 124**  **(December 2017)** | **1.1.1** | Number of **new jobs** and other livelihoods generated, **disaggregated by sex**.   1. New jobs created for women 2. New jobs created for men 3. Additional females benefiting from strengthened livelihoods 4. Additional males benefiting from strengthened livelihoods   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 73, b) 71, c) 86, d) 82 | 0  0  0  0 | 217,441  329,855  2,092,448  1,416,168 | 416,554  584,312  4,682,523  3,475,504 | 549,845  1,078,996  7,039,504  5,389,586 | 861,123  1,174,126  6,666,167  4,052,428 | 917,505  1,269,251  10,158,530  8,542,720 |
| **Indicator 1.1.1 note**: Tracks the cumulative number of new jobs created and cumulative number of additional people benefiting from strengthened livelihoods with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onward. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data was provided for the total number of people. An **additional 214,258 new jobs** were generated by 2017, and **228,172 additional people** benefitted from strengthened livelihoods by 2017, for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see **indicators 1.3.2** and **6.1.1**.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **1.1.2** | Number of countries with **improved policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place** at the national and sub-national levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 105 | 0 | 37 | 63 | 70 | 96 | 81 |
| **Indicator 1.1.2 note**: Tracks the number of countries where UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) led to improvements in policies, systems and institutional measures with the aim of generating and strengthening employment and livelihoods. The effectiveness of UNDP support is tracked using a qualitative assessment (extent to which policies, systems and/or institutional measures are in place at the national and sub-national levels (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely), and counting the number of countries where improved policies, systems and/or institutional measures were put in place with UNDP support.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **1.1.3** | Number of new schemes which expand and **diversify the productive base** based on the use of **sustainable production technologies**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 75 | 0 | 616 | 1,306 | 1,960 | 2,140 | 2,752 |
| **Indicator 1.1.3 note**: Tracks the cumulative number of new schemes (specified as new demonstration projects, advocacy and knowledge-generation schemes, skills-building schemes, and implementation support schemes) implemented with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) and that played a role in prompting follow-up action and/or led to transformational change from January 2014 onwards.  **2016/2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 1.2.** Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection  **Number of countries linked: 66**  **(December 2017)** | **1.2.1** | Number of countries with **policy and institutional measures that increase access to social protection schemes**, targeting the poor and other at-risk groups, disaggregated **by sex**, **rural/urban**   1. Increase access for **men** 2. Increase access for **women** 3. Increase access in **urban** areas 4. Increase access in **rural** areas   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 40, b) 40, c) 38, d) 40 | 3  3  3  5 | 6  7  6  7 | 7  8  9  10 | 11  12  15  14 | 19  21  21  19 | 16  16  18  16 |
| **Indicator 1.2.1 note**: Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) for policy and institutional measures on social protection on the basis of a rating scale (1 = National policy dialogue has determined who is excluded from social protection schemes and why; 2 = Policy/legislation reform has been planned to increase access and target those not previously covered, particularly the poor and other at-risk groups in rural areas; 3 = Policy/legislative reform proposals have been tabled for approval that have clear measures to increase access and target those not previously covered, particularly the poor and other at-risk groups in rural areas; 4 = Policy/legislative reforms have been approved and implemented with some evidence that these will lead to increased access and improved targeting in rural areas, and 5 = Policy/legislative reforms have shown evidence of effectiveness and have adequate and predictable financing and institutional capacities. This indicator counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support resulted in measures being at least approved and implemented. Indicator language has been slightly revised to refer to measures instead of reforms.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
|  | **1.2.2** | Number of countries **with improved financial sustainability of social protection systems**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 34 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 17 | 22 | 19 |
| **Indicator 1.2.2 note**: Tracks the number of countries where UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) led to sustainable financing for social protection, based on objective criteria and evidence. The effectiveness of UNDP support is tracked using a qualitative assessment (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely), counting the number of countries that, with UNDP support, improved financial sustainability of social protection systems since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 1.3.** Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.  ***Number of countries linked:* 109**  **(December 2017)** | **1.3.1** | Number of **new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste** at national and/or subnational level  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 100 | 0 | 370 | 844 | 1,463 | 1,764 | 2,256 |
| **Indicator 1.3.1 note**: Tracks the cumulative number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national levels, created since January 2014 (based on requests from programme countries).  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **1.3.2** | Number of **new jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste**, disaggregated by sex.   1. New jobs (women) 2. New jobs (men) 3. Additional females benefiting from strengthened livelihoods 4. Additional males benefiting from strengthened livelihoods   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 51, b) 51, c) 74, d) 75 | 0  0  0  0 | 24,435  22,215  811,983  665,792 | 42,313  40,655  2,774,340  2,796,872 | 62,619  75,695  3,555,103  3,468,418 | 218,253  120,926  4,415,514  4,224,080 | 115,015  115,566  5,622,871  6,845,600 |
| **Indicator 1.3.2 note**: Tracks the cumulative number of new jobs created and additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste with UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014. When data disaggregated by sex was not available data was provided for the total number of people. An **additional 967 jobs** were generated by 2016, and **123,168 additional people** benefitted from strengthened livelihood programmes by 2016, for which sex disaggregation was not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results see **indicators 1.1.1** and **6.1.1**.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 1.4.** Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented  **Number of countries linked: 119**  **(December 2017)** | **1.4.1** | Number of countries with strengthened systems in place to **access, deliver, monitor, and report on and verify use of climate finance.**   1. Countries with improved access to climate finance (by government and non-government institutions) 2. Countries with strengthened systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify climate finance   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 91, b) 87 | 0  0 | 24  17 | 46  48 | 56  61 | 76  81 | 71  79 |
| **Indicator 1.4.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) for putting in place systems to access, deliver, monitor, report and/or verify use of climate finance, using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which climate finance is being accessed and/or that system is strengthened: 1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence shows UNDP support led to improved access and/or systems since January 2014. These two sub-indicators were adjusted in 2015 to measure change since the baseline, like other IRRF output indicators measuring change over time (rather than only change since the previous year).  **2017 reporting note:** a) 2017 target corrected from 77 to 76 due to prior computational inaccuracy. | | | | | | |
| **1.4.2** | Number of countries where **implementation of** **comprehensive measures** – plans, strategies, policies, programmes and budgets –to achieve **low-emission and climate-resilient** development objectives has **improved**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 113 | 0 | 43 | 76 | 93 | 107 | 104 |
| **Indicator 1.4.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to improve implementation of comprehensive measures (defined as plans, strategies, policies, programmes and/or budgets) for low-emission and climate resilient development by using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which climate finance is being accessed and/or that system is strengthened, 1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where there is objective evidence that UNDP support led to improved implementation of measures, from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 1.5.** Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access (especially off-grid sources of renewable energy)  **Number of countries linked: 84**  **(December 2017)** | **1.5.1** | Number of **new development partnerships** with funding for improved **energy efficiency and/or sustainable energy solutions** targeting underserved communities/groups and women  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 73 | 0 | 220 | 516 | 716 | 799 | 894 |
| **Indicator 1.5.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new partnerships with funding established (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **1.5.2** | Number of **additional** people with **improved energy access**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 61 | 0 | 1,622,207 | 2,564,956 | 5,276,791 | 6,118,153 | 6,737,903 |
| **Indicator 1.5.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional people whose access to energy has improved as a result of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 2: **Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance** | | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\*** Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data** | | **2017 Target** |
| **2.1** | Number of countries with **open access to data** on government budgets, expenditures and public procurement | 36.8% (2012) | 36.6% (2017) | | Direction of travel: **Increase** |
| **Source**: UNDP utilizes data from the International Budget Partnership to track progress in countries requesting support. The simple average for 84 (2012) and 94 (2017) programme countries. The average over the 2017 index is lower than the baseline because the new survey covered 10 additional countries. The average 2017 index across 84 countries is 38.7%, which is slightly higher than the baseline. Of these countries, there was progress (regression) in 42 (37) countries. The Open Budget Survey measures the state of budget transparency, participation, and oversight in countries around the world. The Open Budget Index (OBI), ranging between 0 and 100, is a simple average of quantified responses for the 95 survey questions related to budget transparency. For details, see Open Budget Survey 2017, <https://www.internationalbudget.org/opening-budgets/open-budget-initiative/open-budget-survey/2017-news/>. | | | | |
| **2.2** | Voter turnout | 67.8% (2013\*) | 66.3% (2017\*) | Direction of travel based on past trend: **Increase**, 70.0% | |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate, based on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union, on the average voter turnout in 116 and 113 programme countries in 2013 and 2017. Using a comparable sample, there was progress (regression) in 38 (37) countries. Direction of travel is estimated by UNDP based on historical world trends. | | | | |
| **2.3** | Percentage of **women in national parliaments** | 20.8% (2013) | 22.1% (2017) | | International Target: **30%** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union (<http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp>) for 147 and 150 programme countries in 2013 and 2017. This indicator saw progress (regression) in 78 (35) countries. Figures represent the aggregate percentage (total number of women in parliaments divided by the total number of seats). The international target of 30% of women in decision making positions (by 1995) comes from ECOSOC Report E/1990/90. | | | | |

| **Output**(UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | | | **2017** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | | | **Target** | | **Actual** |
| **Output 2.1.** Parliaments,constitution making bodies and electoral institutions enabled to perform core functions for improved accountability, participation and representation, including for peaceful transitions  **Number of countries linked: 88**  **(December 2017)** | | **2.1.1a** | | Number of **parliaments** with **improved administrative and human resources capacities** to discharge their mandates in relation to law-making, oversight and representation  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 68 | | 0 | | 31 | | 45 | | 50 | | | | 62 | | 57 |
| **Indicator 2.1.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to strengthen parliamentary administrative and human resource capacities by using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which administrative and HR capacities have improved: 1: Not improved, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support improved parliamentary capacities since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.1b** | | Number of **constitution-making bodies** **(CMBs)** with **improved** **administrative and human resources capacities** to undertake drafting, public outreach and consultation and with mechanisms to ensure the participation of women and marginalized groups  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 46 | | 0 | | 25 | | 32 | | 34 | | | | 44 | | 42 |
| **Indicator 2.1.1b note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to strengthen CMB administrative and human resources capacities, using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which administrative and HR capacities have improved: 1: Not improved, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support improved CMB capacities since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | | **Target** | | | **Actual** | |
|  | **2.1.1c** | | Number of **Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs)** with **strengthened capacity** to perform their functions, including; financial and operational planning, conducting operations for elections and referenda, voter information and stakeholder outreach top hold credible and inclusive elections  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 59 | | 0 | | 30 | | 39 | | 41 | | | 52 | | | 49 | |
| **Indicator 2.1.1c note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries, within the scope of the United Nations electoral assistance normative framework) to strengthen the capacities of EMBs, using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which capacities have improved: 1: Not improved, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support improved EMB capacities since January 2014. Three additional countries requested clearance from the United Nations Department of Political Affairs to receive electoral assistance and will be included in the milestones and target when deemed appropriate.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.2** | | Number of **additional registered electors**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 52 | | 0 | | 29,492,102 | | 68,175,254 | | 74,906,127 | | | | 94,794,442 | | 165,757,148 | |
| **Indicator 2.1.2 note:** Tracks the number of additional registered electors as a result of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1.3** | | Number of **additional women participating as candidates** in national elections  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 57 | | 0 | | 3,822 | | 35,035 | | 288,958 | | | | 278,118 | | 304,442 | |
| **Indicator 2.1.3 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional women participating as candidates in national elections as a result of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 2.2**. Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures across sectors and stakeholders  **Number of countries linked: 72**  **(December 2017)** | **2.2.2** | | Number of **new proposals adopted** to **mitigate sector specific corruption risks** (e.g. extractive industries, and public procurement in the health and other sectors)  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 45 | | 0 | | 30 | | 58 | | 93 | | 123 | | | | 118 | |
| **Indicator 2.2.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new proposals adopted to mitigate sector-specific corruption risks as a result of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 2.3** Capacities of human rights institutions strengthened  Number of countries linked: **58**  **(December 2017)** | **2.3.1** | | Number of countries with **strengthened** **operational institutions** supporting the **fulfilment** of nationally and internationally **ratified human rights obligations**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 70 | | 0 | | 25 | | 37 | | 48 | | 62 | | | | 58 | |
| **Indicator 2.3.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to strengthen the capacities of operational institutions to fulfil nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations, using a qualitative rating scale (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support strengthened the capacities of operational institutions.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 2.4.** Frameworks and dialogue processes engaged for effective and transparent engagement of civil society in national development  **Number of countries linked: 80**  **(December 2017)** | **2.4.1** | Number of countries where relevant **civil society groups** have **strengthened capacity** to engage in **critical development and crisis-related issues**, disaggregated by women’s, youth, and other excluded groups.   1. Women’s groups 2. Youth groups 3. Other excluded groups   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 54, b) 60, c) 55 | 0  0  0 | 21  25  23 | 37  39  34 | 42  46  41 | 50  54  52 | 49  55  49 |
| **Indicator 2.4.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) for civil society engagement in national dialogue processes on development, with a focus on the most critical development and crisis-  related issues, using a qualitative rating scale (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to improved capacities in these groups. | | | | | | |
| **2017 reporting note:** The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 49 to 50, (b) 2017 target increased from 53 to 54, (c) 2017 target increased from 51 to 52. | | | | | | |
| **2.4.2** | Number of countries with **strengthened environments for civic engagement** including: **legal/regulatory framework for civil society organizations** to function in the public sphere and contribute to development; and **effective mechanisms/platforms to engage civil society** (with a focus on women, youth or excluded groups)   1. Women’s groups 2. Youth groups 3. Excluded groups   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 50, b) 51, c) 57 | 16  16  15 | 22  21  19 | 33  30  30 | 32  38  42 | 47  48  50 | 41  45  49 |
| **Indicator 2.4.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to strengthen environments for civic engagement, using a qualitative rating scale that measures the degree to which the environment (legal/regulatory frameworks and engagement platforms) has become more conducive to civic engagement (1: low, 2: medium, and 3: high) since January 2014. This counts countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to at least a medium degree of engagement.  **2017 reporting note:** The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 45 to 47, (b) 2017 target increased from 47 to 48, (c) 2017 target increased from 48 to 50. | | | | | | |

| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | | **Actual** |
| **Output 2.5.** Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation  **Number of countries linked: 73**  **(December 2017)** | **2.5.1** | Number of countries with **legal, policy and institutional frameworks** in place for conservation, sustainable **use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.**   1. Legal frameworks 2. Policy frameworks 3. Institutional frameworks   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 84, b) 91, c) 87 | | 14  13  10 | | 30  24  24 | | 37  38  34 | | 59  59  50 | | 71  73  68 | | | 64  71  67 |
| **Indicator 2.5.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to put in place (a) legal, (b) policy, and/or (c) institutional frameworks for conservation, sustainable use, and access to/benefit of sharing natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which each type of framework is in place: 1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely). This is done by counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that highlights how UNDP support led to frameworks being at least partially in place.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **2.5.2** | Number of countries with **improved** **capacities** to implement national or sub-national plans for **Integrated Water Resource Management**, and/or **to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems**.   1. Integrated Water Resource Management 2. Oceans and marine ecosystems   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 60, b) 45 | 0  0 | | 17  13 | | 33  22 | | 43  30 | | | | 54  39 | 53  39 | |
| **Indicator 2.5.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to improve capacities to implement IWRM and/or protect and restore oceans and marine ecosystems, using a qualitative rating scale (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) and by counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that highlights how UNDP support led to capacities being improved since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** The following value was corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 53 to 54. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 2.6.** Legal reform enabled to fight discrimination and address emerging issues (such as environmental and electoral justice)  **Number of countries linked: 23**  **(December 2017)** | **2.6.1** | Number of countries where proposals for **legal reform to fight discrimination** (e.g. people affected by HIV, persons with disabilities, women, minorities and migrants) have been **adopted (contributing to UNAIDS UBRAF)**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 27 | 11 | | 20 | | 22 | | 24 | | 27 | | | 26 | |
| **Indicator 2.6.1 note:** Indicator derived from UNAIDS Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework (UBRAF) that tracks the number of countries where proposals for legal reform to fight discrimination have been adopted. In the UNDP IRRF, legal reform to fight discrimination must be adopted as a result of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) as of January 2014. As of 2017, proposals have been drafted in 30 countries that receive supported by UNDP.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 3: **Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services** | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | | **Latest Data** | | **2017 Target** | |
| **3.1** | Level of **public confidence** in the delivery of basic services | 52.5% (2013) | | 53.5% (2016) | | Direction of travel: **Increase** | |
| **Source**: Index based on Gallup World Poll questions about satisfaction with public services (education, highways and transportation). UNDP aggregated the baseline (simple average) for 121 programme countries and latest data year for 108 countries. There was progress (regression) in 65 (43) countries. Country level information can be found on the Worldwide Governance Indicators website, which is maintained by the World Bank. There is no numeric, internationally agreed target. | | | | | | |
| **3.2** | **Coverage of HIV and AIDS services**, disaggregated by sex, age (children/adult)  **3.2.a) Number of people receiving ARV therapy**  a.1) Percentage of **eligible adults** receiving ARV therapy  a.2) Percentage of **eligible children** receiving ARV therapy  b.1) Percentage of **females** 15-24 years of age with comprehensive  correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS  b.2) Percentage of **males** 15-24 years of age with comprehensive correct  knowledge of HIV/AIDS | 1. 12.9 million (2013)   a.1) 36% (2013)  a.2) 38% (2013)  b.1) 30.3% (2013\*)  b.2) 33.3% (2013\*) | | 1. 17.7 million (2017)   a.1) 45% (2016)  a.2) 48% (2016)  b.1) 30.1% (2016\*)  b.2) 35.2% (2016\*) | | 1. More than 15 million (by 2015) 2. Direction of travel: **Increase** | |
| **Source**: Coverage of antiretroviral (ARV) therapy is based on data for low and middle-income countries, according to WHO 2013 guidelines. The international target of 15 million corresponds to 2015 (United Nations General Assembly Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS, 2011). For comprehensive knowledge of HIV/AIDS, UNDP calculations are based on the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The simple average of data is 95 (80) programme countries for women in 2013 (2016) and 66 (70) programme countries for men in 2013 (2016). For females (b1), there was progress (regression) in 21 (15) countries. For males (b2), there was progress (regression) in 15 (5) countries. There is no numeric target for specific age or sex groups. | | | | | | |
| **3.3** | **Access to justice services**, disaggregated by type of service  (civil/criminal justice services)  a) Civil Justice Index  b) Criminal Justice Index | a) 45.5% (2013)  b) 43.1% (2013) | | 1. 49.9% (2017) 2. 45.4% (2017) | | Not available | |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations are based on World Justice Project data (<http://worldjusticeproject.org/>). The Civil Justice Index represents the simple average of the sub-index, “People can access and afford civil justice.” The Criminal Justice Index represents the simple average of sub-index, “Criminal adjudication system is timely and effective.” Calculations are based on data for 71 (85) programme countries in 2013 (2017). Under civil justice there was progress (regression) in 46 (25) countries. In criminal justice there was progress (regression) in 39 (32) countries. Targets: Since there is no numeric internationally agreed target these indexes are not included in most national statistics systems and there is limited coverage and history. It is not possible to establish credible targets. | | | | | | |
| **3.5** | **Homicide rate,** disaggregated by sex(per 100,000 inhabitants)   1. Female   b) Male | | **5.9** per 100,000 inhabitants (2013\*)  a) 2.4 per 100,000 inhabitants (2013\*)  b) 9.2 per 100,000  inhabitants (2013\*) | | **6.1** per 100,000 inhabitants (2015\*)  a) 2.5 per 100,000 inhabitants (2015\*)  b) 9.5 per 100,000  inhabitants (2015\*) | | Direction of travel: **Decrease** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations use statistics from UNODC (<http://www.unodc.org/gsh/en/data.html>) for 161 programme countries. Sex disaggregation is available for 146 countries. Sixty-nine (64) countries presented “epidemic” levels (defined as more than 10 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants) of male homicide in 2013 (2015), and 3 (5) countries presented epidemic levels of female homicide in 2013 (2015). No internationally-agreed numerical targets are available. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output**(UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 3.1.** Core functions of government enabled to ensure national ownership of recovery and development processes  **Number of countries linked: 33**  **(December 2017)** | **3.1.1** | **Number of countries** where targets in national recovery plans related to restoring or strengthening core government functions have been met.  **Targets related to restoring or strengthening:**  a) Policy formulation and public financial management  b) Managing the centre of government  c) Civil service management  d) Local governance  e) Aid coordination  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 22, b) 22, c) 23, d) 20, e) 21 | 1  1  2  0  1 | 7  4  5  4  7 | 7  8  10  6  9 | 9  13  12  12  12 | 14  19  17  12  16 | 13  16  14  12  15 |
| **Indicator 3.1.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to meet targets in national recovery plans related to restoring or strengthening: a) policy formulation and public financial management, b) managing the centre of government, c) civil service management, d) local governance and/or e) aid coordination, using a qualitative rating scale (1: targets not adequately developed, 2: targets met very partially, 3: targets partially met, and 4: targets largely met) and counting the number of countries where there is objective evidence that targets related to UNDP-supported functions have been at least partially met since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 3.2.** Functions, financing and capacity of sub-national level institutions enabled to deliver improved basic services and respond to priorities voiced by the public  **Number of countries linked: 79**  **(December 2017)** | **3.2.2** | Number of countries where sub-national governments/administrations show **improved capacities for planning, budgeting and/or monitoring** basic services delivery  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 71 | 0 | 23 | 39 | 51 | 67 | 60 | |
| **Indicator 3.2.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to improve capacities of sub-national governments/administrations to plan, budget and/or monitor delivery of basic services by using a qualitative rating scale (1: no capacity, 2: very partial capacity, 3: partial capacity and 4: capacity largely in place) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved since January 2014. Support to planning is to be delivered in 66 countries, support to monitoring is to be delivered in 65 countries, and support to budgeting is to be delivered in 55 countries.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** | |
| **Output 3.3.** National institutions, systems, laws and policies strengthened for equitable, accountable and effective delivery of HIV and related services  **Number of countries linked: 60**  **(December 2017)** | **3.3.1** | Number of people who have access to **HIV and related services**, disaggregated by **sex** and **type of service**.   1. **Behavioural change communication**    1. Number of **males** reached    2. Number of **females** reached   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set under this indicator: 25   1. **ARV treatment**    1. Number of **males** reached    2. Number of **females** reached   Number of countries supported in 2016: 22 | 10,273,561  9,229,663  1,376,885  (total people) | 12,112,129  10,400,068  1,675,962  (total people) | 12,354,253  10,682,692  1,789,267  (total people) | 14,450,805  11,308,304  1,998,027  (total people) | 13,531,253  11,114,171  1,000,000  (total people) | 16,094,050  12,924,101  2,123,539  (total people) | |
| **Indicator 3.3.1.a note:** Tracks the cumulative number of people that, with UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries), were reached with HIV-related behavioural change communication since January 2014. Disaggregated data is provided where available. As of 2017, behavioural change communication reached an **additional 1,812,564 people,** for which sex disaggregation is not available. Figures reported here are not expected to match those reported through the Global Fund portfolio as not all countries where UNDP is an interim Principal Recipient are linked to this output. Additionally, UNDP provides support for behavioural change communication outside the scope of Global Fund projects.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.  **Indicator 3.3.1.b note:** Tracks the number of people that, with UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries), gained access to antiretroviral treatment in each year of the Strategic Plan. The indicator was revised in 2014 to track total numbers reached with ARVs, using the more robust Global Fund dataset that harmonizes and captures the majority of UNDP support for ARV treatment. Harmonized data for both 2014 and 2015 is in this report. As of the end of 2017, sex-disaggregated data is still not collected or reported on a consistent basis across Global Fund grants. Reporting systems, both national and global, are undergoing revision in order to capture sex-disaggregated data.  **2017 reporting note:** UNDP is called upon to implement Global Fund programmes, as interim ‘Principal Recipient’, in a select number of countries, particularly those facing significant capacity constraints, complex emergencies, or other difficult circumstances. The Country Coordinating Mechanism and/or the Global Fund requests UNDP act as interim Principal Recipient where no suitable local entity could be identified, and in countries under the Global Fund’s Additional Safeguard Policy (ASP). While serving as interim Principal Recipient, UNDP works to develop national capacity and strengthen national systems for the implementation of Global Fund grants. UNDP manages Global Fund grants on an interim basis until a national entity can assume full responsibility for programme implementation. As such, the UNDP grant portfolio is dynamic with grants frequently handed over to national Principal Recipients in tandem with UNDP taking over the administration of grants in other places. UNDP calculates aggregated country results for the number of people currently on antiretroviral therapy (ART) from Global Fund-supported programmes through annual data harmonization consultations with the Global Fund. The majority of reported results from UNDP implemented Global Fund programmes are based on national reporting, although some are grant-specific. The Global Fund and UNDP attribute national or grant specific ART results to UNDP only when UNDP is the interim Principal Recipient of the grants, otherwise results get transferred to national Principal Recipients. Reported number for the 2017 Actual is as of June 2017. Harmonized end-year numbers are not available at the time. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** | |
|  | **3.3.2** | **a)** Percentage of UNDP-managed Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria grants that are **rated as exceeding or meeting expectations**  Number of countries with UNDP-managed Global Fund grants varies each year  **b)** Difference between **percentage of UNDP-managed Global Fund grants** rated as exceeding or meeting expectations, and **percentage of other Global Fund grants** rated as exceeding or meeting expectations  Number of countries with UNDP-managed Global Fund grants varies each year | 44.6%  (2009-2013)  5.4%  (2011-2013) | 62.5%  20.8% | 53%  15.2% | 48%  10% | 55%  15% | 50%  Not Available | |
| **Indicator 3.3.2.a note:** Tracks the percentage of GFATM grants managed by UNDP (at the request of programme countries and/or the Global Fund) in a way that meets or exceeds expectations (A1 and A2).  **2017 reporting note:** Baseline (average performance of UNDP-rated grants over the 2009-2013 period), milestones and 2017 target are unchanged. UNDP plays a primary role in supporting counties facing challenging circumstances to deliver essential social services financed by the Global Fund. The UNDP role as Principal Recipient is an interim arrangement that lasts until one or more national entities (government entities and/or CSOs) are able to take over grant implementation. As of the end of 2017, UNDP transferred the Principal Recipient role to national entities in 30 countries. In the same period, new grants were taken on, including an HIV grant in Angola and a multi-country grant for the Caribbean. The combination of handing over mature, strong performing grants, taking over new, often poorly performing grants, and starting new grants was expected to bring the percentage of Global Fund grants rated A1 or A2 down from 2015 onwards. To reflect this evolving segment of the UNDP portfolio, the baseline reflects the average performance of UNDP-rated grants over the 2009-2013 period.  **Indicator 3.3.2.b note:** This indicator reflects the relative performance of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP and Global Fund grants managed by other entities. It is calculated as the difference between the percentage of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP that are rated as A1 or A2 (indicator 3.2.2.a) and the percentage of Global Fund grants managed by others that are rated as A1 or A2. The number of countries reflects those where UNDP is managing Global Fund grants in 2017; this number will change over time. The Global Fund has 461 active grants in over 100 countries.  **2017 reporting note:** Baseline reflects average difference in grant performance from 2011 to 2013, which has been measured from March 2011 onwards. As noted in the 2014 Annual Report, the 2014 milestone reflected the expected high performance of the portfolio of mature strong performing UNDP-managed grants, while a lower level was expected from 2015 onwards for reasons cited in the reporting note for sub-indicator 3.3.2.a above. 2017 Actual data is not available due to changes in the Global Fund reporting system and processes. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** | |
| **Output 3.4.** Functions, financing and capacity of rule of law institutions enabled, including to improve access to justice and redress  **Number of countries linked: 47**  **(December 2017)** | **3.4.1** | Number of **additional people** who have **access to justice**, disaggregated **by sex**  **Access to legal aid services**   1. Number of additional men 2. Number of additional women   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set under this indicator: 40  **Cases receiving judgment in the first instance of the formal justice system**   1. Number of new GBV cases 2. Number of new non-GBV cases   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: c) 19, d) 18 | 0  0  0  0 | 407,580  409,279  10,855  352,796 | 718,938  740,113  18,312  407,033 | 996,116  990,146  23,390  564,078 | 1,030,660  1,028,129  29,803  459,876 | 1,247,013  1,272,426  28,052  848,662 | |
| **Indicator 3.4.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional men and women who have access to legal aid services with UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries), and the cumulative number of additional cases where judgments are made in the first instance of the formal justice system (disaggregated by Gender Based Violence cases or others), with UNDP support, since January 2014. An **additional 1,617,762 people** had access to legal aid services by the end of 2017 for which sex disaggregated data is not available.  **2017 reporting note:** The following values were adjusted upwards to reflect the contribution of two additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 1,016,660 to 1,030,660, and the (b) 2017 target increased from 991,129 to 1,028,129. | | | | | | | |
|  | **3.4.2** | Number of **additional victims** whose grievances cases are addressed within **transitional justice processes**, disaggregated by sex.   1. Additional male victims 2. Additional female victims   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 23 | 0  0 | 139,605  72,699 | 414,825  304,534 | 470,000  356,460 | 629,737  423,957 | 534,814  408,131 | |
| **Indicator 3.4.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional male and female victims who were provided with transitional justice services to address grievances, with UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | | **Actual** |
| **Output 3.5.** Communities empowered and security sector institutions enabled for increased citizen safety and reduced levels of armed violence  **Number of countries linked: 38**  **(December 2017)** | **3.5.1** | Number of countries with **improved** **capacities for security sector governance and oversight**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 39 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 27 | 32 | | 32 |
| **Indicator 3.5.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to improve security sector capacities for governance and oversight, using a qualitative rating scale (1: no improved capacities, 2: slightly improved capacities, 3: improved capacities, 4: significantly improved capacities) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support improved capacities as of January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: the 2017 target increased from 31 to 32. | | | | | | | |
| **3.5.2** | Number of countries where gender-sensitive **evidence-based security strategies** for reducing armed violence and/or control of small arms are in operation at the community level  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 35 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 20 | 29 | | 25 |
| Indicator 3.5.2 note: Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to community level gender-sensitive and evidence-based security strategies by using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially, 4: largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to strategies being at least partially operational since January 2014. 2017 reporting note: No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 4: **Faster progress is achieved in reducing gender inequality and promoting women’s empowerment** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest Data** | **Target 2017** |
| **4.1** | **Wage gap** between men and women | 16.0% (2013) | 18.4% (2016) | Direction of travel based on past trend: **Decrease** 16% (trend) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations using data from ILO (Global Wage Database). Simple average is for 57 (76) programme countries for 2013 (2016). There was progress (regression) in 23 (18) countries. There is no internationally-agreed numerical target.  **2017 reporting note:** Baseline revised to 16.0%. | | | |
| **4.2** | **Gender gap in access to credit** | 7.3% (2011) | 6.7% (2014) | Direction of travel based on past trend: **Decrease** 5% (trend) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on World Bank, Global FINDEX database, which measures the gap between the percentage of adult men that have an account at a formal financial institution and the percentage of adult women with an account at a formal financial institution. Simple average is for 108 (105) programme countries for 2011 (2014). There was progress (regression) in 47 (50) countries. Projected trend estimated by UNDP was consistent with a 25% reduction of the differential in access to credit for men and women at the national level.  **2017 reporting note:** No update from the World Bank after 2015. | | | |
| **4.3** | (Harmonized Indicator with UN Women) Number of countries where there is evidence that **national prevalence of physical and/or sexual violence experienced by women has decreased** | 14 (2016\*) | 18 (2017\*) | 19 |
| **Source**: Information is analysed by UN Women and gathered from Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), the Domestic Violence Module, STAT Compiler, and national reports, all available at: <http://dhsprogram.com/Data/>. This covers only intimate partner violence. Twenty-two countries had comparable data as of 2017 and, out of these, there was decrease in 18 countries. Target (19 countries have a decrease in prevalence of physical or sexual abuse) taken from revised UN Women Impact Indicator 3B (Updated Development Result Framework, Annex C in UN Women Strategic Plan 2014-2017). | | | |
| **4.4** | Proportion of **decision making** positions (executive, legislative and judicial) occupied by women at national level  a) Proportion of women in **Parliaments**  b) Proportion of women in **Ministerial positions**  c) Proportion of women in **highest Court** | a) 20.8% (2013)  b) 15.6% (2013)  c) 26.6% (2013) | a) 22.1% (2017)  b) 16.4% (2017)  c) 36.1% (2017) | 30% women in decision making positions. |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations are based on the following sources: The participation of women in ministerial positions and in lower or single house in parliaments comes from Inter-Parliamentary Union, while the participation of women in the highest national court comes from national sources, headquarters (2013), and country offices (2017). Reported figures are based on: a) 147 (150) countries for 2013 (2017), b) 146 (146) countries for 2013 (2017), and c) 98 (88) countries for 2013 (2017). The number of women in parliaments increased (decreased) in 78 (35) countries. The number of women in ministerial positions increased (decreased) in 71 (68) countries. The number of women in Highest Court increased (decreased) in 40 (20) countries. Figures represent the aggregate proportion (sum of women in office divided by the total number of seats). The international target of 30% of women in decision making positions comes from ECOSOC Report E/1990/90. | | | |

| **Output** (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 4.1.** Country led measures accelerated to advance women’s economic empowerment  **Number of countries linked: 16**  **(December 2017)** | **4.1.1** | Number of countries where **policies** to promote **women’s economic empowerment** show **improved** implementation  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 27 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 16 | 23 | 21 |
| **Indicator 4.1.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to develop and implement policies that promote women’s economic empowerment, using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially and 4: largely) and by counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to measurable change from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 4.2.** Measures in place and implemented across sectors to prevent and respond to Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)  **Number of countries linked: 14**  **(December 2017)** | **4.2.1** | Number of countries that have a **strengthened legal and/or policy framework** **in place** to prevent and address sexual and gender based violence  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 30 | 0 | 7 | 13 | 18 | 23 | 21 |
| **Indicator 4.2.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) for partners to put in place legal and/or policy frameworks that prevent and address sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), which is further specified as: a) a comprehensive definition of SGBV, b) adequate framework of SGBV offences with appropriate criminal penalties, c) protection and occupation orders available along with enforcement mechanisms, d) specific duties to prevent and address SGBV, e) SGBV regulations, and/or f) appropriate budget to implement and enforce SGBV laws and policies. Tracking is done by using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially and 4: largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that demonstrate UNDP-supported frameworks show changes since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** the 2017 target was adjusted from 30 to 23 to correct computational inaccuracy. | | | | | | |
| **4.2.2** | Number of **additional countries** with multi-sectorial **services in place** (including justice and security services) to **prevent and address SGBV**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 25 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 15 |
| **Indicator 4.2.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to create and/or strengthen one or more SGBV services (specified as policing services, legal aid and justice services, health and HIV services, economic and employment assistance, other related services), using a binary scale (no= non-existent; yes=existent) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to new and/or strengthened services being in place, from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 4.3.** Evidence-informed national strategies and partnerships to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment  **Number of countries linked: 12**  **(December 2017)** | **4.3.2** | Number of countries with **mechanisms** in place to collect, disseminate **sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics,** and apply gender analysis  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 18 | 15 |
| **Indicator 4.3.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks the effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to put in place mechanisms to collect, disseminate sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics, and apply gender analysis, using a qualitative rating scale (1= little evidence, 2= moderate evidence and 3= consistent evidence) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence shows UNDP-supported mechanisms are in place to collect and/or disseminate sex-disaggregated data and apply gender analysis.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 4.4.** Measures in place to increasewomen’s participation in decision-making  **Number of countries linked: 24**  **(December 2017)** | **4.4.1** | Number of **laws and policies** in place to secure **women’s participation in decision making.**   1. New laws and policies 2. Strengthened laws and policies   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 24, b) 30 | 0  0 | 8  13 | 21  42 | 31  57 | 45  83 | 46  74 |
| **Indicator 4.4.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new and/or strengthened laws and policies to increase women’s participation in decision-making supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions from one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 44 to 45, and (b) 2017 target increased from 82 to 83. | | | | | | |
| **4.4.2** | Number of **additional women** benefitting from private and/or public measures to support women’s preparedness for **leadership and decision-making roles**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 28 | 0 | 5,745 | 13,124 | 24,826 | 27,242 | 30,789 |
| **Indicator 4.4.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional womenbenefitting from private and/or public measures to support women’s preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles with UNDP support (requested from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 5: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data** | **2017 target** |
| **5.1** | **Mortality rate** from **natural hazards** | 17.9 per million inhabitants (2013) | 10.6 per million inhabitants (2017) | Direction of travel: **decrease** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on the EM-DAT Database (number of people killed by natural disasters) and UNDESA (population) data for 142 (2013) and 135 (2017) programme countries. Counts the number of people killed by natural disasters (per million of population) in programme countries. The rate considers the total population in programme countries and not only those “exposed” to natural disasters. The value for 2013 represents the average for the period of 2004 to 2013, the value for 2017 represents the average for the period 2008 to 2017. (In comparison, there were several events in 2004, which was particularly deadly due to earthquakes and tsunamis in South Asia). There is no internationally-agreed target. | | | |
| **5.2** | **Economic loss** from natural hazards (e.g. geo-physical and climate-induced hazards) as a proportion of GDP | 0.28% of GDP (2013) | 0.21% of GDP (2017) | Direction of travel: **decrease** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on EM-DAT Database (economic loss from natural disasters) and IMF (GDP). Sum of economic loss as a share of the sum of GDP from 144 (2013) and 102 (2017) programme countries. The value for 2013 represents the average for the period of 2004 to 2013, while the value for 2017 represents the average for the period 2008 to 2017. There is no internationally-agreed target. | | | |
| **5.3** | **Economic loss** from conflicts as a proportion of GDP | 0.33% of GDP (2013) | 0.55% of GDP (2015) | Direction of travel: **decrease** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on data from the Institute for Economics and Peace and the World Bank (for GDP in 2011 US dollars PPP). The annual cost of conflict is estimated to be 2% of GDP in affected countries. There is no internationally-agreed target.  **2017 reporting note:** No update from the Institute for Economics and Peace since the last report. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output**(UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.1.** Mechanisms in place to assess natural and man-made risks at national and sub-national levels  **Number of countries linked: 51**  **(December 2017)** | **5.1.1** | Number of countries **having standardized damage and loss accounting systems** in place with sex and age disaggregated data collection and analysis, including gender analysis  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 25 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 16 |
| **Indicator 5.1.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to put in place Standardized Damage and Loss Accounting Systems (also referred to as National Disaster Observatories) for systematically collecting, storing, analysing, and disseminating disaster-related data and information with sex and age disaggregation by using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially and 4: largely) and counting the cumulative number of counties where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to effective systems being partially or largely in place.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **5.1.2** | Number of **new plans and programmes that are informed by multi-hazard national and sub-national disaster and climate risk assessments**, taking into account differentiated impacts e.g. on women and men.   1. Number of new plans and programmes 2. Number of new plans and programmes that differentiate impacts on women and men   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 40, b) 41 | 0  0 | 140  86 | 270  145 | 481  328 | 483  370 | 899  430 |
| **Indicator 5.1.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new plans and programmes supported by UNDP (based on requests from programme countries) since January 2014 that are informed by multi-hazard disaster and climate risk assessments, identifying those that differentiate impact on target groups.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.2.** Effective institutional, legislative and policy frameworks in place to enhance the implementation of disaster and climate risk management measures at national and sub-national levels  **Number of countries linked: 64**  **(December 2017)** | **5.2.1** | Number of **new** **disaster reduction** and/or **integrated disaster risk reduction and adaptation plans** (disaggregated by gender responsiveness), and dedicated i**nstitutional frameworks and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms**, put in place.   1. Number of new instruments in place 2. Number of new instruments which are gender responsive   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 67, b) 56 | 0  0 | 696  117 | 1,035  295 | 1,239  423 | | 1,312  522 | 1,388  549 |
| **Indicator 5.2.1 Note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new instruments (disaster reduction plans, integrated disaster risk reduction and adaptation plans, and institutional frameworks and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms) supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) that have been put in place since January 2014, identifying those that are gender responsive.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **5.2.2** | Number of countries with **legislative and/or regulatory provisions** at national and sub-national levels for effectively **managing disaster and climate risks**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 54 | 23  (55 provisions) | 28  (77 provisions) | 36  (107 provisions) | 38  (134 provisions) | 47  (164 provisions) | | 41  (167 provisions) |
| **Indicator 5.2.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of countries supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) to put in place (defined as having a budget allocation) legislative and/or regulatory provisions for effectively managing disaster and climate risk since January 2014, counting only the number of countries where 50% or more of provisions put in place effectively manage disaster and climate risks.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.3.** Gender responsive disaster and climate risk management is integrated in the development planning and budgetary frameworks of key sectors (e.g. water, agriculture, health and education)  **Number of countries linked: 20**  **(December 2017)** | **5.3.1** | Number of **new** national/sub-national **development and** **key sectorial** **plans** that **explicitly address disaster and/or climate risk management being implemented**, disaggregated for those which aregender responsive.   1. Number of **new** **plans** with some DRM and/or CRM components 2. Number of additional **budgeted plans** with some DRM and/or CRM components 3. Number of additional plans with some DRM and/or CRM components which are **gender responsive**   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26 | 0  0  0 | 8  5  8 | 79  59  59 | 116  103  96 | 140  108  110 | | 153  124  120 |
| **Indicator 5.3.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new development and sectorial plans supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) since January 2014, and implemented (defined as those with a budget allocation) at national or sub-national levels that explicitly address disaster and/or climate risk management (identifying those that are gender responsive). Seven additional countries beyond the listed ones (for a total of 20) entered baselines, milestones and targets for this indicator.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.4.** Preparedness systems in place to effectively address the consequences of and response to natural hazards (e.g. geo-physical and climate related) and man-made crisis at all levels of government and community  **Number of countries linked: 49**  **(December 2017)** | **5.4.1** | Number of countries with **new** **end-to-end early warning systems** **(EWS)** for man-made crisis and all major natural hazards (e.g. geo-physical and climate-induced hazards)  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 46 | 0 | 20  (163 EWS) | 26  (190 EWS) | 30  (240 EWS) | 42  (312 EWS) | | 37  (321 EWS) |
| **Indicator 5.4.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of countries with new end-to-end early warning systems (EWS) supported by UNDP (as requested by programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **5.4.2** | Number of countries with **new mechanisms** at national and sub-national level to **prepare for and recover from disaster events** with adequate **financial and human resources, capacities and operating procedures**   1. Number of countries with new preparedness plans that cover **only response** 2. Number of countries with new preparedness plans that cover **response and recovery**   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 40, b) 42 | 0  0 | 18  (81 plans)  21  (264 plans) | 25  (124 plans)  28  (408 plans) | 31  (250 plans)  34  (499 plans) | 31  (283 plans)  39  (720 plans) | | 33  (330 plans)  37  (703 plans) |
| **Indicator 5.4.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of countries with new mechanisms (defined as disaster preparedness plans) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) since January 2014, differentiating between those that cover only response and those that cover response *and* recovery.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | | | **2017** |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | | **Target** |
|  | **5.4.3** | **Proportion of at-risk population covered** by national and community level **contingency plans for disaster events** (e.g. evacuation procedures, stockpiles, search and rescue, communication protocols and response plans  a) At risk of flood  b) At risk of earthquake  c) At risk of hurricane  d) At risk of landslide  e) At risk of drought  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator:  a) 27, b) 15, c) 8, d) 11, e) 16 | 9.2%  3.7%  16.9%  0.8%  21.9% | 16.7%  3.9%  26.2%  11.1%  26.5% | 23.5%  6.3%  29.4%  14.0%  30.6% | 22.6%  9.7%  32.8%  15.6%  40.5% | 23.1%  23.8%  77.6%  19.2%  32.3% | | 15.9%  21.5%  69.3%  10.2%  23.4% |
| **Indicator 5.4.3 note:** Tracks the percentage of the population at risk to each type of disaster (defined as flood, earthquake, hurricane, landslide and draught) that are covered by contingency plans supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) as of January 2014. In cases where the “population at risk” grows faster than coverage, the percentage of “population at risk” covered may go down even while coverage is being put in place.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.5.** Policy frameworks and institutional mechanisms enabled at the national and sub-national levels for the peaceful management of emerging and recurring conflicts and tensions  **Number of countries linked: 46**  **(December 2017)** | **5.5.1** | Number of countries with **improved** **sustainable** national and/or local **human and/or financial capacities** to address emerging and/or recurring conflicts.   1. National    1. Financial capacities    2. Human Resource capacities 2. Local 3. Financial capacities 4. Human Resource capacities   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 23 | 0  0  0  0 | 6  8  4  5 | 10  12  8  10 | 10  14  10  13 | | 12  17  13  14 | 11  16  12  15 |
| **Indicator 5.5.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to put in place financial and/or human resource capacities necessary to prevent, manage, or resolve conflicts, or ease tensions (for example, by convening multi-stakeholder dialogues to bridge significant gaps on critical national issues, and/or conducting advocacy for peace and social cohesion), using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= partially, and 3=largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 5.6.** Mechanisms are enabled for consensus-building around contested priorities, and address specific tensions, through inclusive and peaceful processes  **Number of countries linked: 22**  **(December 2017)** | **5.6.1** | Number of countries where national **mechanisms for mediation and consensus building** show **increased** capacities to **build consensus** on contested issues and resolve disputes  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 28 | 0 | 13 | 17 | 21 | | 24 | 24 |
| **Indicator 5.6.1 note:** Qualitative indicator assesses effectiveness of UNDP support (based on requests from programme countries) to increase the capacities of mechanisms for mediation and consensus-building on objective criteria and evidence. The effectiveness of UNDP support is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially, and 4: largely) that counts the number of countries where UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 6: **Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data (2017)** | **2017 target** |
| **6.1** | Number of countries meeting critical benchmarks for social and economic recovery within 18 months after a crisis  a) Nutrition  b) Health  c) Water, sanitation and hygiene  d) Education  e) Solid waste management  f) Food security  g) Shelter  h) Economic livelihoods  i) Infrastructure | 3  3  4  1  1  0  1  1  1 | 6  8  6  5  4  8  4  6  6 | Not applicable |
| **Source**: The measurement is based on building blocks of affected men and women's livelihoods (e.g. financial, jobs/income, human, natural, physical, and social), recovery of household/community assets, and access to critical socio-economic infrastructure that allows crisis affected people to ‘build back better’. The main focus is on stabilizing affected men and women’s livelihoods. A ‘livelihood’ refers to the capabilities, assets (both material and social) and activities required for basic quality of life. The five building blocks are: financial, social, human, natural, and physical. Sustainable early livelihood opportunities should be put in place in humanitarian settings. The indicator definition was clarified in 2015 to capture the number of countries meeting at least one critical benchmark in each area, based on reports from relevant countries.  **2017 reporting note:** Latest progress for 2017 is shown for the refined indicator definition based on feedback from 22 relevant countries. As per the Midterm Review, targets are not shown due to the unpredictable nature of demand and progress under this outcome area. | | | |
| **6.2** | Number of post disaster and post conflict countries having **operational strategies** to support recovery and address the causes or triggers of crises  **a) Disaster**  i) Number of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them  ii) Number of affected countries with an **operational** strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis  **b) Conflict**  i) Number of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them  ii) Number of affected countries with an **operational** strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis | a .i) 4  a .ii) 0  b .i) 3  b .ii) 1 | a .i) 7 (2017)  a .ii) 3 (2017)  b .i) 12 (2017)  b .ii) 7 (2017) | Not applicable |
| **Source**: Operational strategies means “assessment and planning procedures that integrate risk reduction/conflict prevention in the recovery of agendas, mechanisms, political will, partnerships and resources (institutional, human, economic) to implement the recovery process.” The indicator definition was refined in 2015 to count the number of disaster and conflict affected countries, rather than percentage of affected countries, that have strategies in place. This was due to volatility in the number of countries affected by disaster and conflict each year.  **2017 reporting note:** Baselines and latest progress data for 2017 are shown for the refined indicator definition based on reports from 20 relevant countries affected by disaster and/or conflict in 2017. As per the Midterm Review, targets are not shown due to the unpredictable nature of demand and progress under this outcome area. | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data** | **2017 target** |
| **6.4** | Percentage of (monetary equivalent) benefits from **temporary employment/ productive livelihoods options** in the context of early economic recovery programmes **received by women and girls** (UNSC 1325, led by UNDP and UN Women) | 36% | 38% (2017) | Not applicable |
| **Source**: Baseline and target derived from feedback from 13 UNDP country offices. Monetary value of total benefits distributed in 2013 (2017) was $163,480,883 ($487,914,584) US dollars, and the monetary value of benefits received by women and girls was $59,080,679 ($183,450,780) US dollars, or 36% (38%) of total funds.  **2017 reporting note**: As stated in the Midterm Review, the target has been removed to reflect the unpredictable nature of demand and progress under this outcome area. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 6.1.** From the humanitarian phase after crisis, early economic revitalization generates jobs and other environmentally sustainable livelihoods opportunities for crisis affected men and women  **Number of countries linked: 30**  **(December 2017)** | **6.1.1** | Number of **additional people** benefitting from **emergency jobs and other livelihoods** in **crisis or post-crisis settings**, disaggregated by sex.   1. New emergency jobs for women 2. New emergency jobs for men 3. Additional women benefitting from other emergency livelihoods 4. Additional men benefitting from other emergency livelihoods   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 24 (a and b), 26 (c and d) | 0  0  0  0 | | 42,141  63,726  1,955,824  2,060,472 | | 53,681  91,884  2,025,395  3,285,644 | | 93,036  149,355  2,295,111  3,568,997 | | 57,557  103,018  1,731,789  2,975,763 | | 151,095  305,989  2,852,757  4,588,209 | |
| **Indicator 6.1.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new emergency jobs created and cumulative number of additional people benefiting from strengthened livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings with UNDP support (requested by programme countries) since January 2014. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data was provided for the total number of people. An **additional 500 new emergency jobs** were generated by 2017 and an **additional 457,599 people** benefitted from strengthened livelihood programmes in crisis or post-crisis settings by the end of 2017. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see **indicators 1.1.1** and **1.3.2**.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | **Actual** | |
|  | **6.1.2** | Percentage of crisis-affected countries where critical **benchmarks are identified and actions implemented for Local Economic Revitalization (LER)** within eighteen months of the start of the crisis and/or of UNDP interventions   1. LER benchmark 1 2. LER benchmark 2 3. LER benchmark 3 4. LER benchmark 4   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 13, b) 11, c) 10, d) 8 | 1. 8% 2. 9% 3. 10% 4. 13% | | 1. 23% 2. 27% 3. 30% 4. 13% | | 1. 23% 2. 27% 3. 30% 4. 13% | | 1. 31% 2. 27% 3. 30% 4. 25% | | 1. 62% 2. 55% 3. 50% 4. 25% | | 1. 58% 2. 50% 3. 56% 4. 43% | |
| **Indicator 6.1.2 Note:** Tracks the percentage of crisis-affected countries where UNDP support (requested by programme countries) to up to four country-set critical Local Economic Revitalization benchmarks are achieved within 18 months of the start of the crisis and/or UNDP intervention, from January 2014 onwards.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 6.2.** National and local authorities /institutions enabled to lead the community engagement, planning, coordination, delivery and monitoring of early recovery efforts  **Number of countries linked: 23**  **(December 2017)** | **6.2.1** | Percentage of countries where national and/or sub-national institutions show **improved capacities to lead and coordinate the early recovery process** within 18 months of the start of the crisis and/or of UNDP interventions  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 19 | 0% | | 22% | | 50% | | 63% | | 70% | | 67% | |
| **Indicator 6.2.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (requested by programme countries) to improve capacities (physical infrastructure, equipment and vehicles, human resources, leadership skills, and institutional arrangements) to lead and coordinate early recovery processes, using a qualitative rating scale (level reached by necessary capacities: 1=Less than pre-crisis: 2=Back to pre-crisis, and 3=Better than pre-crisis) and by counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved since January 2014. This includes calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6.2.2** | Percentage of countries affected by crisis with a **strengthened financing or aid management mechanism** being **accountably and effectively used** for early recovery within 18 months of the start of the crisis and/or of UNDP interventions  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 18 | 0% | | 17% | | 35% | | 44% | | 67% | | 59% | |
| **Indicator 6.2.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (requested by programme countries) to accountably and effectively use financing and aid management mechanisms, using a qualitative rating scale (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved as of January 2014, and calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 6.3.** Innovative partnerships are used to inform national planning and identification of solutions for early recovery  **Number of countries linked: 14**  **(December 2017)** | **6.3.1** | **Number of new partnerships** operational to ensure implementation of innovative solutions for early recovery, disaggregated by **type of partnership**.   1. New South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships 2. New public-private partnerships 3. New private sector partnerships 4. Other new partnerships   Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 10, b-d) 8 | 0  0  0  0 | | 7  2  9  23 | | 12  9  22  56 | | 20  13  29  115 | | 25  26  37  68 | | 22  14  37  200 | |
| **Indicator 6.3.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new partnerships that implemented innovative solutions for early recovery (as requested by programme countries) and were operational (defined as those that have accountability mechanisms fully implemented) since January 2014, disaggregated by the type of partner involved.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **6.3.2** | Percentage of **total resources mobilized** in post-crisis situations **allocated to early recovery** within 18 months of the start of the crisis and/or of UNDP interventions  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 10 | 11.2% | | 15.1% | | 18.7% | | 22.5% | | 17.1% | | 16.0% | |
| **Indicator 6.3.2 note:** Tracks the percentage of resources mobilized in post-crisis settings and allocated to early recovery efforts with support from UNDP (requested by programme countries) as of January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | | **2016** | | **2017** | | | |
| **Baseline** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Actual** | | **Target** | | **Actual** | |
| **Output 6.4.** Recovery processes reinforce social cohesion and trust and enable rapid return to sustainable development  **Number of countries linked: 21**  **(December 2017)** | **6.4.1** | Percentage of conflict-affected countries **more effectively** bringing together **sub-national, national institutions and communities, including women**, for peaceful resolution of recurrent conflicts within 18 months of the end of conflict  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 16 | 0% | | 47% | | 58% | | 55% | | 68% | | 64% | |
| **Indicator 6.4.1 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to bring together institutions and communities for peaceful resolution of recurrent conflicts, using a qualitative rating scale (1=not significant; 2=average; 3=significant) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported participatory conflict resolution processes contributed to peaceful solutions since January 2014. Includes calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **6.4.2** | Percentage of countries that **improve institutional, policy and budgetary arrangements** **for risk management** within 18 months of start of crisis and/or UNDP intervention (early recovery)  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 13 | | 0% | | 41% | | 53% | | 59% | | 64% | | 59% |
| **Indicator 6.4.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (as requested by programme countries) to improve risk management arrangements, using a qualitative rating scale (1: Not improved 2: very partially; 3: partially; 4: largely) and by counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported arrangements led to improvements from January 2014 onwards. Includes calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 7: **Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\***Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **2013 baseline** | **Latest data** | **2017 target** |
| **7.1** | Extent to which the agreed post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals (SDGs) **reflect sustainable human development concepts and ideas** | Not applicable | The 2030 Agenda adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015 explicitly balances the three dimensions of sustainable development in an integrated and indivisible framework. | Not applicable |
| **Source**: UNDP reporting.  **2017 reporting note:** 2013 baselines and 2017 targets are not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. UNDP supported extensive consultations at global and national levels on development priorities that informed the design of the new agenda. | | | |
| **7.2** | Existence of an **initial global agreement on financing mechanisms** for the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals | Not applicable | United Nations member states adopted in July 2015 the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, which provides a global framework for financing sustainable development, and is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. | Not applicable |
| **Source**: UNDP reporting.  **2017 reporting note:** 2013 baselines and 2017 targets are not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. As one of the major institutional stakeholders of the ‘Financing for Development’ process, UNDP was actively involved in the preparatory phase and during the Third International Conference on Financing for Development to help ensure more progressive language was included in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda in areas such as debt sustainability, special challenges of SIDS and the need to ensure development finance strategies are risk-informed. | | | |
| **7.3** | Existence of a **global succession plan** to ensure unfinished MDGs are taken up post 2015 | Not applicable | In adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations member states committed themselves to the "full realization of all the MDGs, including the off-track MDGs." The new global Sustainable Development Goals "build upon the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals and seek to address their unfinished business." | Not applicable |
| **Source**: UNDP reporting.  **2017 reporting note:** 2013 baselines and 2017 targets are not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. UNDP supported the development of a common United Nations approach, including guidelines for United Nations Country Teams in support of SDG implementation. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output**(UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand) | **Output Indicator** (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries) | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 7.1.** Global consensus on completion of MDGs and the post 2015 agenda informed by contributions from UNDP  **Contributing units: BPPS**  **(December 2017)** | **7.1.1** | Number of organizations and of people **participating in dialogues** on the **post 2015 agenda and sustainable development goals** (disaggregated by type of organization, e.g. government, civil society and women’s organizations)   * 1. Number of government organizations   2. Number of civil society organizations   3. Number of women’s organizations   4. Number of people | 969  1,987  659  1,345,772 | 969  1,987  659  7,100,000  (49% female) | 991  2,605  659  9,700,000 (48% female) | 991  2,605  659  9,700,000 | 991  2,605  659  9,700,000 | 991  2,605  659  9,700,000 |
| **Indicator 7.1.1 note:** Data provided by UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Tracks the number of organizations and people that, with UNDP support, participated in dialogues on the post-2015 agenda and SDGs. Data on the number of people participating comes from the MY World platform and United Nations global citizen survey, both implemented by UNDP.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output 7.2.** Global and national data collection, measurement and analytical systems in place to monitor progress on completion of MDGs and the post 2015 agenda and sustainable development goals  **Number of countries linked: 35**  **(December 2017)** | **7.2.2** | Number of countries **using updated and disaggregated data** to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with post-2015 agenda  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 40 | 9 | 17 | 22 | 30 | 34 | 33 |
| **Indicator 7.2.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (requested by programme countries) to use updated and disaggregated data to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with post-2015 agenda, using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially and 4: largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support led to “[use of] updated and disaggregated data” to a partial or large extent.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | Actual | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 7.3.** National development plans to address poverty and inequality are sustainable and risk resilient  **Number of countries linked: 37**  **(December 2017)** | **7.3.1** | Number of **new country diagnostics** carried out **to inform policy options** on national response to globally agreed development agenda, including analysis of sustainability and risk resilience, with **post-2015** **poverty eradication commitments and targets specified**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 41 | 0 | 64 | 121 | 176 | 231 | 265 |
| **Indicator 7.3.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new country diagnostics carried out with support from UNDP (as requested by programme countries) to inform policy options on national responses to globally agreed development agendas since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output 7.4.** Countries enabled to gain equitable access to, and manage, ODA and other sources of global development financing  **Number of countries linked: 22**  **(December 2017)** | **7.4.2** | Number of countries that have **more effective mechanisms** in place to **access, deliver, monitor, report on and/or verify use of ODA and other sources of global development financing**  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 27 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 18 | 20 | 20 |
| **Indicator 7.4.2 note:** Qualitative indicator tracks effectiveness of UNDP support (requested by programme countries) to mechanisms that access, deliver, monitor, report and/or verify use of ODA and other sources of global development financing by using a qualitative rating scale (1: not adequately, 2: very partially, 3: partially and 4: largely) and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists of UNDP support contributing to putting in place effective mechanisms.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 7.5.** South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships established and/or strengthened for development solutions  **Number of countries linked: 17**  **(December 2017)** | **7.5.1** | Number of **new South-South and triangular cooperation** **partnerships** that deliver measurable and sustainable development benefits for participants (national, regional, sub-regional, inter-regional entities)  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26 | 0 | 63 | 213 | 293 | 325 | 404 |
| **Indicator 7.5.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) that deliver measurable and sustainable development benefits for participants (defined as national, regional, sub-regional and/or inter-regional entities), created from January 2014 onwards. “Data collected” refers to country outputs that have the primary objective of promoting South-South and triangular cooperation. Additional results achieved by utilizing South-South and triangular cooperation modalities are embedded in other outcomes.  **2017 reporting note**: The 2017 target was adjusted to reflect corrections from two offices. | | | | | | |
| **7.5.3** | Evidence of **harmonization of policies, legal frameworks and regulations** across countries for sustaining and expanding South-South and triangular cooperation that maximizes mutual benefits  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 19 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 19 |
| **Indicator 7.5.3 note:** Tracks the number of countries which, with support from UNDP (as requested by programme countries), established legal, regulatory or policy frameworks for South-South and triangular cooperation and/or an institutional focal point within government for South-South and triangular cooperation.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output 7.6.** Innovations enabled for development solutions, partnerships and other collaborative arrangements  **Number of countries linked: 17**  **(December 2017)** | **7.6.1** | Number of **new public-private partnership** mechanisms that provide innovative solutions for development  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 21 | 0 | 54 | 126 | 164 | 149 | 234 |
| **Indicator 7.6.1 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of new public-private partnership mechanisms supported by UNDP (requested by programme countries) that provide evidence of creating innovative solutions for development since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** The 2017 target was adjusted to reflect corrections from two offices. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
|  | **7.6.2** | Number of **additional pilot and demonstration projects** initiated or **scaled up by national partners** (e.g. expanded, replicated, adapted or sustained)  (a) Number of **additional** pilots and demonstration projects **initiated** by national partners  (b) Number of **additional** pilots and demonstration projects **scaled up** by national partners  Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 25, b) 23 | 0  0 | 62  27 | 160  92 | 276  185 | 382  166 | 338  215 |
| **Indicator 7.6.2 note:** Tracks the cumulative number of additional pilot/demonstration projects initiated or scaled up by national partners with support from UNDP (as requested by programme countries) since January 2014.  **2017 reporting note:** 2017 target increased from 380 to 382 to reflect contributions from two offices not previously captured. | | | | | | |
| **Output 7.7.** Mechanisms in place to generate and share knowledge about development solutions  **Contributing units: BPPS and HDRO (December 2017)** | **7.7.1** | Access to **Human Development Reports, to contribute to development debate and action**   1. Number of overall website page visits 2. Number of HDR report landing page views 3. Number of Facebook followers 4. Number of Twitter followers | 4,604,821  924,067  44,080  729 | 3,824,209  910,833  187,350  1,570 | 4,246,598  992,040  220,121  3,541 | 4,175,034  1,084,404  233,983  6,130 | 5,000,000  1,000,000  300,000  3,200 | 4,564,011  1,107,867  237,069  8,094 |
| **Indicator 7.7.1 note:** Data provided by the UNDP Human Development Report Office (HDRO) tracks the number of website page visits (in English, French and Spanish) on the HDRO website (<http://hdr.undp.org/en>). Reflected is the number of views on the landing pages of all HDR reports (every year) and the number of social media platform followers on Facebook and on Twitter. Visits to the website in 2013 were exceptionally high due to the launch of an early and high-visibility report. Numbers were expected to dip in 2014 before rising to exceed 2013 numbers in 2017. HDR landing page views are computed for the landing page of HDR hosted at hdr.undp.org and the landing page of the report micro-site (<http://report.hdr.undp.org/>) that was launched by HDRO in 2015.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **7.7.2** | Evidence of the **relevance, to national partners,** **of development solutions** shared over the knowledge platforms (including of South-South and triangular Cooperation platform) | Not available | 82.9% | 84.9% | 85.6% | 80% | 86.2% |
| **Indicator 7.7.2 note:** Data provided by UNDP BPPS.Tracks user feedback as a proxy indicator of the relevance to partners of development solutions shared over the knowledge platforms supported by UNDP. A headquarter-administered survey targeting all registered platform users, undertaken in the first quarter of each year, measures the percentage of users who indicated that development solutions shared over UNDP knowledge platforms are useful. ‘Knowledge platforms’ include the UNDP website and all ‘Teamworks’-based interactive online platforms that allow external (non-UNDP) users—including national government partners, partnering international organizations and NGOs, and the global public—to search and retrieve information and resources of any kind (e.g. articles, files, videos, images, etc.). Once developed, the South-South exchange platform and a public online library of knowledge products will be included.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **Output** | **Output Indicator** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **Output 7.8.** Governance institutional, and other critical bottlenecks addressed to support achievement of the MDGs and other internationally agreed development goals  **Contributing units: BPPS**  **(December 2017)** | **7.8.1** | Number of countries **implementing MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) action plans** to drive progress on lagging MDGs through national and/or sub-national budgets | 33 | 45 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| **Indicator 7.8.1 Note:** Data provided by UNDP BPPS. Tracks the number of countries implementing MDG acceleration action plans with support from UNDP (requested by programme countries) to accelerate MDG results. Implementation is defined as having a MAF Action Plan completed and endorsed by relevant country authorities. The number of countries is cumulative, and each country is only counted once; even if multiple plans exist at national and sub-national levels. See indicator **7.8.2** for related data on this support.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |
| **7.8.2** | Number of countries developing action plans to “**close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and transition to the** **SDGs** | 0 | 2 | 22 | 35 | 39 | 39 |
| **Indicator 7.8.2 note:** Data provided by UNDP BPPS.Tracks the number of countries developing actions plans with support from UNDP (requested by programme countries) to “close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and transition to the SDGs. An Action Plan “being developed” is defined as the transition planning process already launched (e.g. application of Rapid Integrated Assessment [RIA] or similar assessment) and the plan in the development phase(e.g. development of SDG Implementation Roadmap or similar SDG Action Plan). Number of countries is cumulative and each country is counted once even if multiple plans are developed at national and sub-national levels. See indicator **7.8.1** for related data.  **2017 reporting note:** No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years. | | | | | | |

**Tier Three: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency**

| **Results Statement** | **Indicator\*** | | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Actual** | **Target** | **Actual** |
| **1. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY OF RESULTS** | | | | | | | | |
| **1.1** Programme effectiveness enhanced for achieving results at all levels through quality criteria and quality assurance processes | **1** | Percentage of country programme outcomes that are reported as either on-track or achieved (cross checked with evaluation findings) | 70.6% (ROAR) 50% (EVAL) | 76% | 78% | 78% | 75% | 82% |
| (ROAR) | (ROAR) | (ROAR) | (ROAR) | (ROAR) |
| **Note:** This indicator measures the percentage of country programme outcomes that were either reported as “achieved” or “partially achieved” in the result oriented annual reports (ROARs). Milestones and targets are projections based on ROAR and CPD cycle analysis. Systematic ways to cross check the actuals reported through ROARs with evaluation findings were not available. | | | | | | | |
| **2** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as an effective contributor in identified areas | **Average: 52%** | **Average: 54%** | N/A | 57% | 70% | N/A |
| i. Poverty eradication through inclusive and sustainable development | - Poverty eradication: 44%  - Democratic Governance: 56%  - Crisis Prevention and Recovery: 45%  -Environment and Energy: 56%  - MDGs: 58% | 53% | N/A | 55% | 70% | N/A |
| ii. Democratic governance | 56% | N/A | 56% | 70% | N/A |
| iii. Institutional capacity building for delivery of basic services | 56% | N/A | 60% | 70% | N/A |
| iv. Gender equality and women’s empowerment | 56% | N/A | 59% | 70% | N/A |
| v. Reducing likelihood of conflict and the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change | 45% | N/A | 50% | 70% | N/A |
| vi. Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development in post-conflict/disaster settings | 44% | N/A | 48% | 70% | N/A |
| vii. Contribution to development debates and international development goals | 66% | N/A | 69% | 70% | N/A |
| **Note:** Data from the 2012 Partnership Survey is for a reference purposes only. The Partnership Survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations; therefore, the baseline is not comparable. The Partnership Survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016). | | | | | | | |
| **3** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track. | 92.6% (2014) | 92.6% | 95.8% | 88% | 95% | 96% |
| **Note:** The indicator measures the percentage of project outputs that were assessed as either “achieved” or “on-track” in the Corporate Strategic Planning system. | | | | | | | |
| **4** | Percentage of Country Office annual results reports which meet or exceed expected organizational quality standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 67% | 75% | 64% | 80% | 90% | 87% |
| 2012 ROARs | 2013 ROARs | 2014 ROARs | 2015 ROARs | 2016 ROARs | 2017 ROARs |
| **Note:** The 2017 actual data refers to the rating of 2016 ROARs. Lower ratings in 2015 should be interpreted in the context of more rigorous organizational quality standards introduced with 2014 ROARs, especially in terms of using an evidence and results focus under the current Strategic Plan. | | | | | | | |
| **5** | Percentage of projects meeting or exceeding organizational quality standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 72% (2014) | 72% | 51% | 63% | 60% | 73% |
| **Note:** The baseline is collected from Phase 1 of the Project Quality Assurance (QA) system implementation, which includes quality ratings from a sample of 107 projects in 21 country offices. Data for 2015 is based on rating 505 projects (about 8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in 70 country offices as part of Phase 2 of Project QA, which was still in its pilot phase. Quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all development projects in 2016, and data for 2017 includes all active projects in UNDP. | | | | | | | |
| **6** | Percentage of new country programme documents that meet organizational standards in the first submission for internal appraisal **(QCPR related indicator)** | 79% (2014) | 79% | 71% | 51.5% | 80% | 89% |
| **Note:** The baseline reports the results of headquarter CPD appraisals in 2014 (HQ PACs requested re-submission of 4 out of 19 CPDs). 2015 data is based on 28 CPDs appraised for the September and January Executive Board sessions. This is the first group of CPDs that were rated against the new quality standards for programmes, a rigorous and evidence-based assessment tool, on a pilot basis. All CPDs were re-rated against the quality standards after appraisal in 2016, and 100% of new CPDs met the standards before they were submitted to the Executive Board. | | | | | | | |
| **7** | Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with: | 71% | N/A | N/A | 65% | 80% | N/A |
| i. UNDP policy services | 74% | N/A | N/A | 65% | 80% | N/A |
| ii. UNDP programme/project guidelines and support | 68% | N/A | N/A | 65% | 80% | N/A |
| **Note:** Data from this indicator is collected through a biannual Heqdquarters Products and Services Survey (HQ PSS). Following the 2014-2015 reorganisation of UNDP, the HQ PSS was redesigned to focus on UNDP core business-to-business activities, with increased targeting of respondent groups and survey simplification. 2016 actuals are therefore not completely comparable with the initial baseline.  **Note to 2017 actual:** Inputs on indicators 7.i. and 7.ii. are N/A as the last HQ PSS was completed in 2016. There was no HQ PSS for 2017. | | | | | | | |
| **1.2** UNDP’s key development approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects for more durable results | **8** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate quality standards for capacity development **(QCPR related indicator)** | 76.6% (2014) | 76.60% | 64.2% | 76% | 65% | 80% |
| **Note:** The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion for “National Ownership and Sustainability” that integrates corporate quality standards for capacity development. The baseline is collected from Phase 1 of the Project QA system implementation, which includes quality ratings from a sample of 107 projects in 21 country offices. 2015 data is based on the rating of 505 projects (about 8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in 70 country offices as part of Phase 2 of Project QA, which was still being piloted. Quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all projects in 2016, and data for 2017 includes all active development projects in UNDP. | | | | | | | |
| **9** | a. Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective. **(QCPR related indicator)** | 30% | 34% | 35% | 37% | 57% | 48% |
| b. Number of country offices that track and report on expenditures using gender markers validated by a quality assurance process. [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR] | 3 | 28 | 48 | 49 | 70 | 57 |
| **Note 9a:** Based on the gender marker: Expenditures as of March of the current year for the previous reporting year and tracked by outputs according to their contribution to gender equality. The indicator adds up gender projects (GEN 3) and projects with a significant gender component (GEN 2). | | | | | | | |
| **Note 9b:** The SEAL initiative helps country offices put in place quality control mechanisms to better use the gender marker and revisit their portfolio to check accuracy. | | | | | | | |
| **10** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 60.0% (2014) | 60.0% | 61.2% | 80% | 70% | 87% |
| **Note:** The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion on social and environmental standards. The baseline is collected from Phase 1 of the Project QA system implementation that includes quality ratings from a sample of 107 projects in 21 country offices, but not the screening procedure. The baseline was lowered from 78.5% to 60.0% to take the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) into account. A project that rates satisfactory or above on the Social and Environmental Standards quality criterion, but does not complete the screening as required, should not be considered as meeting corporate social and environmental standards. 2015 data is based on the rating of 505 projects (8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in Phase 2 of Project QA, which was still being piloted. Both quality ratings and compliance with the SESP is considered. Quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all projects in 2016, and data for 2017 includes all active development projects in UNDP. | | | | | | | |
| **11** | Percentage of programmes/projects where south-south or triangular cooperation is used to achieve results **(QCPR related indicator)** | 8% | N/A | 10% | 8% | 30% | 8% |
| **Note:** The baseline was calculated at the beginning of 2014 through a comprehensive mapping of 3,500 on-going projects, of which 269 (8%) had integrated South-South or triangular cooperation approaches. Starting in 2015, country offices reported on specific South-South initiatives through the ROARs. | | | | | | | |
| **1.3** Knowledge management institutionalized and learning is made part of its performance culture. | **12** | Existence of (and use of) a database of searchable lessons learned from evaluations and project completion reports | Excel-based extract of lessons from decentralized evaluation reports published in 2011 and 2012 completed. | A corporate lessons learned database prototype will be developed in 2015. Meanwhile, the Excel based evaluation tool has been updated with references to lessons learned in 2013 and 2014 | Facility to capture lessons learned from evaluations established within the Corporate Planning System. | UNDP collected 1670 evaluation-related lessons learned in 2016 in the Evaluation Resource Centre database. A lessons learned capture mechanism at project level will be developed by end of 2017 | Tool updated to incorporate lessons from 2015 and 2016 evaluations, project completion reports and other relevant sources. | UNDP collected 409 evaluation-related lessons learned in 2017 through the Evaluation resource Centre. |
| **13** | Use of UNDP knowledge products: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Number of downloads of UNDP publications from UNDP’s public website | 179,695 | 265,474 | 285,044 | 285,649 | 315,000 | 480,000 |
| b. Number of citations of HDRs in academic publications | 403 (2014) | 403 | 442 | 326 | 550 | 311 |
| **Note:** 13.a. The means of verification is statistical data for 1,591 global and regional products that were in the UNDP library as of March 2017 (compared to 1,953 in 2015). All were tracked through Google analysis of UNDP website traffic.  **Note:** 13.b The means of verification is Google Scholars. The 2016 HDR was published in March 2017. | | | | | | | |
| **2. FIELD/COUNTRY OFFICE OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | | | | | | |
| **2.1** UNDP is an efficient and cost conscious organization | **14** | Procurement efficiency: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Percentage of procurement cases submitted to the ACP that are approved upon first review | 75.24% | 81% | 83.50% | 84% | 85% | 83% |
| b. Percentage of business units with a consolidated Procurement Plan. | 21% | 71% | 76.0% | 73% | 80% | 80% |
| **15** | a. Percentage of cost-sharing agreements that comply with the new cost recovery policy (third party contributions only) | the new policy started in January 2014 | 65% | 76.0% | 89% | 90% | 91% |
| b. Average cost recovery rate (disaggregated by funding instrument) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Third party cost sharing | 5.90% | 6.23% | 6.80% | 7.39% | 8.00% | 6.87% |
| 1. Government cost sharing | 3.80% | 4.06% | 4.02% | 3.90% | 3.50% | 3.73% |
| 1. South-South contributions | n/a | 6.08% | 6.56% | 3.99% | 3.50% | 3.20% |
| 1. Other trust funds | 6.00% | 4.50% | 7.73% | 8.05% | 8.00% | 8.56% |
| 1. GFATM | 6.50% | 6.69% | 7.26% | 7.01% | 7.00% | 6.94% |
| 1. GEF Contributions below $10 million | 9.60% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% | 9.50% |
| 1. GEF Contributions above $ 10 million | 9.60% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% | 9.00% |
| 1. LOFTA | 3.80% | 4.00% | 4.00% | 4.01% | 4.00% | 3.99% |
| 1. Thematic contributions | 4.30% | 7.01% | 4.24% | 7.37% | 7.00% | 7.93% |
| 1. Montreal Protocol | 7.50% | 7.80% | 7.00% | 7.00% | 7.00% | 7.00% |
| 1. EC | 6.00% | 6.40% | 6.37% | 6.66% | 7.00% | 6.74% |
| **Note:** For Indicator 15(a), the 2017 actual reflects the total number of active agreements in 2017. For technical reasons, Thematic Trust Funds have not been included in this calculation but, as this affects less than one per cent of the total number of agreements, the impact is not material. | | | | | | | |
| **16** | Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 81% financial quality  30% IPSAS | 51% | 78% | 87% | 80% | 94% |
| **17** | 1. percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities | 71% | 76% | 78% | 81% | 84% | 82% |
| 1. percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | 96% | 94% | 94% | 94% | 94% | 95% |
| **18** | UNDP Carbon Footprint (CO2 emissions in tons CO2-equivalent) | 69,896 | 67,799 | 68,391 | 68,391 | 63,792 | N/A |
| **Note:** 2016 actual data was made available in July 2017.  **Note to 2017 actual:** UNDP is in the process of launching a web-based environmental reporting tool to collect and process data. It will take three months to collect all data and verify and aggregate a global estimate. The final actual value is expected to be available in July/August 2018. | | | | | | | |
| **3. CORPORATE OVERSIGHT AND ASSURANCE (internal audit, investigations and corporate evaluations)** | | | | | | | | |
| **3.1** Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP operations improved and development effectiveness enhanced with support from The Evaluation Office and the Office of Audits | **19** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory or partially satisfactory quality, including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards **(SWAP-related indicator)**. | 39% | 52% | 76% | 74% | 75% | 74% |
| Note: The 2013 baseline is calculated based on the assessment of 269 decentralized evaluations conducted in 2013. The 2014 actual was derived from a sample of 42 decentralized evaluations conducted that year. Under the new Evaluation Policy, adopted by the Executive Board in 2016, the Independent Evaluation Office revised the methodology to assess the quality of decentralized evaluations. The revised methodology has been applied to 170 decentralized evaluations conducted in 2016, and 84 of the 266 evaluations conducted in 2015. As with the Independent Evaluation Office report on evaluations, the indicator is calculated based on the sum of decentralized evaluations assessed as either satisfactory (including both ‘highly satisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory’) or moderately satisfactory (in 2015 this was 25 percent satisfactory and 51 percent moderately satisfactory, and in 2016 it was 27 percent satisfactory and 47 percent moderately satisfactory). In 2017, 261 decentralized evaluations were quality assessed out of which 21 percent were rated satisfactory (1% highly satisfactory and 20% satisfactory) and 53 percent were rated moderately satisfactory. | | | | | | | |
| **20** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as: | (average 2011-2013) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Satisfactory | 35% | 36% | 31% | 33% | >30% | 37% |
| 1. Partially satisfactory | 58% | 57% | 58% | 62% | <65% | 59% |
| 1. Unsatisfactory | 7% | 7% | 11% | 5% | <15% | 4% |
| **Note:** Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits. | | | | | | | |
| **21** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified | 94.2% (2013)  97.6% (average 2011-2013) | 95.20% | 99.70% | 100% | ≥ 98% | 100% |
| **3.2** Management action on evaluation and audit findings taken to improve efficiency and effectiveness | **22** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Decentralized evaluations | 68% | 78% | 85.20% | 88% | >95% | 88% |
| 1. Independent evaluations | 80% | 82% | 83.50% | 96% | >95% | 91% |
| **Note:** The data source for this indicator is the Evaluations Resources Centre. The implementation rate is calculated as follows: total number of management responses that are “completed,” “on-going,” and “initiated” divided by the number of total actions, excluding those that are “no longer applicable.” | | | | | | | |
| **23** | Rate of implementation of agreed upon: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. internal audit recommendations | 88% | 81% | 85% | 87% | ≥ 85% | 92% |
| 1. external audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 80% | 96% | 92% | 96% | 85% | 96% |
| **Note:** The indicator is disaggregated since tracking the implementation of audit recommendations is done separately. Recommendations tracked for the indicator are those that had a target implementation date of 31 December 2017. Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits. | | | | | | | |
| **4. LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE DIRECTION** | | | | | | | | |
| **4.1** UNDP leaders foster a working environment in which staff are engaged, leading to improved performance and a smooth transition to the new Strategic Plan | **24** | Percentage of all staff surveyed who expressed confidence in leadership and direction | 71% | 67% | N/A | 71% | 76% | N/A |
| **25** | Percentage of all staff surveyed who feel empowered in their job | 57% | 54% | N/A | 65% | 65% | N/A |
| **26** | Staff engagement index | 72% | 69% | N/A | 79% | 76% | N/A |
| **Note:** Indicators 24, 25 and26 are calculated based on Global Staff Survey (GSS) responses. Please note that in the 2016 GSS the formulae applied for the calculation of these three indicators have changed, and 2013 baseline and 2014 actuals have been re-calculated accordingly. For comparison purposes, the 2013 baselines were 24 (71%), 25 (57%), and 26 (72%). The 2014 actuals were 24 (70%), 25 (54%), and 26 (71%). 2016 actuals calculated using the old formulae would have been 24 (73%), 25 (69%) and 26 (79%).  **Note to 2017 actual:** Inputs on indicators 24, 25 and 26 are N/A as the Global Staff Survey is conducted once every two years. The last survey was completed in 2016. | | | | | | | |
| **27** | Percentage of project outputs that are aligned to corporate outcomes | 81.30% | 86.60% | 87.50% | 89% | 90% | 96% |
| **Note:** The indicator captures ongoing development outputs managed by headquarters units and country offices that are linked to Strategic Plan outcomes/outputs in the Atlas Enterprise Resource Planning system. | | | | | | | |
| **5. CORPORATE FINANCIAL, ICT AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | | | |
| **5.1** UNDP policies and procedures fit for purpose to enable staff to carry out their jobs effectively | **28** | Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with UNDP management services | 71% (2012) | N/A | N/A | 64% | 80% | N/A |
| **Note:** Data from this indicator was collected through a biannual PSS. Following the 2014-2015 reorganisation of UNDP, the PSS was redesigned to focus on UNDP core business-to-business activities, with increased targeting of respondent groups and survey simplification. 2016 actuals are not completely comparable with the initial baseline.  **Note to 2017 actual:** Inputs on this indicator are N/A as the last headquarter HQ PSS was completed in 2016. There was no HQ PSS for 2017. | | | | | | | |
| **29** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 8.44% | 8.29% | 7.87% | 7.86% | 8.10% | 6.93% |
| **30** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs | 3.30% | 3.50% | 3.3% | 3.30% | 3% | 2.96% |
| **6. CORPORATE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | | | |
| **6.1** UNDP equipped to attract, develop and retain a talented and diversified workforce | **31** | Average time taken to fill eligible vacancies across specified categories |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Candidate Pools in calendar days | 28 | 28 | 29 | 30 | < 30 | 29 |
| 1. RRs/RCs in weeks | 11 | 9 | 10 | 9 | ≤11 | 8 |
| **Note: “**Average time taken to fill” refers to the period between the posting of a vacancy announcement to a candidate being notified of selection. | | | | | | | |
| **32** | Percentage of staff who are female (QCPR related indicator): |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. At all levels | 42% | 42% | 51% | 51% | 50% | 51% |
|  | 1. P4-P5 | 38% | 39% | 40% | 41% | 50% | 42% |
|  | 1. D1 and above | 36% | 36% | 38% | 39% | 50% | 38% |
| **33** | Percentage of annual performance management and development processes completed on time. | 31.0% | 45.3% | 80.9% | 88% | 85% | 88% |
| **Note:** Indicator 33 is measured at the beginning of April every year. | | | | | | | |
| **7. CORPORATE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION** | | | | | | | | |
| **7.1** Effective support for the Executive Board provided to enable oversight | **34** | Percentage of Executive Board members who report satisfaction with UNDP support services | 80.25% (2015) | 80.25% | 90.1% | 85% | 90% | 94% |
| **Note:** Since 2015, UNDP surveys Executive Board member satisfaction with UNDP support services in the first quarter every year. The survey obtained a total of eleven responses in 2015, nine responses in 2016, and 12 responses in 2017. | | | | | | | |
| **7.2** UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice by its partners | **35** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding from government and other non-government partners (including international financial institutions, regional development banks, civil society, private sector). **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Total | $4,628 | $4,590 | $4,394 | $4,782 | $4,928 | $4,822 |
| Trend from previous year |  | -0.8% | -4.3% | 8.8% |  | 0.8% |
| 1. Regular Resources | $896 | $793 | $704 | $618 | $925 | $612 |
| Trend from previous year |  | -11.5% | -11.2% | -12.2% |  | -1.0% |
| 1. Other Resources (non-programme country government, multilaterals and other non-government partners) | $2,671 | $2,945 | $2,850 | $3,272 | $3,253 | $3,204 |
| Trend from previous year |  | 10.3% | -3.2% | 14.8% |  | -2.1% |
| 1. Other Resources (programme country government cost sharing) | $1,061 | $852 | $840 | $892 | $750 | $1,006 |
| Trend from previous year |  | -19.7% | -1.4% | 6.2% |  | 12.8% |
| **Note:** Amounts in each year are in million US dollars and represent the level of resources in that year (non-cumulative) for the category specified. Cumulative amounts for in the 2014-2017 period are: Total = $19,359 million US dollars; regular resources = $3,600 million US dollars; other resources (non-programme government and non-government partners) = $12,759 million US dollars, and other resources (programme government cost sharing) = $3,000 million US dollars. Non-government refers to: United Nations system, MPTFs, World Bank Group, European Union, regional banks, vertical funds, NGOs/CSOs, private sector and foundations. | | | | | | | |
| **36** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organization | 87% (2012) | 90% | N/A | 89% | 90% | N/A |
| **Note:** Data from the 2012 partnership survey is for reference purposes only. The partnership survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations, therefore the baseline is not comparable. The partnership survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016). | | | | | | | |
| **37** | Percentage of partners satisfied with quality and timeliness of reporting **[QCPR RELATED]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| i. Favourable | N/A | 75% | N/A | 76% | 80% | N/A |
| ii. Neutral | N/A | 19% | N/A | 16% | 15% | N/A |
| iii. Unfavourable | N/A | 6% | N/A | 8% | 5% | N/A |
| **Note:** The previous indicator “percentage of Member States giving positive feedback on the quality of corporate reporting on results and mandates” has been changed to align data collection with UNDP partnership surveys and extend data collection to additional partners besides Executive Board member states. This is in response to a recommendation from an audit of UNDP management of third-party cost sharing resources to improve the quality and timeliness of reporting. The partnership survey was conducted February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016). | | | | | | | |
| **38** | Percentage of country offices and headquarters units that are compliant with the internal standards for the international aid and transparency initiative (IATI) and Information Disclosure Policy | 52% (2013) | 60% | 82% | 81% | 98% | 93% |
| **8. STAFF AND PREMISES SECURITY** | | | | | | | | |
| **8.1** UNDP Country Offices are more resilient due to sound business continuity systems and security arrangements | **39** | Percentage of Country Offices meeting minimum operations security standards (MOSS) | 77.70% | 83.30% | 85.90% | 94.0% | 90% | 93% |
| **40** | Percentage of Country Offices and headquarters units meeting Business Continuity Plan requirements | 24% | 52% | 68% | 65% | 95% | 75% |
| **9. UN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION** | | | | | | | | |
| **9.1** Greater progress on coordination, leadership and management of the Resident Coordinator system ensured | **41** | Percentage of actions in the UNDP QCPR Implementation Plan that are achieved. | 32% achieved 65% in progress (2014) | 32% achieved 65% in progress | 72% | 86% | 70-100% achieved | 86% |
| **Note:** The Implementation Plan was approved and the baseline for this indicator was set in 2014. | | | | | | | |
| **42** | Percentage of UNDP partners satisfied with UNDP leadership of the Resident Coordinator System | 71% (2012) | 62% | N/A | 74% | 80% | N/A |
| **Note:** Data from the 2012 partnership survey is for reference purposes only. The partnership survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations; therefore, the baseline is not comparable. The partnership survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016). | | | | | | | |
| **43** | Per cent of country offices using common RBM tools and principles [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR] | N/A | N/A | 43% | 75% | 80% | 79% |
| **44** | Per cent of country offices using the common UNDG capacity measurement approach (when fully developed) **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Note:** The common UNDG capacity measurement approach is being developed in the UNDG Programme Working Group. | | | | | | | |
| **45** | Number of country offices that are applying the Standard Operating Procedures, or components of it. **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | N/A | N/A | 74 | 88 | 85 | 95 |
| 55% | 66% | 63% | 71% |
| i. One programme | N/A | N/A | 58 | 66 | 65 | 68 |
| 43% | 49% | 49% | 51% |
| ii. Common budgetary framework | N/A | N/A | 13 | 43 | 18 | 38 |
| 10% | 32% | 13% | 29% |
| iii. One fund | N/A | N/A | 9 | 18 | 12 | 15 |
| 7% | 13% | 9% | 11% |
| iv. One leader | N/A | N/A | 21 | 67 | 28 | 67 |
| 16% | 50% | 21% | 50% |
| v. Operating as one | N/A | N/A | 24 | 65 | 28 | 66 |
| 18% | 49% | 21% | 50% |
| **Note**: The 2014 milestone and actual from UNDESA Resident Coordinator Survey covered only a sub-set of UNDP country offices (78 United Nations Country Teams) and are not comparable with data reported in UNDP ROARs (2015 and 2016), which covered 100% of 134 UNDP country offices. In 2017, 133 UNDP country offices reported actuals in the ROAR. | | | | | | | |
| **46** | Number of country offices implementing **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| i. common services | N/A | N/A | 122 | 123 | 130 | 123 |
|  | 91% | 92% | 97% | 91% |
| ii. common long-term agreements | N/A | N/A | 102 | 100 | 110 | 103 |
|  | 76% | 75% | 82% | 76% |
| iii. harmonized approach to procurement | N/A | N/A | 51 | 55 | 60 | 67 |
|  | 38% | 41% | 45% | 50% |
| iv. common human resources management | N/A | N/A | 38 | 45 | 45 | 54 |
|  | 28% | 34% | 34% | 40% |
| v. common information and communication technology services | N/A | N/A | 68 | 81 | 75 | 84 |
|  | 51% | 60% | 56% | 63% |
| vi. common financial management services | N/A | N/A | 28 | 37 | 35 | 49 |
|  | 21% | 28% | 26% | 37% |
| **Note:** In 2017, 133 UNDP country offices reported actuals in the ROARs. | | | | | | | |
| **47** | UNDP contribution in cash provided to the resident coordinator system **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]**, in US$ million | $74.00 | $89.00 | $92.10 | $92.60 | $95.30 | $92.10 |
| **Note:** The total UNDP contribution to the Resident Coordinator system will be recorded against this indicator, upon agreement on indicator 49. Amounts reported will represent the yearly UNDP core contribution to financing the United Nations development coordination function. Actuals for 2014-2015 are updated in line with audited UNDP financial statements for 2014-2015. 2017 actuals are from un-audited 2017 UNDP financial statements. The target for 2017 reflects a 3% estimated inflation on updated pro-forma costs from 2016 actuals. | | | | | | | |
| **48** | UNDP contribution in kind provided to the resident coordinator system [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR] | TBD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **Note**: UNDP cannot report on IRRF indicator 48 since there is no common UNDP methodology developed that captures in-kind contributions to the Resident Coordinator system. | | | | | | | |

1. (\*Denotes that the baseline year is the year specified or latest data available.) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)