Annex 4

Results-based reporting

In 2007 the UNOPS Annual Report moved away from solely focusing on financial reporting to include a results-based assessment of the contributions made to the programme outcomes of its partners. This was in line with the UNOPS Business Strategy 2007-2009 and has continued in accordance with the Strategic Plan 2010-2013.

A key methodological decision at the time was to focus reporting of UNOPS contributions at the output level. The unique role of UNOPS inherently affects any results-based assessment of its performance. UNOPS contributes to programme outcomes in partnership with other entities, and since project ownership rests with UNOPS partners, their annual reports may include elaboration of broader outcomes and/or impacts than those described here. While this is most obvious when services are provided to other United Nations entities, the same can be applied to work performed in the spirit of the Paris Declaration, where UNOPS provides services directly to governments.

Thus, successes in this report are measured at the output level, but in certain cases, with the support of partners, impacts and outcomes are also mentioned.

4.1 Projects outputs

As in previous years the data for the operational results section of the Annual Report was gathered using an online results-based reporting tool. Project managers filled out the tool with a range of information, the most important being to report the completed outputs produced by their project in 2011.

At the end of each year all project managers split their projects into work packages and assign each an output (e.g. roads built) from a list of around 400 to explain the work completed over the year. Each project manager assigns portions of his annual budget to each output completed, allowing the system to create dollar figures for money spent across the organization on each output. When the outputs have been mapped to Implementation Support Practices (ISPs) this allows us to estimate roughly how much of UNOPS annual spend is going on work related to each of the ISPs.

Process outputs (e.g. transactions completed, people hired, meetings organised) were not counted - unless they were a specific goal of the project. The tool pulled financial information from Atlas, the enterprise reporting system used by UNOPS, and combined it with the expenditure percentages given by project managers to allow for an estimation of the value of work completed in different regions, goals and ISPs.

4.2 Other information

Information on the three UNOPS cross-cutting concerns was gathered in a separate part of the online tool - to enable project managers to report successes in these areas without assigning a separate section of their expenditure (as with the outputs above). They were asked a series of questions about the project’s work on gender, national capacity and environment and given free text boxes to expand their answers.

In the same section they were also asked questions relating to their project to enable the goal mapping (see below) and on other factors of interest to UNOPS, for example labour days produced. Project managers were also asked to note any clear outcomes and impacts of their projects where possible, in a free text box.

Calculating data splits

4.3 Goals:

UNOPS contribution goals are as follows:

Goal One: Rebuilding peace and stability after conflict
Goal Two: Early recovery of communities affected by natural disaster
Goal Three: The ability of people to develop local economies and obtain social services
Goal Four: Environmental sustainability and adaptation to climate change
Many projects supported by UNOPS work towards one, two or more of our contribution goals. However to ensure clarity and remove the possibly of double-counting, the projects were each placed into their primary goal for the purpose of this report.

The 1,049 projects were automatically sorted in the following way:

1. All projects that stated their main focus was the environment were placed in Goal 4 (environmental sustainability).
2. All remaining projects that helped people prepare for, limit or recover from natural disasters were placed in Goal 2 (post-disaster).
3. All remaining projects implemented where a UN mission is operating were placed in Goal 1 (post-conflict). Any other projects with a clear peacebuilding goal were manually placed in Goal 1.
4. All remaining projects were placed in Goal 3 (other development environments).

4.4 Low income and conflict countries:

The list of low income countries referenced in paragraph 2 was sourced from the World Bank. It includes all countries which had a GNI per capita of $1,005 or less in 2010.

This was combined with data from our post-conflict work (see 4.3 above) to give figures for UNOPS delivery in low income countries and in those affected by conflict.

4.5 Implementation Support Practices:

UNOPS currently has five ISPs:

- Infrastructure
- Justice and security sector reform
- Census and elections
- Environment
- Health

In this document, the size of the portfolio supported by each ISP is measured at the output level. These portfolios often overlap. They are calculated in the following ways:

- All outputs are ‘mapped’ to one or more ISPs. For example the output *hospitals built* is mapped to both Infrastructure and Health.
- Certain outputs do not fall under the five ISPs e.g. *schoolbooks procured*, and these are mapped to Other.
- Certain outputs are too vague to map to any ISP or Other, e.g. *grants managed* and so these are mapped to Unknown.

Remapping Unknown

- All projects which have selected an output mapped to Unknown are individually classified (by reading the project documents etc.) and mapped to one or more ISPs or Other. This project-level mapping gives an overall impression of the work done by the project.
- The analysis system finds a work package, notes the output, and checks the mapping. If the output is mapped to an ISP or Other, the system assigns the money from the work package to one of those categories. If it mapped to Unknown the system checks the project-level mapping and assigns the work package expenditure to the categories denoted through the project mapping.
- This way we bring the Unknown category down to zero.

Remapping Other

- In order to have a clearer view of what type of work was falling into the Other category, the work packages assigned to an output that had been mapped to Other were reclassified. Where possible these work packages were assigned to certain subsets of Other including Other_education, Other_disaster management, Other_international cooperation, etc.
These subsets do not represent all the work UNOPS did in these categories – only the work which falls outside the five ISPs. E.g. *schools built* still comes under Infrastructure, not Other_education. These subsets are not designed to show how much work UNOPS has done in each of these areas – but rather to clarify what type of work we are doing outside of the ISPs.