

2025 IRRF Supplementary: Scorecard Explanation

2025 Annual Report of the Administrator · Executive Board submission

Overview of results achievement

This supplementary scorecard provides a more detailed explanation of 2022-2025 results for Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators of the UNDP Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF), with a focus on underperforming areas. It accompanies the 2025 Annual Report of the Administrator as background documentation for the Executive Board.

Status key:	GREEN ≥ 90%	AMBER 60–89%	RED < 60%
Achievement rate is capped at 150%. GREEN = average achievement ≥ 90%; AMBER = 60–89%; RED < 60%.			

Tier 2: Programme outcomes

Of the 56 Tier 2 indicators reported for 2025, 48 achieved GREEN status, representing 86 per cent of the Tier 2 portfolio, with an average achievement rate of 117 per cent across all indicators.

In Signature Solution 1 (Poverty and Inequality), four of ten indicators recorded AMBER results, largely attributable to the fading of post-COVID momentum in social protection systems rather than a reversal of underlying progress. Strong performance was recorded across Signature Solutions 4 (Environment), 5 (Energy) and the Enablers cluster, where all indicators reached or exceeded their targets. Signature Solution 2 (Governance) also performed strongly, with 11 of 12 indicators achieving GREEN. Seven indicators achieved AMBER status and one achieved RED, distributed across areas where external conditions presented particular challenges during the reporting period. In Signature Solution 3 (Resilience), the structural barriers to peace architecture in fragile and conflict-affected settings account for the only RED result at the Tier 2 level. Both dynamics are examined further in the analysis below.

Tier 3: Organisational performance

Of the 52 Tier 3 indicators, 35 achieved GREEN status (67 per cent), with an average achievement rate of 94 per cent. People (6 of 7 GREEN), United Nations Coordination and Coherence (all 3 GREEN), and Risk Management (4 of 5 GREEN) reflect areas of sustained organisational strength. The overall picture is of an organisation performing solidly on its core functions while managing a recognised transition. As UNDP's programme results have advanced, the internal systems and resourcing models needed to sustain them at scale are still catching up - a sequencing dynamic common to organisations at this stage of strategic plan implementation.

Areas requiring attention include institutional knowledge management, evaluation output, portfolio approach adoption and surge deployment capacity - all of which are the subject of active remediation and are examined further in the challenge analysis below. The remaining three RED results, in flexible funding, impact measurement and knowledge dissemination, reflect known investment gaps in knowledge infrastructure and web reach, both of which are identified as priorities for the next Strategic Plan period.

Analysis of key challenges

Of the 56 Tier 2 and 52 Tier 3 indicators reported in the IRRF, 12 achieved below 75 per cent of their 2025 targets. These are presented below, organised around the underlying institutional and contextual constraints that explain the shortfalls.

Five challenge areas are identified. Two relate primarily to constraints within partner country systems, where UNDP's influence is real but bounded. One reflects a specific normative and operational gap in fragile and conflict-affected settings. Two are organisational in nature, where management acknowledges direct accountability and where concrete responses are expected in the context of the 2026–2029 Strategic Plan.

Summary of key challenges

#	Challenge	Indicators (achievement rate)
1	Social protection systems and institutionalisation Tier 2 · 2 indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1.2.1 65% Social Protection Schemes ● 1.2.2 65% Social Protection Services
2	Data ecosystems and statistical capacity for SDG monitoring Tier 2 · 1 indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1.1.3 72% Data collection for SDGs
3	Peace and security architecture in fragile and conflict-affected settings Tier 2 · 2 indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 3.2.3 43% Youth, peace and security framework ● 3.1.2 74% Early warning and preparedness
4	Evaluation output and knowledge management Tier 3 · 3 indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 7.1.1 45% Impact evaluations output ● 3.1.2 49% Publication downloads ● 1.3.3 52% Accelerator Lab learning challenges
5	Operating model and resource mobilisation Tier 3 · 4 indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5.1.3 46% Flexible funding resources ● 1.4.1 65% Project partnerships ● 6.3.2 60% GPN/Express One Roster deployment ● 6.2.1 67% Country offices adopting portfolio approach

Social protection systems and institutionalisation

Two indicators below 75%: IRRF 1.2.1 (65%) · IRRF 1.2.2 (65%)

What the results show

Both indicators in this cluster measure the degree to which countries have moved from expanding access to social protection - a process UNDP supported intensively during the COVID-19 period - to institutionalising the systems, benefit structures and capacities needed to sustain that access. At 65 per cent achievement against target for both, the results indicate that while coverage and reach have grown in many programme countries, the deeper institutionalisation required to meet the benchmark has stalled in a significant number of cases.

The pattern is consistent across the sub-components: countries have expanded the types of services available, increased participant numbers and extended benefit duration, but have not yet reached the “fully in place” threshold that the indicator requires. This reflects a meaningful difference between scaling a programme and embedding a system.

What drove the shortfall

The targets for these indicators were set in 2021 against a backdrop of rapid global expansion in social protection, driven by emergency response to COVID-19. The momentum of that period - characterised by government receptivity, emergency financing and strong donor support for cash transfer mechanisms and

digital registries - did not translate into the sustained, reform-level engagement needed to institutionalise systems within the subsequent four-year cycle.

Several compounding factors are relevant. Fiscal consolidation in the post-COVID period reduced government discretionary space precisely when sustained investment in social protection architecture was most needed. Electoral cycles in multiple programme countries introduced shifts in priorities that interrupted reform trajectories. In a number of contexts, the transition from emergency to structural social protection also exposed deeper gaps in legal frameworks, administrative capacity and sectoral coordination that require longer-term engagement than the current Strategic Plan period allowed. In addition, uneven administrative capacity and delivery systems - particularly at subnational level - have limited the translation of national policy commitments into consistent service provision.

What is being done

The 2026–2029 Strategic Plan repositions UNDP's social protection offer around system-strengthening rather than programme delivery, with a sharper focus on the legal, institutional and fiscal conditions that determine sustainability. Country offices will continue their support to strengthen people's access to social protection services, particularly for vulnerable groups such as youth, informal sector workers, persons with disabilities, displaced populations and ethnic minorities. Ensuring equitable access will remain a core focus.

UNDP is also working with partner governments and IFIs to align social protection investment more explicitly with fiscal planning cycles, recognising that sustainable systems require multi-year budget commitments that emergency-era financing models did not demand.

Data ecosystems and statistical capacity and SDG monitoring

One indicator below 75%: IRRF 1.1.3 (72%)

What these indicators measure

IRRF 1.1.3 measures the number of countries that have established data collection and analysis mechanisms capable of providing disaggregated data to monitor progress towards the SDGs. The indicator has three sub-components: conventional data collection systems, administrative reporting mechanisms, and innovative data sources such as geospatial data, administrative big data, and citizen-generated data. Only countries rated "4 – fully in place" are counted as meeting the benchmark for each modality. The indicator thus captures not merely the existence of data collection capacity, but whether that capacity has been institutionalised to a level sufficient to support sustained, SDG-aligned monitoring across all sub-components.

What the results show

At 72 per cent achievement, the result reflects genuine progress across several sub-components, including conventional data collection and administrative reporting, where UNDP came close to target. The most significant shortfall is in innovative data sources, where results fell short of what was anticipated when the target was set.

The aggregate picture masks considerable variation: a number of programme countries have built strong, well-resourced statistical systems with UNDP support, while others have experienced deterioration in data infrastructure during the period, reflecting the sensitivity of national statistical capacity to both fiscal conditions and the sustained commitment of governments.

What drove the shortfall

Three structural constraints are primarily responsible. First, national statistical systems in a number of programme countries face chronic underfunding that predates the current Strategic Plan period and has worsened as development assistance budgets have been reduced. In several cases, funding cuts during the 2023–2025 period directly affected the operational capacity of national statistics offices that UNDP was supporting. Second, progress on data interoperability - a prerequisite for producing the disaggregated, SDG-aligned indicators the benchmark requires - has been slower than anticipated, partly because it requires

coordination across government agencies with different mandates, incentives and technical systems. Third, the institutionalisation of innovative data approaches, including use of geospatial data, administrative big data and citizen-generated data, has proven more complex than early pilots suggested, requiring sustained investment in legal frameworks, technical standards and institutional change management that cannot be delivered within short project cycles.

What is being done

UNDP is recalibrating its data and statistics offer for the new Strategic Plan period, with stronger emphasis on systems integration and data governance rather than stand-alone data collection projects. This indicator has been retained and carried forward into the 2026-2029 Strategic Plan period, with 32 countries already integrating it into their country programme documents in 2026.

Peace and security architecture in fragile and conflict-affected settings

Two indicators below 75%: IRRF 3.2.3 (43%) · IRRF 3.1.2 (74%)

What these indicators measure

IRRF 3.2.3 (Youth, Peace and Security framework) is a common indicator shared between UNDP, UNFPA, and UN Women. It tracks how many countries have formally adopted a national Youth, Peace and Security (YPS) framework – a government-endorsed policy instrument that explicitly addresses the role of young people in preventing and resolving conflict. Only countries rated “4 – the framework has been formally launched or recognised by a national-level governmental entity” meet the benchmark. IRRF 3.1.2 (Early Warning and Preparedness) tracks how many countries have fully established multi-hazard early-warning and preparedness measures to manage the impacts of conflicts, disasters, pandemics, and other shocks. Only those rated “4 – fully in place” meet the benchmark, meaning all relevant components – detection, communication, response coordination, and community readiness – must be operational across hazard types. Both are cumulative indicators, measuring the total number of countries that have achieved the benchmark since the Strategic Plan baseline was set in 2021.

What the results show

This cluster brings together two indicators that, while distinct in focus, reflect a common underlying condition: in the most fragile and conflict-affected settings where UNDP operates, both normative frameworks for inclusive peace and operational preparedness systems remain underdeveloped relative to targets. For IRRF 3.2.3, the 2025 target was 25 countries; the result was 12, giving an achievement rate of 43 per cent. This represents meaningful progress from a baseline of two countries, but is significantly below target, concentrated in settings where formal government endorsement requires sustained upstream political engagement that UNDP can support but cannot substitute for. For IRRF 3.1.2, 20 countries achieved the fully-in-place rating against a target of 26, yielding an achievement rate of 74 per cent. While this sits just below the 75 per cent threshold, the gap is substantive: many countries have functional systems for specific hazard types but have not achieved the multi-hazard, multi-agency integration that the benchmark requires.

What drove the shortfall

Progress on the YPS framework implementation has been constrained by the pace at which governments in fragile settings have been able to translate the normative framework of the YPS agenda into operational policy and institutional structures. This is not primarily a function of UNDP’s programme delivery; it reflects the political and institutional preconditions required before advisory and technical support can be meaningfully applied. In several priority countries, active conflict, governance transitions and political resistance to inclusive youth participation have together prevented the indicator’s threshold conditions from being met.

For early warning and preparedness, the shortfall reflects both operational and resource constraints. Some have strong systems for weather-related hazards or public health emergencies, but coordination gaps, uneven coverage, and incomplete multi-hazard readiness, and in some cases, delays caused by the technical

complexity of full operationalisation, prevent them from reaching the highest rating. In several contexts, national crisis management- mechanisms exist but remain pending formal approval.

What is being done

The 2026–2029 Strategic Plan includes a strengthened focus on conflict prevention and the upstream peace continuum. UNDP is continuing to champion the shift from advocacy to a formalised, multisectoral coordination frameworks. Youth-led and youth-inclusive YPS coalitions continue to emerge in a number of countries. These coalitions play a central role in policy advocacy, coordination, and meaningful youth participation, providing a strong foundation for developing comprehensive and participatory YPS frameworks globally. YPS implementation approach that better sequences normative advocacy with technical assistance, recognising that the indicator’s benchmark conditions require prior political progress that UNDP can support but cannot substitute for.

On early warning, UNDP is deepening its collaboration with partners and regional mechanisms to align early warning investment with existing inter-agency platforms, reducing duplication and improving sustainability. The organisation is also piloting a set of process-level milestones for fragile contexts that will provide a more differentiated picture of progress in settings where reaching full achievement within a four-year cycle is structurally unlikely.

Evaluation output and knowledge management

Four indicators below 75%: IRRF 7.1.1 (45%)· IRRF 3.1.2 (49%)· IRRF 1.3.3 (52%)

What these indicators measure

IRRF 7.1.1 tracks the percentage of higher-level evaluations – impact, thematic, programme, outcome, and portfolio evaluations – as a proportion of all decentralised evaluations conducted by regional offices, country offices, and hosted agencies. It is intended as a measure of whether UNDP’s evaluation portfolio prioritises strategic, systems-level learning over mandatory project compliance. IRRF 3.1.2 (Tier 3) measures unique visitors to UNDP’s principal digital knowledge platforms – the Data Futures Platform, Crisis Risk Dashboards, Human Development Data Centre, country and regional websites, and SparkBlue – together with downloads of the Development Futures Series, serving as a proxy for the external reach of UNDP’s knowledge products. IRRF 1.3.3 (Tier 3) tracks the number of Accelerator Lab learning challenges addressed in formal partnership with external actors across five categories: UN entities, the private sector, civil society organisations, local governments, and academia.

What the results show

Indicator 7.1.1 achieved 45 per cent of its 2025 target. The result is largely structural: under the current methodology, the indicator captures only decentralised evaluations conducted by regional offices, country offices, and hosted agencies, and the overwhelming majority of completed decentralised evaluations are mandatory, project-level assessments required at programme close. This structural constraint limits the proportion of higher-level strategic evaluations that can be counted, irrespective of the quality of the evaluation portfolio as a whole.

Indicator 3.1.2 also did not fully meet its 2025 target. Some platforms performed close to expectations, while others experienced gaps. Notably, certain digital platforms saw strong engagement, but others had much lower traffic, partly due to changes in calculation methods and reduced organisational activity. Additionally, downloads of key publications were well below target, influenced by less promotional activity, diminished search engine visibility, and the increased use of AI tools for information retrieval, which has lessened reliance on traditional search channels.

Indicator 1.3.3 fell short of its 2025 target. The Accelerator Labs worked on learning challenges in partnership with UN entities, private sector partners, civil society organisations, local governments, and academia. Although there was a notable gap between the achievements and the set targets, the learning model continued

to generate meaningful outcomes. The shortfall was mainly due to the phase-out context experienced in 2025, rather than any decrease in programme quality.

Taken together, these results point to a gap between UNDP's generation of knowledge and its ability to formalise, disseminate and have that knowledge recognised within the broader development and academic ecosystem. This is distinct from a question of programme quality: in many cases, the underlying work is of high standard. The gap is in the infrastructure for converting that work into citable, shareable, institutionally legible evidence.

What drove the shortfall

Three constraints are primarily responsible. The volume and timeliness of decentralised and thematic evaluations was affected by resource pressures at both headquarter and country office level, limiting the pipeline of completed, quality-assured outputs available for dissemination. In 2025, the Accelerator Labs entered a phaseout period, with efforts focused on closing ongoing work, supporting programmatic country office activities, and managing staff transitions. The Accelerator Lab network's learning challenge methodology, while analytically strong, depends on external partner validation and joint documentation processes. Despite this, engagement continued. The mix of partner types was consistent with previous years, and Labs continued to work with nontraditional partners, reflecting the embedded nature of innovation practices within UNDP. During 2024-2025, there was also a deliberate shift toward deeper, higher quality engagements, and some activities were likely underreported as teams prioritised transition and final delivery.

Third, UNDP's broader digital presence reflects a structural challenge: the organisation's knowledge products compete in an environment that rewards formal academic publishing conventions and sustained digital investment, neither of which has been adequately resourced.

What is being done

The 2026–2029 Strategic Plan incorporates a strengthened approach to evaluation resourcing, including revised minimum standards for country programme evaluation coverage. An updated Knowledge and Innovation Strategy, currently in development, will address the translation gap between UNDP's operational learning and its external knowledge footprint.

A new Digital, Artificial Intelligence and Innovation Hub under the 2026-2029 Strategic Plan will build on the work of the Accelerator Labs. The new hub will drive integrated analytics, multi-stakeholder collaboration and the application of innovation in support of sustainable human development.

Operating model and resource mobilisation

Four indicators below 75%: IRRF 5.1.3 (46%) · IRRF 1.4.1 (65%) · IRRF 6.3.2 (60%) · IRRF 6.2.1 (67%)

What these indicators measure

IRRF 5.1.3 measures the proportion of UNDP's total programme expenditure financed through flexible and pooled funding, with three sub-components: regular (core) resources, UN pooled funding, and UNDP Funding Windows. IRRF 1.4.1 tracks the percentage of UNDP projects implemented in partnership with a defined set of actor types – UN entities, international financial institutions, the private sector, civil society organisations, and multi-stakeholder coalitions. IRRF 6.3.2 tracks deployments through the GPN/Express One surge roster across five modalities (UNDP staff, consultants, SURGE personnel, UN Volunteers, and Standby Partner experts), together with the total annual value of deployments funded through the Crisis Bureau. IRRF 6.2.1 measures the number of country offices and headquarters units that have formally adopted portfolio approaches to programme design, management, and financing.

What the results show

The four indicators in this cluster are organisational, drawn from Tier 3 of the IRRF. Taken together, their 2025 results reveal an organisation whose operating model is under structural stress. IRRF 5.1.3, at 46 per cent the most acute result in this cluster, recorded a regular resources ratio of 9 per cent against a target of 15 per cent;

UN pooled funding at 5 per cent against 12 per cent; and funding windows at 3 per cent against 8 per cent. All three sub-components declined from their 2021 baseline values, meaning the flexibility gap widened across the Strategic Plan period.

For IRRF 1.4.1, the proportion of projects implemented in partnership with UN entities, international financial institutions (IFIs), the private sector, civil society organisations, and multi-stakeholder coalitions all fell short of their respective targets. In the case of IRRF 6.3.2, SURGE deployments were below target, with no UN, though consultant deployments met target and the annual deployment value was achieved. Regarding IRRF 6.2.1, the adoption of portfolio approaches by country offices remained below the planned target.

What drove the shortfall

The core, flexible and pooled funding shortfall reflects a structural trend in the broader development finance landscape that predates this Strategic Plan period and has accelerated during it. Voluntary core contributions have declined in real terms across the sector as major donors have restructured their aid allocations, increased bilateral earmarking and, in some cases, reduced overall Official Development Assistance commitments.

The partnership diversification indicator reflects a parallel constraint: UNDP's programming model has historically been built around a relatively concentrated set of bilateral and multilateral government donors, and the effort to broaden toward foundations, the private sector and South-South partners requires relationship development, legal framework adjustments and internal incentive structures that take time to change. The Roster deployment shortfall indicates that while UNDP's surge capacity has been invested in, its deployment pathways have not been sufficiently integrated into country office planning cycles to generate the utilisation rates the target anticipated. The portfolio approach adoption gap reflects the genuine difficulty of transitioning programming that is still heavily reliant on earmarked funding for projects, and donor relationships to a fundamentally different operating logic within a single Strategic Plan period.

What is being done

The 2026–2029 Strategic Plan and its associated Integrated Resources Plan include a comprehensive response to the funding and operating model challenges identified here. This includes a targeted core funding mobilisation strategy aimed at reversing the trend in flexible resource ratios over the plan period, a revised partnership architecture that sets explicit targets for non-traditional and South-South funding, and a restructured deployment model for the Global Surge mechanism that better integrates with country office planning processes.

The transition to portfolio-based programming is being supported through dedicated guidance, a revised accountability framework and a phased rollout plan that allows country offices to build portfolio approaches into new programme cycles rather than retrofitting them onto existing ones.