## Annex I – 2014 Development Report Card

1. Annex I responds to Executive Board decision 2014/10, below, by providing a report card that summarizes UNDP’s progress and performance in 2014, including a description of the methodology used to generate it.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2014/10 | 2. *Takes note with appreciation* of the efforts of UNDP to enhance its progress and performance reporting by **developing a** **“report card”** and *encourages* the management to **further enhance it** in the area of performance assessment |

1. **Methodology used for assessing development results.** Assessment of development performance in 2014, in the report card, was conducted at output level. As a first step, performance under every indicator for each output was recorded, on the basis of 2014 milestones and actual results for 2014 (see Annex II for output-level data collection methodologies). The second step consisted of comparing the actual 2014 result for each indicator with its 2014 milestone, by calculating the percentage of the 2014 milestone that was actually achieved. Finally, a non-weighted average of resulting percentages was taken across all indicators under an output, to calculate the average percent achievement for that output. The result of this calculation was translated into a “traffic light” coding for presentation in the report card, with colors having the respective meanings below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the average percent achievement across the output is equal to or above the milestone (i.e., at or above 100%) |
| **Amber** | If the average percent achievement across the output is between 50% and 99% of the milestone |
| **Red** | If the average percent achievement across the output is less than 50% of the milestone |
| **Grey** | If there is currently insufficient data to assess average percent achievement for all indicators under the output |

1. The percentage of the 2014 milestone that was actually achieved was calculated, for output indicators presenting cumulative results over the strategic plan cycle, by comparing actual progress since the baseline with expected progress since the baseline. For output indicators showing non-cumulative results (3.3.1, 3.3.2, 7.7.1, 7.7.2) and/or output indicators for which there was no expected change between baseline and milestone (such that there was no meaningful denominator[[1]](#footnote-1) - as in the fourth component of indicators 1.4.1 and 6.1.2, and indicator 7.1.1), the percent achievement was calculated by comparing overall results achieved with overall results expected, i.e. without subtracting the baseline. Formulas utilized are presented below:

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

1. All relevant indicators and sub-indicators for which a milestone was set in the IRRF were used to calculate the average percent achievement across an output, except for indicators 2.6.1, 5.1.2.b, 5.3.1 and 7.5.3, for which insufficient data existed to assess indicator-level performance (for instance, due to 2014 actual data being missing for too many countries to determine whether the indicator milestone was met). For indicators 5.1.2.b and 7.5.3, a provisional traffic light was calculated based on the remaining indicators under the output for which sufficient data was available. In the case of indicators 2.6.1 and 5.3.1, the missing data prevented determination of a traffic light for these two outputs, since they were the only indicators for output 2.6 and 5.3 respectively. Final results and traffic lights for these outputs will be confirmed in the next reporting cycle.

**Development Performance Report Card**

| **Development Outcomes & Outputs** | | **2014 Expenditure to Budget Ratio** | | **Indicator Performance Against**  **2014 Milestones** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **Sustainable growth and development** | |  | | |
| 1.1 | Structural transformation of productive capacities | 90% | | 111% |  |
| 1.2 | Social protection | 80% | | 60% |  |
| 1.3 | Sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste | 87% | | 75% |  |
| 1.4 | Climate change adaptation and mitigation | 84% | | 102% |  |
| 1.5 | Energy efficiency / universal modern energy access | 86% | | 110% |  |
| **2** | **Citizen voice, rule of law, accountability and democratic governance** | | | |  |
| 2.1 | Parliaments, constitution-making bodies and electoral institutions | 88% | | 117% |  |
| 2.2 | Anti-corruption awareness, prevention and enforcement measures | 85% | | 80% |  |
| 2.3 | Capacities of human rights institutions | 81% | | 105% |  |
| 2.4 | Civil society engagement in national development | 86% | | 72% |  |
| 2.5 | Natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems | 83% | | 119% |  |
| 2.6 | Discrimination and emerging issues | 90% | | TBC |  |
| **3** | **Strengthened institutions for universal access to basic services** | | | |  |
| 3.1 | National ownership of recovery and development processes | 91% | | 176% |  |
| 3.2 | Sub-national capacity to deliver improved basic services | 80% | | 91% |  |
| 3.3 | HIV and related services | 105% | | 100% |  |
| 3.4 | Rule of law / access to justice | 84% | | 213% |  |
| 3.5 | Citizen security | 78% | | 139% |  |
| **4** | **Gender equality and women’s empowerment** | | | |  |
| 4.1 | Women’s economic empowerment | 83% | | 125% |  |
| 4.2 | Sexual and gender-based violence | 76% | | 183% |  |
| 4.3 | Gender evidence | 76% | | 100% |  |
| 4.4 | Women’s participation in decision-making | 82% | | 86% |  |
| **5** | **Risk reduction - conflict and natural disaster, including climate change** | |  | | |
| 5.1 | Mechanisms to assess natural and man-made risks | 91% | | 124% |  |
| 5.2 | Disaster and climate risk management | 83% | | 94% |  |
| 5.3 | Gender-responsive disaster and climate risk management | 64% | | TBC |  |
| 5.4 | Natural hazard preparedness | 79% | | 104% |  |
| 5.5 | Peaceful management of conflicts and tensions | 70% | | 149% |  |
| 5.6 | Consensus-building around contested priorities | 81% | | 91% |  |
| **6** | **Early recovery in post-conflict and post-disaster settings** | |  | | |
| 6.1 | Early economic revitalization | 82% | | 129% |  |
| 6.2 | Capacities for early recovery efforts | 71% | | 83% |  |
| 6.3 | Innovative partnerships in early recovery | 91% | | 57% |  |
| 6.4 | Social cohesion and trust | 82% | | 133% |  |
| **7** | **Thought leadership** | | | |  |
| 7.1 | Global consensus on MDGs and post-2015 agenda | 71% | | 180% |  |
| 7.2 | Monitor progress on MDGs and post-2015 agenda | 76% | | 100% |  |
| 7.3 | National development plans on poverty and inequality | 86% | | 145% |  |
| 7.4 | ODA and other global development financing | 76% | | 86% |  |
| 7.5 | South-south and triangular cooperation | 81% | | 89% |  |
| 7.6 | Innovations for development solutions | 83% | | 135% |  |
| 7.7 | Knowledge about development solutions | 82% | | 101% |  |
| 7.8 | MDGs and other internationally-agreed development goals | 85% | | 68% |  |

## Annex II – Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF): Methodology and 2014 results

1. Annex II responds to Executive Board decisions below, regarding the integrated results and resources framework 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 on performance and results for 2014*. The full populated IRRF template is presented with 2013 baselines, 2014 milestones, 2014 achieved results, and 2017 targets.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Decision #** | **Relevant paragraphs** |
| 2013/27 | 3. ***Approves***the UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017, as contained in **document DP/2013/40**; |
| 12. *Requests* UNDP 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 as contained 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 the informal ‘theory of change’ documents for the seven development outcomes by the annual session 2014; |
| 2014/11 | 3. *Recognizes* that the integrated results and resources framework should effectively demonstrate the linkages between results and resources, and in this regard ***encourages* reporting of** **resources allocated to different outcomes in the integrated results and resources framework, as well as reporting on resources utilized against respective outputs upon completion of the reporting cycle**, in accordance with the priorities and areas of work of the strategic plan. |
| 4. *Requests* UNDP 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 requests* UNDP 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 2015** to support preparation of the annual report of the Administrator in 2015; |
| 10. *Requests* UNDP to ensure that any relevant **indicators and targets of the integrated results and resources framework are made consistent with the sustainable development goals in the context of the post-2015 development agenda, when appropriate**; |
| 11. *Calls on* UNDP to **apply the integrated results and resources framework as soon as possible** and to keep the Executive Board informed on progress and challenges encountered in this process. |

**Population of the IRRF with baselines, milestones (where applicable), targets and 2014 “actual” results**

1. ***Data collection for impact indicators*.** All impact indicators rely on international published data sources, as stated in the populated IRRF template. For these indicators, a baseline was provided but no targets were set given that UNDP cannot establish them outside the scope of intergovernmental processes. Indicators can be reviewed once Sustainable Development Goals and respective indicators are agreed, with respective targets adopted.
2. ***Data collection for outcome indicators derived from international data sources***. Similarly, most outcome indicators except for indicators 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 has collected and updated baselines, and included 2017 targets as “direction of travel” on the basis of trend analysis, in both cases utilizing the most current data available as of February 2015. Baselines for several indicators were updated, as stated in respective indicator notes. Progress data for 2014 has been added where possible, but for the majority of these indicators it is not yet available due to time lags in data collection and reporting at international level. Where data lags prevent reporting on 2014 progress against outcome indicators this year, it will be included in results reporting in future years.
3. ***Data collection for UNDP-reported outcome indicators and for 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 reported by UNDP country offices through UNDP’s new online corporate planning and monitoring system. A reporting exercise was undertaken between mid-December 2014 and February 2015, through which country offices were requested to report results achieved in 2014 for all relevant IRRF indicators to which their respective programmes were linked. Data provided by country offices was quality assured at regional and headquarters level. Incomplete or inconsistent data was verified directly with country offices where possible. The following assumptions were then applied to country-level data, to enable calculation of a consistent aggregated time series of results expected over the Strategic Plan period, and ensuring conservative and therefore robust reporting on results:

* *Missing milestones or targets*: For countries reporting some expected results for an indicator, but with expected values missing for one or more years, the previous value in the time series was rolled forward (e.g. if a country did not provide a 2015 milestone, the 2014 milestone value was also used for 2015); or if no earlier value was available, the next value in the time series was rolled backwards (e.g. if a country did not provide a 2014 milestone, the 2015 milestone value was used for 2014). This approach was designed to provide a comparable time series in expected results across years, whilst making conservative assumptions that do not overestimate the scale of changes over the Strategic Plan period.
* *Missing baselines*: If no baseline was reported, it was assumed to be equal to the 2014 milestone. If no 2014 milestone was provided, but a 2014 actual was reported, the baseline was assumed to be equal to the 2014 actual (i.e. a conservative assumption of no new results delivered) *unless* there was an indication that these were new results (e.g. later milestones were provided indicating further increases, or a comment was provided).
* *Missing 2014 actuals*: No assumptions were made about 2014 actual results achieved where none were reported. The only adjustment made to 2014 actual results was to correct totals when they were missing or lower than reported 2014 actual results for component indicators, e.g. male and female values (as noted below). The actual results presented in the report represent only confirmed results from country programmes, and are incomplete in some cases. Indicators with incomplete reporting on 2014 actual results are flagged in the populated IRRF; full results for 2014 will be confirmed as part of future results reporting.
* *Adjustments to ensure a meaningful cumulative time series*: If the reported baseline was higher than the first milestone or target in the time series, it was assumed the baseline was not included in the remaining time series, and the baseline was adjusted to zero. If any milestone or target was lower than a previous milestone, it was assumed that milestones showed annual increments, so milestones were summed to produce cumulative milestones. In such cases, if the target was equal to the sum of annual milestones, it was assumed to represent a cumulative target already and was not adjusted; otherwise the annual milestones and target values were summed to produce a cumulative target. If a reported 2014 actual result was lower than the baseline, but milestones and target were not lower than the baseline, it was assumed the baseline was included in the milestones and target but not the 2014 actual; in such cases, the baseline was adjusted to zero and the reported baseline value was subtracted from milestone and target values.
* *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 for which sex disaggregation is not currently available. Similarly for results with other disaggregation, if a valid total was not provided, it was assumed to be at least as high as the sum of reported components.
* *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. Then 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, i.e., the extra results beyond what existed in the baseline year, before summing country values to calculate overall UNDP additional results. For some indicators, countries were missing 2014 actual data, as reporting cycles are not yet reconciled. These countries were excluded from the calculation of 2014 overall UNDP actual results, but not from the calculation of milestones. Missing data was flagged in respective indicator notes, and will be included in future reporting.

1. ***Updated baselines, milestones, and targets*.** For some indicators, baselines, milestones and/or targets have been updated since the January 2015 Technical Note, based on availability of more complete or correct country information, better understanding by country offices of indicator definitions and sources, and/or updated programme plans and priorities. For these indicators, the updated figures are used in this Annual Report, but previously published baselines, milestones or targets from the January 2015 Technical Note are shown for reference in the IRRF template under the respective indicator note.
2. ***Number of countries reporting on result*.** The populated IRRF shows the number of countries linked to each output, and in addition a more specific count of the number of countries expected to contribute to results under each output indicator during the SP cycle 2014-2017. Note that “country” refers to both countries and territories which 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: i) data on UNDP performance collected on an on-going basis through systems such as Atlas (indicators 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 46, 47, 48); ii) 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, 22, 23, 41, 43, 44, 45); and iii) data from periodic surveys capturing perceptions on UNDP performance (indicators 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 28, 34, 36, 37, 42). A small number of indicators cannot be reported in 2015 because: i) systems or methodologies are still being developed (indicators 13, 43, 44, 46, 48); or ii) the relevant survey has not yet taken place (indicators 7, 28, 37).
4. ***Updated OEE milestones*.** A few indicators (e.g. 4 and 22) had milestones updated compared to the IRRF included in the Technical Note presented to the EB during an informal session in January 2015. Notes included under relevant indicators explain the rationale behind changes in data and methodology.
5. ***Use of IRRF data in the narrative sections of the Annual Report*.** Results presented in the 2014 Annual Report are based primarily on country office reporting of actual 2014 results achieved against the streamlined set of IRRF indicators, straightforwardly reporting on the performance under the relevant indicator, except for the figures related to total jobs and livelihoods, which show aggregate performance under 3 related indicators (see paragraph 16 below for description of methodology). IRRF-derived results are complemented by reporting done by country, regional and global programming units through 2014 Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs), an internal report drawing on project monitoring, national statistics, independent and decentralized evaluations, partner assessments and other qualitative and quantitative evidence.
6. ***Calculation of total people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods and total jobs created*:** Box 1 of the Annual Report includes figures on the total number of new jobs created, and the total number of people benefitting from improved livelihoods, through direct UNDP support in 2014. Unlike other IRRF figures cited in the report, these figures are calculated drawing on *more than one IRRF indicator.* The methodology for the calculation is as follows:

* 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 of these indicators, the calculation takes into account the reported number of jobs created for males, jobs created for females, and jobs created where sex disaggregation is not available (as shown in the reporting notes below each indicator in the populated IRRF). Whilst country offices usually report results of specific projects under only relevant one output indicator, the definition of indicator 1.1.1 is broad and does allow potential for overlap with results reported under the specific categories 1.3.2 and 6.1.1. Therefore a conservative approach has been taken to include, for each programme country, *either* results reported under 1.1.1 *or if higher,* the sum of results reported under 1.3.2 and 6.1.1 (as there would not usually be overlap between the results delivered through NRM projects and emergency projects). The resulting total figure is likely to be an underestimate of the total number of jobs created by UNDP across all three areas.
* Similarly the figure on total 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 of these indicators, the calculation takes into account the reported number of males benefitting, females benefitting, and people benefitting for whom sex disaggregation is not available (as shown in the reporting notes below each indicator in the populated IRRF). For each programme country, *either* results reported under 1.1.1 *or if higher,* the sum of results reported under 1.3.2 and 6.1.1, are included. The resulting total figure is again likely to be an underestimate of the total number of people benefitting 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** |
| **1** | Number and proportion of **people living below**  a) **1.25 US Dollars** a day (PPP)  b) **2.50 US Dollars** a day (PPP) | a) 1 billion, 17.6% of total population (2013\*)  b) 2.7 billion, 47% of total population (2013\*) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on The World Bank (World Development Indicators and Poverty and Inequality Database) and the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs - UNDESA (2012 Revision of the World Population Prospects). Measures the number of people below poverty line as a percentage of population in countries with data. (a) Based on 104 programme countries, using latest data on poverty rate and 2013 population. (b) Based on 104 programme countries, using latest data on poverty rate and 2013 population.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2012) were a) 1.2 billion and b) 2.9 billion. Significant changes driven by new measurements in large Asian countries. | |
| **2** | **Poverty gap** (%)  a) at **1.25 US Dollars** a day (PPP)  b) at **2.50 US Dollars** a day (PPP)  c) at **National Poverty Lines** | a) 7.9% (2013\*)  b) 20.2% (2013\*)  c) 13.2% (2013\*) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on The World Bank (World Development Indicators and Poverty and Inequality Database). Simple average, based on: (a) 104 programme countries, (b) 104 programme countries, and (c) 78 programme countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2012) a) 8.1%, b) 20.2%, c) 12.5%. | |
| **3** | **Multi-dimensional poverty index** (MPI), adjusted to reflect national data, standards and definitions | 0.175 (2013\*) |
| **Source**: UNDP Human Development Report 2014. Simple average, based on 88 programme countries, using latest data up to 2013 (only Bangladesh with MPI data for that year). The baseline is consistent with a poverty rate of 30% of population.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2011) was 0.168. New values reflect a change in methodology and country data availability. | |
| **4** | **Human Development Index** (HDI)  **Inequality**-adjusted HDI (IHDI) | 0.63 (2013)  0.47 (2013) |
| **Source**: UNDP Human Development Report 2014. Simple average based on 144 UNDP programme countries for HDI and 111 UNDP programme countries for IHDI. The global index (computed by UNDP HDR Office for all countries, including programme and other countries) is 0.702 for the HDI and 0.541 for IHDI.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2012) HDI 0.62, IHDI 0.47. | |

## 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** | **2014 Actual** | **2017 target** |
| **1.1** | **Employment rate,** disaggregated by **sex**  a.1) Female employment rate (employment as a share of labor force)  a.2) Male employment rate (employment as a share of labor 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) 89.3% (2013)  a.2) 92.1% (2013)  b.1) 48.0% (2013)  b.2) 70.6% (2013) | Not yet available | Direction of travel: **Increase** by 0.5% (2012-2017) |
| **Source:** UNDP estimate based on data from the International Labour Organization. Baseline is the simple average from 132 programme countries that have data available. There is no numeric internationally-agreed target for employment rate. For monitoring purposes, UNDP uses the direction of travel (increase), utilizing country projections by the IMF (World Economic Outlook October 2013) to generate an overall programme countries’ employment rate estimate of a 0.5 point (total) increase between 2012 and 2017. Estimate is based on the simple average of 70 programme countries with data available.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2012) were: a.1) 89.5%, a.2) 91.9%, b.1) 47.9%, b.2) 70.2% | | | |
| **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 labor 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. 42.5%[[2]](#footnote-2) (2012) 2. 21.7% (2012) 3. 95.5% (2013) 4. 28.7% (2013) 6. 15 (2013) 7. 83 (2013) 8. 40 (2013 9. 2 (2013) | Not yet available | Direction of travel: **Increase** |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from International Labor Organization from 134 (a), 128 (b), 146 (c) and 107 (d), and 140 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).  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated with latest data. Previous values were a) 44.2% (2012), b) 23.1% (2012), c) 98.4% (2013), d) 36.9% (2008), e.i) 15 (2013), e.ii) 89 (2013), e.iii) 40 (2013), e.iv) 2 (2013). | | | |
| **1.3** | Annual **emissions of carbon dioxide** (million tons CO2 equivalent) | 31,480 Million tons CO2 equivalent (2011) | Not yet available | To be determined (Paris 2015) |
| **Source**: UNDP estimate based on data from World Resource Institute for 145 UNDP programme countries. Targets are to be determined: Countries are currently preparing for a new international treaty which is expected to be signed at the *21st Conference of the Parties* in Paris in December 2015.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated with new data up to 2011. Previous value 28,879 Million tons CO2 equivalent (2010). | | | |
| **1.4** | Coverage of **cost-efficient and sustainable energy**, disaggregated by rural/urban  a)Percentage of population with **connection to electricity** (total)   * + - Urban     - Rural   b)Percentage of population with **access to non-solid fuels** (total)   * + - Urban     - Rural | a) **80.3% (2010\*)**   * 94.1% (2010\*) * 68.4% (2010\*)   b) **47.7% (2010\*)**   * 76.1% (2010\*) * 23.3% (2010\*) | 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), based on 149 UNDP programme countries, b) Weighted average using UNDESA population data, based on 137 UNDP programme countries. There is no numeric internationally agreed target. Direction of travel/trends estimated by UNDP using historical trends.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated with latest data for 2010. Previous values were a) overall 80.5%, urban 94.2%, rural 68.6%; b) overall 48.4%, urban 76.5%, rural 23.9% (all 2010). | | | |
| **1.5** | **Hectares of land** that are **managed sustainably** under an *in-situ* conservation regime,a sustainable use regime andan 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. **2.45** billion ha (2013) 2. **103** million ha (2013) 3. **0** ha (2013) | 1. **2.46** billion ha (2014) 2. Not yet available 3. Not yet available | 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 146 UNDP programme countries. 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 (2011) and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) (2013) for 119 UNDP programme countries. UNDP monitors this indicator on the basis of a direction of travel target (increase) as there is no internationally agreed spatial target for sustainable use. The relevant Aichi Target (#7) speaks only of sustainable management, without a numerical target.  **c) Source**:UNDP estimate based on Global Environment Facility (GEF)-UNDP portfolio. Baseline reflects the fact that work in ABS was in nascent stages in 2013, and therefore 2013 coverage could conservatively be estimated as 0 ha.Direction of travel only for monitoring (increase) since there is no internationally agreed spatial target for ABS. The relevant Aichi Target (#16) speaks only of the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol, without a numerical target.  **2014 Reporting Note:** a) Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous value (2010) a) 1.3 billion ha. The difference is explained by the fact that the database on protected areas was significantly updated. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | **Actual** |  |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2014** | **2017** |
| **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:* 117 (February 2015)** | **1.1.1** | Number of **new jobs and other livelihoods** generated, 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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 73, b) 70, c) 79, d) 76*** | 0  0  0  0 | 236,199  342,828  1,735,485  1,131,170 | 205,842  305,406  2,173,662  1,514,547 | 657,983  782,266  4,996,493  2,170,915 |
| **Indicator 1.1.1 Note**: Tracks the number of new jobs created and 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 were provided for the total number of people. An **additional 267,900 new jobs** were generated in 2014, and **478,618 additional people** benefitted from strengthened livelihoods in 2014, for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see **indicators 1.3.2** and **6.1.1**.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: (a) 697,108; (b) 1,524,891; (c) 588,121; (d) 203,330; previous targets were: (a) 2,413,098; (b) 4,765,749; (c) 4,125,033; (d) 1,311,905. The reduction in the milestones and targets for jobs created reflects adjustments by two country offices which had originally based targets on the total number of jobs expected to be created nationally over the period, rather than those directly supported by UNDP. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 99*** | 0 | 31 | 33 | 76 |
| **Indicator 1.1.2 Note**: Tracks the number of countries where UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) has led to improvements in policies, systems and institutional measures with the aim of generating and strengthening employment and livelihoods. The effectiveness of UNDP’s 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), counting the number of countries where improved policies, systems and/or institutional measures were put in place with UNDP support.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 26, previous target was 65. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 63*** | 0 | 471 | 595 | 1,642 |
| **Indicator 1.1.3 Note**: Tracks the number of new schemes (specified as new demonstration projects, new advocacy and knowledge-generation schemes, new skills-building schemes, and new implementation support schemes) implemented with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), that played a catalytic role in prompting a follow-up action and/or leading to transformational change, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 419, previous target was 1,579. | | | | |
| **Output 1.2.** Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection  ***Number of countries linked:* 55 (February 2015)** | **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 **women** 2. Increase access for **men** 3. Increase access in **rural** areas 4. Increase access in **urban** areas   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: a) 35, b) 36, c) 33, d) 33*** | 3  3  1  3 | 4  4  2  3 | 3  3  2  3 | 15  16  12  11 |
| **Indicator 1.2.1 Note**: Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) for policy and institutional measures on social protection is tracked 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; 5 = Policy/legislative reforms have evidence of effectiveness and have adequate and predictable financing and institutional capacity), and counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has resulted in measures being at least approved and implemented. The indicator language has been slightly revised to refer to measures instead of reforms.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines, 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline values were a) 2, b) 2, c) 1 d) 2; previous 2014 milestones were: a) 3, b) 3, c) 2, d) 2; previous targets were a) 12, b) 13, c) 11, d) 8. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1.2.2** | Number of countries with **improved** **financial sustainability** of **social protection systems**  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 31*** | 0 | 6 | 6 | 19 |
| **Indicator 1.2.2 Note**: Tracks the number of countries where UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) has led to sustainable financing for social protection, based on objective criteria and evidence. The effectiveness of UNDP’s support is tracked using a qualitative assessment (1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries which, with UNDP support, have improved financial sustainability of social protection systems from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous target was 16. | | | | |
| **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:* 112 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 87*** | 0 | 600 | 581 | 1,442 |
| **Indicator 1.3.1 Note**: Tracks the 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 level, created from January 2014 onward (on demand from programme countries).  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices, and to correct an error by one country office which previously reported on number of partners rather than of partnership mechanisms. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 640, previous target was 3,490. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 41 (a & b), 66 (c & d)*** | 0  0  0  0 | 43,706  25,591  766,895  603,768 | 11,654  12,401  778,661  624,820 | 180,779  86,888  3,973,796  3,509,002 |
| **Indicator 1.3.2 Note**: Tracks the 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 (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onward. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data were provided for the total number of people. An **additional 37,718 people** benefitted from strengthened livelihoods in 2014 for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, see **indicators 1.1.1** and **6.1.1**.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 41,873, b) 23,609, c) 761,298, d) 596,714; previous targets were: a) 179,871, b) 85,516, c) 3,958,988, d) 3,487,836. | | | | |
| **Output 1.4.** Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented  ***Number of countries linked:* 114 (February 2015)** | **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. Extent to which climate finance is being accessed (by government and non-government institutions) 2. Extent to which there is a strengthened system in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify climate finance   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: a) 80, b) 78*** | 0  0 | 21  15 | 21  15 | 47  47 |
| **Indicator 1.4.1. Note:** Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) for putting in place systems to access, deliver, monitor, report and/or verify use of climate finance, is tracked 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), counting the number of countries where there is objective evidence that UNDP support has led to improved access and/or systems in each year.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 19, b) 15; previous targets were: a) 41, b) 40. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 106*** | 0 | 37 | 39 | 96 |
| **Indicator 1.4.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve implementation of comprehensive measures (defined as plans, strategies, policies, programmes and/or budgets) for low-emission and climate resilient development, is tracked through 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), counting the number of countries where there is objective evidence that UNDP support has led to improved implementation of measures, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 28, previous target was 87. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 95 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 65*** | 0 | 151 | 139 | 545 |
| **Indicator 1.5.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new partnerships with funding established (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 113, previous target was 509. | | | | |
| **1.5.2** | Number of **additional** people with **improved energy access**  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 52*** | 0 | 1,051,722 | 1,336,476 | 5,372,048 |
| **Indicator 1.5.2 Note:** Tracks the number of people whose access to energy has improved as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 1,005,931, previous target was 10,906,788. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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) | | **Baseline 2013** | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **2.1** | Number of countries with **open access to data** on government budgets, expenditures and public procurement | 37 (2012\*) | Not yet available | Direction of travel: **Increase** |
| **Source**: UNDP will utilize data from the International Budget Partnership to track progress in countries requesting support. 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 the quantified responses for the 95 survey questions that are related to budget transparency. Survey data was collected in 2012: the simple average for 85 programme countries is 37. The OBI data show that in six years (from 2006 to 2012), 40 countries have made progress. For details, [see Open Budget Survey 2012](http://internationalbudget.org/wp-content/uploads/OBI2012-Report-English.pdf). | | | |
| **2.2** | Voter **turnout** | 68.5% (2013) | 68.8% | 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 98 and 103 programme countries in 2013 and 2014 respectively. Using a comparable sample, there was improvement (regression) in 8 (13) countries. Direction of travel estimated by UNDP based on historical world trends.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated to reflect final 2013 data now available from international sources. For reference, previous baseline was 67.9% (2013). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.3** | Percentage of **women in national Parliaments** | | | 20.8% (2013) | | | 21.0% | International target**: 30%**  SP 2017 trend:  **22.7%** | |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union (PARLINE database: http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp) for 146 and 147 programme countries in 2013 and 2014 (January), respectively. There was improvement (regression) in the indicator in 33 (26) countries. Figures represent the aggregate proportion (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. UNDP estimated a 2017 trend of 22.7% based on historical figures.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated to reflect final 2013 data available from international sources. For reference, previous baseline was 20.4% (2013). | | | | | | | | |
| **Outputs** *(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)* | | **Baseline** | | **Milestones** | | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | **Actual** | |
| **2013** | | **2014** | **2014** | | **2017** |
| **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:* 97 (February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 61*** | 0 | | 24 | 29 | | 55 |
| **Indicator 2.1.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to strengthen parliaments’ administrative and human resources capacities is tracked 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), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has improved parliaments’ capacities from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 28, previous target was 58. | | | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 40*** | 0 | 15 | | 22 | | 36 |
| **Indicator 2.1.1b Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to strengthen CMBs’ administrative and human resources capacities is tracked 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), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has improved CMBs’ capacities from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 8, previous target was 20. | | | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 56*** | 0 | 22 | | 30 | | 46 |
| **Indicator 2.1.1c Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries, within the scope of the UN’s electoral assistance normative framework) to strengthen capacities of EMBs is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (extent to which capacities have improved: 1- Not improved, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has improved EMBs’ capacities from January 2014 onwards. An additional 3 countries have requested clearance from the UN Department of Political Affairs to receive electoral assistance, and will be included in milestones and target once appropriate.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 19, previous target was 36. | | | | | | |
| **2.1.2** | Number of **new registered electors**  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 46*** | 0 | 21,311,515 | | 18,131,078 | | TBC\* |
| **Indicator 2.1.2 Note:** Tracks the number of additional registered electors as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 10,860,312. \*Updated target to be provided following further data verification with country offices. | | | | | | |
| **2.1.3** | Number of **additional women participating as candidates** in national elections  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 41*** | 0 | 3,010 | | 2,848 | | 10,706 |
| **Indicator 2.1.3 Note:** Tracks the number of additional women participating as candidates in national elections as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 1,114, previous target was 8,298. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 67 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 29*** | 0 | 20 | 16\* | | 70 |
| **Indicator 2.2.2 Note:** Tracks the number of new proposals adopted to mitigate sector-specific corruption risks as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 18, previous target was 72. 2014 actual results data is missing for two countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | | |
| **Output 2.3** Capacities of human rights institutions strengthened  ***Number of countries linked:* 75 (February 2015)** | **2.3.1** | Number of countries with **strengthened** **operational institutions** supporting the **fulfillment** of nationally and internationally **ratified human rights obligations**  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 63*** | 0 | 22 | 23 | | 50 |
| **Indicator 2.3.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to strengthen operational institutions’ capacities to fulfil nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has strengthened capacities of operational institutions.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 18, previous target was 46. | | | | | |
| **Output 2.4.** Frameworks and dialogue processes engaged for effective and transparent engagement of civil society in national development  ***Number of countries linked:* 84 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 46, b) 51, c) 49*** | 0  0  0 | 17  20  15 | 21  23  18 | | 37  41  37 |
| **Indicator 2.4.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s 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, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to improved capacities for these groups.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 13, b) 17, c) 14; previous targets were: a) 33, b) 37, c) 35. | | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 48, b) 48, c) 54*** | 15  14  16 | 20  20  26 | 17\*  16\*  16\* | | 37  39  42 |
| **Indicator 2.4.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to strengthened environments for civic engagement is tracked using a qualitative rating scale measuring the degree to which the environment (i.e., legal/regulatory frameworks and engagement platforms) has become more conducive to civic engagement (1=low, 2=medium and 3=high) from January 2014 onwards; and counting countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to at least a medium degree.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 Milestones updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baselines were: a) 15, b) 12, c) 12; previous 2014 milestones were: a) 20, b) 19, c) 22; previous targets were: a) 38, b) 40, c) 42. \*2014 actual results data is missing for three countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | | |
| **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:* 81 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 78, b) 83, c) 80*** | 13  10  10 | 25  15  20 | 23\*  18\*  19\* | 62  60  58 | |
| **Indicator 2.5.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to put in place (a) legal, (b) policy and/or (c) institutional frameworks for conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems is tracked 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), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has to at least partially putting in place frameworks from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines,2014 milestones and 2017 targets were updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baselines were: a) 12, b) 10, c) 9; previous 2014 milestones were: a) 21, b) 13, c) 18; previous targets were: a) 56, b) 55, c) 52. \*2014 actual results data is missing for two countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 52, b) 45*** | 1. 0 2. 0 | 1. 13 2. 9 | 1. 15 2. 13 | 1. 44 2. 33 |
| **Indicator 2.5.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve capacities to implement IWRM and/or protect and restore oceans and marine ecosystems is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to capacities being improved, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 13, b) 7; previous targets were: a) 41, b) 29. | | | | |
| **Output 2.6.** Legal reform enabled to fight discrimination and address emerging issues (such as environmental and electoral justice)  ***Number of countries linked:* 25 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 10 | 14 | 11\* | 20 |
| **Indicator 2.6.1 Note:** Indicator derived from UNAIDS *Unified Budget, Results and Accountability Framework* (UBRAF), which tracks the number of countries where proposals for legal reform to fight discrimination have been adopted. In UNDP’s IRRF, legal reform to fight discrimination must be adopted as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards. Proposals have been planned in 40 countries supported by UNDP.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline was 12, previous target was 19. \*2014 actual results data is missing for several countries expected to contribute to results and is too incomplete to allow a traffic light assessment; final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 3: **Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** (**\*** Using latest data up to the year specified) | | **Baseline 2013** | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **3.1** | Level of **public confidence** in the delivery of basic services | 52.4% (2013) | Not yet available | 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 123 programme countries. The Index is available at the country level in the Worldwide Governance Indicators website, from the World Bank. There is no numeric internationally agreed target.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated to reflect 2013 data now available. For reference, previous baseline (2012) was 53%. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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) 37% (2013\*)  a.2) 23% (2013\*)  b.1) 29.3% (2013\*)  b.2) 34.1% (2013\*) | 1. 13.6%   a.1) 38%  a.2) 24% | a) More than 15 million (2015)  b) Direction of travel: **Increase** |
| **Source**: for coverage of ARV therapy, UNAIDS, based on data for low and middle income countries, following WHO 2013 guidelines. The international target of 15 million corresponds to 2015 (UN General Assembly Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS, 2011). For comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS, UNDP calculations based on UN-MDGs. Simple average of data regarding 84 programme countries for women and 59 programme countries for men. There is no numeric target for specific age or sex groups.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated to reflect 2013 data now available. For reference, previous baselines were: a) 9.7 million (2012); a.1) 64% (2012); a.2) 34% (2012). b.1) 32.8% (circa 2010), b.2) 36.6% (circa 2010). Variations in coverage in indicators a1) and a2) explained by new methodologies, following WHO 2013 guidelines (instead of WHO 2010 guidelines). | | | |
| **3.3** | **Access to justice services**, disaggregated by type of service (civil/criminal justice services)  a) Civil Justice Index  b) Criminal Justice Index | a) 0.46 (2013)  b) 0.43 (2013) | Not yet available | Not available |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on World Justice Project (http://worldjusticeproject.org/). The Civil Justice Index represents the simple average of 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”, based on data for 70 programme countries. Targets: Since There is no numeric internationally agreed target, these are indexes not included in most national statistics systems and have 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 | **6.9** per 100,000 inhabitants (2012)  a) 3.0 per 100,000 inhabitants (2012)  b) 10.8 per 100,000 inhabitants (2012) | Not yet available | Direction of travel: **Decrease** |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations using statistics from UNODC (<http://www.unodc.org/gsh/en/data.html>) for 144 programme countries. Figures represent absolute proportion of homicides over population of reference or weighted average (using population). 79 countries present “epidemic” levels (defined as more than 10 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants) of male homicides, and 5 countries present epidemic levels of female homicide. No internationally-agreed numerical targets are available. UNDP uses direction of travel: a reduction, with emphasis on reducing rates in countries experiencing epidemic levels.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baselines updated with latest data. Previous values were: overall 6.8 (2012), female 2.9 (2012), male 10.7 (2012). | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | **Actual** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2014** | **2017** |
| **Output 3.1.** Core functions of government enabled to ensure national ownership of recovery and development processes  ***Number of countries linked:* 35 (February 2015)** | **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 center of government  c) Civil service management  d) Local governance  e) Aid coordination  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 1  1  2  0  2 | 2  3  3  3  7 | 5  3  4  3  6 | 13  15  13  12  16 |
| **Indicator 3.1.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand 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 center of government, c) Civil service management, d) Local governance and/or e) Aid coordination, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= targets not adequately developed, 2= targets met very partially, 3= targets partially met, and 4= targets largely met), counting the number of countries where there is objective evidence that targets related to UNDP-supported functions have been at least partially met from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline and 2014 milestone for component (e), and 2017 targets for all components, were updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline for e) was 0, previous 2014 milestone for e) was 6, and previous targets were: a) 12, b) 14, c) 12, d) 11, e) 14. | | | | |
| **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:* 82 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 61*** | 0 | 22 | 20 | 61 |
| **Indicator 3.2.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve capacities of sub-national governments/administrations to plan, budget and/or monitor delivery of basic services is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= no capacity, 2= very partial capacity, 3= partial capacity, and 4= capacity largely in place), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities show improvement from January 2014 onwards. Support to planning and monitoring is expected to be delivered in 65 countries, and support to budgeting is expected to be delivered in 55 countries. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 57 (February 2015)** | **3.3.1** | Number of people who have access to **HIV and related services**, disaggregated by **sex** and **type of service**.   1. **Behavioral change communication**    1. Number of **males** reached    2. Number of **females** reached   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 24***   1. **ARV treatment**    1. Number of **males** reached    2. Number of **females** reached   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 10,586,007  10,097,656  1,376,885  (total people) | 11,600,023  11,454,832  1,400,000  (total people) | 10,694,870\*  9,645,756\*  1,400,000\*  (total people) | 12,818,417  12,166,122  TBC |
| **Indicator 3.3.1.a Note:** Tracks the number of people that, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), were reached with HIV-related behavioral change communication. Disaggregated data is provided where it is available. An **additional 1,757,652 people** were reached with behavioral change communication in 2014 for which sex disaggregation is not available (based on 2014 data currently 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 have linked to this output, and UNDP also provides support for behavioral change communication outside the scope of Global Fund projects.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Indicator specification was revised, along with baselines, 2014 milestones and 2017 targets, to capture the total number of people supported by UNDP instead of reporting only additional people reached compared with a 2013 baseline, to best reflect evolving HIV prevalence rates and programme coverage. For reference, previous baselines were shown as 0; previous 2014 milestones were: a.i) 115,441, a.ii) 1,473,638; previous targets were: a.i) 1,456,256, a.ii) 2,209,104. Furthermore, since reporting timelines are not aligned with Global Fund timelines, 2014 actual results data is missing for several countries expected to contribute to results: final results will be reported at a later date.  **Indicator 3.3.1.b Note:** Tracks the number of people that, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), have gained access to anti-retroviral (ARV) treatment, from January 2014 onwards. This indicator has been slightly revised to track total numbers of people reached with ARVs using the more robust Global Fund dataset which is subject to a harmonization process and captures the majority of UNDP’s support for ARV treatment. The harmonized data for 2014 is not yet published but will be available in Q3 2015, and will be included in next year’s Annual Report. Sex disaggregated data is not currently published for Global Fund data, however is expected to be available for 2015 results, to be published in 2016 and onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline and 2014 milestone have been revised on the basis of Global Fund harmonized data for 2013. Future milestones and targets will be added once final Global Fund data for 2014 is confirmed. For reference, previous baselines were shown as 0; previous 2014 milestones were: b.i) 295,716, b.ii) 443,352; previous targets were: b.i) 1,065,771, b.ii) 1,572,554. \*Provisional results for 2014, final harmonized results due Q3. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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) | 60%  20% | 62.5%  20.8% | 55%  10% |
| **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).  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline, 2014 milestone and 2017 target have been revised. As of 31 January 2015, UNDP is managing 47 Global Fund grants in 25 countries, as well as one Regional Grant in Asia-Pacific covering another 7 countries. UNDP plays a key role in supporting counties facing challenging circumstances to deliver essential social services financed by the Global Fund. UNDP’s role as Principal Recipient is an interim arrangement that lasts until one or more national entities (i.e. government entities and/or CSOs) are ready and able to take over grant implementation. To date, UNDP has exited and transferred the Principal Recipient role to national entities in 23 countries. In 2014, UNDP transitioned six grants. It is expected that UNDP will transition out of another three countries in 2015 (six grants), another five counties (eight grants) in 2017, and another country (two grants) in 2017. At the same time, new grants are in the pipeline, including Afghanistan, a multi-country grant for the Pacific, and a few other countries in Asia, West Africa, and Latin America. The combination of handing over mature, strong performing grants, taking over new often poorly performing grants, and starting new grants will bring the percentage of GF grants rated A1 or A2 down from 2015 onwards. To reflect this evolving profile of the portfolio, the current baseline reflects the average performance of UNDP-rated grants over the 2009-2013 period. For reference, previous baseline for 2013 only was 68%, previous 2014 milestone was 74%, and previous target was 90%.  **Indicator 3.3.2.b Note:** New indicatorreflecting the relative performance of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP, and Global Fund grants managed by others. Calculated as the difference between the percentage of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP which are rated as A1 or A2 (indicator 3.2.2.a) and the percentage of Global Fund grants managed by others which are rated as A1 or A2. The number of countries reflects those where UNDP is managing Global Fund grants in 2014; this number will change over time. The Global Fund itself currently has grants in over 140 countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline reflects average difference in grant performance from 2011 to 2013, which has been measured from March 2011 onwards. 2014 milestone reflects the expected high performance of the current portfolio of mature strong performing UNDP-managed grants, a lower level is expected from 2015 onwards for the reasons cited in Reporting Note for sub-indicator 3.3.2.a above. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 63 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 31***  **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 currently been set under this indicator: 11*** | 0  0  0  0 | 382,824  363,286  7,949  55,448 | 373,946  391,281  10,354  347,904 | 910,978  922,581  29,447  287,918 |
| **Indicator 3.4.1 Note:** Tracks the additional number of UNDP-supported (on demand from programme countries) men and women with access to legal aid services; and the number of cases receiving judgment in the first instance of the formal justice system (disaggregated by whether cases are of Gender Based Violence or other), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices, and a calculation formula misspecification. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 128,166, b) 132,151, c) 7,865, d) 55,448; previous targets were: a) 861,817, b) 865,088, c) 65,412, d) 186,972. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 14*** | 0  0 | 87,000  30,054 | 110,587  58,454 | 221,961  88,297 |
| **Indicator 3.4.2 Note:** Tracks the number of additional male and female victims who have been provided with transitional justice services to address their grievances, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards. An **additional 27,300 people** had cases addressed in 2014 for which sex disaggregated data is not available.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 85,498, b) 28,955; previous targets were a) 206,135, b) 67,113. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 3.5.** Communities empowered and security sector institutions enabled for increased citizen safety and reduced levels of armed violence  ***Number of countries linked:* 48 (February 2015)** | **3.5.1** | Number of countries with **improved** **capacities for security sector governance and oversight**  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 34*** | 0 | 9 | 10 | 24 |
| **Indicator 3.5.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve capacities for governance and oversight of security sector is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= no improved capacities, 2= slightly improved capacities, 3= improved capacities, 4= significantly improved capacities), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has improved capacities from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 12, previous target was 18. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 30*** | 3 | 6 | 8 | 25 |
| **Indicator 3.5.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to community level gender-sensitive and evidence-based security strategies is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3=partially, 4=largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to strategies being at least partially operational from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous target was 20. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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) | | **Baseline 2013** | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **4.1** | **Wage gap** between men and women | 18% (2011\*) | Not yet available | Direction of travel based on past trend:  **Decrease**, 16% (trend) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations using data from International Labour Organization (Global Wage Database). Simple average for 44 programme countries with data in recent years. Since there is no internationally-agreed numerical target, target is set (a decrease) on the basis of a trend estimation by UNDP, using historical data. | | | |
| **4.2** | **Gender gap in access to credit** | 7% (2011) | Not yet available | Direction of travel based on past trend:  **Decrease**, 5% (trend) |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations based on World Bank, Global FINDEX database. It measures the gap between the percentage of adult men that have an account at a formal financial institution and the percentage of adult women that have an account at a formal financial institution. Baseline is the simple average for 111 programme countries for 2011. Projected trend estimated by UNDP consistent with a 25% reduction of the differential in access to credit between men and women at the national level. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4.3** | [Harmonized Indicator with UN women] Percentage of countries where there is evidence that **national prevalence of physical and/or sexual violence experienced by women has decreased** | | | 0% | | Not yet available | | 10% | |
| **Source**: information is collected by UN Women from publicly available sources for both intimate partner and non-partner violence. Target (10% of countries have a decrease in prevalence of physical or sexual abuse) taken from 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) 15.7% (2013)  c) 26% (2013) | | a) 21.0%  b) 16.1%  c) 27%\* | | **30% women in decision making positions**  a) 22.7% (trend)  b) 16.8% (trend)  c) Not available | |
| **Source**: UNDP calculations 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, based on 146 (145 in the case of b) and 147 programme countries for 2013 and 2014, respectively. The proportion of women in parliaments increased (decreased) in 33 (26) countries. The proportion of women in ministerial positions increased (decreased) in 45 (54) countries. Figures represent the aggregate proportion (sum of women in office divided by the sum of seats). The participation of women in the highest national court, comes from national sources for 102 programme countries, compiled by UNDP. The international target of 30% of women in decision making positions comes from ECOSOC Report E/1990/90. UNDP estimated 2017 expected values based on historical figures.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated to reflect final 2013 data from international sources for component (a). For reference, previous baseline was 20.4%. \*Progress data for part (c) is currently based on 2014 data for only 30 countries. | | | | | | | | |
| **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)* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | | **Actual** | |
| **2013** | **2014** | | **2014** | | **2017** |
| **Output 4.1.** Country led measures accelerated to advance women’s economic empowerment  ***Number of countries linked:* 18 (February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 16*** | 0 | 4 | | 5 | | 12 |
| **Indicator 4.1.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to develop and implement policies to promote women’s economic empowerment is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3= partially and 4= largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to measurable change from January 2014 onwards. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 25 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 24*** | 0 | 3 | 5 | 23 |
| **Indicator 4.2.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) for partners to put in place legal and/or policy frameworks to prevent and address sexual and gender based violence (SGBV), specified as (i) a comprehensive definition of SGBV, (ii) adequate framework of SGBV offences with appropriate criminal penalties, (iii) protection and occupation orders available along with enforcement mechanisms, (iv) specific duties to prevent and address SGBV, (v) SGBV regulations, and/or (vi) appropriate budget to implement and enforce SGBV laws and policies, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3= partially and 4= largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported frameworks show change from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 4, previous target was 22. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 9*** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| **Indicator 4.2.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to creation and/or strengthening of 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), is tracked using a binary scale (no= non-existent; yes=existent), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to new and/or strengthened services being in place, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous target was 8. | | | | |
| **Output 4.3.** Evidence-informed national strategies and partnerships to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment  ***Number of countries linked:* 18 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 14*** | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| **Indicator 4.3.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to put in place mechanisms to collect, disseminate sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics, and apply gender analysis, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= little evidence, 2= moderate evidence and 3= consistent evidence), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported mechanisms are in place to collect and/or disseminate sex-disaggregated data and apply gender analysis.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline, 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices, for reference, previous baseline was 1, previous 2014 milestone was 2, and previous target was 10. | | | | |
| **Output 4.4.** Measures in place to increasewomen’s participation in decision-making  ***Number of countries linked:* 30 (February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 11, b) 13*** | 0  0 | 10  15 | 8\*  12\* | 26  64 |
| **Indicator 4.4.1 Note:** Tracks the number of UNDP-supported (on demand from programme countries) new and/or strengthened laws and policies to increase women’s participation in decision-making from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 10, b) 16; previous targets were: a) 24, b) 72. \*2014 actual results data is missing for two countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 0 | 5,807 | 5,638 | 27,952 |
| **Indicator 4.4.2 Note:** Tracks the number of womenbenefitting from UNDP-supported (on demand from programme countries) private and/or public measures to support women’s preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles, from January 2014 onward.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 5,502, previous target was 27,514. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 5: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | **Baseline 2013** | | **Actual 2014** | | **Target 2017** | | |
| **5.1** | **Mortality rate** from **natural hazards** | | | 17 per million inhabitants (2013) | | 13.4 per million inhabitants | | Direction of travel: **decrease** | | |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on EM-DAT Database (number of people killed by natural disasters) and UN-DESA (population), for 159 programme countries. Counts the number of people killed by natural disaster per million of population in programme countries. This rate considers all population in programme countries and not only those “exposed” to natural disasters. The mortality rate for “linked countries” is 27.5 per million in 2013 and 20.4 in 2014. The value for 2013 represents the average for the period 2004-2013, the value for 2014 represents the value for the period 2005-2014 (2004 was a particularly deadly year due to Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami). 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 | | | 0.3% of GDP (2013) | | 0.3% of GDP | | 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 programme countries. The average of economic losses per country a 0.46% of GDP. The value for 2013 represents the average for the period 2004-2013, the value for 2014 represents the value for the period 2005-2014. There is no internationally-agreed target. | | | | | | | | | |
| **5.3** | **Economic loss** from conflicts as a proportion of GDP | | | 0.45% of GDP (2013) | | Not yet available | | Direction of travel: **decrease** | | |
| **Source**: UNDP calculation based on data from the Institute for Economics and Peace and the IMF (for GDP). The annual cost of conflict is estimated to be 2% of GDP in affected countries. There is no internationally-agreed target. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Outputs** *(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)* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | | **Actual** | |
| **2013** | **2014** | | **2014** | | **2017** |
| **Output 5.1.** Mechanisms in place to assess natural and man-made risks at national and sub-national levels  ***Number of countries linked:* 41**  **(February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 21*** | 0 | 1 | | 1 | | 10 |
| **Indicator 5.1.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to put in place Standardized Damage and Loss Accounting Systems (also referred to as National Disaster Observatories) for systematically collecting, storing, analyzing, and disseminating disaster-related data and information with sex and age disaggregation, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3= partially and 4= largely), counting the number of counties where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to effective systems being partially or largely in place.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect latest expected results from country offices. For reference, previous target was 12. The reduction reflects revised targets for two countries. | | | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 29*** | 0  0 | 78  38 | | 116  19\* | | 365  177 |
| **Indicator 5.1.2 Note:** Tracks the number of new plans and programmes supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards that are informed by multi-hazard disaster and climate risk assessments, identifying those that differentiate impact on target groups.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target for part (a) updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone for a) was 73, previous target for a) was 253. \*Country reporting on sub-indicator 5.1.2.b was affected by a glitch in the data capture system which prevented countries from viewing milestones, and led to partial reporting of 2014 actuals. Partial data is shown here but is too incomplete to allow traffic light assessment. | | | | | | |
| **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:* 72**  **(February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 57, b) 43*** | 0  0 | 90  63 | | 98  99 | | 500  347 |
| **Indicator 5.2.1 Note:** Tracks the 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 (on demand from programme countries) that are put in place from January 2014 onwards, identifying those that are gender responsive.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 51, b) 33; previous targets were: a) 458, b) 279. | | | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 45*** | 20 (53 provisions) | 26 (69 provisions) | | 21 (56 provisions)\* | | 39 (195 provisions) |
| **Indicator 5.2.2 Note:** Tracks the number of countries supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) to put in place (defined as having a budget allocation) legislative and/or regulatory provisions for effectively managing disaster and climate risk, from January 2014 onwards, counting only the number of countries where 50% or more of provisions put in place are effectively managing disaster and climate risks.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline was 20 (51 provisions), previous 2014 milestone was 26 (64 provisions), previous target was 36 (135 provisions). \*2014 actual results data is missing for four countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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:* 13**  **(February 2015)** | **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 **budgeted new plans** with some DRM and/or CRM components 3. Number of **budgeted new plans** with some DRM and/or CRM components which are **gender responsive**   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 0  0  0 | 6  4  6 | 2\*  1\*  2\* | 124  93  96 |
| **Indicator 5.3.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new development and key sectorial plans supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards, being implemented (defined as those with a budget allocation) at national or subnational level that explicitly address disaster and/or climate risk management, identifying those that are gender responsive. Seven additional countries beyond the linked ones (for a total of 20 countries) entered baselines, milestones and targets for this indicator.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 39, b) 14, c) 5; previous targets were: a) 162, b) 131, c) 74. The reduction in milestones and targets reflects corrections by two countries based on improved classification of results to match IRRF indicator definitions. \*2014 actual results data is missing for several countries expected to contribute to results and is too incomplete to allow a traffic light assessment; final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | |
| **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:* 46**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 37*** | 0 | 18  (161 EWS) | 17  (158 EWS) | 33  (239 EWS) |
| **Indicator 5.4.1 Note:** Tracks the number of countries with new end-to-end early warning systems (EWS) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones was 16 countries (163 EWS), previous target was 28 countries (233 EWS). | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 28, b) 32*** | 0  0 | 15  (59 plans)  13  (259 plans) | 13  (76 plans)  14  (254 plans) | 20  (191 plans)  28  (616 plans) |
| **Indicator 5.4.2 Note:** Tracks the number of countries with new mechanisms (defined as disaster preparedness plans) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards, differentiating between those that cover only response and those that cover both response and recovery.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 13 countries (48 plans), b) 12 countries (261 plans); previous targets were: a) 19 countries (209 plans), b) 27 countries (623 plans). | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 20, b) 11, c) 7, d) 7, e) 14*** | 1.5%  3.9%  58.7%  0.0%  2.2% | 5.7%  7.6%  57.9%  12.5%  2.6% | 5.7%  7.6%  58.1%  12.6%  2.8% | 9.3%  37.1%  96.7%  21.3%  4.7% |
| **Indicator 5.4.3 Note:** Tracks the percentage of the population at risk of each type of disaster event (defined as flood, earthquake, hurricane, landslide and draught) covered by contingency plans with support by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards. In cases where “population at risk” grows faster than coverage can be arranged, the percentage of “population at risk” covered can actually go down even while coverage is being put in place.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Substantial revisions have been made to baselines and 2014 milestones due to adoption of a more conservative analytic approach in cases of incomplete country reporting. Countries are only included in calculated results if they provided valid data for population at risk and population covered, and if the latter does not exceed the former. For reference, previous baselines were: a) 7.2%, b) 8.9%, c) 7.8%, d) 13.1%, e) 21.3%; previous 2014 milestones were: a) 10.1%, b) 8.5%, c) 8.8%, d) 13.3%, e) 21.6%; previous targets were: a) 16.4%, b) 35.9%, c) 98.1%, d) 19.2%, e) 25.3%. | | | | |
| **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:* 30**  **(February 2015)** | **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    1. Financial capacities    2. Human Resource capacities   ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 23*** | 0  0  0  0 | 5  6  2  4 | 6  9  4  5 | 11  17  9  12 |
| **Indicator 5.5.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to put in place financial and/or human resource capacities necessary to prevent, manage, or resolve conflicts, to ease tensions (for example, through convening multi-stakeholder dialogue to bridge significant gaps on critical national issues, and/or conducting advocacy for peace and social cohesion), is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= partially, and 3=largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: National: a) 2, b) 5, Local: a) 2, b) 4; previous targets were: National: a) 9, b) 15, Local: a) 8, b) 12. | | | | |
| **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:* 30**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 20*** | 0 | 11 | 10 | 19 |
| **Indicator 5.6.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to increase capacities of mechanisms for mediation and consensus-building, is assessed based on objective criteria and evidence. The effectiveness of UNDP’s support is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3=partially, and 4=largely), counting the number of countries where UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was: 10 | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 6: **Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings** | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** *The 18-month period depicts the duration of a typical humanitarian phase. Note that all milestones and targets will need to be adjusted depending on the number of countries that might be affected by disasters between mid-2014 and 2017.* | | **Base line 2013** | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **6.1** | Percentage of affected populations meeting critical benchmarks for social and economic recovery within 18 months after a crisis, disaggregated by type of crisis | 45% (disaster)  40% (conflict) | Not yet available | 65% (disaster)  65% (conflict) |
| **Source**: The measurement is based on building blocks of affected men and women's livelihoods (financial e.g. jobs/income; human; natural; physical; social), recovery of household / community assets, and access to key socio-economic infrastructure that allow crisis affected people to build back better. The main focus is on stabilizing affected men and women’s livelihoods. A livelihood refers to capabilities, assets (both material and social) and activities required for a living. It has five building blocks: financial; social; human, natural, and physical. Early livelihoods opportunities that are sustainable should be put in place right from the humanitarian settings. Data is based on historical trends and a percentage based on the average number of people reached in previous crises.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Indicator calculation, baselines and targets to be revised as reporting will be based on country level data reported by affected programme countries | | | |
| **6.2** | Percentage of post disaster and post conflict countries having **operational strategies** to address the causes or triggers of crises  **a) Disaster**  i) % of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them  ii) % of affected countries with an operational strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis  **b) Conflict**  i) % of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them  ii) % of affected countries with an operational strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis | a.i) 9% (34 countries)  a.ii) 0% (34 countries)  b.i) 13% (31 countries)  b.ii) 0% (31 countries) | 6%\*  0%\*  16%\*  3%\* | 29%  18%  35%  29% |
| **Source**: Operational strategies means “assessment and planning procedures which integrate risk reduction/conflict prevention in the recovery agenda, mechanisms, political will, partnerships and resources (institutional, human, economic) to implement the recovery process.”  **2014 Reporting Note:** The indicator has been slightly modified to separately report on the two key sub-elements of this outcome level result. Baseline and 2017 targets have been updated to reflect more complete reporting for the 34 UNDP programme countries affected by disaster, and 31 programme countries affected by conflict, in 2014. For reference, previous baselines for the overall indicator were: 18% (disaster), 20% (conflict); previous 2017 targets for the overall indicator were: 30% (disaster), 50% (conflict). \*Preliminary 2014 actual data is based on partial reporting: four relevant countries affected by disaster, and five countries affected by conflict, have not yet been able to report 2014 data. | | | |
| **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 & UN Women) | 36% | 35%\* | 38% |
| **Source**: Baseline and target derived from information reported by 11 UNDP country offices. Monetary value of total benefits distributed in 2013 was $169,580,883, monetary value of benefits received by women and girls (US$) $61,080,679, or 36% of the total funds.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from 11 UNDP programme countries. For reference, previous baseline was 30%, previous target was 40%. \*Preliminary 2014 actual data is based on partial reporting: four relevant countries have not yet been able to report 2014 data. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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).*  *Note: Results of UNDP’s early recovery interventions should be detectable within 18 months of a programme country’s demand for support.* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | **Actual** |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2014** | **2017** |
| **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:* 36**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 19 (a & b), 22 (c & d)*** | 0  0  0  0 | 38,456  61,637  2,232,210  2,253,435 | 57,752  78,520  2,824,970  2,905,400 | 69,527  122,865  2,480,257  2,497,293 |
| **Indicator 6.1.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new emergency jobs created and number of additional people benefiting from strengthened livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onward. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data were provided for the total number of people: an **additional 181,630 people** benefitted from strengthened livelihoods in 2014 for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see **indicators 1.1.1** and **1.3.2**.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 38,456, b) 45, 634, c) 2,261,035, d) 2,279,017; previous targets were: a) 62,315, b) 100,603, c) 4,089,339, d) 4,124,283. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 7, b) 5, c) 4, d) 2*** | 1. 10% 2. 11% 3. 13% 4. 17% | 1. 30% 2. 33% 3. 25% 4. 17% | 1. 30% 2. 33% 3. 38% 4. 17% | 1. 70% 2. 56% 3. 50% 4. 33% |
| **Indicator 6.1.2 Note:** Tracks the percentage of crisis-affected countries where UNDP support (on demand from 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.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline,2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baselines were all shown as 0%, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 25%, b) 29%, c) 17%, d) 0%, previous targets were: a) 75%, b) 57%, c) 50%, d) 25%. | | | | |
| **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:* 27**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 17*** | 0% | 27% | 27% | 63% |
| **Indicator 6.2.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve capacities (physical infrastructure, equipment and vehicles, human resources, leadership skills, and institutional arrangements) to lead and coordinate early recovery processes, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (level reached by necessary capacities: 1=Less than pre-crisis: 2=Back to pre-crisis: 3=Better than pre-crisis), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards, and calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 23%, previous target was 73% of 22 linked countries. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 13*** | 0% | 14% | 9% | 44% |
| **Indicator 6.2.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to accountably and effectively use financing and aid management mechanisms, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1- Not adequately, 2- Very partially, 3- Partially, and 4-Largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported capacities improved from January 2014 onwards, and calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous target was 55% of 22 linked countries. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 6.3.** Innovative partnerships are used to inform national planning and identification of solutions for early recovery  ***Number of countries linked:* 7**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: a) 7, b) 6, c) 6, d) 4*** | 0  0  0  0 | 4  4  8  23 | 2  1  7  23 | 18  19  30  57 |
| **Indicator 6.3.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new partnerships to ensure implementation of innovative solutions for early recovery (on demand from programme countries) that were operational (defined as those that have accountability mechanisms fully implemented) from January 2014 onwards, disaggregated by the type of partner involved.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 2, b) 4, c) 8, d) 23; previous targets were: a) 15, b) 16, c) 31, d) 58. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 8*** | 2.3% | 15.5% | 5.1% | 29.6% |
| **Indicator 6.3.2 Note:** Tracks the percentage of resources mobilized in post-crisis settings allocated to early recovery with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline,2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline was 2.8%, previous 2014 milestone was 2.4%, and previous target was 5.5%. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 6.4.** Recovery processes reinforce social cohesion and trust and enable rapid return to sustainable development  ***Number of countries linked:* 20**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 13*** | 0% | 29% | 41% | 62% |
| **Indicator 6.4.1 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to bring together institutions and communities for peaceful resolution of recurrent conflicts, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1=not significant; 2=average; 3=significant), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported participatory conflict resolution processes have contributed to peaceful solutions from January 2014 onwards, and calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 35%, previous target was 76% of 17 linked countries. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 8*** | 0% | 24% | 29% | 38% |
| **Indicator 6.4.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to improve risk management arrangements, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= Not improved 2= very partially; 3= partially; 4= largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP-supported arrangements have led to improvements from January 2014 onwards, and calculating the percentage over the total number of supported countries.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous target was 47% of 17 linked countries. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 7: **Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles** | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | **Baseline 2013** | | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** | |
|  | Extent to which the agreed post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals **reflect sustainable human development concepts and ideas** | | | Not applicable | | Draft goals under discussion | \*To be determined | |
| Source: UNDP reporting. \*2017 target to be determined by the mid-term review (MTR) of the SP and its annexes, in 2016. | | | | | | | |
|  | Existence of an **initial global agreement on financing mechanisms** for the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals | | | Not applicable | | Draft under discussion | \*To be determined | |
| **Source**: UNDP reporting. \*2017 target to be determined by the mid-term review (MTR) of the SP and its annexes, in 2016. | | | | | | | |
| **7.4** | Existence of a **global succession plan** to ensure unfinished MDGs are taken up post 2015 | | | Not applicable | |  | \*To be determined | |
| **Source**: UNDP reporting. \*2017 target to be determined by the mid-term review (MTR) of the SP and its annexes, in 2016. | | | | | | | |
| **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)* | | **Baseline** | **Milestones** | | | **Target** |
| **Planned** | **Actual** | |
| **2013** | **2014** | **2014** | | **2017** |
| **Output 7.1.** Global consensus on completion of MDGs and the post 2015 agenda informed by contributions from UNDP  ***Contributing units::* BPPS**  **(February 2015)** | | **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  1,345,772 | 969  1,987  659  7,000,000  (49% female) | | Not relevant |
| **Indicator 7.1.1 Note:** Data provided by UNDP’s Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Tracks the number of organizations and people that, with UNDP support, participate in dialogues on the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals. Data on the number of people participating comes from the *MY World* platform, the UN’s global citizen survey, put in place by UNDP. Milestone 2015 and 2016, and target 2017, are not relevant, since UNDG dialogues have ended and the process moved towards intergovernmental negotiations.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 actual result reflects people voting through MY World platform by 10 December 2014, when the figure reached 7 million. The total number of people voting has continued to increase over the remainder of 2014, reaching over 7.3 million by April 2015. | | | | | |
| **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:* 32**  **(February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 33*** | 7 | 13 | 13 | | 24 |
| **Indicator 7.2.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to use updated and disaggregated data to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with post-2015 agenda, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3= partially and 4= largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has let do “us[e of] updated and disaggregated data” to a partial or large extent. One additional country beyond the linked ones (for a total of 33 countries) entered baselines, milestones and targets for this indicator.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline was 0, previous target was 23. | | | | | |
| **Output 7.3.** National development plans to address poverty and inequality are sustainable and risk resilient  ***Number of countries linked:* 43**  **(February 2015)** | | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 35*** | 0 | 42 | 61 | | 149 |
| **Indicator 7.3.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new country diagnostics carried out with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries) to inform policy options on national response to globally agreed development agenda, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 32, previous target was 134. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 7.4.** Countries enabled to gain equitable access to, and manage, ODA and other sources of global development financing  ***Number of countries linked:* 30**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 17*** | 0 | 7 | 6 | 17 |
| **Indicator 7.4.2 Note:** Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP’s support (on demand from programme countries) to mechanisms to access, deliver, monitor, report and/or verify use of ODA and other sources of global development financing, is tracked using a qualitative rating scale (1= not adequately, 2= very partially, 3= partially and 4= largely), counting the number of countries where objective evidence exists of UNDP support having put in place effective mechanisms.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 4, previous target was 12. | | | | |
| **Output 7.5.** South-South and Triangular cooperation partnerships established and/or strengthened for development solutions  ***Number of countries linked:* 21**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 15*** | 0 | 28 | 25 | 142 |
| **Indicator 7.5.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new SS&TC partnerships supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) that are delivering 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 which have as primary objective promoting SS&TC. Additional results achieved by utilizing SS&TC modalities are embedded in other outcomes.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestone and 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestone was 22, previous target was 136. | | | | |
| **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 currently been set under this indicator: 13*** | 8 | 9 | 7\* | 13 |
| **Indicator 7.5.3 Note:** Tracks the number of countries which, with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries), establish legal, regulatory or policy frameworks for SS&TC; and/or an institutional focal point within government for SS&TC.  **2014 Reporting Note:** Baseline updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous baseline was 7. \* 2014 actual results data is missing for two countries expected to contribute to results, final results will be reported at a later date. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 7.6.** Innovations enabled for development solutions, partnerships and other collaborative arrangements  ***Number of countries linked:* 24**  **(February 2015)** | **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 currently been set under this indicator: 19*** | 0 | 39 | 52 | 145 |
| **Indicator 7.6.1 Note:** Tracks the number of new PPP mechanisms supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) with evidence of providing innovative solutions for development, from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2017 target updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. Previous target was 139. | | | | |
| **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 **scaled up** by national partners  (b) Number of **additional** pilots and demonstration projects **initiated** by national partners  ***Number of countries for which a 2017 target has currently been set under this indicator: 16*** | 0  0 | 40  22 | 59  27 | 112  106 |
| **Indicator 7.6.2 Note:** Tracks the number of additional pilot / demonstration projects initiated or scaled up by national partners with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.  **2014 Reporting Note:** 2014 milestones and 2017 targets updated to reflect more complete reporting from country offices. For reference, previous 2014 milestones were: a) 35, b) 9; previous targets were: a) 100, b) 93. | | | | |
| **Output 7.7.** Mechanisms in place to generate and share knowledge about development solutions  ***Contributing units:* BPPS and HDRO (February 2015)** | **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 | 4,000,000  940,000  200,000  1,600 | 3,824,209  910,833  187,350  1,570 | 5,000,000  1,000,000  300,000  3,200 |
| **Indicator 7.7.1 Note:** Data provided by UNDP’s Human Development Report Office (HDRO). Tracks the number of website page visits (in English, French and Spanish) of the HDRO website (<http://hdr.undp.org/en>) and of HDR reports thereby available; and the number of HDRO social media platform followers (Facebook and Twitter). Visits to the website in 2013 were exceptionally high due to an early and high-visibility report launch and are projected to dip in 2014 due to an overhaul of the corporate data system as well as a report launch during a lower traffic period (summer). As such, milestones for the website will hold and are expected to exceed 2013 numbers by 2017. HDR report landing page views are computed for the global report search page. In addition, from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014, **9,932** users accessed the Regional Reports search page, while **36,913** users accessed the National Reports search page. Users also browsed through and downloaded the reports through the HDRO Library home page, which received **133,899** visits in that period.  **2014 Reporting Note:** The indicator definition for component (b) was slightly revised, along with baseline, 2014 milestone and 2017 target, to reflect the number of views of landing pages for all HDR reports, not only the most recent HDR. For reference, previous baseline was 336,376, previous 2014 milestone was 400,000, and previous target was 500,000. | | | | |
| **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 | 70% | 82.9% | 80% |
| **Indicator 7.7.2 Note:** Data provided by UNDP’s Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (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 HQ-administered survey targeting all registered platform users, undertaken in March 2015, measured the percentage of responding users who indicate that the 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, counterparts international organizations and NGOs, as well as the global public, to search and retrieve knowledge resources of any kind, including articles, files, videos, images, and etc. Once developed, the South-South exchange platform and a public online library of knowledge products will be included as well. | | | | |
| **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**  **(February 2015)** | **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 | 53 | 40 | 57 |
| **Indicator 7.8.1 Note:** Data provided by UNDP’s Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Tracks the number of countries implementing MDGs acceleration action plans with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries) to accelerate MDGs results. Implementation is defined as having a MAF Action Plan completed and endorsed by relevant country authorities. 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: new plans from 2015 onwards are captured via the related indicator, as those put in place to “close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and/or for transition to SDGs. | | | | |
| **7.8.2** | Number of countries developing action plans to “**close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and transition to the** **SDGs** | 0 | 4 | 4 | 24 |
| **Indicator 7.8.2 Note:** Data provided by UNDP’s Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS).Tracks the number of countries developing actions plans with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries) to “close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and transition to the SDGs. An Action Plan “being developed” is defined as *the MAF and/or transition planning process having already been launched and the plan being in its development phase* (i.e., the plan is yet to be completed and endorsed by relevant country authorities). Number of countries is cumulative, and each country is only counted once even if multiple plans are being developed at national and sub-national levels. See indicator **7.8.1** for related data. | | | | |

**Tier Three: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency**

| **Higher quality programmes through results-based management** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Cost Classification: Development Effectiveness]  **1. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY OF RESULTS** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline 2013** | **Milestone 2014** | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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) | 75.6 (ROAR)  55% (EVAL) | 76.1% (ROAR)  Not Available (EVAL) | TBD (ROAR)  60% (EVAL) |
| **Note**: This indicator measures the percentage of country programme outcomes that are either “achieved” or “made positive changes” reported by Country Offices in the results oriented annual reports (ROARs). Cross checks with evaluation findings will be reported when they become available. | | | | |
| **2.** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as an effective contributor in identified areas   1. Poverty eradication through inclusive and sustainable development 2. Democratic governance 3. Institutional capacity building for delivery of basic services 4. Gender equality and women’s empowerment 5. Reducing likelihood of conflict and the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change 6. Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development in post-conflict/disaster settings 7. Contribution to development debates and international development goals | * Poverty eradication: 44% * Democratic Governance: 56% * Crisis Prevention and Recovery: 45% * Environment and Energy: 56% * MDGs: 58%   **Average: 52%** | Not available | 1. 53% 2. 56% 3. 56% 4. 56% 5. 45% 6. 44% 7. 66%   **Average: 54%** | 70% for each outcome |
| **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, such that the baseline is not comparable. | | | | |
| **3.** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track. | 92.6% (2014) | Not available | 92.6% | TBD |
| **Note**: The indicator measures the percentage of project outputs that are 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% [2012 ROARs] |  | 75% [2013 ROARs] | 90% |
| **Note**: The 2014 actual refers to the rating of results oriented annual reports (ROARs) for 2013, where 101 ROARs (75%) met the organizational quality standard. The first milestone for this indicator was set for the 2014 ROARs at 77%. It will be reported next year. | | | | |
| **5.** | Percentage of projects meeting or exceeding organizational quality standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 72% (2014) | Not available | 72% | TBD |
| **Note**: 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. Phase 2 in 2015 will extend the system to 70 country offices, with full application worldwide planned in 2016. | | | | |
| **6.** | Percentage of new country programme documents that meet organizational standards in the first submission for internal appraisal **(QCPR related indicator)** | 79% (2014) | Not available | 79% | TBD |
| **Note**: The baseline reports the results of HQ CPD appraisals in 2014 (HQPACs requested re-submission of 4 out of 19 CPDs). The new organisational standards for programmes will be rolled out in 2015. | | | | |
| **7.** | Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with:   1. UNDP policy services 2. UNDP programme/project guidelines and support | 1. 74% (2012) 2. 68% (2012) | Not available | Not available | 1. 80% 2. 80 |
| **Note**: 2012 data from the most recent Products and Services Survey (PSS) is used as baseline. The Products and Services Survey methodology is being revised and it will be implemented in 2015. | | | | |
| **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) | Not available | 76.6% | TBD |
| **Note**: The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion for “National Ownership & 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. Phase 2 in 2015 will extend the system to 70 country offices, with full application worldwide planned in 2016. | | | | |
| **9.** | 1. Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective. **(QCPR related indicator)** 2. Number of country offices that track and report on expenditures using gender markers validated by a quality assurance process. **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | 1. 30% 2. 3 | 1. 40% 2. 34 | 1. 36% 2. 28 (25 certified in 2014) | 1. 57% 2. 70 |
| **Note 9a**: Based on the gender marker: expenditures tracked by outputs according to their contribution to gender equality. Baselines, milestones and targets contemplate 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. In addition, UNDP HQ also checks the accuracy of scores of those COs. This process is carried out over 2 years in each Country Office, and it is rolled out in 34 Country Offices every two years. | | | | |
| **10.** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 78.5% (2014) | Not available | 78.5% | TBD |
| **Note**: The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion for “Social & Environmental Standards” that integrates corporate quality standards for social and environmental standards. 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. Phase 2 in 2015 will extend the system to 70 country offices, with full application worldwide planned in 2016. | | | | |
| **11**. | Percentage of programmes/projects where south-south or triangular cooperation is used to achieve results **(QCPR related indicator)** | 8% | 8% | 13.4% | 30% |
| **Note**: The baseline was calculate at the beginning of 2014 through a comprehensive mapping of 3,500 on-going projects, out of which 269 (8%) had integrated South-South or triangular cooperation approaches. In the 2014 Country Offices results oriented annual reports (ROARs), 469 projects out of 3,492 reported South-South and triangular cooperation activities. | | | | |
| **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. | “Evaluation Tool” piloted with lessons from 2011 and 2012 decentralized evaluations, and disseminated to staff | 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 | Tool updated to incorporate lessons from 2015 and 2016 evaluations, project completion reports and other relevant sources. |
| **13.** | Number of citations of UNDP publications in professional publications | TBD | TBD | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: The intended data source for this indicator has not permitted complete monitoring of citations of UNDP publications in professional publications as expected in 2014. The methodology is being finalized to allow reporting from 2015 onwards. As a partial proxy for 2014 reporting, the global Human Development Report [2014] received 403 academic citations in the year after its publication, detected through Google Scholar. | | | | |

| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 2. **FIELD/COUNTRY OFFICE OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestone** 2014 | **Actual** 2014 | **Target 2017** |
| **2.1** UNDP is an efficient and cost conscious organization | **14.** | Procurement efficiency:   1. Percentage of procurement cases submitted to the ACP that are approved upon first review 2. Percentage of business units with a consolidated Procurement Plan. | 1. 75.24% 2. 21% | 1. 78% 2. 71% | 1. 81% 2. 71% | 1. 85% 2. 80% |
| **15.** | 1. Percentage of cost-sharing agreements that comply with the new cost recovery policy (third party contributions only) | the new policy started in January 2014 | 55% | 65% | 90% |
| 1. Average cost recovery rate (disaggregated by funding instrument)    1. Third party cost sharing    2. Government cost sharing    3. South-South contributions    4. Other trust funds    5. GFATM    6. GEF   vi.1. Contributions below $10 million  vi.2. Contributions above $ 10 million   1. LOFTA 2. Thematic contributions 3. Montreal Protocol 4. EC | 1. 5.9% 2. 3.8% 3. n/a 4. 6.0% 5. 6.5%   vi.1. 9.6%  vi.2. 9.6%   1. 3.8% 2. 4.3% 3. 7.5% 4. 6.0% | 1. 7.25% 2. 3.5% 3. 3.5% 4. 7.25% 5. 7%   vi.1. 9.5%  vi.2. 9%   1. 4% 2. 7% 3. 7% 4. 7% | * 1. 6.23%   2. 4.06%   3. 6.08%   4. 4.50%   5. 6.69%   vi.1.9.5%  vi.2. 9%   * 1. 4%   2. 7.01%   3. 7.8%   4. 6.4% | 1. 8.0% 2. 3.5% 3. 3.5% 4. 8.0% 5. 7%   vi.1. 9.5%  vi.2. 9%   1. 4% 2. 7% 3. 7% 4. 7% |
| **Note**: For Indicator 15(a), the actual reflects the total number of active agreements in 2014. The compliance rate for agreements signed in 2014 is 74%. For technical reasons, TTFs have not been included in this calculation, but as this affects less than 1 percent 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 | 50% (joint financial quality and IPSAS) | 51% | 80% (joint financial quality and IPSAS) |
| **17.** | 1. percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities 2. percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities   [**COMMON QCPR INDICATOR**] | 1. 71% 2. 96% | 1. 80% 2. 95% | 1. 76% 2. 94% | 1. 84% 2. 94 |
| **18.** | UNDP Carbon Footprint (CO2 emissions) | 69,896 tons CO2-equivalent | 67,799 tons CO2-equivalent | 67,799 tonnes CO2-equivalent | 63,792 tons CO2-equivalent |
| **Note:** the 2014 actuals reported here refer to the pre-inventory estimate | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 3. **CORPORATE OVERSIGHT AND ASSURANCE (internal audit, investigations and corporate evaluations)** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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 quality, including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards **(SWAP-related indicator)**. | TBD (2014) | NA | NA | TBD |
| **Note**: The methodology to assess the quality of evaluation reports is to be revised by the Independent Evaluation Office, in the framework of the new evaluation policy. In 2015, UNDP expects to be in a position to report on both 2015 and 2014 assessments of decentralized evaluations. The 2014 figure will become the newly established baseline. During 2014, the Independent Evaluation Office has tested the application of UNEG criteria, including criteria on gender responsiveness, in a meta-evaluation covering 26 Decentralized evaluations (as part of the reporting to the UN SWAP on gender). The average score was “5.12=Approaches requirements” on a scale from 0-12. | | | | |
| **20.** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as satisfactory, partially satisfactory, and unsatisfactory   1. Satisfactory 2. Partially satisfactory 3. Unsatisfactory | (average 2011-2013)   1. 35% 2. 58% 3. 7% | 1. >30% 2. <65% 3. <15% | 1. 36% 2. 57% 3. 7% | 1. >30% 2. <65% 3. <15% |
| **Note**: This indicator substitute the previous “percentage of UNDP’s programme covered by Office and Audit and Investigation (OAI)’s audit annually” to ensure consistency with indicator 21 measuring UNDP performance (result) rather than UNDP investment (input). UNDP investment in both the Office of Audit and Investigations and the Independent Evaluation Office are included in the annual reporting to the Executive Board by those independent offices. 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) | ≥ 98% | 95.2% | ≥ 98% |
| Note: The world “expenditures” has been added to ensure the indicator correctly reflects what is measured. Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits. | | | | |
| **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 2. Independent evaluations | 1. 68% 2. 80% | 1. 74% 2. 82% | 1. 78% 2. 82% | 1. >95% 2. >95% |
| **Note**: The data source of this indicator is the Evaluations Resources Centre. The implementation rate is calculated as follows: total number of management responses which are “completed”, “on-going” and “initiated” divided by the number of total key actions excluding those are “no longer applicable”. Baseline and milestones were adjusted compared to what previously reported because the formula used in 2013 included only management responses which are “completed” and “on-going” but not “initiated.” | | | | |
| **23.** | Rate of implementation of agreed upon:   * 1. internal audit recommendations   2. external audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 1. 88% 2. 80% | 1. ≥ 85% 2. 85% | a. 81%  b. 96% | a. ≥ 85%  b.85% |
| **Note**: The indicator was disaggregated since tracking of the implementation of audit recommendations is done separately by OAI for internal audits and by BOM for external audits. Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Making UNDP a more open, adaptable and agile institution** | | | | | | |
| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 4. **LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE DIRECTION** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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% | 71% | 70% | 76 |
| **25.** | Percentage of all staff surveyed who feel empowered in their job | 57% | 57% | 56% | 65% |
| **26.** | Staff engagement index | 72% | 72% | 71% | 76% |
| **Note**: Calculated based on Global Staff Survey (GSS) questions on: UNDP as an organization to work for; treating staff with respect; being proud to work with UNDP; inspiration to work; and intention to stay. | | | | |
| **27.** | Percentage of project outputs that are aligned to corporate outcomes | 81.3% | 86.3% | 88.3% | 90% |
| **Note**: The indicator captures ongoing development outputs managed by headquarters units and country offices that are linked to the Strategic Plan outcomes/outputs. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Improved management of financial and human resources in pursuit of results** | | | | | | |
| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 5. **CORPORATE FINANCIAL, ICT AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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) | TBD | Not available | 80% |
| **Note**: 2012 data from the most recent Products and Services Survey (PSS) is used as baseline. The Products and Services Survey methodology is being revised and the indicator will be calculated in 2015. | | | | |
| **29.** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 8.44% | 8.2% | 8.29% | 8.1% |
| **30.** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs | 3.3% | 3.3% | 3.5% | 3.0% |

| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 6. **CORPORATE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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 2. RRs/RCs | 1. 20 working days 2. 11 weeks | 1. < 1 month 2. ≤11 weeks | 1. 20 working days 2. 9 weeks | 1. < 1 month 2. ≤11 weeks |
| **Note**: *Average time taken to fill* refers to the period ranging from vacancy announcement to candidate notification of selection. The additional category of *International Professional FTA* posts which require clearance by the Compliance Review Board in New York, will be added in next IRRF submissions. | | | | |
| **32.** | Percentage of staff who are female **(QCPR related indicator)**:   1. At all levels 2. P4-P5 3. D1 and above | 1. 42% 2. 38% 3. 36% | 1. 45% 2. 40% 3. 38% | 1. 42% 2. 39% 3. 36% | 1. 50% 2. 50% 3. 50% |
| **33.** | Percentage of annual performance management and development (PMD) processes completed on time. | 64.7% | 75% | 38.66%  (45.31% - on April 1 2015) | 85% |

| **Improved management of financial and human resources in pursuit of results** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 7. **CORPORATE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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) | TBD | 80.25% | TBD |
| **Note**: UNDP surveyed EB members’ satisfaction with UNDP support services for the first time in 2015. The survey obtained a total of 11 responses. In future iterations of the survey, UNDP will try to enhance participation. The results represent satisfaction with support provided during the previous year, and thus it is considered the actual for 2014. | | | | |
| **7.2** UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice by its partners | **35.** | Size and trend in funding from government and other non-government partners (including international financial institutions, regional development banks, civil society, private sector). **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | Total  $4.692b | Total  $4.751.5b  (1.3% increase from 2013) | Total  $4.588b (2% decrease from 2013) | Total  $4.928b |
| Regular Resources  $896m | Regular Resources  $875m  (2.3% decrease from 2013) | Regular Resources  $793m (11.4% decrease from 2013) | Regular Resources  $925m |
| Other Resources (Government)  $1.311b | Other Resources (government and non-government partners)  $3.126.5b  (14.3% increase from 2013) | Other Resources (government and non-government partners)  $2.944b (7.3% increase from 2013) | Other Resources (government and non-government partners)  $3.253m |
| Other Resources  (Non-government)  Multilateral partners: $1.360b  Other partners: $64m |
| Other Resources (Government Cost Sharing)  $1.061m | Other Resources (Government Cost Sharing)  $750m  (29.3% decrease from 2013) | Other Resources (Government Cost Sharing)  $851m (19.8% decrease from 2013) | Other Resources (Government Cost Sharing)  $750m |
| **Note**: Amounts in each year are in million, and represent the level of resources expected in that year (non-cumulative) for the category. The cumulative amounts targeted in the 2014-2017 period are: Total = $19,359; Regular Resources = $3,600; Other Resources (government and non-government partners) = $12,759; and Other Resources (government Cost Sharing) = $3,000.  Non-government includes: UN System, MPTFs, World Bank Group, EU, regional banks, vertical funds, NGOs/CSOs, private sector and foundations. In 2013 UNDP received $1,360 million from multilateral partners (UN system, MPTFs, EU, World Bank Group, regional banks and vertical funds) and $64 million from other partners (private sector, foundations, NGOs/CSOs, etc.). | | | | |
| **36.** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organization | 87% (2012) | Not available | 90% | 90% |
| **Note**: Partner Surveys are carried out every 2 years. The 2012 Partner Survey exercise was limited to country-level partners, such that perceptions of partners from HQ locations and donor capitals were not captured, resulting in a partial or limited coverage. The methodology and sampling frame have been reformulated, such that the 2015 survey will include the following partners in HQ and partner country locations: Governments; United Nations Agencies, Funds and Programmes; IFIs and Multilateral Organizations (the World Bank, EU, etc.); NGOs / CSOs; Private sector; Foundations; and Others. | | | | |
| **37.** | Percentage of Member States giving positive feedback on the quality of corporate reporting on results and mandates **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | TBD | Not available | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: The first survey to calculate this indicator will be done after the September 2015 EB session in order to collect Member States’ feedback on quality of reporting related to the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 | | | | |
| **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) | 80% | 60% | 100% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[cost classification: management functional clusters]** 8. **STAFF AND PREMISES SECURITY** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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) | 77.7% | 82.5% | 83.3% | 90% |
| **40.** | Percentage of Country Offices and headquarters units meeting Business Continuity Plan requirements | 24% | 65% | 52% | 95% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coordination of the UN Development System** | | | | | | |
| **[cost classification: coordination] 9. UN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION [cost classification: coordination]** | | | | | | |
| **Results statement:** | **No.** | **Indicator** | **Baseline** 2013 | **Milestones** 2014 | **Actual 2014** | **Target 2017** |
| **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) | Not applicable | 32% achieved 65% in progress | 70-100% achieved |
| **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) | 80% | 62% | 80% |
| **Note**: The 2012 Partnership Survey was limited to country-level partners, not capturing perceptions of partners from HQ locations and donor capitals. The methodology, questionnaire and sampling have been reformulated, and the 2015 survey included partners in HQ and partner country locations. The 2014 actual is the average % of favorable responses to 4 questions on UNDP’s contribution to the RC System. | | | | |
| **43.** | Per cent of country offices using common RBM tools and principles **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | TBD | Not available | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: Common methodology is being developed with other UNDG agencies | | | | |
| **44.** | Per cent of country offices using the common UNDG capacity measurement approach (when fully developed) **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | TBD | Not available | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: The common UNDG capacity measurement approach is being developed in the UPN. | | | | |
| **45.** | Number of country offices that are applying the Standard Operating Procedures, or components of it. **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | (67%) 73 out of 109 Survey respondents |  | (73%) 57 out of 78 Survey respondents | TBD |
| **46.** | Number of country offices implementing common services, common long-term agreements, harmonized approach to procurement, common human resources management, information and communication technology services, or financial management services. **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | TBD | Not available | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: Data for indicators 46 will be available in the next report through the new UNDG-resident coordinator annual report system. | | | | |
| **47.** | UNDP contribution in cash provided to the resident coordinator system **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | $74m | $92.65m | $89.7m | $92.65m |
| **Note**: The total UNDP contribution to the RC system will be recorded against this indicator, waiting for an agreement on indicator **49**; the amounts reported will represent the yearly UNDP core contribution to financing of the UN development coordination function | | | | |
| **48.** | UNDP contribution in kind provided to the resident coordinator system **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** | TBD | Not available | Not available | TBD |
| **Note**: Pending UNDG agreement on the definition of *in-kind.* | | | | |

## Annex III – Coordination of UN development system and QCPR Implementation

In 2014 UNDP’s coordination efforts were focused on providing further support to countries wishing to implement various elements of the Standard Operating Procedures for Delivering as One; accelerating implementation the of the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review, and engaging with UNDG partners to develop a common vision for the UN development system’s fitness to deliver the post-2015 agenda.

In order to ensure an optimally relevant and rigorous process for attracting high-caliber Resident Coordinator (RC) candidates, an **entirely new Resident Coordinator Assessment Centre (RCAC)** was launched in 2014. The new scenarios and exercises that have been developed for the Centre reflect much better the complexity of the RC role, representing well the development, humanitarian, human rights, political and security dimensions in which RCs routinely operate.

As of December 2014, of the 125 RCs appointed by the Secretary General, **39% were women, 44% were from the South, and 49%** are from UN system entities other than UNDP. The percentage of RCs coming from non-UNDP entities is the highest ever. This is a testament to the ongoing commitment by the UNDP Administrator and the Secretary-General to ensure that the RC pool reflects the full spectrum of experience and competencies available in the UN system. Going forward, greater efforts will be needed to promote better gender balance and geographical spread. In this regard, UNDP fully supports the corresponding recommendation of JIU report 2013/13 on the “Selection and Appointment of UN Resident Coordinators” that “more candidates should be nominated by the POs and the nominations should better reflect the required diversity in gender, geographical and organizational origin”.

An equal priority for UNDP, as manager of the RC system, is ensuring that the RC system is mutually accountable and collectively owned. In 2014, **implementation of the RC system cost-sharing agreement** kicked in, providing RCs and their offices with the adequate, predictable and necessary resources to carry their functions more efficiently and effectively. UNDP contributed over three quarters of the total cost and is now working closely with UNDG partners to ensure that all agencies are able to contribute their share in full, and that the system is fully funded, for the 2016-2017 biennium. Further work also remains to be done with regards to **implementation of the Management and Accountability System** for the Resident Coordinator system (MAS). By the end of 2014, 11 of 20 UN organizations had fully implemented the four mutual accountability criteria outlined in the MAS framework. While this is an improvement year-over-year (i.e. only five agencies had implemented them in full in 2012) it still represents a far from ideal scenario. Full implementation of the MAS remains a key QCPR requirement.

By the end of 2014 UNDP participated in the voluntary adoption of **43 Delivering as One countries** (now 44) globally, by providing country-level leadership in the in implementation of the various DaO elements. At the global level UNDP contributed to the development and release of an integrated package of support for countries wishing to implement the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and is **integrating the SOPs into its own Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures** (POP) for seamless operations both vertically within UNDP and horizontally across inter-agency processes.

UNDP has **fully aligned its Strategic Plan with the QCPR cycle**. Additionally, in response to ECOSOC resolution E/2013/L.17, together with other funds and programmes, UNDP has consolidated its annual reporting on the implementation of the QCPR within its annual reporting on the implementation of its strategic plans, including through the **integration into the Strategic Plan Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) of QCPR common indicators** that are fully aligned with the Secretary-General’s QCPR monitoring framework.

In response to the QCPR call for simplification of agency-specific programming instruments and processes to bring them further in line with the UNDAF, in 2014 UNDP presented to the Executive Board **a revised format and procedures for Country Programme Documents**, including a one-step approval procedure for country programmes. The new CPD format mirrors the UNDAF and the revised procedures allow countries to align their CPD cycle with those of the UNDAF and national development strategies. Additionally, the quality assurance of country programmes was strengthened through the **institutionalization of a new Headquarters Programme Appraisal Committee**, chaired at the ASG level. Over the course of the year 19 new programmes were reviewed at headquarters using the new HQ PAC arrangements. **Clear, measurable programme quality criteria** are being rolled out in 2015 – these are also aligned with new corresponding project quality standards, ensuring tighter linkages and accountabilities between programme strategy and project design and implementation. Country offices invested in aligning ongoing country programmes with the new strategic plan to ensure higher quality, more focused programmes and projects that deliver results more cost-effectively to programmes countries.

At the second regular session of the Executive Board in 2014 UNDP presented the paper “**Achieving critical mass for development success**” which contributed to the dialogue on funding the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 while also responding to QCPR mandates with respect to critical mass and structured dialogues for financing of development activities. The paper argues for an approach to critical mass that will improve the benefits of overall (regular plus other) funding available to UNDP, thus, increasing the likelihood that the organization can deliver on its commitments in the Strategic Plan. The paper calls for a shift from a high proportion of highly earmarked non-core resources towards a higher proportion of core and minimally earmarked non-core resources, thereby providing more flexible and predictable funding for development. Subsequently, UNDP presented at the first regular session of the Executive Board of 2015 its **Resource Mobilization Strategy** and the key elements of its new funding framework, which will become operational in 2016, and will continue to engage with Executive Board Member States regularly on these issues going forward.

UNDP believes that demonstrating the UN’s business efficiency and effectiveness is no longer a choice, but a prerequisite for the UN to become a partner of choice for programme countries. In 2014, in collaboration with UNDG partners, UNDP continued implementation of the **Business Operations Strategy (BOS)**, the backbone of the ‘Operating as One’ pillar of the SOPs. The BOS is a strategic planning tool for UN Country Teams (UNCTs) which aims to reduce transaction costs and duplications of efforts, thereby enhancing cost-effectiveness and quality of operational support processes, such as in the areas of procurement, ICT, HR, logistics, administration and finance. The BOS is currently being piloted in 14 countries. Although realized costs-savings will only become apparent around the end of 2017 when the BOS pilots complete their full cycle, preliminary estimates indicate that there is significant potential for cost-savings generated in ICT, human resources, and other common services. For example, estimated cost savings for Ethiopia, in the next three years are over $12 million, and in Rwanda, $15 million over five years. Total projected cost savings per year, for five of the pilots, are estimated at around $6.8 million.

In addition, with regard to the Joint Operations Facility in Brazil – a single service window that provides ICT, HR and travel support to eight agencies – we are projecting annual cost savings in the range of $1.8 million. Together with other members of the UNDG Working Group on Business Operations, UNDP is embarking on an initial evaluation of the BOS, including a rigorous cost-benefit analysis, which will be able to tell us how we can better support the scaling up of the BOS in a meaningful manner in tandem with around 60 new UNDAFs. To date, over 39 additional countries have already expressed an open interest to adopt the BOS.

1. Where there is no expected change between baseline and milestone, subtracting the baseline from the 2014 milestone yields zero, and it is not possible to divide a number by zero [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. (\*denotes that the baseline year is the year specified or latest data available) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)