

Table of Contents

Methodological Notes	2
Tier One: Impact	6
Tier Two: Development Outcomes and Outputs	7
Outcome 1:	7
Outcome 2:	14
Outcome 3:	21
Outcome 4:	27
Outcome 5:	30
Outcome 6:	36
Outcome 7:	41
Tier Three: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency	47

Annex 2 – Integrated Results and Resources Framework: Methodology and 2016 Results

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

Decision no.	Relevant paragraphs
2013/27	3. Approves the UNDP strategic plan, 2014-2017, as outlined 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 in Annex II of DP/2013/40 , appropriately disaggregated, including by sex and age, where relevant, to be finalized by the annual session 2014, as well as developing capacity throughout UNDP for data collection and reporting on the indicators; and (b) refinement of informal ‘theory of change’ documents for the seven development outcomes of the 2014 annual session.
2014/11	3. 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 against respective outputs upon completion of the reporting cycle , and 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 in 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 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 throughout the process.

Population of the IRRF 2016: “actual” results

2. **Data collection for impact indicators.** All impact indicators rely on international published data sources, as stated in the populated IRRF template. A baseline was provided for these indicators but no targets were set given that UNDP cannot establish them outside the scope of intergovernmental processes. In this report, baselines for some indicators were updated utilizing the most current data available as of March 2017, as stated in respective indicator reporting notes. Latest progress data has been provided for 2016, 2015 or 2014, according to availability.

3. **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 includes 2017 targets as “direction of travel” on the basis of trend analysis. In this Annual Report, baselines for several indicators were updated utilizing the most current data available as of March 2017, as stated in respective indicator reporting

notes. Latest progress data has been provided for 2016, 2015 or 2014, according to availability. For some outcome indicators no progress update is available due to time lags in data collection and reporting requirements at the international level. Progress updates for these indicators will be included in results reporting in coming years.

4. **Data collection for UNDP-reported outcome indicators and all output indicators.** Outcome indicators 4.4.c, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4, and all output indicators in the IRRF, rely on data from UNDP country offices through the online corporate planning system.

5. The annual reporting exercise was undertaken between mid-November 2016 and January 2017, where country offices reported results achieved in 2016 for all relevant IRRF indicators. An unprecedented level of data completeness was achieved in the 2016 results reporting exercise, with 2016 actual results values provided by country offices for 99.8% of the indicators with a 2016 milestone stated, i.e. only 0.2% missing data. Data provided by country offices was quality assured at regional and headquarters levels. Intensive effort was made this year to verify incomplete or inconsistent data with country offices, which resulted in almost all data issues being resolved and corrected without the need for assumptions to be applied. The following assumptions were then applied to country-level data, to enable calculation of a consistent time series of results expected over the Strategic Plan period, and to ensure conservative and robust reporting on results. These assumptions are consistent with those applied for 2014 and 2015 reporting, and reflect the different types of potential inconsistencies introduced when country offices report on cumulative expected and actual results across multiple years.

Missing baselines. If no valid baseline was reported, it was assumed to be equal to the first actual result reported, as a conservative assumption that reported results were not additional since the baseline. If no actual was reported the baseline was assumed to be equal to the first milestone reported. Exceptions to this conservative assumption were made only if there was an indication in the country comments that these were new results, in which case the baseline was set at zero. (Only two new cases required this assumption in 2016.)

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

Missing actuals. For cumulative indicators only, where countries reported expected results but were missing actual values for one or more years, a minimum assumption was made that the cumulative actual result was as high as the cumulative actual result reported for the previous year (i.e. the cumulative 2016 actual was assumed to match the cumulative 2015 actual result). No assumptions were made about missing actual values for indicators defined on an annual (non-cumulative) basis. This conservative approach ensures reporting on 2016 actuals was as complete as possible without making any assumptions about actual results beyond those confirmed by country programmes. As noted above, efforts were made to obtain missing actual values from country offices, which resulted in a completion rate of 99.8% of 2016 actual results values, and 100% of 2014 and 2015 actual results values now provided, for countries with reported milestones. (Only two new cases required this assumption in 2016.)

Countries adding reporting on new IRRF indicators for 2016 and 2017. Countries were permitted to add reporting against new IRRF indicators to reflect new programmes initiated in 2016. In these instances countries were required only to report a baseline value, 2016 expected and actual results, and a 2017 target. If the country chose to report on all years of the Strategic Plan, a conservative assumption was made that the expected and actual results for previous years (2014 and 2015) were equal to the baseline value. (Ninety-three cases followed this assumption in 2016.)

Adjustments to ensure a meaningful cumulative time series:

- 1) If any reported milestones or the target were lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator it was assumed that the baseline was not included in any of the reported time series for that indicator, and the baseline was adjusted to zero. (No new cases required this assumption in 2016.)
- 2) If all reported actuals were lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator, but the milestones and target were not lower than the baseline, it was assumed that the baseline was included in the expected results but not in the reported actuals. In such cases the baseline was adjusted to zero and the reported baseline value was subtracted from the milestone and target values only. (No new cases required this assumption in 2016.)
- 3) If the reported 2016 actual was lower than the reported baseline for a cumulative indicator, but no other expected or actual results were lower than the baseline, it was assumed that the 2016 actual was accidentally reported on an annual basis, and the cumulative 2015 actual was added to the 2016 actual. (No new cases required this assumption in 2016.)
- 4) If the reported 2016 actual was lower than the reported 2015 actual for a cumulative indicator it was assumed that the 2016 actual was incorrectly reported and the cumulative 2016 actual was adjusted to be as high as the 2015 actual if the country office did not provide a corrected figure. (Only two new cases required this assumption in 2016.)
- 5) If any reported milestone was lower than a previous milestone it was assumed that the later milestone was accidentally reported on an annual basis, and the previous cumulative milestone was added to the later milestone. An exception was made if this produced a value greater than the final 2017 target (which experience has shown is much more reliably reported on a cumulative basis). In such cases the previous cumulative milestone was used to replace the later milestone, without adding values. Exceptions were also made if the country had reported underperformance in the previous year (where the actual was below the milestone) and in these cases the lower milestone was assumed to be an intentional revision downwards and retained, unless the milestone was lower than the previous actual, in which case the previous actual was added to the milestone. (No new cases required this assumption in 2016.)

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 available. Similarly, for results where other disaggregation is used, if a valid total was not provided, it was assumed to be as high as the sum of reported components. (Seven new cases required this assumption in 2016.)

Adjustments to show additional results. For indicators designed to measure additional results achieved over the Strategic Plan period, country level results were adjusted as described above. The baseline value was then 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 (the extra results beyond what existed in the baseline year). These additional country level results were then added together to calculate the overall additional results in each year.

6. **Updated baselines, milestones, targets and actual results from previous years.** As agreed at the Midterm Review, no further changes have been permitted to baselines, milestones, targets or the actual results from previous years unless, (a) a change was required to correct factual inaccuracies identified in a country office’s reporting in previous years (e.g. if a country reported results on an annual rather than cumulative basis), or (b) a country began reporting on a new IRRF indicator for the first time to reflect new programmes. For indicators where either of these situations apply, updated figures are shown for applicable years in this Annual Report. Previously published baselines, milestones, actuals or targets from the Midterm Review and 2015 Annual Report of the Administrator are shown for reference under the respective indicator reporting notes.

7. **Number of countries linked and number of countries reporting on results.** The populated IRRF shows the number of countries linked to each output and a more specific count of the number of countries expected to contribute to results under each output indicator during the Strategic Plan cycle for 2014-2017. ‘Country’ refers to both countries and territories that receive UNDP programme resources.

8. **Data collection for Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency (OEE) results.** IRRF tier III indicators are populated with data from three types of sources: a) data on UNDP performance collected on an on-going basis through systems such as Atlas or tools for on-line analytics (indicators 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 38, 39, 40, 47); b) data self-reported on a regular basis by country offices or other units, validated by evidence and quality assurance processes (indicators 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23, 41, 43, 45, 46), and c) data from periodic surveys capturing perceptions on UNDP performance (indicators 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 28, 34, 36, 37, 42). Two indicators (44 and 48) cannot be included in 2016 reporting because methodologies are still being developed.

9. **Adjustment to IRRF Tier III indicators:** upon the new decentralized evaluations' assessment performed by the Independent Evaluation Office (as mandated by the new evaluation policy adopted by the Executive Board in 2016), indicator 19 on "percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory quality", was adjusted to include evaluations that were rated both satisfactory and partially satisfactory. The change is to ensure consistency with the Independent Evaluation Office report. Disaggregated values for satisfactory and partially satisfactory decentralized evaluations are reported in the note. Milestones and targets have been revised to reflect the new methodology.

10. **Use of IRRF data in the narrative sections of the annual report.** Results presented in the annual report narrative are based primarily on country office reporting of cumulative actual 2016 results achieved against the streamlined set of IRRF indicators, except for figures related to total jobs and livelihoods, which show aggregate performance under three related indicators (see paragraph 13 below for description of methodology). IRRF-derived results are complemented by examples of results delivered through country, regional and global programmes that draw on reporting by country offices and headquarters units through 2016 Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs); an internal report on project monitoring; national statistics; independent and decentralized evaluations; partner assessments, and other qualitative and quantitative evidence.

11. **Calculation of total people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods and total jobs created.** Box 1 of the midterm review includes figures on the total number of new jobs created and the total number of people benefitting from improved livelihoods by the end of 2016, through direct UNDP support. 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 and females, and jobs created where sex disaggregation is not available (as shown in the reporting notes below each indicator in the populated IRRF). While country offices usually report results of specific projects under only one relevant output indicator, the definition of indicator 1.1.1 is broad and allows potential for overlap with results reported under the specific categories 1.3.2 and 6.1.1. Therefore, a conservative approach was 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 is not usually an overlap between the results delivered through natural resources management 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 the total number of people benefitting from improved livelihoods is based on country office reporting on the three IRRF output indicators relating to livelihoods: 1.1.1.c-d (number of additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods), 1.3.2.c-d (number of additional people benefitting from livelihoods strengthened through solutions for management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste) and 6.1.1.B (number of additional people benefitting from diversified livelihoods opportunities through UNDP emergency projects). For each of these indicators, the calculation takes into account the reported number of males and females benefitting, and people benefitting where 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 likely to be an underestimate of the total number of people who benefit from improved livelihoods across all three areas.

Tier One: Impact

Impact: Eradication of poverty and a significant reduction of inequality and exclusion			
Impact indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)		Baseline	Latest Data
1	Number and proportion of people living below a) 1.25 US Dollars a day (PPP 2005) b) 1.90 US Dollars a day (PPP 2011)	a) 1 billion, 18% of population (2013) b) 0.9 billion, 15% of population (2012)	a) 0.83 billion, 14% of population (2015) b) 0.70 billion, 12% of population (2015)
	Source: a) Based on the Millennium Development Goals Report 2015, United Nations. Estimates for Developing Regions (pp. 14-15), b) Based on World Bank revision of international poverty lines, in Cruz, M, J. Foster, B. Quillin, and P. Schellekens (2015), "Ending Extreme Poverty and Sharing Prosperity: Progress and Policies" The World Bank (p.6). Estimates for Developing World. Global standards were revised by the World Bank in 2015: the 1.25 dollars (PPP2005) /day poverty line was replaced by the 1.90 dollars (PPP2011)/day poverty line. Statistics based on PPP2005 poverty lines will not be further updated.		
2	Poverty gap (%) a) at 1.25 US Dollars a day (PPP 2005) b) at 1.90 US Dollars a day (PPP 2011) c) at National Poverty Lines	a) 7.9% (2013*) b) 7.7% (2013*) c) 13.2% (2013*)	a) n/a b) 7.6% (2014*) c) 12.6% (2015*)
	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) 113 (107) programme countries in 2013 (2014), and (c) 93 (87) programme countries in 2013 (2015). As no new data is reported for PPP2005 poverty lines, (a) is kept as a reference, (b) replaces the poverty gap based on the 2.50 dollar day (PPP 2005) by the 1.90 dollar day (PPP 2011).		
3	Multi-dimensional poverty index (MPI), adjusted to reflect national data, standards and definitions	0.171 (2013*)	0.164 (2015*)
	Source: UNDP Human Development Report 2015. Simple average, based on 102 programme countries. The baseline is consistent with a poverty rate of 29.5% of the population. The latest value for 2014 is consistent with a poverty rate of 28.8% of the population. 2016 Reporting note: Baseline updated with new data. Previous baseline was 0.172, based on 101 programme countries.		
4	a) Human Development Index (HDI) b) Inequality-adjusted HDI (IHDI)	a) 0.636 (2013) b) 0.481 (2013)	a) 0.642 (2015) b) 0.486 (2015)
	Source: based on UNDP Human Development Report 2015, Statistical Annex, tables 2 and 3. Simple average based on 143 UNDP programme countries for HDI. Simple average based on 111 (117) UNDP programme countries for IHDI in year 2013 (2014). In 2015, the global HDI (computed by UNDP HDR Office for all countries, including programme and other countries) is 0.717 for the HDI and 0.557 for IHDI. 2016 Reporting Note: Baseline updated with new data. Previous values for 2013 were a) 0.63 (144 countries) and b) 0.48 (112 countries).		

Tier Two: Development Outcomes and Outputs

Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded				
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data, up to the year specified)		2013 baseline	Latest data	2017 Target
1.1	Employment rate, disaggregated by sex a.1) Female employment rate (employment as a share of labour force) a.2) Male employment rate (employment as a share of labour force) b.1) Female employment-to-population ratio (employment as a share of working-age population) b.2) Male employment-to-population ratio (employment as a share of working-age population)	a.1) 88.61% (2013) a.2) 91.85% (2013) b.1) 46.77% (2013) b.2) 69.76% (2013)	a.1) 88.88% (2016) a.2) 91.82% (2016) b.1) 47.10% (2016) b.2) 69.81% (2016)	Direction of travel: Increase by 0.5% (2012-2017)
<p>Source: UNDP estimate based on data from the International Labour Organization. Baseline is the simple average from 139 programme countries that have data available. The number of countries with progress (regression) is the following: a.1) 68 (59), a.2) 55 (72), b.1) 90 (37) b.2) 58 (70). There is no numeric internationally-agreed target for employment rate. For monitoring purposes, UNDP used the direction of travel (increase) and country projections by the 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 from 70 programme countries with available data.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous values (for 2013) were: a.1) 88.36%, a.2) 92.44%, b.1) 46.73% and b.2) 69.41%</p>				
1.2	Coverage of social protection systems, disaggregated by at-risk groups a) Percentage of population above legal retirement age in receipt of a pension b) Percentage of working-age population actively contributing to a pension scheme c) Percentage of unemployed not receiving unemployment benefits d) Contributors to employment injury benefits (as percentage of total labour force) e) Maternity benefits by type: i. Number of countries that have both statutory and employer-granted maternity benefits ii. Number of countries that have statutory maternity benefits only iii. Number of countries that have employer-granted maternity benefits only iv. Number of countries that have neither statutory nor employer-granted maternity benefits	a) 42.4% (2012) b) 21.8% (2012) c) 95.5% (2013) d) 28.7% (2013) e) i. 15 (2013*) ii. 82 (2013*) iii. 40 (2013*) iv. 2 (2013*)	Not yet available	Direction of travel: Increase
<p>Source: UNDP estimate based on data from International Labour Organization from 134 (a), 128 (b), 147 (c) and 106 (d), and 139 UNDP programme countries, respectively. There is no numeric internationally agreed target for social protection. For monitoring purposes, UNDP uses the direction of travel (increase in social protection coverage).</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Previous baselines a) 42.8%, b) 22.0%, c) 95.4%, d) 28.7%, e) ii. 83</p>				

(*Denotes that the baseline year is the year specified or latest data available)

1.3	Annual emissions of carbon dioxide (million tons CO ₂ equivalent)	32,525 Million tons CO ₂ equivalent (2013)	Not yet available	Direction of Travel: Decrease (*).
<p>Source: UNDP estimate based on data from World Resource Institute for 145 UNDP programme countries. Target consistent with conditional and unconditional country pledges set to be achieved after 2020. The Paris Agreement (signed by 175 countries on 22 April 2016) sets out a global action plan to limit global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius (with respect to pre-industrial levels), while pursuing efforts to keep temperature rise to 1.5 degree. The agreement entered into force on October 2016.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated with new data up to 2013. Previous value 32,366 million tons CO₂ equivalent (2012).</p>				
1.4	Coverage of cost-efficient and sustainable energy, disaggregated by rural/urban a) Percentage of population with connection to electricity (total) i) Urban ii) Rural b) Percentage of population with access to non-solid fuels (total) i) Urban ii) Rural	a) 82.0% (2013) i) 94.9% (2013) ii) 70.2% (2013) b) 51.3% (2012*) i) 83.3% (2012*) ii) 22.3% (2012*)	a) 82.8% (2014) i) 95.1% (2014) ii) 71.3% (2014) b) Not yet available	Direction of travel based on past trend: a) Increase, 89% b) Increase, 56%
<p>Source: UNDP estimate based on Global SE4ALL data, managed by the World Bank. a) Weighted average using population data from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) (World Urbanization Prospects, the 2011 Revision), and based on data from 146 UNDP programme countries (urban: 142 countries, rural: 143 countries), b) Weighted average using UNDESA population data and based on 144 UNDP programme countries. There is no numeric internationally agreed target. Direction of travel/trends estimated by UNDP using historical trends.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated with new released data for (a) and to reflect changes in sample for (b). Previous values were a) overall 82.0%, urban 95.4%, rural 69.8%; b) overall 51.2%, urban 83.2%, rural 22.3%.</p>				
1.5	Hectares of land that are managed sustainably under an <i>in-situ</i> conservation regime, a sustainable use regime and an access and benefits sharing (ABS) regime a) Number of hectares of land managed under an <i>in-situ</i> conservation regime b) Number of hectares of land managed under a sustainable use regime c) Number of hectares of land managed under an access and benefits sharing (ABS) regime	a) 1.46 billion ha (2013) b) 92.6 million ha (2013) c) 0 ha (2013)	a) 1.48 billion ha (2016) b) 97.7 million ha (2016*) c) 30 ha (2016)	Direction of travel based on past trend: a) Increase in area b) Increase in area c) Increase in area

<p>a) Source: UNDP estimate based on World Database on Protected Areas for 136 UNDP programme countries. Based on GIS estimates. Reference target: Aichi Target 11 (By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas) and information from the Convention on Biological Diversity.</p> <p>b) Source: UNDP estimate based on data from Organic World Net (2011) and Forest Stewardship Council (2013) for 155 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) focuses only on sustainable management, without a numerical target.</p> <p>c) Source: UNDP estimate based on the Global Environment Facility (GEF)-UNDP portfolio. Baseline reflects ABS work was in early stages in 2013 and, therefore, 2013 coverage could conservatively be estimated as 0 ha. Latest data reflects one out of 45 relevant projects in 40 countries. Direction of travel is used for monitoring (increase) since there is no internationally agreed spatial target for ABS. The relevant Aichi Target (#16) focuses on the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol, without a numerical target.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baselines updated following changes in original sources. For a) the previous baseline was 1.50 billion ha (2013), and for c) the previous baseline was 103 million ha (2013).</p>
--

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 126 (December 2016)</p>	<p>1.1.1</p>	Number of new jobs and other livelihoods generated, disaggregated by sex.	0	217,441	416,554	682,859	549,845	861,123
		a) New jobs created for women	0	329,855	584,312	902,207	1,078,996	1,174,126
		b) New jobs created for men	0	2,092,448	4,682,523	5,476,576	7,039,504	6,666,167
		c) Additional females benefiting from strengthened livelihoods	0	1,416,168	3,475,504	3,795,402	5,389,586	4,052,428
		d) Additional males benefiting from strengthened livelihoods	0					
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 72, b) 70, c) 85, d) 81						
<p>Indicator 1.1.1 Note: Tracks the cumulative number of new jobs created and cumulative number of additional people benefiting from strengthened livelihoods with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onward. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data were provided for the total number of people. An additional 160,075 new jobs were generated by 2016, and 101,377 additional people benefitted from strengthened livelihoods by 2016, for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see indicators 1.3.2 and 6.1.1.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Minor corrections have been made to the following values to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by four country offices: (a) 2015 actual increased from 414,888 to 416,554; 2016 milestone increased from 681,475 to 682,859; 2017 target increased from 854,739 to 861,123; (b) 2015 actual increased from 580,462 to 584,312; 2016 milestone increased from 829,398 to 902,207; 2017 target increased from 1,157,447 to 1,174,126; (c) 2015 actual decreased from 4,687,304 to 4,682,523; 2016</p>								

		milestone decreased from 5,537,640 to 5,476,576; 2017 target decreased from 6,724,394 to 6,666,167; (d) 2015 actual decreased from 3,481,903 to 3,475,504; 2016 milestone decreased from 3,863,512 to 3,795,402; 2017 target decreased from 4,116,138 to 4,052,428.						
	1.1.2	Number of countries with improved policies, systems and/or institutional measures in place at the national and sub-national levels to generate and strengthen employment and livelihoods Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 104	0	37	63	79	70	96
		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. 2016 reporting note: Minor corrections have been made to the following values to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 78 to 79; 2017 target increased from 95 to 96.						
	1.1.3	Number of new schemes which expand and diversify the productive base based on the use of sustainable production technologies Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 75	0	616	1,306	1,666	1,960	2,140
		Indicator 1.1.3 note: Tracks the cumulative 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) and that played a role in prompting follow-up action and/or leading to transformational change, from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value was corrected downwards from 1,483 to 1,306 to ensure the accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by two country offices. The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 2,135 to 2,140 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.						
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 1.2. Options enabled and facilitated for inclusive and sustainable social protection Number of countries linked: 62 (December 2016)	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	3	6	7	11	11	19
		a) Increase access for men	3	7	8	13	12	21
		b) Increase access for women	3	6	9	14	15	21
		c) Increase access in urban areas						
		d) Increase access in rural areas	5	7	10	14	14	19

		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 40, b) 40, c) 38, d) 40						
		<p>Indicator 1.2.1 Note: Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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) that counts the number of countries where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has resulted in measures being at least approved and implemented. Indicator language has been slightly revised to refer to measures instead of reforms.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Minor corrections have been made to the 2017 targets to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: a) increased from 18 to 19; b) increased from 20 to 21; c) increased from 20 to 21; d) increased from 18 to 19.</p>						
	1.2.2	Number of countries with improved financial sustainability of social protection systems	0	7	14	19	17	22
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 33						
		<p>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 support is tracked using a qualitative assessment (1: Not adequately, 2: Very partially, 3: Partially, and 4: Largely), counting the number of countries that, with UNDP support, have improved financial sustainability of social protection systems from January 2014 onwards.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
Output 1.3. Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste. <i>Number of countries linked: 113 (December 2016)</i>	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	0	370	844	1,200	1,463	1,764
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 96						
		<p>Indicator 1.3.1 Note: Tracks the cumulative number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level, created from January 2014 onward (on demand from programme countries).</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value was corrected downwards from 971 to 844 to accurately capture results previously reported on an incorrect basis by two country offices. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of three additional</p>						

		country offices not previously captured, and accurately capture results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The 2016 milestone increased from 1,195 to 1,200, and 2017 target increased from 1,478 to 1,764.						
	1.3.2	Number of new jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste, disaggregated by sex.						
		a) New jobs (women)	0	24,435	42,313	147,744	62,619	218,253
		b) New jobs (men)	0	22,215	40,655	76,309	75,695	120,926
		c) Additional females benefiting from strengthened livelihoods	0	811,983	2,774,340	3,964,989	3,555,103	4,415,514
		d) Additional males benefiting from strengthened livelihoods	0	665,792	2,796,872	3,844,520	3,468,418	4,224,080
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 49, b) 49, c) 74, d) 75						
		Indicator 1.3.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new jobs created and additional people benefitting from strengthened livelihoods through management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onward. Where data disaggregated by sex was not available, data was provided for the total number of people. An additional 967 jobs were generated by 2016, and 123,168 additional people benefitted from strengthened livelihoods by 2016, for which sex disaggregation is not available. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, see indicators 1.1.1 and 6.1.1 . 2016 reporting note: Minor corrections have been made to the following values to ensure the accurate capturing of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by two country offices: (a) 2015 actual decreased from 42,455 to 42,313, and (b) 2015 actual decreased from 40,692 to 40,655.						
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 1.4. Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors which is funded and implemented Number of countries linked: 116 (December 2016)	1.4.1	Number of countries with strengthened systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, and report on and verify use of climate finance.						
		a) Countries with improved access to climate finance (by government and non-government institutions)	0	24	46	60	56	77
		b) Countries with strengthened systems in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and verify climate finance	0	17	48	62	61	81
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 91, b) 87						

		<p>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, from January 2014 onwards. Note that these two sub-indicators were adjusted in 2015 to measure change since the baseline, as done for all other IRRF output indicators measuring change over time, rather than change since the previous year.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Minor corrections have been made to the following values to reflect the contributions of four additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 57 to 60; 2017 target increased from 74 to 77; (b) 2016 milestone increased from 60 to 62; 2017 target increased from 78 to 81.</p>						
	1.4.2	<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 113</p>	0	43	76	93	94	108
		<p>Indicator 1.4.2 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
<p>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)</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 81 (December 2016)</p>	1.5.1	<p>Number of new development partnerships with funding for improved energy efficiency and/or sustainable energy solutions targeting underserved communities/groups and women</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 69</p>	0	220	516	632	716	799
	<p>Indicator 1.5.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new partnerships with funding established (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value was corrected upwards from 513 to 516 to accurately capture results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 631 to 632, and the 2017 target increased from 798 to 799.</p>							
	1.5.2	Number of additional people with improved energy access	0	1,622,207	2,564,956	4,791,911	5,276,791	6,118,153

	Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 59						
<p>Indicator 1.5.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of additional people whose access to energy has improved as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value was corrected upwards from 2,564,934 to 2,564,956 to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 4,780,057 to 4,791,911, and 2017 target increased from 6,096,299 to 6,118,153.</p>							

Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance				
Outcome Indicators (* Using latest data up to the year specified)		2013 baseline	Latest data	2017 Target
2.1	Number of countries with open access to data on government budgets, expenditures and public procurement	36.8% (2012)	40.9% (2015)	Direction of travel: Increase
<p>Source: UNDP utilizes data from the International Budget Partnership to track progress in countries requesting support. Simple average for 84 programme countries. Between 2012 and 2015, there was progress (regression) in 45 (34) countries. The Open Budget Survey measures the state of budget transparency, participation, and oversight in countries around the world. The Open Budget Index (OBI), ranging between 0 and 100, is a simple average of the quantified responses for the 95 survey questions related to budget transparency. OBI data show that in six years (from 2006 to 2012), 40 countries made progress. For details, see Open Budget Survey 2012.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated. Previous baseline was 37.2% for 85 programme countries.</p>				
2.2	Voter turnout	67.8% (2013*)	66.0% (2016*)	Direction of travel based on past trend: Increase, 70.0%
<p>Source: UNDP estimate, based on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union, on the average voter turnout in 116 and 130 programme countries in 2013 and 2016 respectively. Using a comparable sample, there was progress (regression) in 31 (36) countries. Direction of travel estimated by UNDP based on historical world trends.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated to reflect more recently available data for 2013. For reference, previous baseline was 68.3% (2013).</p>				
2.3	Percentage of women in national parliaments	20.8% (2013)	22.1% (2016*)	International Target: 30% SP 2017 trend: 22.7%
<p>Source: UNDP calculation based on data from the Inter-Parliamentary Union (http://www.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp) for 147 and 150 programme countries in 2013 and 2016, respectively. There was progress (regression) in the indicator in 77 (35) 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.</p>				

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
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: 90 (December 2016)	2.1.1a	Number of parliaments with improved administrative and human resources capacities to discharge their mandates in relation to law-making, oversight and representation Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 65	0	31	45	54	50	62
		Indicator 2.1.1 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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 parliamentary capacities from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 61 to 62 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.						
	2.1.1b	Number of constitution-making bodies (CMBs) with improved administrative and human resources capacities to undertake drafting, public outreach and consultation and with mechanisms to ensure the participation of women and marginalized groups Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 46	0	25	32	38	34	44
Indicator 2.1.1b note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) to strengthen CMB 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 CMB capacities from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 37 to 38, and 2017 target increased from 43 to 44.								

Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
	<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 58</p>	0	30	39	46	41	52
	<p>Indicator 2.1.1c note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries, within the scope of the United Nations 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 improved EMB capacities from January 2014 onwards. An additional three countries requested clearance from the United Nations Department of Political Affairs to receive electoral assistance, and will be included in milestones and target once appropriate.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
	<p>2.1.2 Number of additional registered electors</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 44</p>	0	29,492,102	68,175,254	77,262,227	74,906,127	94,794,442
<p>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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2015 actual increased from 68,049,834 to 68,175,254; 2016 milestone increased from 77,136,807 to 77,262,227, and 2017 target increased from 94,669,022 to 94,794,442.</p>							
	<p>2.1.3 Number of additional women participating as candidates in national elections</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 49</p>	0	3,822	35,035	276,529	288,958	278,118
	<p>Indicator 2.1.3 note: Tracks the cumulative 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: 2015 actual increased from 34,866 to 35,035; 2016 milestone increased from 276,360 to 276,529, and the 2017 target increased from 277,949 to 278,118.</p>						

Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
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: 60 (December 2016)	2.2.2 Number of new proposals adopted to mitigate sector specific corruption risks (e.g. extractive industries, and public procurement in the health and other sectors) Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 43		0	30	58	90	93	123
		Indicator 2.2.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new proposals adopted to mitigate sector-specific corruption risks as a result of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 87 to 90; 2017 target increased from 120 to 123.						
Output 2.3 Capacities of human rights institutions strengthened Number of countries linked: 63 (December 2016)	2.3.1 Number of countries with strengthened operational institutions supporting the fulfilment of nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 69		0	25	37	49	48	62
		Indicator 2.3.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 48 to 49, and 2017 target increased from 60 to 62.						

Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 2.4. Frameworks and dialogue processes engaged for effective and transparent engagement of civil society in national development Number of countries linked: 72 (December 2016)	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. a) Women’s groups b) Youth groups c) Other excluded groups Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 53, b) 59, c) 54	0	21	37	43	42	49	
		0	25	39	47	46	53	
		0	23	34	43	41	51	
<p>Indicator 2.4.1 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP support (on demand from programme countries) for civil society engagement in national dialogue processes on development, with a focus on the most critical development and crisis-related issues, 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 among these groups.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 42 to 43; 2017 target increased from 48 to 49; (b) 2016 milestone increased from 45 to 47; 2017 target increased from 51 to 53; (c) 2016 milestone increased from 42 to 43; 2017 target increased from 50 to 51.</p>								
	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) a) Women’s groups b) Youth groups c) Excluded groups Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 50, b) 50, c) 56	16	22	33	38	32	45	
		16	21	30	42	38	47	
		15	19	30	44	42	48	

		<p>Indicator 2.4.2 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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 (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 led to at least a medium degree.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: (a) baseline increased from 15 to 16; 2014 actual value increased from 21 to 22; 2015 actual value increased from 32 to 33; 2016 milestone increased from 37 to 38; 2017 target increased from 44 to 45; (b) baseline increased from 14 to 16; 2014 actual value increased from 19 to 21; 2015 actual value increased from 28 to 30; 2016 milestone increased from 40 to 42; 2017 target increased from 45 to 47; (c) baseline increased from 14 to 15; 2014 actual value increased from 18 to 19; 2015 actual value increased from 29 to 30; 2016 milestone increased from 43 to 44, and the 2017 target increased from 47 to 48.</p>					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 76 (December 2016)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>a) Legal frameworks b) Policy frameworks c) Institutional frameworks</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 84, b) 91, c) 86</p>	14	30	37	56	59	72
		13	24	38	55	59	74
		10	24	34	50	50	68
	<p>Indicator 2.5.1 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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 led to frameworks being at least partially in place.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
	<p>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.</p> <p>a) Integrated Water Resource Management b) Oceans and marine ecosystems</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 59, b) 45</p>	0	17	33	47	43	53
		0	13	22	33	30	39

		<p>Indicator 2.5.2 note: Qualitative indicator, through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 46 to 47; 2017 target increased from 52 to 53, and (b) 2016 milestone increased from 32 to 33.</p>					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>Output 2.6. Legal reform enabled to fight discrimination and address emerging issues (such as environmental and electoral justice)</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 21 (December 2016)</p>	<p>2.6.1</p> <p>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)</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26</p>	11	20	22	25	23	26
		<p>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 the UNDP 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 29 countries supported by UNDP by 2016.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>					

Outcome 3: Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services			
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)	2013 baseline	Latest Data	2017 Target
3.1 Level of public confidence in the delivery of basic services	52.5% (2013)	52.3% (2015)	Direction of travel: Increase
<p>Source: Index based on Gallup World Poll questions about satisfaction with public services (education, highways and transportation). UNDP aggregated the baseline (simple average) for 122 programme countries. There was progress (regression) in the indicator in 59 (51) countries. Country level information can be found in the Worldwide Governance Indicators website; maintained by the World Bank. There is no numeric internationally agreed target.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline updated. Previous baseline was 52.4.</p>			
3.2 Coverage of HIV and AIDS services , disaggregated by sex, age (children)			
3.2.a) Number of people receiving ARV therapy	a) 12.9 million (2013)	a) 18.2 million (2016)	a) More than 15 million (by 2015)
a.1) Percentage of eligible adults receiving ARV therapy	a.1) 36% (2013)	a.1) 45% (2015)	Direction of travel: Increase
a.2) Percentage of eligible children receiving ARV therapy	a.2) 38% (2013)	a.2) 50% (2015)	
b.1) Percentage of females 15-24 years of age with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS	b.1) 30.3% (2013*)	b.1) 31.0% (2014*)	
b.2) Percentage of males 15-24 years of age with comprehensive correct knowledge of HIV/AIDS	b.2) 33.3% (2013*)	b.2) 34.0% (2014*)	
<p>Source: for coverage of antiretroviral (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 the United Nations MDGs. Simple average of data regarding 95 (88) programme countries for women in 2013 (2014) and 66 (62) programme countries for men in 2013 (2014). For females (b1), there was progress (regression) in 6 (4) countries. For males (b2), there was progress (regression) in 10 (7) countries. There is no numeric target for specific age or sex groups.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baselines updated to reflect revisions in data. Previous baselines were: a.1) 35% (2013); a.2) 27% (2013). The sharp increase in indicator a.2 is due to significant reduction in estimated number of eligible children.</p>			
3.3 Access to justice services , disaggregated by type of service (civil/criminal justice services)			
a) Civil Justice Index	a) 45.5% (2013)	a) 48.7% (2015)	Not available
b) Criminal Justice Index	b) 43.1% (2013)	b) 43.8% (2015)	
<p>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.” Calculations are based on data for 71 (74) programme countries in 2013 (2015). In civil justice there was progress (regression) in 54 (17) countries. In criminal justice there was progress (regression) in 47 (24) countries. Targets: Since there is no numeric internationally agreed target, these indexes are not included in most national statistics systems, and there is limited coverage and history, it is not possible to establish credible targets.</p>			
3.5 Homicide rate , disaggregated by sex (per 100,000 inhabitants)	5.9 per 100,000 inhabitants (2013*)	5.8 per 100,000 inhabitants (2014*)	Direction of travel: Decrease
a) Female	a) 2.4 per 100,000 inhabitants (2013*)	a) 2.4 per 100,000 inhabitants (2014*)	
b) Male	b) 9.2 per 100,000 inhabitants (2013*)	b) 9.2 per 100,000 inhabitants (2014*)	

Source: UNDP calculations using statistics from UNODC (<http://www.unodc.org/gsh/en/data.html>) for 146 programme countries. Figures represent absolute proportion of homicides over population of reference or weighted average (using population). 69 (68) countries present “epidemic” levels (defined as more than 10 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants) of male homicides in 2013 (2014), and 3 (5) countries present epidemic levels of female homicide in 2013 (2014). No internationally-agreed numerical targets are available. UNDP uses direction of travel (reduction) with emphasis on reducing rates in countries experiencing epidemic homicide levels.
2016 reporting note: Baselines updated with latest data. Previous values were: overall 6.0 (2013), female 2.4 (2013), and male 9.5 (2013).

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 3.1. Core functions of government enabled to ensure national ownership of recovery and development processes Number of countries linked: 30 (December 2016)	3.1.1	Number of countries where targets in national recovery plans related to restoring or strengthening core government functions have been met.	1	7	7	9	9	14
		Targets related to restoring or strengthening: a) Policy formulation and public financial management	1	4	8	12	13	19
		b) Managing the centre of government	2	5	10	13	12	17
		c) Civil service management	0	4	6	10	12	12
		d) Local governance	1	7	9	13	12	16
e) Aid coordination								
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 22, b) 22, c) 23, d) 20, e) 21						
		Indicator 3.1.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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 centre 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.						
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 3.2. Functions, financing and capacity of sub-national level institutions enabled to deliver improved basic services and respond to	3.2.2	Number of countries where sub-national governments/administrations show improved capacities for planning, budgeting and/or monitoring basic services delivery	0	23	39	53	51	67
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 67						

<p>priorities voiced by the public</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 80 (December 2016)</p>	<p>Indicator 3.2.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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 is expected to be delivered in 66 countries, support to monitoring is expected to be delivered in 65 countries, and support to budgeting is expected to be delivered in 55 countries.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2016 milestone value was corrected upwards from 52 to 53 to accurately capture results previously reported incorrectly by one country office.</p>							
<p>Output</p>	<p>Output Indicator</p>		<p>2013</p>	<p>2014</p>	<p>2015</p>	<p>2016</p>		<p>2017</p>
			<p>Baseline</p>	<p>Actual</p>	<p>Actual</p>	<p>Milestone</p>	<p>Actual</p>	<p>Target</p>
<p>Output 3.3. National institutions, systems, laws and policies strengthened for equitable, accountable and effective delivery of HIV and related services</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 63 (December 2016)</p>	<p>3.3.1</p>	<p>Number of people who have access to HIV and related services, disaggregated by sex and type of service.</p> <p>a) Behavioural change communication</p> <p>i. Number of males reached</p> <p>ii. Number of females reached</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set under this indicator: 25</p> <p>b) ARV treatment</p> <p>i. Number of males reached</p> <p>ii. Number of females reached</p> <p>Number of countries supported in 2016: 22</p>	<p>10,273,561</p> <p>9,229,663</p> <p>1,376,885</p> <p>(total people)</p>	<p>12,112,129</p> <p>10,400,068</p> <p>1,675,962</p> <p>(total people)</p>	<p>12,354,253</p> <p>10,682,692</p> <p>1,789,267</p> <p>(total people)</p>	<p>12,834,235</p> <p>10,824,642</p> <p>1,900,000</p> <p>(total people)</p>	<p>14,450,805</p> <p>11,308,304</p> <p>1,998,027</p> <p>(total people)</p>	<p>13,531,253</p> <p>11,114,171</p> <p>1,000,000</p> <p>(total people)</p>
<p>Indicator 3.3.1.a note: Tracks the cumulative number of people that, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), were reached with HIV-related behavioural change communication, from January 2014 onwards. Disaggregated data is provided where it is available. An additional 1,803,161 people were reached with behavioural change communication by 2016 for which sex disaggregation is not available. Figures reported here are not expected to match those reported through the Global Fund portfolio, as not all countries where UNDP is an interim Principal Recipient are linked to this output, and UNDP also provides support for behavioural change communication outside the scope of Global Fund projects.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two country offices that were able to provide sex disaggregated reporting for the first time this year: a.i) baseline increased from 10,263,561 to 10,273,561; 2016 milestone increased from 12,818,659 to 12,834,235; 2017 target increased from 13,505,664 to 13,531,253; a.ii) baseline increased from 9,226,663 to 9,229,663; 2016 milestone increased from 10,817,018 to 10,824,642, and the 2017 target increased from 11,103,908 to 11,114,171.</p> <p>Indicator 3.3.1.b note: Tracks the number of people that, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), have gained access to antiretroviral treatment in each year of the Strategic Plan. The indicator was revised in 2014 to track total numbers reached with ARVs using the more robust Global Fund dataset that is subject to a harmonization process and captures the majority of UNDP support for ARV treatment. Harmonized data for both 2014 and 2015 is confirmed in this report. As of end-2016, sex-disaggregated data is still not being collected or reported on a consistent basis across Global Fund grants. Reporting systems, both national and global, are still undergoing revision in order to be able to capture sex-disaggregated data. We expect to be able to provide sex disaggregated reporting of people reached with ARVs by the final year of the Strategic Plan.</p>								

	<p>2016 reporting note: UNDP is called upon to implement Global Fund programmes, as interim ‘Principal Recipient’ in a select number of countries, particularly those facing significant capacity constraints, complex emergencies, or other difficult circumstances. The Country Coordinating Mechanism and/or the Global Fund requests UNDP to act as interim Principal Recipient where no suitable local entity could be identified, and in countries under the Global Fund’s Additional Safeguard Policy (ASP). While serving as interim Principal Recipient, UNDP works to develop national capacity and strengthen national systems necessary for the implementation of Global Fund grants UNDP manages Global Fund grants on an interim basis, until a national entity is able to assume the full responsibility for implementation of the programmes. As such the UNDP grant portfolio is dynamic, with grants frequently being handed over to national Principal Recipients, while at the same time UNDP takes over the administration of grants in other places. UNDP calculates aggregated country results for the number of people currently on antiretroviral therapy (ART) from Global Fund-supported programs through annual data harmonization consultations with the Global Fund. The majority of reported results from UNDP implemented Global Fund programmes are based on national reporting, although some are grant-specific. The Global Fund and UNDP attribute national or grant specific ART results to UNDP only while UNDP is the interim Principal Recipient of the grants, otherwise the results get transferred to national Principal Recipients. The milestone for 2015 was set taking into consideration a significant observed increase in the ART results from 2013 to 2014; yet, due to the transfer of responsibility to national principal recipients in Zambia (720,439 people on ART), Haiti (65,000), Belarus (7,000) and Uzbekistan (7,800) in 2017, as well as a slowdown in the average monthly enrolment of new people on treatment in Zimbabwe, the 2017 annual target was brought down to 1,000,000 at the 2016 mid-term review.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
3.3.2	<p>a) Percentage of UNDP-managed Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria grants that are rated as exceeding or meeting expectations</p> <p>Number of countries with UNDP-managed Global Fund grants varies each year</p>	44.6% (2009-2013)	62.5%	53%	54%	48%	55%
	<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries with UNDP-managed Global Fund grants varies each year</p>	5.4% (2011-2013)	20.8%	15.2%	15%	10%	15%
<p>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).</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline (average performance of UNDP-rated grants over the 2009-2013 period), milestones and 2017 target are unchanged. As of 31 December 2016, UNDP is managing 37 Global Fund grants in 21 countries, as well as two Regional Grants in Africa and Asia-Pacific, together covering an additional 26 countries. UNDP plays a key role in supporting counties facing challenging circumstances to deliver essential social services financed by the Global Fund. The UNDP role as Principal Recipient is an interim arrangement that lasts until one or more national entities (i.e. government entities and/or CSOs) are ready and able to takeover grant implementation. As of end 2016, UNDP has exited and transferred the Principal Recipient role to national entities in 26 countries. In 2016, UNDP transitioned out of three countries (6 grants). It is currently expected that UNDP, will complete a transition out of another four countries (4 grants in total) in 2017. At the same time, new grants</p>							

		<p>have been taken on, including an HIV grant in Angola and a multi-country grant for the Caribbean. The combination of handing over mature, strong performing grants, taking over new often poorly performing grants, and starting new grants was expected to bring the percentage of Global Fund grants rated A1 or A2 down from 2015 onwards. To reflect this evolving profile of the portfolio, the baseline reflects the average performance of UNDP-rated grants over the 2009-2013 period.</p> <p>Indicator 3.3.2.b note: This indicator reflects the relative performance of Global Fund grants managed by UNDP, and Global Fund grants managed by others. It is 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 2016; this number will change over time. The Global Fund has 461 active grants in over 100 countries.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baseline reflects average difference in grant performance from 2011 to 2013, which has been measured from March 2011 onwards. As noted in the 2014 Annual Report, the 2014 milestone reflected the expected high performance of the portfolio of mature strong performing UNDP-managed grants, a lower level was expected from 2015 onwards for the reasons cited in Reporting Note for sub-indicator 3.3.2.a above. The 2017 target was updated from 10% to 15% at the Midterm Review in 2016 based on latest evidence of actual performance. UNDP continues to outperform other principal recipients, however as we hand over 15 mature strong performing grants to national entities, and as the Global Fund engages UNDP as principal recipient in more challenging operating environments it is possible that UNDP performance as compared to others will be lower than in previous years.</p>					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>Output 3.4. Functions, financing and capacity of rule of law institutions enabled, including to improve access to justice and redress</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 52 (December 2016)</p>	<p>3.4.1</p> <p>Number of additional people who have access to justice, disaggregated by sex</p> <p>Access to legal aid services</p> <p>a) Number of additional men</p> <p>b) Number of additional women</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set under this indicator: 38</p> <p>Cases receiving judgment in the first instance of the formal justice system</p> <p>c) Number of new GBV cases</p> <p>d) Number of new non-GBV cases</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: c) 12, d) 9</p>						
		0	407,580	718,938	903,456	1,013,934	1,016,660
		0	409,279	740,113	884,698	1,044,922	991,129
		0	10,855	18,312	22,492	23,390	29,803
		0	352,796	407,033	212,116	564,078	459,876
	<p>Indicator 3.4.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of additional men and women with access to legal aid services, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries); and the cumulative number of additional cases receiving judgment in the first instance of the formal justice system (disaggregated by whether cases are of Gender Based Violence or other), with UNDP support, from January 2014 onwards. An additional 1,182,194 people had access to legal aid services by 2016 for which sex disaggregated data is not available.</p>						

		2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 902,456 to 903,456; 2017 target increased from 1,015,660 to 1,016,660; (b) 2016 milestone increased from 884,578 to 884,698, and 2017 target increased from 991,009 to 991,129.						
	3.4.2	Number of additional victims whose grievances cases are addressed within transitional justice processes , disaggregated by sex. a) Additional male victims b) Additional female victims	0 0	139,605 72,699	414,825 304,534	481,363 358,996	470,000 356,460	629,737 423,957
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 17						
		Indicator 3.4.2 note: Tracks the cumulative 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.						
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 3.5. Communities empowered and security sector institutions enabled for increased citizen safety and reduced levels of armed violence Number of countries linked: 33 (December 2016)	3.5.1	Number of countries with improved capacities for security sector governance and oversight Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 34	0	9	24	28	27	31
		Indicator 3.5.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 27 to 28, and the 2017 target increased from 30 to 31.						
	3.5.2	Number of countries where gender-sensitive evidence-based security strategies for reducing armed violence and/or control of small arms are in operation at the community level Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 35	3	10	16	19	20	29
		Indicator 3.5.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.						

Outcome 4: Faster progress is achieved in reducing gender inequality and promoting women's empowerment			
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)	2013 baseline	Latest Data	Target 2017
4.1 Wage gap between men and women	16.1% (2013)	16.3% (2015)	Direction of travel based on past trend: Decrease 16% (trend)
<p>Source: UNDP calculations using data from International Labour Organization (Global Wage Database). Simple average for 56 (57) programme countries for 2013 (2015). There was progress (regression) in 14 (20) countries. 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baselines updated with latest data. Previous value was 16.3% (2013).</p>			
4.2 Gender gap in access to credit	7.3% (2011)	6.7% (2014)	Direction of travel based on past trend: Decrease 5% (trend)
<p>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. Simple average for 108 (105) programme countries for 2011 (2014). There was progress (regression) in 47 (50) countries. Projected trend estimated by UNDP was consistent with a 25% reduction of the differential in access to credit between men and women at the national level.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baselines updated. Previous value was 7.2% (2011).</p>			
4.3 (Harmonized Indicator with UN Women) Number of countries where there is evidence that national prevalence of physical and/or sexual violence experienced by women has decreased	14 (2016*)	14 (2016*)	19
<p>Source: information is collected and analysed by UN Women from Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Domestic Violence Module, STAT Compiler and national reports, available at: http://dhsprogram.com/Data/. Covers only intimate partner. There were only 18 countries with comparable data. Out of these, there was decrease in 14 countries, increase in 3 countries and no significant change in one country. Target (19 countries have a decrease in prevalence of physical or sexual abuse) taken from revised UN Women Impact Indicator 3B (Updated Development Result Framework, Annex C in UN Women Strategic Plan 2014-2017).</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Indicator formulation changed from “percentage of countries” to “number of countries” in order to further harmonize with UN Women Impact Indicator 3B. Due to lack of comparable data for previous years, this indicator has a “late” baseline. This information refers only to “national prevalence of physical and/or sexual violence experienced by women and girls aged 15 years or older in the previous 12 months by an intimate partner”. No consistent information about non-intimate partner available.</p>			
4.4 Proportion of decision making positions (executive, legislative and judicial) occupied by women at national level a) Proportion of women in Parliaments b) Proportion of women in Ministerial positions c) Proportion of women in highest Court	a) 20.8% (2013) b) 15.6% (2013) c) 26.6% (2013)	a) 22.1% (2016) b) 16.4% (2016) c) 32.5% (2016)	30% women in decision making positions. a) 22.7% (trend) b) 16.8% (trend) c) Not available
<p>Source: UNDP calculations are based on the following sources: The participation of women in ministerial positions and in lower or single house in parliaments comes from Inter-Parliamentary Union, the participation of women in the highest national court, comes from national sources, collected by headquarters (2013) and country offices (2016). Reported figures based on a) 147 (150) countries for 2013 (2016), b) 146 (144) countries for 2013 (2016), c) 98(102) countries for 2013 (2016). The proportion of women in parliaments increased (decreased) in 77 (35) countries. The proportion of women in ministerial positions increased (decreased) in 71 (68) countries. The proportion of women in Highest Court increased (decreased) in 40 (20) countries. Figures represent the aggregate proportion (sum of women in office divided by the sum of seats). 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.</p>			

2016 reporting note: An intensive effort was made by headquarters and regional bureaux this year to obtain more complete data on indicator (c), which relies on reporting by UNDP country offices as there is no international data source providing this information. This led to a substantial increase from 62 countries to 102 countries providing data on indicator (c). Accordingly, an updated baseline has been calculated based on reporting by these 102 country offices (98 of these were able to provide a baseline value), substantially enhancing the comparability of the trend since the set of UNDP programme countries included in the baseline closely matches those reporting latest progress. Previous baseline value for indicator: (b) 15.8% (c) 26.0%.

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 4.1. Country led measures accelerated to advance women's economic empowerment Number of countries linked: 13 (December 2016)	4.1.1 Number of countries where policies to promote women's economic empowerment show improved implementation Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26	0	6	11	16	16	23
	Indicator 4.1.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2015 actual increased from 10 to 11; 2016 milestone increased from 14 to 16, and the 2017 target increased from 21 to 23.						
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: 20 (December 2016)	4.2.1 Number of countries that have a strengthened legal and/or policy framework in place to prevent and address sexual and gender based violence Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 30	0	7	13	18	18	30
	Indicator 4.2.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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.						

		2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value was corrected downwards from 14 to 13 to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incomplete basis by one country office. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 17 to 18, and the 2017 target increased from 29 to 30.						
	4.2.2	Number of additional countries with multi-sectorial services in place (including justice and security services) to prevent and address SGBV	0	3	6	11	10	15
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 25						
		Indicator 4.2.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 14 to 15 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
Output 4.3. Evidence-informed national strategies and partnerships to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment Number of countries linked: 11 (December 2016)	4.3.2	Number of countries with mechanisms in place to collect, disseminate sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics , and apply gender analysis	1	2	5	8	8	18
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 26						
	Indicator 4.3.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.							
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
Output 4.4. Measures in place to increase women’s participation in decision-making Number of countries linked: 26 (December 2016)	4.4.1	Number of laws and policies in place to secure women’s participation in decision making. a) New laws and policies b) Strengthened laws and policies	0	8	21	28	31	44
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 24, b) 30	0	13	42	61	58	82

		<p>Indicator 4.4.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new and/or strengthened laws and policies to increase women’s participation in decision-making supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards, each reflecting the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2017 target increased from 43 to 44; (b) 2017 target increased from 81 to 82.</p>						
	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	0	5,745	13,124	20,828	24,826	27,242
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 28						
		<p>Indicator 4.4.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of additional women benefitting from private and/or public measures to support women’s preparedness for leadership and decision-making roles, with UNDP support (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards. 2016 reporting note: The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 27,142 to 27,242 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.</p>						

Outcome 5: Countries are able to reduce the likelihood of conflict and lower the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change				
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)		2013 baseline	Latest data	2017 target
5.1	Mortality rate from natural hazards	17.9 per million inhabitants (2013)	12.0 per million inhabitants (2016)	Direction of travel: decrease
	<p>Source: UNDP calculation based on the EM-DAT Database (number of people killed by natural disasters) and UNDESA (population), for 143 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 value for 2013 represents the average for the period of 2004 to 2013, the value for 2016 represents the value for the period 2007 to 2016 (In the comparison, there is big influence of events in year 2004, which was a particularly deadly year due to Indian Ocean earthquake and tsunami). There is no internationally-agreed target. 2016 reporting note: Previous baseline was 17 per million inhabitants.</p>			
5.2	Economic loss from natural hazards (e.g. geo-physical and climate-induced hazards) as a proportion of GDP	0.28% of GDP (2013)	0.25% of GDP (2016)	Direction of travel: decrease
	<p>Source: UNDP calculation based on EM-DAT Database (economic loss from natural disasters) and IMF (GDP). Sum of Economic loss as a share of the sum of GDP from 144 programme countries. The value for 2013 represents the average for the period 2004-2013, the value for 2016 represents the value for the period 2007-2016. There is no internationally-agreed target. 2016 reporting note: Baseline adjusted to two digits. Previously reported baseline was 0.3% of GDP.</p>			
5.3	Economic loss from conflicts as a proportion of GDP	0.33% of GDP (2013)	0.55% of GDP (2015)	Direction of travel: decrease
	<p>Source: UNDP calculation based on data from the Institute for Economics and Peace and the World Bank (for GDP in 2011 US\$ PPP). The annual cost of conflict is estimated to be 2% of GDP in affected countries. There is no internationally-agreed target. 2016 reporting note: Revised Baseline. Previously reported baseline was 0.45% of GDP.</p>			

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 5.1. Mechanisms in place to assess natural and man-made risks at national and sub-national levels Number of countries linked: 43 (December 2016)	5.1.1 Number of countries having standardized damage and loss accounting systems in place with sex and age disaggregated data collection and analysis, including gender analysis Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 25		0	1	5	8	7	16
		Indicator 5.1.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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, analysing, 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 cumulative number of counties where objective evidence exists that UNDP support has led to effective systems being partially or largely in place. 2016 reporting note: The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 15 to 16 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.						
	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. a) Number of new plans and programmes b) Number of new plans and programmes that differentiate impacts on women and men Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 37, b) 31		0	140	270	436	481	483
			0	86	145	294	328	334
Indicator 5.1.2 note: Tracks the cumulative 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. 2016 reporting notes: Indicator 5.1.2(a) The 2015 actual value was corrected upwards from 268 to 270 to accurately capture results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 428 to 436; 2017 target increased from 464 to 483. Indicator 5.1.2(b) An intensive effort was made by headquarters and regional bureaux this year to identify and address reporting gaps for this indicator component, which arose due to a system error for this component near the start of the Strategic Plan. Substantial corrections have been								

		made to the following values to reflect the contributions of eight additional country offices that were not previously captured: 2014 actual increased from 42 to 86; 2015 actual increased from 63 to 145; 2016 milestone increased from 147 to 294; 2017 target increased from 166 to 334.					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
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: 60 (December 2016)	5.2.1 Number of new disaster reduction and/or integrated disaster risk reduction and adaptation plans (disaggregated by gender responsiveness), and dedicated institutional frameworks and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms , put in place. a) Number of new instruments in place b) Number of new instruments which are gender responsive Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 60, b) 52	0	696	1,035	1,219	1,239	1,312
	a) 0 b) 117 295 445 423 522						
Indicator 5.2.1 Note: Tracks the cumulative number of new instruments (disaster reduction plans, integrated disaster risk reduction and adaptation plans, and institutional frameworks and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) that are put in place from January 2014 onwards, identifying those that are gender responsive. 2016 reporting notes: Indicator 5.2.1(a) The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 1,311 to 1,312 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured. Indicator 5.2.1(b) An intensive effort was made by headquarters and regional bureaux this year to identify and address reporting gaps for this indicator component. Corrections have been made to the following values to reflect the contributions of six additional country offices that were not previously captured: 2014 actual increased from 105 to 117; 2015 actual increased from 274 to 295; 2016 milestone increased from 407 to 445; 2017 target increased from 469 to 522.							
	5.2.2 Number of countries with legislative and/or regulatory provisions at national and sub-national levels for effectively managing disaster and climate risks Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 47	23 (55 provisions)	28 (77 provisions)	36 (107 provisions)	40 (140 provisions)	38 (134 provisions)	47 (164 provisions)
Indicator 5.2.2 note: Tracks the cumulative 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. 2016 reporting note: An intensive effort was made by headquarters and regional bureaux this year to identify and address reporting gaps for one of the components required for calculation of this indicator. Corrections have been made to the following values to reflect the contributions of three additional country offices that were not previously captured, and to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: baseline increased from 22 to 23 (and from 51 to 55 provisions); 2014 actual increased from 27 to 28 (and from 73 to							

		77 provisions); 2015 actual increased from 35 to 36 (and from 101 to 107 provisions); 2016 milestone increased from 38 to 40 (and from 132 to 140 provisions), and the 2017 target increased from 44 to 47 (and from 153 to 164 provisions).						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone		Target	
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)	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 are gender responsive.	0	8	79	113	116	140
		a) Number of new plans with some DRM and/or CRM components	0	5	59	84	103	108
		b) Number of additional budgeted plans with some DRM and/or CRM components	0	8	59	88	96	110
		c) Number of additional plans with some DRM and/or CRM components which are gender responsive						
Number of countries linked: 15 (December 2016)		<p>Indicator 5.3.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new development and 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of three additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 105 to 113; 2017 target increased from 130 to 140; (b) 2016 milestone increased from 83 to 84; 2017 target increased from 104 to 108; (c) 2016 milestone increased from 87 to 88; 2017 target increased from 104 to 110.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
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 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)	0	20 (163 EWS)	26 (190 EWS)	36 (271 EWS)	30 (240 EWS)	42 (312 EWS)	
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 46						
		<p>Indicator 5.4.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of countries with new end-to-end early warning systems (EWS) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual number of early warning systems was corrected upwards from 189 to 190 EWS to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 35 to 36 countries (and from 270 to 271 EWS), and the 2017 target increased from 41 to 42 countries (and from 311 to 312 EWS).</p>						

Number of countries linked: 45 (December 2016)	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						
		a) Number of countries with new preparedness plans that cover only response	0	18 (81 plans)	25 (124 plans)	30 (260 plans)	31 (250 plans)	31 (283 plans)
		b) Number of countries with new preparedness plans that cover response and recovery	0	21 (264 plans)	28 (408 plans)	37 (531 plans)	34 (499 plans)	39 (720 plans)
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 39, b) 42						
<p>Indicator 5.4.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of countries with new mechanisms (defined as disaster preparedness plans) supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) from January 2014 onwards, differentiating between those that cover only response and those that cover both response and recovery.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual numbers of plans were corrected upwards as follows to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: (a) 2015 actual increased from 123 to 124; (b) 2015 actual increased from 407 to 408.</p>								
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
	5.4.3	Proportion of at-risk population covered by national and community level contingency plans for disaster events (e.g. evacuation procedures, stockpiles, search and rescue, communication protocols and response plans)						
		a) At risk of flood	9.2%	16.7%	23.5%	23.4%	22.6%	23.1%
		b) At risk of earthquake	3.7%	3.9%	6.3%	7.8%	9.7%	23.8%
		c) At risk of hurricane	16.9%	26.2%	29.4%	32.9%	32.8%	77.6%
		d) At risk of landslide	0.8%	11.1%	14.0%	17.8%	15.6%	19.2%
		e) At risk of drought	21.9%	26.5%	30.6%	40.3%	40.5%	32.3%
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 27, b) 14, c) 8, d) 11, e) 16						
<p>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 the “population at risk” grows faster than coverage can be arranged, the percentage of “population at risk” covered can go down even while coverage is being put in place.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual value for indicator (a) was corrected downwards from 23.6% to 23.5% to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office. The following values for indicator (e) were corrected to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: baseline decreased from 25.6% to 21.9%, 2014 actual</p>								

		decreased from 28.8% to 26.5%, 2015 actual decreased from 30.7% to 30.6%, 2016 milestone increased from 37.3% to 40.3%, 2017 target decreased from 33.6% to 32.3%. The 2017 target for indicator (b) was adjusted downwards from 23.9% to 23.8% to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
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: 27 (December 2016)	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. a) National i. Financial capacities ii. Human Resource capacities b) Local i. Financial capacities ii. Human Resource capacities Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 23	0	6	10	12	10	12
		0	8	12	14	14	17
		0	4	8	11	10	13
		0	5	10	11	13	14
		Indicator 5.5.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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.					
		2016 reporting note: The following values for indicator bi) were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 10 to 11 countries; 2017 target increased from 12 to 13 countries.					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 5.6. Mechanisms are enabled for consensus-building around contested priorities, and address specific tensions, through inclusive and peaceful processes	5.6.1 Number of countries where national mechanisms for mediation and consensus building show increased capacities to build consensus on contested issues and resolve disputes Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 27	0	13	17	19	21	24
		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 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.					

Number of countries linked: 24 (December 2016)	2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 18 to 19 countries; 2017 target increased from 22 to 24 countries.
---	--

Outcome 6: Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development pathways are achieved in post-conflict and post-disaster settings			
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)	2013 baseline	Latest data (2016)	2017 target
<p>6.1 Number of countries meeting critical benchmarks for social and economic recovery within 18 months after a crisis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Nutrition b) Health c) Water, sanitation and hygiene d) Education e) Solid waste management f) Food security g) Shelter h) Economic livelihoods i) Infrastructure <p>Source: The measurement is based on building blocks of affected men and women’s livelihoods (financial e.g. jobs/income, human, natural, physical, and social), recovery of household/community assets, and access to critical 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. The indicator definition was clarified in 2015 to capture the number of countries meeting at least one critical benchmark in each area, based on reporting by relevant countries.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Latest progress for 2016 is shown for the refined indicator definition based on reporting by 22 relevant countries. As per the Midterm Review, targets are not shown due to the unpredictable nature of demand and progress in this outcome area.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>4</p> <p>6</p> <p>5</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>6</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p>6.2 Number of post disaster and post conflict countries having operational strategies to support recovery and address the causes or triggers of crises</p> <p>a) Disaster</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Number of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them ii) Number of affected countries with an operational strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis <p>b) Conflict</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Number of affected countries with causes and triggers of crisis identified and a strategy to address them ii) Number of affected countries with an operational strategy to address causes and triggers of crisis 	<p>a .i) 4</p> <p>a .ii) 0</p> <p>b .i) 3</p> <p>b .ii) 1</p>	<p>a .i) 7 (2016)</p> <p>a .ii) 1 (2016)</p> <p>b .i) 11 (2016)</p> <p>b .ii) 5 (2016)</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>

Annex 2: Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) Methodology and 2016 Results

<p>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.” The indicator definition was refined in 2015 to count the number of disaster and conflict affected countries, rather than percentage of affected countries, that have strategies in place, due to volatility in the number of countries affected by disaster and conflict in each year.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: Baselines and latest progress data for 2016 are shown for the refined indicator definition based on reporting by 16 relevant countries affected by disaster and/or conflict in 2016. Previously published baselines for 18 relevant countries affected by disaster and/or conflict in 2015 and reporting on this indicator were a .i) 5 and b .ii) 4. As per the Midterm Review, targets are not shown due to the unpredictable nature of demand and progress in this outcome area.</p>				
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)		2013 baseline	Latest data	2017 target
6.4	Percentage of (monetary equivalent) benefits from temporary employment/ productive livelihoods options in the context of early economic recovery programmes received by women and girls (UNSC 1325, led by UNDP and UN Women)	36%	47% (2016)	Not applicable
<p>Source: Baseline and target derived from information reported by 13 UNDP country offices. Monetary value of total benefits distributed in 2013 was \$163,480,883 US dollars, monetary value of benefits received by women and girls \$59,080,679 US dollars, or 36% of the total funds.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: As stated in the Midterm Review, the target has been removed to reflect the unpredictable nature of demand and progress in this outcome area.</p>				

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
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	6.1.1	Number of additional people benefitting from emergency jobs and other livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings , disaggregated by sex.						
		a) New emergency jobs for women	0	42,141	53,681	45,824	93,036	57,557
		b) New emergency jobs for men	0	63,726	91,884	84,080	149,355	103,018
		c) Additional women benefitting from other emergency livelihoods	0	1,955,824	2,025,395	1,631,071	2,295,111	1,731,789
		d) Additional men benefitting from other emergency livelihoods	0	2,060,472	3,285,644	2,857,952	3,568,997	2,975,763
Number of countries linked: 27 (December 2016)		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 20 (a and b), 25 (c and d)						
<p>Indicator 6.1.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new emergency jobs created and cumulative number of additional people benefitting 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 889 new emergency jobs were generated by 2016, and an additional 61,176 people benefitted from strengthened livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings by 2016. For complementary jobs and livelihoods results, please see indicators 1.1.1 and 1.3.2.</p>								

		2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: (c) 2016 milestone increased from 1,629,971 to 1,631,071; 2017 target increased from 1,730,439 to 1,731,789; (d) 2016 milestone increased from 2,856,352 to 2,857,952, and the 2017 target increased from 2,973,913 to 2,975,763.					
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
	<p>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</p> <p>a) LER benchmark 1 b) LER benchmark 2 c) LER benchmark 3 d) LER benchmark 4</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 13, b) 11, c) 10, d) 8</p>	a) 8% b) 9% c) 10% d) 13%	a) 23% b) 27% c) 30% d) 13%	a) 23% b) 27% c) 30% d) 13%	a) 31% b) 36% c) 30% d) 25%	a) 31% b) 27% c) 30% d) 25%	a) 62% b) 55% c) 50% d) 25%
	<p>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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>Output 6.2. National and local authorities /institutions enabled to lead the community engagement, planning, coordination, delivery and monitoring of early recovery efforts</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 27 (December 2016)</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 19</p>	0%	22%	50%	59%	63%	70%
	<p>Indicator 6.2.1 Note: Qualitative indicator through which the effectiveness of UNDP 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, and 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were adjusted downwards to reflect an increase in the denominator (number of linked countries) for 2016 onwards: 2016 milestone decreased from 62% to 59%; 2017 target decreased from 73% to 70%.</p>						

	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	0%	17%	35%	48%	44%	67%
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 18						
		Indicator 6.2.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were adjusted downwards to reflect an increase in the denominator (number of linked countries) for 2016 onwards: 2016 milestone decreased from 50% to 48%, and the 2017 target decreased from 69% to 67%.						
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 6.3. Innovative partnerships are used to inform national planning and identification of solutions for early recovery Number of countries linked: 8 (December 2016)	6.3.1	Number of new partnerships operational to ensure implementation of innovative solutions for early recovery, disaggregated by type of partnership .	0	7	12	19	20	25
	a)	New South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships	0	2	9	13	13	26
	b)	New public-private partnerships	0	9	22	29	29	37
	c)	New private sector partnerships	0	23	56	64	115	68
	d)	Other new partnerships	0	23	56	64	115	68
		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 9, b-d) 8						
		Indicator 6.3.1 note: Tracks the cumulative 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 18 to 19; 2017 target increased from 23 to 25; (b) 2016 milestone increased from 12 to 13; 2017 target increased from 24 to 26; (d) 2016 milestone increased from 62 to 64, and the 2017 target increased from 65 to 68.						
	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	11.2%	15.1%	18.7%	16.5%	22.5%	17.1%

		Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 10						
		<p>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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
<p>Output 6.4. Recovery processes reinforce social cohesion and trust and enable rapid return to sustainable development</p> <p>Number of countries linked: 22 (December 2016)</p>	<p>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</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 16</p>	0%	47%	58%	64%	55%	68%	
	<p>Indicator 6.4.1 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were adjusted downwards to reflect an increase in the denominator (number of linked countries) for 2016 onwards: 2016 milestone decreased from 74% to 64%, and the 2017 target decreased from 79% to 68%.</p>							
	<p>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)</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 14</p>	0%	41%	53%	50%	59%	64%	
		<p>Indicator 6.4.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were adjusted downwards to reflect an increase in the denominator (number of linked countries) for 2016 onwards: 2016 milestone decreased from 58% to 50%, and the 2017 target decreased from 74% to 64%.</p>						

Outcome 7: Development debates and actions at all levels prioritize poverty, inequality and exclusion, consistent with our engagement principles				
Outcome Indicators (*Using latest data up to the year specified)		2013 baseline	Latest data	2017 target
7.1	Extent to which the agreed post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals (SDGs) reflect sustainable human development concepts and ideas	Not applicable	The 2030 Agenda adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015 explicitly balances the three dimensions of sustainable development in an integrated and indivisible framework.	Not applicable
<p>Source: UNDP reporting. 2016 reporting note: 2013 baseline and 2017 target not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. UNDP supported extensive consultations at global and national levels on development priorities that informed the design of the new agenda.</p>				
7.2	Existence of an initial global agreement on financing mechanisms for the post-2015 agenda and sustainable development goals	Not applicable	United Nations member states adopted in July 2015 the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, which provides a global framework for financing sustainable development, and is an integral part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.	Not applicable
<p>Source: UNDP reporting. 2016 reporting note: 2013 baseline and 2017 target not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. As one of the major institutional stakeholders of the Financing for Development process, UNDP was actively involved in the preparatory phase and during the Third International Conference on Financing for Development, and helped ensure more progressive language was included in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda in areas such as debt sustainability, the special challenges of SIDS and the need to ensure development finance strategies are risk informed.</p>				
7.3	Existence of a global succession plan to ensure unfinished MDGs are taken up post 2015	Not applicable	In adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, United Nations member states committed themselves to the "full realization of all the MDGs, including the off-track MDGs." The new global Sustainable Development Goals "build upon the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals and seek to address their unfinished business."	Not applicable
<p>Source: UNDP reporting. 2016 reporting note: 2013 baseline and 2017 target not applicable as the indicator measures specific global actions/agreement related to the adaptation of the 2030 Agenda. UNDP has supported the development of a common United Nations approach, including guidelines for United Nations Country teams, to support the implementation of the SDGs.</p>				

Output (UNDP provides specific support for the following results, based on national demand)	Output Indicator (output indicators measure only those results which are specifically supported by UNDP, in response to demand from programme countries)	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 7.1. Global consensus on completion of MDGs and the post 2015 agenda informed by contributions from UNDP Contributing units: BPPS (December 2016)	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)	969	969	991	991	991	991
	a. Number of government organizations b. Number of civil society organizations c. Number of women’s organizations d. Number of people	1,987	1,987	2,605	2,605	2,605	2,605
		659	659	659	659	659	659
		1,345,772	7,100,000 (49% female)	9,700,000 (48% female)	9,700,000	9,700,000	9,700,000
Indicator 7.1.1 note: Data provided by UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS). Tracks the number of organizations and people that, with UNDP support, 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 United Nations global citizen survey, put in place by UNDP. 2016 reporting note: Total participating people reached 9.7 million by the end of 2015, compared to an expected total of 8 million. No further update to cumulative results as the dialogues have now ended.							
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: 30 (December 2016)	7.2.2 Number of countries using updated and disaggregated data to monitor progress on national development goals aligned with post-2015 agenda	9	17	22	30	30	34
	Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 40						
Indicator 7.2.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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 led to “[use of] updated and disaggregated data” to a partial or large extent. Six additional countries beyond the linked ones (for a total of 22 countries) entered baselines, milestones and targets for this indicator. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country offices not previously captured: 2014 actual increased from 16 to 17; 2015 actual increased from 21 to 22; 2016 milestone increased from 29 to 30, and the 2017 target increased from 33 to 34.							

Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 7.3. National development plans to address poverty and inequality are sustainable and risk resilient Number of countries linked: 32 (December 2016)	7.3.1	Number of new country diagnostics carried out to inform policy options on national response to globally agreed development agenda, including analysis of sustainability and risk resilience, with post-2015 poverty eradication commitments and targets specified Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 41	0	64	121	162	176	231
		Indicator 7.3.1 note: Tracks the cumulative 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. 2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: 2016 milestone increased from 161 to 162, and the 2017 target increased from 230 to 231.						
		Output 7.4. Countries enabled to gain equitable access to, and manage, ODA and other sources of global development financing Number of countries linked: 25 (December 2016)	7.4.2	Number of countries that have more effective mechanisms in place to access, deliver, monitor, report on and/or verify use of ODA and other sources of global development financing Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 20	0	8	16	19
Indicator 7.4.2 note: Qualitative indicator through which effectiveness of UNDP 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.								
Output	Output Indicator		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
Output 7.5. South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships established and/or strengthened for development solutions Number of countries linked: 21 (December 2016)	7.5.1	Number of new South-South and triangular cooperation partnerships that deliver measurable and sustainable development benefits for participants (national, regional, sub-regional, inter-regional entities) Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 24	0	63	213	271	293	330
		Indicator 7.5.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new South-South and triangular cooperation 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						

		<p>which have as primary objective promoting South-South and triangular cooperation. Additional results achieved by utilizing South-South and triangular cooperation modalities are embedded in other outcomes.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of three additional country offices not previously captured: 2016 milestone increased from 260 to 271, and the 2017 target increased from 310 to 330.</p>						
	7.5.3	<p>Evidence of harmonization of policies, legal frameworks and regulations across countries for sustaining and expanding South-South and triangular cooperation that maximizes mutual benefits</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 19</p>	10	12	17	19	18	19
		<p>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 South-South and triangular cooperation; and/or an institutional focal point within government for South-South and triangular cooperation.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured: baseline value increased from 9 to 10; 2014 actual value increased from 11 to 12; 2015 actual value increased from 16 to 17; 2016 milestone increased from 18 to 19, and the 2017 target increased from 18 to 19.</p>						
Output 7.6. Innovations enabled for development solutions, partnerships and other collaborative arrangements	7.6.1	<p>Number of new public-private partnership mechanisms that provide innovative solutions for development</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: 21</p>	0	54	126	129	164	149
Number of countries linked: 20 (December 2016)		<p>Indicator 7.6.1 note: Tracks the cumulative number of new public-private partnership mechanisms supported by UNDP (on demand from programme countries) with evidence of providing innovative solutions for development, from January 2014 onwards.</p> <p>2016 reporting note: The 2017 target was corrected upwards from 148 to 149 to reflect the contribution of one additional country office not previously captured.</p>						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
	7.6.2	<p>Number of additional pilot and demonstration projects initiated or scaled up by national partners (e.g. expanded, replicated, adapted or sustained)</p> <p>(a) Number of additional pilots and demonstration projects initiated by national partners</p> <p>(b) Number of additional pilots and demonstration projects scaled up by national partners</p> <p>Number of countries for which a 2017 target has been set for this indicator: a) 23, b) 22</p>						
		0	62	160	242	276	380	
		0	27	92	121	185	166	
		<p>Indicator 7.6.2 note: Tracks the cumulative number of additional pilot/demonstration projects initiated or scaled up by national partners with support from UNDP (on demand from programme countries), from January 2014 onwards.</p>						

		2016 reporting note: The 2015 actual values were corrected upwards as follows to ensure accurate capture of results previously reported on an incorrect basis by one country office: (a) 2015 actual increased from 159 to 160, and the (b) 2015 actual increased from 91 to 92. The following values were corrected upwards to reflect the contributions of two additional country office not previously captured: (a) 2016 milestone increased from 241 to 242; 2017 target increased from 375 to 380, and the (b) 2017 target increased from 163 to 166.						
Output 7.7. Mechanisms in place to generate and share knowledge about development solutions Contributing units: BPPS and HDRO (December 2016)	7.7.1	Access to Human Development Reports, to contribute to development debate and action						
		a. Number of overall website page visits	4,604,821	3,824,209	4,246,598	4,700,000	4,175,034	5,000,000
		b. Number of HDR report landing page views	924,067	910,833	992,040	980,000	1,084,404	1,000,000
		c. Number of Facebook followers	44,080	187,350	220,121	266,000	233,983	300,000
		d. Number of Twitter followers	729	1,570	3,541	2,600	6,130	3,200
		Indicator 7.7.1 note: Data provided by the UNDP Human Development Report Office (HDRO) tracks the number of website page visits (in English, French and Spanish) of the HDRO website (http://hdr.undp.org/en); the number of views of landing pages for all HDR reports each year, and the number of social media platform followers on Facebook and on Twitter. Visits to the website in 2013 were exceptionally high due to an early and high-visibility report launch and were expected to dip in 2014, before rising to exceed 2013 numbers by 2017. HDR landing page views are computed for the landing page of HDR hosted at hdr.undp.org and the landing page of the report micro site (http://report.hdr.undp.org/), which was introduced by HDRO for the first time in 2015.						
	7.7.2	Evidence of the relevance, to national partners, of development solutions shared over the knowledge platforms (including of South-South and triangular Cooperation platform)	Not available	82.9%	84.9%	78%	85.6%	80%
		Indicator 7.7.2 note: Data provided by UNDP 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 headquarter - administered survey targeting all registered platform users, undertaken in the first quarter of each year, measures 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.						
Output	Output Indicator	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
Output 7.8. Governance institutional, and other critical bottlenecks addressed to support achievement of the	7.8.1	Number of countries implementing MDG Acceleration Framework (MAF) action plans to drive progress on lagging MDGs through national and/or sub-national budgets	33	45	53	53	53	

MDGs and other internationally agreed development goals Contributing units: BPPS (December 2016)	<p>Indicator 7.8.1 Note: Data provided by UNDP 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 on this support. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>							
	7.8.2	Number of countries developing action plans to “close the unfinished business” of the MDGs and transition to the SDGs	0	2	22	36	35	39
	<p>Indicator 7.8.2 note: Data provided by UNDP 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 transition planning process having already been launched (e.g. application of Rapid Integrated Assessment (RIA) or similar assessment) and the plan being in its development phase (e.g. development of SDG Implementation Roadmap or similar SDG Action Plan). 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. 2016 reporting note: No change to the previously published baselines, milestones, targets or actuals for previous years.</p>							

Tier Three: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
1. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY OF RESULTS								
1.1 Programme effectiveness enhanced for achieving results at all levels through quality criteria and quality assurance processes	1	Percentage of country programme outcomes that are reported as either on-track or achieved (cross checked with evaluation findings)	70.6% (ROAR) 50% (EVAL)	76% (ROAR)	78% (ROAR)	75% (ROAR)	78% (ROAR)	75% (ROAR) 60% (EVAL)
	Note: This indicator measures the percentage of country programme outcomes that are either “achieved” or “partially achieved” reported in the result oriented annual reports. Milestones and targets are projections based on ROAR and CPD cycle analysis. The 2017 result will be triangulated with evaluation findings, including the Strategic Plan evaluation, consistently with the baseline.							
	2	Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as an effective contributor in identified areas	Average: 52%	Average: 54%	N/A	70%	57%	70%
		i. Poverty eradication through inclusive and sustainable development	- Poverty eradication: 44%	53%	N/A	70%	55%	70%
		ii. Democratic governance	- Democratic Governance: 56%	56%	N/A	70%	56%	70%
		iii. Institutional capacity building for delivery of basic services	- Crisis Prevention and Recovery: 45%	56%	N/A	70%	60%	70%
		iv. Gender equality and women’s empowerment	- Environment and Energy: 45%	56%	N/A	70%	59%	70%
		v. Reducing likelihood of conflict and the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change	- Environment and Energy: 45%	45%	N/A	70%	50%	70%
		vi. Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development in post-conflict/disaster settings	- Environment and Energy: 45%	44%	N/A	70%	48%	70%
	vii. Contribution to development debates and international development goals	- MDGs: 58%	66%	N/A	70%	69%	70%	
Note: Data from the 2012 Partnership Survey is for a reference purposes only. The Partnership Survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations, such that the baseline is not comparable. The Partnership Survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016).								
3	Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track.	92.6% (2014)	92.6%	95.8%	95%	88%	95%	
Note: The indicator measures the percentage of project outputs that are assessed as either “achieved” or “on-track” in the Corporate Strategic Planning system.								

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
4	Percentage of Country Office annual results reports which meet or exceed expected organizational quality standards (QCPR related indicator)	67%	75%	64%	80%	80%	90%
		2012 ROARs	2013 ROARs	2014 ROARs	2015 ROARs	2015 ROARs	2016 ROARs
<p>Note: The 2016 actual refers to the rating of results oriented annual reports (ROARs) for 2015. Lower ratings in 2015 should be interpreted in the context of more rigorous organizational quality standards introduced with the 2014 ROARs, especially in terms of use of evidence and results focus under the current Strategic Plan.</p>							
5	Percentage of projects meeting or exceeding organizational quality standards (QCPR related indicator)	72% (2014)	72%	51%	55%	63%	60%
<p>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. Data for 2015 is based on the rating of 505 projects (about 8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in 70 country offices as part of phase 2 of Project QA, which was still a pilot phase. The quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all development projects in 2016, so the data for 2016 includes all active projects in UNDP (3541 projects) for the first time. We expect to see a phased upward trajectory starting in this indicator as offices make course corrections to improve quality programming.</p>							
6	Percentage of new country programme documents that meet organizational standards in the first submission for internal appraisal (QCPR related indicator)	79% (2014)	79%	71%	75%	51.5%	80%
<p>Note: The baseline reports the results of headquarter CPD appraisals in 2014 (HQPACs requested re-submission of 4 out of 19 CPDs). 2015 data is based on 28 CPDs appraised for the September and January Executive Board sessions. This is the first group of CPDs that were rated against the new quality standards for programmes, a rigorous and evidence-based assessment tool, on a pilot basis. 2016 data is based on 33 CPDs appraised for the June and September 2016 and January 2017 Executive Board sessions. The quality standards have been approved as a required corporate policy starting in 2016. In 2016, all CPDs were re-rated against the quality standards after appraisal, and 100% of new CPDs met the standards before it was submitted to the Executive Board.</p>							
7	Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with:	71%	N/A	N/A	80%	65%	80%
	i. UNDP policy services	74%	N/A	N/A	80%	65%	80%
	ii. UNDP programme/project guidelines and support	68%	N/A	N/A	80%	65%	80%
<p>Note: data from this indicator are collected through a biannual Products and Services Survey (PSS). Following the 2014-2015 reorganisation of UNDP, the PSS was redesigned to focus on UNDP’s core business-to-business activities, with increased targeting of respondent groups and survey simplification. 2016 actuals are therefore not completely comparable with the initial baseline and they will be treated as the baseline for next Strategic Plan IRRF.</p>							

Results Statement	Indicator*		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
1.2 UNDP's key development approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects for more durable results	8	Percentage of projects that meet corporate quality standards for capacity development (QCPR related indicator)	76.6% (2014)	76.60%	64.2%	55%	76%	65%
	<p>Note: The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion for “National Ownership and Sustainability” that integrates corporate quality standards for capacity development. The baseline is collected from Phase 1 of the Project QA system implementation, which includes quality ratings from a sample of 107 projects in 21 country offices. Data for 2015 is based on the rating of 505 projects (about 8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in 70 country offices as part of phase 2 of Project QA, which was still a pilot phase. The quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all projects in 2016, so the data for 2016 includes all active development projects in UNDP (3541 projects) for the first time.</p>							
	9	a. Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective. (QCPR related indicator)	30%	34%	35%	40%	37%	57%
		b. Number of country offices that track and report on expenditures using gender markers validated by a quality assurance process. [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	3	28	48	48	49	70
	<p>Note 9a: Based on the gender marker: expenditures as of March of the current year for the previous reporting year, tracked by outputs according to their contribution to gender equality. The indicator adds up gender projects (GEN 3) and projects with a significant gender component (GEN 2).</p>							
	<p>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 headquarters checks the accuracy of scores of those country offices. This process is carried out over 2 years in each country office, and it is rolled out in 34 country offices every two years.</p>							
	10	Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards (QCPR related indicator)	60.0% (2014)	60.0%	61.2%	60%	80%	70%
<p>Note: The Project QA system includes a separate quality criterion on social and environmental standards. The baseline is collected from Phase 1 of the Project QA system implementation, which includes quality ratings from a sample of 107 projects in 21 country offices, but not the screening procedure. The baseline was lowered from 78.5% to 60.0% to take the SESP into account. A project that rates satisfactory or above on the SES quality criterion but does not complete the screening as required should not be considered as meeting corporate social and environmental standards. Data for 2015 is based on the rating of 505 projects (about 8.5% of UNDP’s project portfolio) in phase 2 of Project QA, which was still a pilot phase. Both the quality rating and compliance with the SESP is considered. The quality standards were launched as required corporate policy for all projects in 2016, so the data for 2016 includes all active development projects in UNDP (3541 projects) for the first time.</p>								
11	Percentage of programmes/projects where south-south or triangular cooperation is used to achieve results (QCPR related indicator)	8%	N/A	10%	20%	8%	30%	
<p>Note: The baseline was calculated 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. Starting in 2015, COs have reported on specific South-South initiatives through the Results Oriented Annual Report. In 2015, 459 projects utilized South-South or triangular cooperation to achieve development results out of 4,511 reported outputs (10 %). In the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 midterm review, 13.4 was reported for the 2014 2015 actual, due to an erroneous calculation rectified in the current version. In 2016, there was a slippage to 8%. However, the number of COs that have substantially and systematically utilized South-South and triangular</p>								

Results Statement	Indicator*		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
	cooperation increased from 16% in 2015 to 18% in 2016, also thanks to the integration of the approach into Country Programme Document guidelines. The recently launched South-South and triangular cooperation strategy will operationalize service packages to foster an increase in the utilization of this cooperation modality.							
1.3 Knowledge management institutionalized and learning is made part of its performance culture.	12	Existence of (and use of) a database of searchable lessons learned from evaluations and project completion reports	Excel-based extract of lessons from decentralized evaluation reports published in 2011 and 2012 completed.	A corporate lessons learned database prototype will be developed in 2015. Meanwhile, the Excel based evaluation tool has been updated with references to lessons learned in 2013 and 2014	Facility to capture lessons learned from evaluations established within the Corporate Planning System.	Expand the evaluation lessons learned databased to capture lessons from the Project Quality Assurance process	UNDP collected 1670 evaluation-related lessons learned in 2016 in the Evaluation Resource Centre database. A lessons learned capture mechanism at project level will be developed by end of 2017	Tool updated to incorporate lessons from 2015 and 2016 evaluations, project completion reports and other relevant sources.
	13	Use of UNDP knowledge products:						
		a. Number of downloads of UNDP publications from UNDP's public website	179,695	265,474	285,044	300,000	285,649	315,000
b. Number of citations of HDRs in academic publications	403 (2014)	403	442	500	326	550		

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
	<p>Note: 13.a. The means of verification is statistical data for 1,591 global and regional products that were in the library as of March 2017 (compared to the 1953 in 2015), tracked and provided through Google Analytics of UNDP website traffic.</p> <p>Note: 13.b The means of verification is Google Scholars. The 2016 HDR was published in March 2017, which explains the lower than expected number of citations in 2016.</p>							
2. FIELD/COUNTRY OFFICE OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT								
2.1 UNDP is an efficient and cost conscious organization	14	Procurement efficiency:						
		a. Percentage of procurement cases submitted to the ACP that are approved upon first review	75.24%	81%	83.50%	85%	84%	85%
		b. Percentage of business units with a consolidated Procurement Plan.	21%	71%	76.0%	78%	73%	80%
	15	a. Percentage of cost-sharing agreements that comply with the new cost recovery policy (third party contributions only)	the new policy started in January 2014	65%	76.0%	80.00%	89.00%	90.00%
		b. Average cost recovery rate (disaggregated by funding instrument)						
		i. Third party cost sharing	5.90%	6.23%	6.80%	7.75%	7.39%	8.00%
		ii. Government cost sharing	3.80%	4.06%	4.02%	3.50%	3.90%	3.50%
		iii. South-South contributions	n/a	6.08%	6.56%	3.50%	3.99%	3.50%
		iv. Other trust funds	6.00%	4.50%	7.73%	7.75%	8.05%	8.00%
		v. GFATM	6.50%	6.69%	7.26%	7.00%	7.01%	7.00%
		vi. GEF Contributions below \$10 million	9.60%	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%	9.50%
		vii. GEF Contributions above \$ 10 million	9.60%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%	9.00%
		viii. LOFTA	3.80%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.01%	4.00%
		ix. Thematic contributions	4.30%	7.01%	4.24%	7.00%	7.37%	7.00%
x. Montreal Protocol	7.50%	7.80%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%		
xi. EC	6.00%	6.40%	6.37%	7.00%	6.66%	7.00%		

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017		
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target		
<p>Note: For Indicator 15(a), the 2016 actual reflects the total number of active agreements in 2016. For technical reasons, TTFs have not been included in this calculation but, as this affects less than one per cent of the total number of agreements, the impact is not material.</p>									
	16	Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators	81% financial quality 30% IPSAS	51%	78%	70%	87%	80%	
	17	i. percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities	71%	76%	78%	84%	81%	84%	
		ii. percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	96%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	
	18	UNDP Carbon Footprint (CO2 emissions in tons CO2-equivalent)	69,896	67,799	68,391	65,695	68,391	63,792	
<p>Note: In the first trimester of 2017, UNDP started to roll out a new global UNDP Environmental Report tool, which requires several months to gather and process all data from UNDP facilities. Based on this, the 2016 actual data for indicator 18 will become available in July 2017. For the time-being the 2015 actual data is considered the best estimate for the 2016 actual, which will be updated as soon as new data becomes available.</p>									
3. CORPORATE OVERSIGHT AND ASSURANCE (internal audit, investigations and corporate evaluations)									
3.1 Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP operations improved and development effectiveness enhanced with support from The Evaluation Office and the Office of Audits	19	Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory or partially satisfactory quality, including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards (SWAP-related indicator).	39%	52%	76%	65%	74%	75%	
	<p>Note: The 2013 baseline is calculated based on the assessment of 269 decentralized evaluations conducted in 2013. The 2014 actual was derived from a sample of 42 decentralized evaluations conducted in that year. With the new Evaluation Policy, adopted by the Executive Board in 2016, the Independent Evaluation Office has revised the methodology to assess the quality of decentralized evaluations. The revised methodology has been applied to the 170 decentralized evaluations conducted in 2016, and 84 of the 266 evaluations conducted in 2015. Consistently with the IEO report on evaluations, the indicator is calculated based on the sum of decentralized evaluations assessed as either satisfactory or partially satisfactory (in 2015: 25 percent satisfactory and 51 percent partially satisfactory; in 2016: 27 percent satisfactory and 47 percent partially satisfactory).</p>								
	20	Percentage of internal audits that are rated as:		(average 2011-2013)					
		I. Satisfactory		35%	36%	31%	>30%	33%	>30%
II. Partially satisfactory		58%	57%	58%	<65%	62%	<65%		
III. Unsatisfactory		7%	7%	11%	<15%	5%	<15%		

Results Statement	Indicator*		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
Note: Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits.									
	21	Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified	94.2% (2013) 97.6% (average 2011-2013)	95.20%	99.70%	≥ 98%	100%	≥ 98%	
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							
		i. Decentralized evaluations	68%	78%	85.20%	90%	88%	>95%	
		ii. Independent evaluations	80%	82%	83.50%	85%	96%	>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 that are “no longer applicable.”								
	23	Rate of implementation of agreed upon:							
		a.	internal audit recommendations	88%	81%	85%	≥ 85%	87%	≥ 85%
b.		external audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors)	80%	96%	92%	82%	96%	85%	
Note: The indicator is disaggregated since tracking of the implementation of audit recommendations is done separately. Recommendations tracked for the indicator are those that had a target implementation date of 31 December 2016. Milestones and targets are set based on industry standards for audits.									
4. LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE DIRECTION									
4.1 UNDP leaders foster a working environment in which staff are engaged, leading to improved performance and a smooth transition to the new Strategic Plan	24	Percentage of all staff surveyed who expressed confidence in leadership and direction	71%	67%	N/A	76%	71%	76%	
	25	Percentage of all staff surveyed who feel empowered in their job	57%	54%	N/A	65%	65%	65%	
	26	Staff engagement index	72%	69%	N/A	76%	79%	76%	
	Note: indicators 24, 25 and 26 are calculated based on Global Staff Survey (GSS) responses. Please note that with the 2016 GSS the formulae applied for the calculation of the three indicators have changed and 2013 baseline and 2014 actual have been re-calculated accordingly. For comparison purposes, the 2013 baselines were: 24. 71%, 25. 57%, 26. 72%. The 2014 actuals were 24. 70%, 25. 54%, 26. 71%. The 2016 actuals calculated using the old formulae would have been 24. 73%, 25. 69% and 26. 79%.								
	27	Percentage of project outputs that are aligned to corporate outcomes	81.30%	86.60%	87.50%	80%	89%	90%	

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
<p>Note: The indicator captures ongoing development outputs managed by headquarters units and country offices that are linked to the Strategic Plan outcomes/outputs in the Atlas ERP system.</p>								
5. CORPORATE FINANCIAL, ICT AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT								
<p>5.1 UNDP policies and procedures fit for purpose to enable staff to carry out their jobs effectively</p>	28	Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with UNDP management services	71% (2012)	N/A	N/A	80%	64%	80%
	<p>Note: data from this indicator are collected through a biannual Products and Services Survey (PSS). Following the 2014-2015 reorganisation of UNDP, the PSS was redesigned to focus on UNDP's core business-to-business activities, with increased targeting of respondent groups and survey simplification. 2016 actuals are therefore not completely comparable with the initial baseline and they will be treated as the baseline for next Strategic Plan IRRF.</p>							
	29	Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio)	8.44%	8.29%	7.87%	8.20%	7.86%	8.10%
	30	Percentage of total UNDP expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs	3.30%	3.50%	3.3%	3.10%	3.30%	3%
	<p>Note: The 2016 actual for management activities expenditure spent on travel costs has remained unchanged, but the overall business travel expenditure is down 4% compared to the 2015 period.</p>							
6. CORPORATE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT								
<p>6.1 UNDP equipped to attract, develop and retain a talented and diversified workforce</p>	31	Average time taken to fill eligible vacancies across specified categories						
		i. Candidate Pools in calendar days	28	28	29	< 30	30	< 30
		ii. RRs/RCs in weeks	11	9	10	≤11	9	≤11
	<p>Note: Average time taken to fill refers to the period ranging from vacancy announcement to candidate notification of selection.</p>							
	32	Percentage of staff who are female (QCPR related indicator):						
		i. At all levels	42%	42%	51%	50%	51%	50%
		ii. P4-P5	38%	39%	40%	48%	41%	50%
		iii. D1 and above	36%	36%	38%	45%	39%	50%
33	Percentage of annual performance management and development processes completed on time.	31.0%	45.3%	80.9%	80%	88%	85%	

Results Statement	Indicator*		2013	2014	2015	2016		2017
			Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target
<p>Note: indicator 33 is measured at the beginning of April every year.</p>								
<p>7. CORPORATE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION</p>								
7.1 Effective support for the Executive Board provided to enable oversight	34	Percentage of Executive Board members who report satisfaction with UNDP support services	80.25% (2015)	80.25%	90.1%	87%	85%	90%
		<p>Note: Since 2015, UNDP surveys Executive Board member satisfaction with UNDP support services during the first quarter every year. The survey obtained a total of eleven responses in 2015, nine responses in 2016, and 12 responses in 2017.</p>						
7.2 UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice by its partners	35	Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding from government and other non-government partners (including international financial institutions, regional development banks, civil society, private sector). [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]						
		i. Total	\$4,628	\$4,590	\$4,394	\$4,928	\$4,782	\$4,928
		Trend from previous year		-0.8%	-4.3%		8.8%	
		ii. Regular Resources	\$896	\$793	\$704	\$925	\$618	\$925
		Trend from previous year		-11.5%	-11.2%		-12.2%	
		iii. Other Resources (non-programme country government, multilaterals and other non-government partners)	\$2,671	\$2,945	\$2,850	\$3,253	\$3,272	\$3,253
		Trend from previous year		10.3%	-3.2%		14.8%	
		iv. Other Resources (programme country government cost sharing)	\$1,061	\$852	\$840	\$750	\$892	\$750
		Trend from previous year		-19.7%	-1.4%		6.2%	
		<p>Note: Amounts in each year are in million, and represent the level of resources in that year (non-cumulative) for the category. The cumulative amounts targeted in the 2014-2017 period are: Total = \$19,359 million US dollars; Regular Resources = \$3,600 million US dollars; Other Resources (non-programme government and non-government partners) = \$12,759 million US dollars; and Other Resources (programme government Cost Sharing) = \$3,000 million US dollars. Non-government includes: United Nations System, MPTFs, World Bank Group, European Union, regional banks, vertical funds, NGOs/CSOs, private sector and foundations.</p>						
36	Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organization	87% (2012)	90%	N/A	90%	89%	90%	

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
<p>Note: Data from the 2012 Partnership Survey is for a reference purposes only. The Partnership Survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations, such that the baseline is not comparable. The Partnership Survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016).</p>								
37	Percentage of partners satisfied with quality and timeliness of reporting [QCPR RELATED]							
	i. Favourable	N/A	75%	N/A	80%	76%	80%	
	ii. Neutral	N/A	19%	N/A	15%	16%	15%	
	iii. Unfavourable	N/A	6%	N/A	5%	8%	5%	
<p>Note: the previous indicator 'Percentage of Member States giving positive feedback on the quality of corporate reporting on results and mandates has been changed to align data collection with UNDP partnership surveys and to extend data collection to additional partners besides the Executive Board member states. This is in response to a recommendation from an audit of UNDP management of third-party cost sharing resources to improve the quality and timeliness of reporting. The Partnership Survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016).</p>								
38	Percentage of country offices and headquarters units that are compliant with the internal standards for the international aid and transparency initiative (IATI) and Information Disclosure Policy	52% (2013)	60%	82%	95%	81%	98%	
<p>Note: This indicator captures the percentage of business units that are compliant (meeting 90% of the requirement), i.e. projects that have descriptions, implementing partners and project documents and outputs that have short descriptions. The 2017 target has been adjusted from 100% to 98% considering some slippage.</p>								
8. STAFF AND PREMISES SECURITY								
8.1 UNDP Country Offices are more resilient due to sound business continuity systems and security arrangements	39	Percentage of Country Offices meeting minimum operations security standards (MOSS)	77.70%	83.30%	85.90%	87.5%	94.0%	90%
	40	Percentage of Country Offices and headquarters units meeting Business Continuity Plan requirements	24%	52%	68%	75%	65%	95%
9. UN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION								
9.1 Greater progress on	41	Percentage of actions in the UNDP QCPR Implementation Plan that are achieved.	32% achieved 65% in	32% achieved	72%	75%	86%	70-100% achieved

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
coordination, leadership and management of the Resident Coordinator system ensured		progress (2014)	65% in progress					
	Note: The Implementation Plan was approved and the baseline for this indicator was set in 2014.							
	42	Percentage of UNDP partners satisfied with UNDP leadership of the Resident Coordinator System	71% (2012)	62%	N/A	80%	74%	80%
	Note: Data from the 2012 Partnership Survey is for a reference purposes only. The Partnership Survey questionnaire was revised to align with the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan and expand the sample to partners in headquarter and country locations, such that the baseline is not comparable. The Partnership Survey was conducted in February 2015 (for 2014) and March 2017 (for 2016).							
	43	Per cent of country offices using common RBM tools and principles [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	N/A	43%	70%	75%	80%
	Note: This indicator was calculated from UNDP ROAR. 58 country offices selected "The country office used common RBM tools and principles jointly developed and agreed among UNDG agencies" among various tools and approaches to strengthening capacity for data collection and monitoring. In the 2016 ROAR, a specific question on the actual use of UNDG RBM principles and the handbook obtained a more granular understanding of the actual uptake within the organization.							
	44	Per cent of country offices using the common UNDG capacity measurement approach (when fully developed) [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Note: The common UNDG capacity measurement approach is being developed in the UNDG Programme Working Group.							
	45	Number of country offices that are applying the Standard Operating Procedures, or components of it. [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	N/A	74	80	88	85
					55%	60%	66%	63%
i. One programme		N/A	N/A	58	60	66	65	
				43%	45%	49%	49%	
ii. Common budgetary framework		N/A	N/A	13	15	43	18	
				10%	11%	32%	13%	
iii. One fund		N/A	N/A	9	10	18	12	
				7%	7%	13%	9%	
iv. One leader		N/A	N/A	21	25	67	28	
				16%	19%	50%	21%	
v. Operating as one	N/A	N/A	24	25	65	28		

Results Statement	Indicator*	2013	2014	2015	2016		2017	
		Baseline	Actual	Actual	Milestone	Actual	Target	
				18%	19%	49%	21%	
Note: 2014 milestone and actual from DESA Resident Coordinator Survey covered only a sub-set of UNDP country offices (78 United Nations Country Teams) and are not comparable with the data reported in UNDP ROAR (2015 and 2016), which covered 100% of the 134 UNDP country offices								
46	Number of country offices implementing [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]:							
	i. common services	N/A	N/A	122 91%	125 93%	123 92%	130 97%	
	ii. common long-term agreements	N/A	N/A	102 76%	105 78%	100 75%	110 82%	
	iii. harmonized approach to procurement	N/A	N/A	51 38%	55 41%	55 41%	60 45%	
	iv. common human resources management	N/A	N/A	38 28%	40 30%	45 34%	45 34%	
	v. common information and communication technology services	N/A	N/A	68 51%	70 52%	81 60%	75 56%	
	vi. common financial management services	N/A	N/A	28 21%	30 22%	37 28%	35 26%	
	Note: Data for indicators 46 has been collected from all 135 UNDP country offices for the first time through the ROAR 2015							
	47	UNDP contribution in cash provided to the resident coordinator system [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR], in US\$ million	\$74.00	\$89.00	\$92.10	\$92.70	\$92.60	\$95.30
	Note: The total UNDP contribution to the Resident Coordinator 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 United Nations development coordination function. Actuals for 2014-2015 are updated in line with the audited UNDP financial statements for 2014-2015. 2016 actuals are from unaudited UNDP 2016 financial statements. Target for 2017 reflects 3% estimated inflation on updated pro-forma costs from 2016 actuals.							
48	UNDP contribution in kind provided to the resident coordinator system [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Note: UNDP cannot report on IRRF indicator 48 as long as there is no common UNDP methodology developed that captures in-kind contributions to the Resident Coordinator system								