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# Guiding Principles

The Integrated Results and Resources Framework (IRRF) translates the Strategic Plan, 2018-21 (SP) into a set of development and organisational results that show how UNDP will use the resources entrusted to it by Member States and others to deliver on its mandate and vision. In pursuing its mandate and in line with the provisions of the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review (QCPR) - UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/71/243, UNDP respects national ownership and is guided by national needs and priorities in all its programmes and projects.

The IRRF is meant to be strategic in nature, indicating the proposed trajectory of UNDP during 2018-21. The Framework, however, has been designed to allow for flexibility to respond to changing circumstances, including decisions by Member States and country demand. In developing the IRRF, UNDP was guided by the following principles, based on legislation and lessons learned:

* **Incorporate the 2030 Agenda and SDGs** as well as associated international agreements such as the Addis Ababa Action Agenda, Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, Istanbul Programme of Action, Paris Agreement, New Urban Agenda, SAMOA Pathway and Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction. The IRRF includes SDG indicators at impact and outcome levels. To better capture the principle of leaving no one behind (LNOB), UNDP has improved targeting, to ensure its contributions to development benefit those most in need such as the extreme poor, women and persons with disabilities. To this end, outcome and output indicators target marginalised groups which include women, youth, people with disabilities, people living with HIV, indigenous groups and others, as relevant.
* **Harmonize with other funds and programmes.** UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and UN Women have agreed on a harmonized structure of the IRRF in line with the UNDG RBM Handbook and UNDAF and now United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) Guidelines. In addition, the agencies have identified a common set of SDG indicators to be incorporated at impact and outcome levels to monitor collaborative work towards shared results. Furthermore, common QCPR indicators are integrated in the organisational section of the IRRF.
* **Clarify and simplify.** While staying within the UNDG RBM Handbook and agreements reached with UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women, the IRRF continues a steady process of improvement in UNDP’s results architecture through successive SP cycles. As a consequence, there is a reduction in the number of outcomes and outputs compared to the IRRF for 2014-17: down to 3 development outcomes from seven, 27 development outputs from previously 38; and 56output indicators compared to 93. Similarly, organisational outcomes have been streamlined and reduced from seven to three, and indicators from 48 to 39.

The IRRF is structured to match the text of the draft SP, to tighten the ‘fit’ between concepts and results. This is evident from mirroring of the three development contexts identified in the narrative in three outcomes. Contributions from each signature solution are also described as outputs under each outcome. By so doing, it becomes clearer that outcomes can only be advanced through an integrated, multi-sectoral, approach that address connected causes of a development challenge.

In addition, alignment between the IRRF and results frameworks in country programme documents (CPDs) has been simplified. Monitoring and reporting are undertaken at the country programme (rather than individual project) level, thus saving time and effort, raising the quality of evidence and improving learning.

Overall, a simpler, ‘lighter’, IRRF combined with a reduction in reporting requirements, especially at country level, is helping shift the focus of RBM from compliance towards a results culture that enables management of UNDP’s work based on performance.

* **Centre on country results.** The IRRF reflects country level results that UNDP enables through the implementation of country programmes and projects, in line with national priorities stemming from the 2030 Agenda and the joint response from the UN System that is agreed with the government in the UNSDCF. While cumulative in nature, by collecting actual results achieved annually in each programme country, the IRRF allows for systematic analysis of progress made against annual milestones. As country programme results frameworks adopt UNSDCF outcomes while also aligning with the SP, country level progress in the implementation of the SP, as reported in the IRRF, will also reflect UNDP’s work together with UN Country Teams towards nationally defined annual and multi-year targets. This provides an opportunity to articulate UNDP’s comparative and collaborative advantage in the context where it matters the most: the country level. The approach taken, therefore, makes the IRRF an important monitoring mechanism for UNDP to track the relevance of the SP to a country’s efforts to achieve the SDGs. It also enables strategic management of the organisation through planning, budgeting and risk management from year-to-year. Furthermore, the IRRF tracks progress in the implementation of UNDP’s regional programmes and global projects, thus, measuring UNDP’s contribution to relevant regional and global public goods.
* **Advance gender equality and women’s empowerment.** As an expression of UNDP’s commitment to promoting sustainable development that benefits all people and supports gender equality in all programmes, projects and development contexts, the IRRF includes gender responsive outputs and sex disaggregated indicators and monitors progress through sex disaggregated data across outcomes and signature solutions.

* **Better connect resources to results**. UNDP is advancing results-based budgeting by improving costing methods, reviewing project pipelines, analysing demand by programme countries, using past spending patterns as a guide and income projections by sources of fund for 2018-21. During the SP period, around 125 CPDs (out of 142 or 88%) are expected to be renewed.  As such, the amounts of the resource plan presented in the IRRF are indicative only based on historical data and actual expenditure will be analysed every year in the Annual Report of the Administrator.
* **Build on what works.** Some aspects of the IRRF 2014-17 have proven to be effective: the adoption of baselines, milestones and targets (BMTs) and use of scorecards with ‘traffic lights’ to capture output level performance. Similarly, the use of ‘markers’ for tracking progress on cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, has been a step forward. These aspects have been retained and expanded in 2018-21 with a special emphasis on the SDGs, LNOB, joint programming and South-South and Triangular Cooperation.

1. **Structure of the IRRF**
* **Tier 1: Impact Level (SP Vision)**

Impacts represent long-term development effects that benefit people. These effects are achieved through a wide range of development interventions. UNDP’s contribution to impact are monitored through a set of mostly SDG indicators that are closely related to the vision of the SP: five out of six impact indicators are drawn from the SDG indicator framework. Tracking of progress against impact indicators will draw upon internationally recognised data sources; UNDP does not need to generate data for monitoring at this level.

* **Tier 2.a: Outcome Level (SP Outcomes)**

Outcomes represent medium-term changes in development conditions to which UNDP contributes, working with governments and other partners. Outcomes in the IRRF are framed according to the three main development contexts identified in the SP, namely advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions; accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; and strengthen resilience to shocks and crises. UNDP’s contribution to outcomes will be monitored through indicators drawn mostly from the SDG indicator framework, including UN agency common SDG indicators: 23 out of 27 outcome indicators (85%) are drawn from this framework. As is the case with impact indicators, tracking of progress against outcome indicators utilises data from internationally recognised data sources and does not require additional effort by UNDP.

* **Tier 2.b: Output Level (SP Outputs – UNDP’s signature solutions)**

Outputs are changes in skills or abilities and capacities of individuals or institutions, or the availability of new products and services that result from the completion of activities within a development intervention. They are achieved with resources provided to UNDP and within the timeframe of the SP. Outputs also reflect UNDP’s comparative and collaborative advantage as outlined in the commitments made in the Common Chapter and its Annex.

UNDP’s signature solutions are captured at the output level. The IRRF shows how different combinations of outputs drawn from each of the six signature solutions proposed in the SP contribute to an outcome. This avoids an *exclusive* connection between a particular signature solution and an outcome. In other words, outcomes in the IRRF can only be achieved through efforts *across* UNDP’s signature solutions. This embeds multi-dimensionality and complexity into the IRRF, reflecting the integrated and indivisible nature of the SDGs. The IRRF also incorporates flexibility and avoids a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach: combinations of outputs across signature solutions can vary according to country context.

Output and output indicator statements are gender-responsive and data collected is disaggregated by sex to ensure progress in gender equality and women’s empowerment is closely tracked in the implementation of all signature solutions. Output indicators also follow an agreed convention adopted by UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women whereby, depending on the nature of the issue, reference is made to ‘Number of countries with X or Y’. This convention naturally applies to those countries where, at the request of national governments, UNDP provides assistance in the relevant area while working within the scope of the SP. Development results that are monitored using these indicators represent changes realised with support from UNDP.

* **Tier 3: Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency Level**

Organisational performance is monitored against a set of indicators aimed at assessing if UNDP is fit for purpose to deliver against the SP. This IRRF tier is structured in three major areas covering: accelerated delivery of top-quality programmatic results for the SDGs; organisational efficiency and effectiveness for programme delivery; and operational service arrangements for United Nations system-wide results, coordination and coherence. Outputs in each area are accompanied by indicators, including those relevant to track progress vis-à-vis QCPR mandates. Data reported against Tier 3 indicators comes from a variety of sources, primarily corporate systems, external reviews and surveys, and regular reporting by country offices. Effectiveness and efficiency as monitored through Tier 3 output indicators are two important dimensions of UNDP’s approach to risk management as defined in the Enterprise Risk Management policy. An essential component of UNDP’s approach to risk-informed development is the mandatory adoption of Social and Environmental Standards in all programmes and projects, which continues to be closely assessed in the IRRF Tier 3.

**III. Planning, Monitoring, Results Analysis and Reporting**

The IRRF guides all business units to plan results and allocate resources, monitor progress, analyse and report on performance and lessons learnt.

* **Planning:** At the onset of the SP, UNDP set baselines, annual milestones and targets (BMTs) for output indicators in the IRRF. BMTs were set by all business units based on analysis of data and evidence, lessons learnt and available/forecasted resources. CPDs and regional programme documents (RPDs) and their associated results and resources frameworks (RRFs) have been and will continue to be aligned to the SP and IRRF so that UNDP’s corporate-level commitments and strategies can be followed-through at all levels.
* **Monitoring:** UNDP monitors progress against planned results and resources through its annual planning, budgeting and monitoring exercise. In addition, all business units monitor programme/project status and financial data. Reflecting its commitment to accountability and transparency, UNDP continues to publish project and financial information, including IRRF results, consistent with the standard set by the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).
* **Results Analysis and Reporting:** At the end of each year, UNDP conducts a results analysis and reporting exercise, with all units reviewing results achieved against annual milestones. Reporting against the IRRF comprises quantitative evidence, supplemented by qualitative analysis in Results Oriented Analysis Reports (ROARs). The data and analysis gathered through this process are presented in the Annual Report of the Administrator (ARA). The ARA and its annexes, including a fully populated IRRF with BMTs and actuals, serve as the basis for dialogue with the Executive Board at its Annual Sessions. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the SP provides an important opportunity to assess progress towards implementation of the SP at the midpoint.

**IV. Population of Baselines, Milestones, Targets and Actuals**

In the Executive Board decision (DP/2017/30) it was requested that UNDP “provide baselines and targets for the integrated results and resources framework (DP/2017/38, annex 1)[…] at its annual session 2018, and in the lead-up to that annual session, requests that UNDP engage with the Executive Board on progress with the methodologies underpinning the indicators in the integrated results and resources framework (DP/2017/38, annex 1) and how the outputs in that framework will feed into the common chapter outcomes in the Strategic Plan, 2018-2021.” In response to the decision, UNDP developed methodologies to collect, aggregate and compute data for IRRF indicators and populated BMTs and actuals for the IRRF indicators at impact, outcome, output and organisational levels.

* **Data collection for impact indicators:** Impact indicators are the SDG indicators that rely on internationally published data sources. A baseline was provided for these indicators with the latest available data but no targets were set since UNDP cannot establish these outside intergovernmental processes. Under each impact indicator, the direction of progress towards the 2030 target is included.
* **Data collection for outcome indicators**: Similarly, most outcome indicators are SDG indicators or ones that rely on internationally published data sources. A baseline was provided for these indicators with the latest available data but no targets were set since UNDP cannot establish them outside the scope of intergovernmental processes. Under each outcome indicator, direction of progress towards the 2030 target is included. For the SDG indicators, the Sustainable Development Goals Report and its Statistical Annex are used as the data source for reporting.
* **Data collection for output indicators:** The IRRF linking and BMT setting exercise was conducted from 18 April through 11 May 2018, where all country offices and regional bureaux linked country and regional programme outputs to IRRF outputs, selected relevant IRRF output indicators and set BMTs for the selected indicators. Unit level data was aggregated to the corporate level and presented in this report. The table shows the number of countries[[1]](#footnote-2) that have reported values to each output indicator during 2018-21. The IRRF linking and milestones and targets will continue to be updated to reflect results to be achieved by new CPDs adopted during the SP period.

Data provided by the country offices and regional bureaux was quality assured at regional and headquarters levels. Intensive efforts were made to verify incomplete or inconsistent data with the country offices and regional bureaux. The following assumptions were applied to a limited amount of reported data to enable calculation of a consistent time series of results expected over the SP period.

**Assumption 1 - Missing baselines**. If no valid baseline was reported, it was assumed to be equal to the first milestone (2018) reported as a conservative assumption that there were no additional reported results since the baseline was set.

**Assumption 2 - Missing milestones, actual or targets**. In cases where the baseline value was reported for an indicator but the expected values were missing for one or more years, the missing milestone(s) and/or actual values were assumed to have the same value as previous one(s). For example, if a country does not provide a 2019 milestone, the 2018 milestone value will used for 2019. This approach was designed to provide a comparable time series in expected results across years while making conservative assumptions that do not overestimate the scale of changes over the SP period.

* **Adjustments to show results achieved under the SP.** For indicators designed to measure results achieved over the SP period of 2018-21, the baseline value was subtracted from each year in the time series to yield an effective baseline of zero and ensure milestones, actuals and targets to show only the results achieved during the SP period. Consequently, the indicator descriptions were modified with the phrase “additional” to express the incremental nature of the indicator values. For indicators that are proportions, baseline values are not set to zero so that the level of achievement can be analysed across the reporting years. This approach is applied to most of the IRRF output indicators unless the indicator has an annual nature, such that the baseline situation and those of the following years are not compatible and therefore not comparable. For example, countries may transition out of (or evolve into) crisis situations one year to another. These indicators are explicitly identified as “annual” indicators and baseline values have not been adjusted to zero.
* **Reporting challenges.** A few challenges remained after the completion of the April/May 2018 BMT setting exercise. BMTs of some indicators, particularly under Outcome 3, appear underestimated with a small number of reporting countries.
* **Challenges specific to output indicators using numbers and proportions.**

For the first time, UNDP introduced output level indicators with both numbers and proportions (output indicators 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.2., 1.5.1.1, 1.6.2.1, 2.2.3.2, 3.1.1.2, 3.3.2.1 and 3.6.1.2) with an aim to capture not only the number of people UNDP benefitted but also the degree to which UNDP reached out to the population in need. A few challenges have emerged while pursuing this attempt. For instance, some countries were unable to set sensible denominator values due to difficulty in estimating population in need in specific areas and target groups. Inconsistent approaches have also been observed in denominator values (e.g. capturing entire population of target groups in a country vs. a smaller populating group targeted by UNDP’s interventions). The methodologies and data for the indicators that use proportions will continue to be improved as UNDP learns over this Strategic Plan period.

For indicators expressed as proportions, the global aggregation is calculated using a weighted average approach, i.e. by dividing the sum of all numerator values by the sum of all denominator values to measure UNDP’s global performance. Alternatively, the global aggregate can be calculated using a non-weighted average by averaging the proportion values of each programme country. The non-weighted average shows the level of UNDP’s average performance at country level. The baseline, milestone and target values of proportion indicators presented in the annual session in 2018 used “non-weighted average”, where applicable. After careful review, “weighted average” was adopted in this report to demonstrate UNDP’s global level performance. Performance data based on non-weighted average are available upon request.

When a programme is expanded to cover more populations, both numerator and denominator values may increase, potentially resulting in a performance rate lower than the baseline value, which is not necessarily an indication of negative performance.

* **Data collection for institutional results.** IRRF Tier 3 indicators are populated with data from three sources: a) data on UNDP performance collected on an on-going basis through systems such as Atlas or on-line monitoring and reporting systems, b) data self-reported on a regular basis by country offices or other units and validated by evidence and quality assurance processes, and c) data from periodic surveys.

**V. Data reviews and adjustments**

* In response to the Executive Board decision (2018/5) requesting “*UNDP to continue to refine and improve the IRRF as it continues to implement its Strategic Plan*”, an additional round of data quality review was conducted in July 2018. To better capture UNDP performance with clearer language or granular disaggregation, some modifications were introduced to a few indicators (Output indicators 1.1.1.2, 1.6.1.1 and 2.2.2.2) as reported in the 2018 Annual Report of the Administrator.
* **Tier 2 output indicators.** An additional round of data quality review was conducted between July and October 2019, giving the country offices an opportunity to review and adjust their milestones and targets, particularly those offices that started a new country programme in 2019. The data review exercise resulted in an increase in the number of reporting countries and BMT values for many of the indicators, indicating an increased level of alignment of the country programmes to the SP as well as an increased level of ambition to contribute to the achievement of SDGs. In a few cases, offices requested to remove and/or adjust previously reported indicators due to reporting errors.

**Number of output indicator components with increased countries reporting – 68 (out of 147[[2]](#footnote-3))**

Output components: 1.1.1.1.A, 1.1.1.2.B, 1.1.1.2.C, 1.1.1.3.A, 1.1.1.3.B, 1.1.2.1.A, 1.1.2.1.B, 1.1.2.1.C, 1.1.2.1.D, 1.1.2.1.E, 1.1.2.1.F, 1.1.2.2.A, 1.2.1.1.1, 1.2.1.2.A, 1.2.1.2.B, 1.2.2.2.B.2, 1.2.3.1.A, 1.3.1.1.1, 1.3.1.2.1, 1.4.1.2.A, 1.4.1.2.B, 1.5.1.1.A, 1.5.1.1.B, 1.5.1.1.C, 1.6.1.1.A, 1.6.1.1.B, 1.6.1.1.C, 1.6.1.1.D, 1.6.2.2.C, 2.1.1.1.A, 2.1.1.1.C, 2.1.1.2.1, 2.1.2.1.A, 2.1.2.1.B, 2.1.2.1.C, 2.1.2.1.E, 2.1.2.1.F, 2.1.2.2.A, 2.1.2.2.B, 2.2.2.1.1, 2.2.2.2.C, 2.2.2.3.1, 2.2.2.4.1, 2.2.2.5.B, 2.2.2.5.C, 2.2.3.1.A, 2.2.3.2.A, 2.2.3.2.B, 2.2.3.2.C, 2.2.3.2.D, 2.2.3.3.1, 2.3.1.1.1, 2.4.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.E, 2.6.1.1.F, 3.1.1.2.B, 3.1.1.3.A, 3.1.1.3.B, 3.1.1.3.C, 3.1.1.4.1, 3.2.1.1.1, 3.2.1.3.1, 3.2.2.1.D, 3.3.1.1.A, 3.3.2.2.1, 3.6.1.2.B

**Number of output indicator components with reduced countries reporting –37 (out of 147)**

Output components: 1.1.1.3.C, 1.1.2.1.G, 1.1.2.2.D, 1.1.2.2.G, 1.1.2.2.H, 1.1.2.2.J, 1.1.2.2.K, 1.1.2.3.A.1, 1.1.2.3.B.1, 1.1.2.3.B.2, 1.1.2.3.C.1, 1.1.2.3.C.2, 1.2.1.2.C, 1.2.2.1.A, 1.2.3.1.B, 1.2.3.2.1, 1.4.1.2.D, 1.4.1.2.E, 1.4.1.2.F, 1.6.2.2.B, 2.1.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.C, 2.2.1.1.E, 2.2.3.1.B, 2.4.1.1.B, 2.4.1.1.C, 2.4.1.1.D, 2.6.1.1.A, 2.6.1.1.B, 2.6.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.D, 3.2.2.1.A, 3.3.1.1.B, 3.3.1.1.C, 3.3.1.1.D, 3.3.1.3.1

**Number of output indicator components with increased targets – 99 (out of 147)**

1.1.1.1.A, 1.1.1.1.B, 1.1.1.1.C, 1.1.1.2.A, 1.1.1.2.B, 1.1.1.2.C, 1.1.1.3.A, 1.1.1.3.B, 1.1.1.3.C, 1.1.2.1.A, 1.1.2.1.B, 1.1.2.1.C, 1.1.2.1.E, 1.1.2.1.F, 1.1.2.2.A, 1.1.2.2.C, 1.1.2.2.E, 1.1.2.3.B.1, 1.1.2.3.B.2, 1.1.2.3.C.1, 1.1.2.3.C.2, 1.2.1.1.1, 1.2.1.2.A, 1.2.1.2.B, 1.2.1.2.C, 1.2.3.1.B, 1.2.3.1.C, 1.3.1.1.1, 1.3.1.2.1, 1.4.1.1, 1.4.1.2.A, 1.4.1.2.B, 1.4.1.2.C, 1.4.1.2.D, 1.4.1.2.E, 1.4.1.2.F, 1.5.1.1.A, 1.5.1.1.B, 1.5.1.1.C, 1.5.1.1.D, 1.6.1.1.A, 1.6.1.1.B, 1.6.1.1.D, 1.6.2.2.A, 1.6.2.2.C, 2.1.1.1.A, 2.1.1.1.B, 2.1.1.1.C, 2.1.1.2.1, 2.1.2.1.C, 2.1.2.1.D, 2.1.2.2.A, 2.1.2.2.B, 2.2.1.1.A, 2.2.1.1.B, 2.2.1.1.C, 2.2.1.1.D, 2.2.1.1.E, 2.2.1.1.F, 2.2.2.1.1, 2.2.2.2.C, 2.2.2.3.1, 2.2.2.4.1, 2.2.2.5.A, 2.2.2.5.B, 2.2.2.5.C, 2.2.3.1.A, 2.2.3.1.B, 2.2.3.2.A, 2.2.3.2.B, 2.2.3.2.C, 2.3.1.1.1, 2.3.1.2.1, 2.4.1.1.A, 2.4.1.1.B, 2.4.1.1.C, 2.4.1.1.D, 2.5.1.1.A, 2.5.1.1.B, 2.5.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.A, 2.6.1.1.C, 2.6.1.1.D, 2.6.1.1.E, 2.6.1.1.F, 2.6.1.2.1, 3.1.1.1.1, 3.1.1.2.B, 3.1.1.3.A, 3.1.1.3.B, 3.1.1.3.C, 3.2.1.1.1, 3.2.1.3.1, 3.2.2.1.D, 3.3.1.1.A, 3.3.2.2.1, 3.5.1.1.A, 3.5.1.1.B, 3.5.1.1.C

**Number of output indicator components with reduced targets –20 (out of 147)**

1.1.2.1.D, 1.1.2.1.G, 1.1.2.2.B, 1.1.2.2.D, 1.1.2.2.G, 1.1.2.2.H, 1.1.2.2.I, 1.1.2.2.J, 1.1.2.2.K, 1.2.1.3.A.1, 1.2.1.3.A.2, 1.2.1.3.A.3, 1.2.2.1.A, 1.2.2.2.A.1, 1.2.2.2.B.2, 2.1.2.1.E, 2.2.3.2.D, 3.1.1.2.A, 3.2.2.1.A, 3.6.1.2.B

Detailed information on indicator changes is available on request.

* **Tier 2 proportion indicators**. During the 2019 data review exercise, the country offices carefully reviewed denominator values of Tier 2 proportion indicators so that all proportions are calculated using population-level estimates as the denominator. This has caused previously reported BMT values for some of the indicators to decrease, making the values not comparable between this report and previous ones.

**VI. Amendments to the IRRF outputs and indicators**

* **Tier 2 outcomes, outputs and indicators.** During the MTR, UNDP found that the outcomes, outputs and indicators were properly designed to help UNDP measure the progress towards achieving the SP targets. Therefore, no amendments are proposed to the existing outcomes, outputs and indicators.
* **UNDP’s response to COVID-19 pandemic.** While the existing outcomes, outputs and indicators will remain unchanged, a new and critical output for UNDP’s response to COVID-19 pandemic was introduced under Outcome 3 – strengthen resilience to shocks and crisis. The output will help UNDP plan and implement its responses to the pandemic at global, regional and country levels and monitor and report on progresses and results for future strategy setting. The indicators are being developed and will be included in the IRRF in due course.
* **Tier 3 indicators.** In light of the UNDS repositioning process, three indicators relating to UNDP hosting the Resident Coordinator function are no longer applicable and were removed from the table (3.1.1 Percentage of UN Country Teams presenting single annual report to programme country governments on progress implementing the UNDAF, 3.3.1 Percentage of Resident Coordinators that are female, from programme countries and with entity of origin other than UNDP, and 3.3.3 UNDP contribution to the backbone of Resident Coordinator system in US$ million.)
* **Amendment to Tier 3 indicator 1.1.2.** To better capture the degree to which UNDP reflects the development priorities of national government counterparts, the wording of the indicator has been adjusted in line with the questionnaire of the Partnership Survey conducted in early 2020.
* **Improvement of Tier 3 indicator 1.2.6.** To better capture UNDP’s innovation work, the indicator has been enhanced with three layers: 1 - the degree to which UNDP uses innovative tools and methodologies in its development project outputs, 2 - the degree to which the innovative tools and methodologies are tested or piloted and 3 - the degree to which the innovative tools and methodologies are scaled.
* **Amendments to the milestones and targets of Tier 3 indicator 2.2.1. a) and 2.3.2.** In line with the availability of core resources in relation to the delinking of the Resident Coordinator system, milestones and targets for 2.2.1 a) Percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities and 2.3.2 Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) have been revised.
* **Removal of Tier 3 indicator 3.2.3.** Due to the difficulty in establishing proper data sources to measure clients’ satisfaction with UNDP provision of operational services, the indicator 3.2.3 has been removed.

**VII. Performance and actions**

* The IRRF indicator performance and traffic lights in the Report Card have been critical inputs for UNDP to analyse its performance against the SP targets. The indicator performance was analysed carefully, especially where the number of reporting countries is small, i.e. the performance of a few countries affected the corporate level performance.
* Introduced in November 2019, the Portfolio Analysis Dashboard, an artificial intelligence (AI) powered results and resources monitoring system, has enabled all parts of the organisation to analyse resources invested and results achieved, both IRRF indicator performance and qualitative results reported through the ROARs. The analysis by the country offices, regional bureaux and Global Policy Network were triangulated to identify the factors of successes and challenges, which informed the MTR and will continue to support UNDP’s policy making and programming in the future. The organisational effectiveness and efficiency performance (Tier 3) has been analysed by the indicator owner bureaux, who are providing support to relevant country offices and headquarters bureaux/units to improve their performance.
* Impact of COVID-19 pandemic: The implications of the COVID-19 pandemic are not yet known. While many milestones and targets were increased as part of the data quality review and MTR as UNDP sought to raise the level of ambition towards the Decade of Action for the SDGs, these may need to be reassessed once more as information comes to light and the Executive Board apprised.



 **Note: Resources are in millions of US Dollars, RR-Regular Resources and OR-Other Resources.**

# Tier One: Impact

| **Impact: To help countries to achieve sustainable development by eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks.** |
| --- |
| **Impact indicators** | **Baseline** | **Latest data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **1** | **a.** Proportion of population below the international poverty line, by sex, age, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural)**b.** Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age | a. World: 10.9% (2013)- Employed Population: 9.9% (2016)- Employed Adults: 9.0% (2016)- Employed Youth: 15.1% (2016)- Employed Male: 9.8% (2016)- Employed Female: 9.9% (2016)b. 31.8% (2016) | a. World: 9.9% (2015)- Employed Population: 8.0% (2018)- Employed Adults: 7.2% (2018)- Employed Youth: 13.5% (2018)- Employed Male: 8.3% (2018)- Employed Female: 7.8% (2018)b. 30.4% (2019) | Decrease |
| **Note:**1. Based on the International Poverty Line of US$1.90/day, adults refer to people over the age of 25 and youth refers to those between 15 and 24. For consistency, the baseline year for the world aggregate is 2013 and the latest year for disaggregation is 2017, as published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report” for 2019 (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2019/>) and “Statistical Annex” (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2019/secretary-general-sdg-report-2019--Statistical-Annex.pdf> ). Disaggregation by location is not available.
2. Based on World Bank data (<https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC>) and 119 UNDP programme countries where data is available. Disaggregation by sex or age is not available. Latest data year is 2017 with country-specific data ranging from 2009 to 2019.
 |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target:** 1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day 1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.1.1, 1.2.1  |
| **2** | **a.** Human Development Index**b.** Gender Inequality Index | a. 0.717 (2016)b. 0.443 (2016) | a. 0.731 (2019)b. 0.439 (2019) | a. Increaseb. Decrease |
| **Note**:a. Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/HDI>. The world estimate is based on all countries with available data.b. Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/composite/GII>. The world estimate is based on all countries with available data. |
| **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicators |
| **3** | Growth rates of household expenditure or income per capita among the bottom 40 per cent of the population and total population | Total population: 2.5% (2015)Bottom 40% population: 2.9% (2015) | Total population: 1.8% (2016)Bottom 40% population: 2.1% (2017) | Increase |
| **Note**:Based on the data from the SDG indicator database (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=10.1.1> ) and 62 UNDP programme countries where data is available. The baseline year is 2015 with country-specific data from 2009 to 2015. The year with latest data is 2017 with country-specific data from 2012 to 2017. |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 10.1 By 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 10.1.1 |
| **4** | Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters per 100,000 population (disaggregated by sex to the extent possible) | Deaths/100,000: 5.71 (2016)Missing persons/100,000: 2.78 (2016)Directly affected persons/100,000: 1204.37 (2016) | Deaths/100,000: 1.48 (2018)Missing persons/100,000: 0.50 (2018)Directly affected persons/100,000: 2002.02 (2018) | Decrease |
| **Note**:Based on the data from the SDG indicator database (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=1.5.1> ). The baseline year is 2016 with country-specific data ranging from 2000 to 2016. 80 countries had data for the number of deaths and directly affected persons. 56 countries had data for the number of missing persons. The year with the latest data is 2018 with country-specific data ranging from 2007 to 2018. 111 countries have data for the number of deaths and affected persons. 67 countries have data for the number of missing persons. |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target:** 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.5.1, 11.5.1, 13.1.1  |
| **5** | CO2 emission per unit of value added | a. Total CO2 emissions – Fuel Combustion: 32,276 million tonnes (2015)b. CO2 emission per GDP, PPP: 0.31 kg/constant 2,010 US dollars (2015)c. CO2 emission per unit of manufacturing value added: 0.49 kg/constant 2,010 US dollars (2015) | a. Total CO2 emissions – Fuel Combustion: 32,314 million tonnes (2016)b. CO2 emission per GDP, PPP: 0.30 kg/constant 2,010 US dollars (2016)c. CO2 emission per unit of manufacturing value added: 0.47 kg/constant 2,010 US dollars (2016) | Decrease |
| **Note**: The baseline year is 2015. Values updated from last report, based on “The Secretary General’s Report on Sustainable Development Goals, Statistical Annex” (<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/report/2019/secretary-general-sdg-report-2019--Statistical-Annex.pdf> ). Previously published values for the 2015 baseline have also been updated in the 2019 report. |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 9.4 By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 9.4.1 |

#

# Tier Two: Development Outcomes and Outputs

| **Outcome 1: ADVANCE POVERTY ERADICATION IN ALL ITS FORMS AND DIMENSIONS** |
| --- |
| **Outcome indicators** | **Baseline** | **Latest Data** | **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **1.1** | 1. Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions, by selected measures of multidimensional poverty
2. Proportion of people sliding back into poverty
 | a. 31.5% (2016)b. Data not available | a. 23.1% (2019)b. Data not available | Decrease |
| **Note:**1. Latest data from “Global Multidimensional Poverty Index 2019: Table 1 Developing Countries” (<http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/mpi_2019_table_1.pdf> ), based on data from 101 developing countries.
2. Methodology for this indicator is under development.
 |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target:** 1.2 By 2030, reduce at least by half the proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to national definitions**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) Adapted from 1.2.2 (SDG is based on national definitions); (b) Non-SDG indicator  |
| **1.2** | Proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health and social protection) | Education: 4.7% GDP (2000 – 2016)Health: 2.9% GDP (2015)Social Protection: 4.6% GDP (2000 – 2015) | Education: 4.3% GDP (2003 – 2019)Health: 6.2% GDP (2017)Social Protection: Update not available | Increase |
| **Note:** Calculation based on the data from World Bank (education), WHO (health) and ILO (social protection) databases. Social protection expenditure excludes health expenditure. Percentage of GDP is the simple average of country percentages from 134 (education), 139 (health) and 103 (social protection) UNDP programme countries where data is available. Baseline year varies depending on country data availability. There is no update on social protection expenditure data from ILO. |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources, including through enhanced development cooperation, in order to provide adequate and predictable means for developing countries, in particular least developed countries, to implement programmes and policies to end poverty in all its dimensions**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.a.2 |
| **1.3** | Dollar value of financial and technical assistance (including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation) committed to developing countries | Total ODA 33,404.1 (2015) million constant 2017 US$ | Total ODA 33,514.1 (2017) million constant 2017 US$ | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” from 2019, also known as the “Statistical Annex*.*” Baseline year is 2015. Baseline value was updated in the 2019 report. |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 17.9 Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the Sustainable Development Goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.9.1 |
| **1.4** | Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months | 12% (2017) | Data not available | Decrease |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.5.1 |
| **Note:** Estimates based on newly available data from the SDG database. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=16.5.1>. Baseline estimate is averaged from 30 UNDP programme countries with data between 2004 and 2017. Latest estimate not available due to lack of recent data. |
| **1.5** | Number of new HIV infections per 1,000 uninfected population, by sex, age and key populations | World: 0.27 (2015)Male: 0.31 (2015)Female: 0.28 (2015)Adults (15+): 0.37 (2015)Children (0-14): 0.08 (2015) | World: 0.25 (2017)Male: 0.26 (2017)Female: 0.24 (2017)Adults (15+): 0.40 (2017)Children (0-14): 0.09 (2017) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information, also known as the “Statistical Annex”. The baseline year is 2015. |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UN WOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target**: 3.3 By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 3.3.1 |
| **1.6** | Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 1.4 By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.4.2 |
| **1.7** | 1. Proportion of population with access to electricity (disaggregated by urban/rural areas to the extent possible)
2. Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology
 | a. Total: 85% (2014);Urban: 96% (2014);Rural 73% (2014);b. 57% (2014) | a. Total: 89% (2017);Urban: 97% (2017);Rural 79% (2017);b. 61% (2017) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex”. |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 7.1.1, with additional disaggregation, (b) 7.1.2  |
| **1.8** | 1. Proportion of ever-partnered women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by form of violence and age
2. Proportion of women and girls aged 15 years and older subjected to sexual violence by persons other than an intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by age and place of occurrence
 | a. 19%(2016)b. Data not available | a. 17.8% (2017)b. Data not available | Decrease |
| **Note:** As published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017” for the world aggregated estimate and in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” for latest data, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target**: 5.2 Eliminate all forms of violence against all women and girls in the public and private spheres, including trafficking and sexual and other types of exploitation**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 5.2.1 and 5.2.2  |
| **1.9** | Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals | 34 (2017) | 35 (2018) | Increase |
| **Note:** Estimates based on count of UNDP programme countries reported in the SDG database. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=17.16.1>.  |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 17.16 Enhance the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals in all countries, in particular developing countries**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.16.1 |
| **1.10** | Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNFPA, UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target:** 17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 17.18.1 |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. Countries** | **2017****Baseline** | **2018****Milestone** | **2018****Actual** | **2019 Milestone** | **2019****Actual** | **2020****Milestone** | **2021****Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1**POVERTY** | 1.1.1 Capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other international agreements[[3]](#footnote-4) in development plans and budgets, and to analyse progress towards the SDGs, using innovative and data-driven solutions | **1.1.1.1 Number of *additional* countries that have development plans and budgets that integrate international agreements across the whole-of-government**2**:** |
| 1. 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
 | 75 | 0 | 17 | 16 | 23 | **22** | 30 | 35 |
| 1. Paris Agreement
 | 62 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 14 | **19** | 21 | 27 |
| 1. Other international agreements**[[4]](#footnote-5)**
 | 49 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 10 | **12** | 16 | 21 |
| **Note**: Not all countries provided BMTs and actuals for all components of this indicator.[[5]](#footnote-6) |
| **1.1.1.2 Number of *additional* national and sub-national governments and other partners sharing innovative and data-driven solutions:** |
| 1. National governments
 | 9 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 17 | **8** | 22 | 26 |
| 1. Sub-national governments
 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | **4** | 14 | 22 |
| 1. Other partners
 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | **5** | 8 | 12 |
| **Note:** This indicator has been modified to better capture UNDP performance. (Original indicator: Number of national and sub-national governments and other partners applying innovative and data-driven solutions from the Global South accessed through SSMART**[[6]](#footnote-7)**.) |
| **1.1.1.3 Number of *additional* countries with data collection/analysis mechanisms providing disaggregated data to monitor progress towards the SDGs:** |
| 1. Conventional data collection methods (e.g. surveys)
 | 76 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 18 | **17** | 25 | 30 |
| 1. Administrative reporting systems
 | 67 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 18 | **17** | 24 | 30 |
| 1. New data sources (e.g. big data)
 | 49 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 23 | **21** | 31 | 40 |
| 1.1.2 Marginalised groups, particularly the poor, women, people with disabilities and displaced are empowered to gain universal access to basic services[[7]](#footnote-8) and financial and non-financial assets to build productive capacities and benefit from sustainable livelihoods and jobs  | **1.1.2.1 Number and proportion[[8]](#footnote-9) of *additional* people accessing basic services, disaggregated by target groups** |
| Proportions: |
| 1. Total
 | 20 | 44% | 48% | 51% | 53% | **58%** | 58% | 59% |
| 1. Poor[[9]](#footnote-10)
 | 12 | 60% | 62% | 69% | 68% | **69%** | 71% | 80%  |
| 1. Women
 | 18 | 43% | 47% | 47% | 51% | **61%** | 57% | 56%  |
| 1. People with disabilities
 | 8 | 63% | 62% | 62% | 62% | **62%** | 62% | 62% |
| 1. Youth8
 | 16 | 39% | 49% | 46% | 59% | **47%** | 75% | 76%  |
| 1. Displaced populations
 | 5 | 94% | 96% | 96% | 97% | **100%** | 98% | 99% |
| 1. Other marginalised groups
 | 4 | 8% | 7% | 7% | 6% | **6%** | 5% | 5% |
| Numbers: |
| a) Total | 28 | 0 | 5,291,671 | 8,827,746 | 12,170,046 | **22,124,236** | 19,153,293 | 34,097,564  |
| b) Poor | 18 | 0 | 3,325,602 | 3,665,502 | 6,659,248 | **9,802,975** | 9,906,566 | 14,226,681 |
| c) Women | 27 | 0 | 4,751,855 | 2,938,515 | 10,824,258 | **17,366,193** | 18,800,325 | 29,933,715 |
| d) People with disabilities | 14 | 0 | 125,101 | 17,736 | 258,812 | **374,958** | 508,933 | 754,610 |
| e) Youth | 20 | 0 | 1,493,528 | 1,130,492 | 3,156,846 | **1,732,352** | 5,438,354 | 5,683,980 |
| f) Displaced | 5 | 0 | 70,345 | 76,335 | 140,365 | **142,204** | 210,903 | 281,425  |
| g) Other | 8 | 0 | 105,609 | 163,203 | 283,237 | **353,685** | 470,959 | 613,373 |
| **Note**:* Although all countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty estimating denominator values and/or did not use a consistent approach to populating denominators.
* Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21.  Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results.
* Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.
* “Other” marginalized group components are not elaborated here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.
 |
| **1.1.2.2 Number and proportion of *additional* people accessing financial services and non-financial assets, disaggregated by target groups:** |
| Accessing *financial services*, proportions |
| a) Total | 18 | 69% | 67% | 69% | 68% | **73%** | 69% | 69% |
| b) Poor | 17 | 30% | 31% | 30% | 34% | **30%** | 34% | 35% |
| c) Women | 17 | 64% | 68% | 64% | 68% | **69%** | 69% | 81% |
| d) People with disabilities | 7 | 80% | 90% | 90% | 91% | **91%** | 91% | 92% |
| e) Youth | 15 | 86% | 86% | 86% | 89% | **86%** | 89% | 90% |
| f) Other | 4 | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 8% | 8% |
| Accessing *financial services*, numbers |
| a) Total | 22 | 0 | 17,532,935 | 20,889,299 | 22,148,981 | **24,331,882** | 26,932,514 | 32,230,847 |
| b) Poor | 18 | 0 | 1,273,389 | 367,425 | 4,175,381 | **5,472,186** | 4,522,245 | 4,858,667 |
| c) Women | 22 | 0 | 6,226,912 | 1,906,741 | 7,864,045 | **5,330,015** | 9,429,361 | 25,979,811 |
| d) People with disabilities | 7 | 0 | 8,382,456 | 8,382,547 | 8,858,145 | **8,858,027** | 9,029,672 | 9,202,567 |
| e) Youth | 18 | 0 | 157,603 | 163,950 | 2,134,249 | **171,383** | 2,216,079 | 2,307,126 |
| f) Other | 4 | 0 | 101 | 101 | 228 | **209** | 1,397 | 1,967 |
| Accessing *non-financial assets*, proportions |
| a) Total | 9 | 25% | 25% | 27% | 28% | **28%** | 29% | 30% |
| b) Poor | 8 | 34% | 38% | 36% | 38% | **38%** | 39% | 40% |
| c) Women | 10 | 17% | 17% | 19% | 20% | **20%** | 21% | 21% |
| d) People with disabilities | 2 | 33% | 34% | 55% | 61% | **55%** | 61% | 61% |
| e) Youth | 7 | 11% | 12% | 15% | 15% | **15%** | 15% | 16% |
| f) Other | 1 | 15% | 15% | 15% | 27% | **15%** | 27% | 27% |
| Accessing *non-financial assets*, numbers |
| a) Total | 10 | 0 | 21,726 | 853,410 | 1,244,159 | **1,290,268** | 1,553,949 | 1,908,239 |
| b) Poor | 8 | 0 | 827,441 | 477,115 | 885,610 | **881,848** | 1,175,550 | 1,497,150 |
| c) Women | 12 | 0 | 28,630 | 434,202 | 639,687 | **665,672** | 809,497 | 985,937 |
| d) People with disabilities | 3 | 0 | 726 | 18,243 | 22,015 | **18,243** | 22,040 | 22,040 |
| e) Youth | 8 | 0 | 14,909 | 241,411 | 251,126 | **261,079** | 262,886 | 269,686 |
| f) Other | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,817 | **0** | 8,817 | 8,817 |
| **Note**:Although all countries selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators.* Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21.  Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results.
* Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.
* “Other” marginalized group components are not elaborated here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.
 |
| **1.1.2.3 Number of *additional* countries with an improved enabling environment for expansion of decent work and livelihoods:** |
| 1. Policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks
 | 60 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 20 | **21** | 22 | 25 |
| b) Direct creation of employment in |
| b1) Public sector | 23 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | **8** | 6 | 7 |
| b2) Private sector | 46 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 9 | **12** | 14 | 14 |
| c) Supporting livelihood |
| c1) Public sector | 23 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | **5** | 5 | 7 |
| c2) Private sector | 52 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 17 | **18** | 20 | 21 |
| **Note:** Further disaggregation (c) was added to capture employment creation and livelihood support separately. |
| #2**GOVERNANCE** | 1.2.1 Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic development and deliver basic services4 including HIV and related services | **1.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries where national and sub-national governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage and monitor basic services4** | 84 | 0 | 13 | 19 | 28 | **32** | 40 | 43 |
| **1.2.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with inclusive local economic development (LED) strategies and plans in place:** |
| 1. With institutional frameworks for implementation in local and regional governments
 | 42 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 15 | **12** | 21 | 24 |
| 1. With public-private partnerships at scale for accelerating catalytic LED initiatives
 | 36 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 11 | **7** | 15 | 23 |
| 1. With urban development plans and strategies in line with the New Urban Agenda under implementation
 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | **9** | 14 | 18 |
| **1.2.1.3 Number of people who have access to HIV and related services, disaggregated by sex and type of service:** |
| a) Behavioural change communication |
| Total | 22 | 4,347,495 | 5,097,096 | 5,957,191 | 5,394,396 | **9,353,812** | 5,831,235 | 5,945,278 |
| a1) Number of males reached  | 22 | 1,869,407 | 1,936,017 | 2,299,529 | 2,036,071 | **5,742,029** | 2,190,134 | 2,230,820 |
| a2) Number of females reached | 22 | 2,369,665 | 2,728,190 | 3,469,574 | 2,854,308 | **3,382,031** | 3,067,458 | 3,115,656 |
| b) Antiretroviral (ARV) treatment | n/a | 2.2 million | 1.4million | 1.4million | 1.4million | **1.4** **million** | 1.4million | 1.5million |
| **Note**:* Not all countries reported sex-disaggregated numbers. Therefore, males and females reached may not add up to total.
* This indicator is reported on an annual basis and is not cumulative.
* For component b) UNDP’s work output is based on numbers reported from countries where UNDP is the Principal Recipient of Global Fund grants. When the government can take over responsibility for the management of the grant, UNDP will hand over and cease to claim the number of people accessing ARV treatment as a “UNDP result”. The milestones are therefore based on the assumption that UNDP will continue to act as the Principal Recipient for these countries throughout the SP period.
* ARV treatment numbers are based on the harmonized reporting mechanism managed by The Global Fund.
 |
| 1.2.2 Enabling environment strengthened to expand public and private financing for the achievement of the SDGs | **1.2.2.1 Number of *additional* countries with an enabling environment in place leveraging additional resources from public and private sources[[10]](#footnote-11) for the SDGs:** |
| 1. Policy, legal and regulatory frameworks
 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | **7** | 12 | 14 |
| 1. Institutional mechanisms
 | 32 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 17 | **12** | 18 | 22 |
| **1.2.2.2 Volume[[11]](#footnote-12) of *additional* resources leveraged through public and private financing8 for the SDGs with UNDP support:** |
| At national level |
| a1) Public | 11 | 0 | 52,247,904 | 61,305,812 | 121,575,526 | **107,105,189** | 195,079,549 | 278,744,739 |
| a2) Private | 11 | 0 | 3,301,006 | 4,227,018 | 36,726,649 | **21,384,370** | 77,326,650 | 133,926,651 |
| At sub-national level |
| b1) Public | 5 | 0 | 21,500,000 | 18,485,294 | 41,610,000 | **34,009,780** | 79,830,000 | 91,840,000 |
| b2) Private | 5 | 0 | 2,530,000 | 20,800,093 | 14,745,000 | **33,228,229** | 26,525,000 | 42,825,000 |
| 1.2.3 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication | **1.2.3.1 Number of *additional* countries with effective measures adopted to mitigate and remedy corruption risks at:** |
| 1. National level
 | 42 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | **10** | 11 | 15 |
| 1. Sub-national level
 | 33 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 6 | **13** | 11 | 16 |
| 1. Sector level
 | 34 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 10 | **15** | 16 | 21 |
| **1.2.3.2 Number of *additional* countries that adopt and implement with UNDP assistance, upon request, constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information** | 14 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | **5** | 6 | 6 |
| #3**RESILIENCE** | 1.3.1 National capacities and evidence-based assessment and planning tools enable gender-responsive and risk-informed development investments, including for response to and recovery from crisis  | **1.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with recovery plans and systems in place utilizing sex, age and disability disaggregated data and gender analysis[[12]](#footnote-13)**  | 23 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | **7** | 17 | 18 |
| **1.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with development, risk reduction and recovery interventions informed by multi-hazard and other risk assessments** | 36 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 13 | **12** | 16 | 17 |
| #4**SUSTAINABLE****PLANET** | 1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains | **1.4.1.1 Number of *additional* micro-, small and medium-sized enterprises utilizing supplier development platforms for inclusive and sustainable value chains** | 37 | 0 | 153,372 | 71,106 | 214,714 | **80,610** | 228,778 | 236,272 |
| **1.4.1.2 *Additional* natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime:** |
| 1. Area of land and marine habitat under protection (hectares)
 | 35 | 0 | 6,337,562 | 6,049,241 | 9,430,348 | **6,553,326** | 10,884,546 | 18,939,500 |
| 1. Area of existing protected area under improved management (hectares)
 | 55 | 0 | 30,072,772 | 27,457,810 | 43,258,162 | **40,121,253** | 48,281,062 | 103,850,118 |
| 1. Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under cooperative management
 | 26 | 0 | 66 | 13 | 166 | **5,504** | 5,604 | 5,734 |
| 1. Area under sustainable forest management (hectares)
 | 55 | 0 | 1,749,871 | 4,172,636 | 5,769,724 | **5,045,281** | 9,657,139 | 13,297,751 |
| 1. Area of land under improved sustainable land management regime (hectares)
 | 48 | 0 | 1,632,308 | 11,807,138 | 5,228,466 | **14,260,097** | 74,781,032 | 81,903,724 |
| 1. Amount of chemicals reduced or disposed (metric tons)
 | 27 | 0 | 2,713 | 3,962 | 1,039,186 | **7,996** | 3,096,578 | 3,111,183 |
| #5**ENERGY** | 1.5.1 Solutions adopted to achieve universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy[[13]](#footnote-14) | **1.5.1.1 Number and proportion of *additional* households benefitting from clean, affordable and sustainable energy access:** |
| Proportions: |
| 1. Total households
 | 27 | 45% | 46% | 46% | 47% | **46%** | 47% | 47% |
| 1. Women-headed
 | 18 | 75% | 76% | 75% | 77% | **77%** | 77% | 78% |
| 1. In rural areas
 | 27 | 27% | 26% | 27% | 27% | **24%** | 28% | 28% |
| 1. In urban and peri-urban areas
 | 13 | 95% | 95% | 96% | 96% | **95%** | 96% | 96% |
| Numbers: |
| 1. Total households
 | 28 | 0 | 1,639,056 | 1,654,227 | 3,458,034 | **2,445,721** | 4,577,778 | 5,649,142 |
| 1. Women-headed
 | 21 | 0 | 594,429 | 611,639 | 1,388,757 | **1,404,055** | 1,890,339 | 3,625,109 |
| 1. In rural areas
 | 29 | 0 | 479,508 | 372,259 | 1,018,721 | **1,175,227** | 1,581,627 | 2,030,081 |
| 1. In urban and peri-urban areas
 | 13 | 0 | 1,227,048 | 1,338,724 | 1,953,315 | **1,357,402** | 2,651,179 | 3,336,973 |
| **Note**:* Although all countries that selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some countries were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators.
* Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21.  Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results.
* Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.
 |
| #6**GENDER** | 1.6.1 Country-led measures accelerated to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment | **1.6.1.1 Number of *additional* key measures[[14]](#footnote-15) in place that set and monitor progress towards numeric targets for women's leadership in the:** |
| 1. Public sector
 | 30 | 0 | 32 | 51 | 82 | **77** | 263 | 423 |
| 1. Elected positions, including parliament
 | 11 | 0 | 47 | 47 | 51 | **49** | 52 | 59 |
| 1. Judiciary
 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | **3** | 9 | 12 |
| 1. Private sector
 | 21 | 0 | 32 | 35 | 51 | **51** | 67 | 92 |
| **Note:** Indicator component b) Elected positions and c) Judiciary were added after the Executive Board (2018 June) to better capture UNDP’s performance. |
| 1.6.2 Measures in place and implemented across sectors to prevent and respond to Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) | **1.6.2.1 Proportion of GBV cases reported to authorities receiving judgment in the formal justice system** | 13 | 34% | 35% | 34% | 37% | **36%** | 39% | 42% |
| **Note:** The baseline is kept as reported to indicate the intended and actual status under each reporting year. |
| **1.6.2.2 Number of *additional* countries with frameworks in place to prevent and respond to SGBV:** |
| 1. Multi-sectoral policy and legislation
 | 35 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 6 | **6** | 8 | 11 |
| 1. Multi-sectoral services including justice and security
 | 31 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | **4** | 9 | 13 |
| 1. Platforms for raising awareness and social mobilisation
 | 33 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | **7** | 9 | 11 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Outcome 2: ACCELERATE STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT** |
| **Outcome indicators** | **Baseline** | **Latest data** |  **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **2.1** | Proportion of population covered by social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, new-borns, work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable | Childrena: 35%Mothers with newbornsb: 41%Older personsc: 68%Unemployedd: 22%Persons with severe disabilitye: 28%Vulnerablef: 25% | No update available | Increase  |
| **Note**:As published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2018” and in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” 2018, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Disaggregation by sex is not available. The baseline year is 2016. There is no update available for this indicator. Social protection for different groups refers to:a Proportion of children covered by social protection, b Proportion of mothers with newborns receiving maternity benefits,c Proportion of population above the retirement age receiving a pension,d Proportion of population with severe disabilities collecting disability social protection benefits,e Proportion of unemployed population receiving unemployment benefits, andf Proportion of vulnerable population covered by social assistance. |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target**: 1.3 Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.3.1 |
| **2.2** | 1. Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments
2. Proportion of women in managerial positions
 | a. 23% (2017)b. 30% (2015) | a. 24% (2019)b. 27% (2018) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” |
| **FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES COMMON INDICATOR (UNICEF, UNWOMEN)****Corresponding SDG target**: 5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 5.5.1 (b) 5.5.2 |
| **2.3** | Voter turnout, disaggregated by sex, age, and excluded groups | 66% (2017) | 67% (2018) | Increase |
| **Note**: Estimiate based on data from Inter-Parliamentary Union database (<http://archive.ipu.org/parline-e/parlinesearch.asp> ) where 103 UNDP programme countries reported most recent election data. Baseline year ranged from 2003 to 2017. Latest data year ranged from 2004 to 2018. |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator  |
| **2.4** | Percentage of people who experienced a dispute and had access to a formal or informal dispute mechanism, considered affordable and just (disaggregated by sex) | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator |
| **2.5** | Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by sex, age, disability and population group | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding** **SDG target**: 16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.7.2 |
| **2.6** | Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience with public services | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.6.2 |
| **2.7** | Number of countries that have communicated the establishment or operationalization of an integrated policy/strategy/plan which increases their ability to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change, and foster climate resilience and low greenhouse gas emissions development in a manner that does not threaten food production | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 13.2.1 |
| **2.8** | Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement | Basel Convention: 58%Montreal Protocol: 100%Rotterdam Convention: 71%Stockholm Convention: 51% | No update available | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Baseline year 2015. |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 12.4.1 |
| **2.9** | 1. Proportion of important sites for terrestrial and freshwater biodiversity that are covered by protected areas, by ecosystem type
2. Coverage of protected areas in relation to marine areas
 | a. 47% (2017)b. 13% (2016) | a. 46% (2018)b. 17% (2018) | Increase |
| **Note:** As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” For component a), 2018 value published in last year is revised as in 2019 report. No later data are available. |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 15.1 By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements; 14.5 By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information. **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: (a) 15.1.2, (b) 14.5.1 |
| **2.10** | Progress towards sustainable forest management | 1. Forest area net change rate: -0.09 (2011 – 2015)
2. Above-ground biomass density in forest (tonnes/hectare) 126.9 (2010)
3. Proportion of forest area within protected areas: 16% (2015)
4. Proportion of forest area with a long-term management plan: 57% (2010)
5. Proportion of forest area certified under an independently verified certification scheme: 11% (2014)
 | a. No update availableb. 127.3 (2015)c. No update availabled. No update availablee. No update available | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Some baseline and latest data values are revised where available in the report. No update is available for components a), c), d) and e). |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 15.2 By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 15.2.1 |
| **2.11** | Proportion of population with primary reliance on clean fuels and technology | 57% (2014) | 61% (2017) | Increase |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 7.1 By 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 7.1.2 |
| **2.12** | Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work, by sex, age and location | Unpaid care work: 1.1% (male) 3.3% (female)Domestic chore: 5.1% (male) 15.7% (female) | Unpaid care work: 1.3% (male) 3.8% (female)Domestic chore: 4.5% (male) 14.8% (female) | Decrease for female and increase for male to equality |
| **Note:** Based on data from the Global SDG Indicator Database <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=5.4.1> with available data points for 37 (baseline) and 43 (latest) UNDP programme countries. Disaggregation by age and location is not available. The baseline year is 2015 with country data points from 2000 to 2015. The latest year with data is 2018 with country data points from 2006 to 2018.  |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 5.4 Recognize and value unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services, infrastructure and social protection policies and the promotion of shared responsibility within the household and the family as nationally appropriate**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 5.4.1 |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. countries reporting** | **2017****Baseline** | **2018****Milestone** | **2018 Actual** | **2019****Milestone** | **2019 Actual** | **2020****Milestone** | **2021****Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1**POVERTY** | 2.1.1 Low emission and climate resilient objectives addressed in national, sub-national and sectoral development plans and policies to promote economic diversification and green growth[[15]](#footnote-16) | **2.1.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with targets[[16]](#footnote-17) for low emission and climate-resilient development in:** |
| a) Development plans and strategies | 69 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 16 | **15** | 21 | 21 |
| b) Budgets | 50 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 11 | **11** | 17 | 22 |
| c) Private sector business plans and strategies | 39 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 13 | **14** | 19 | 22 |
| **2.1.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with public-private partnerships at national level to improve the enabling framework[[17]](#footnote-18) for economic diversification and green growth** | 31 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | **9** | 11 | 16 |
| 2.1.2 Capacities developed for progressive expansion of inclusive social protection systems | **2.1.2.1 Number of *additional* countries with policy measures and institutional capacities in place to increase access to social protection schemes, disaggregated by target groups:** |
| 1. Sex
 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | **3** | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Age
 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | **2** | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Persons with disabilities
 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | **5** | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Marginalised groups[[18]](#footnote-19)
 | 18 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | **4** | 6 | 7 |
| 1. Urban poor
 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | **1** | 3 | 5 |
| 1. Rural populations
 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | **1** | 3 | 6 |
| **2.1.2.2 Number of *additional* countries that have improved the range of services provided through their social protection systems to reach marginalised groups:** |
| 1. Types of services
 | 29 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 7 | **7** | 11 | 13 |
| 1. Quality of services (as determined nationally)
 | 25 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | **7** | 9 | 12 |
| #2**GOVERNANCE** | 2.2.1 Use of digital technologies and big data enabled for improved public services and other government functions | **2.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries using frameworks[[19]](#footnote-20) that leverage digital technologies and big data for:** |
| 1. Delivery and monitoring of services
 | 27 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | **6** | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Public engagement
 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | **6** | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Access to and protection of information
 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | **5** | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Legal identity and civil registration
 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | **5** | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Urban development using smart technologies
 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | **6** | 9 | 11 |
| 1. Other critical public services (e.g. public procurement)
 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | **4** | 6 | 8 |
| 2.2.2 Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability | **2.2.2.1 Number of *additional* Electoral Management Bodies (EMBs) with strengthened capacity to conduct inclusive and credible elections** | 50 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 37 | **39** | 47 | 67 |
| **2.2.2.2 Women's participation in elections:** |
| 1. Proportion of women in the voter registry
 | 39 | 47% | 48% | 48% | 48% | **48%** | 49% | 50% |
| 1. Proportion of women on the governing mechanism of the electoral management body
 | 38 | 18% | 18% | 18% | 19% | **18%** | 20% | 21% |
| 1. Number of *additional* countries benefitting from Temporary Special Measures (TSMs) to ensure women’s participation and representation[[20]](#footnote-21)
 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 7 | **8** | 8 | 13 |
| Note:* The baselines of the components a) and b) are kept as reported to indicate the intended and actual status under each reporting year.
* Component c) was converted in July 2018 from “Number of women benefitting from TSM” to “Number of countries benefiting from TSM”, making this component a “Yes/No” type at country level.
 |
| **2.2.2.3 Number of *additional* parliaments with improved capacities to undertake inclusive, effective and accountable law-making, oversight and representation** | 51 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | **17** | 24 | 26 |
| **2.2.2.4 Number of *additional* constitution-making bodies (CMBs) with mechanisms for civic engagement, including the participation of women and other marginalised groups** | 19 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 13 | **24** | 19 | 25 |
| **2.2.2.5 Number of *additional* countries that adopt and implement, with UNDP assistance, legal and regulatory frameworks that enable civil society to function in the public sphere and contribute to sustainable development:** |
|  | 1. Whole of society
 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | **7** | 7 | 10 |
| 1. Women’s groups
 | 31 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | **10** | 14 | 17 |
| 1. Youth groups
 | 30 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | **9** | 14 | 17 |
| 1. Groups representing other marginalised populations
 | 30 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 9 | **9** | 13 | 15 |
| Note: component a) Whole of society was added to better capture UNDP’s performance. The change took place in July 2018. |
| 2.2.3 Capacities, functions and financing of rule of law and national human rights institutions and systems strengthened to expand access to justice and combat discrimination, with a focus on women and other marginalised groups[[21]](#footnote-22) | **2.2.3.1 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened institutions and systems supporting fulfilment of nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations:** |
| 1. Rule of law and justice[[22]](#footnote-23)
 | 68 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 15 | **15** | 24 | 29 |
| 1. Human rights[[23]](#footnote-24)
 | 68 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 14 | **19** | 22 | 26 |
| **2.2.3.2 Number and proportion of *additional* population who have access to justice, disaggregated by sex and marginalised groups:** |
| Proportions |
| 1. Total
 | 30 | 6% | 7% | 7% | 7% | **7%** | 9% | 9% |
| 1. Female
 | 28 | 6% | 6% | 6% | 7% | **7%** | 9% | 9% |
| 1. Male
 | 28 | 7% | 7% | 8% | 8% | **8%** | 9% | 10% |
| 1. Other marginalised group
 | 19 | 11% | 17% | 18% | 20% | **18%** | 22% | 25% |
| Numbers |
| 1. Total
 | 37 | 0 | 3,604,842 | 3,232,374 | 8,335,045 | **7,021,060** | 17,912,155 | 23,839,399 |
| 1. Female
 | 34 | 0 | 1,659,757 | 1,637,893 | 4,005,853 | **3,664,772** | 10,348,679 | 12,388,707 |
| 1. Male
 | 33 | 0 | 1,913,918 | 2,561,707 | 4,183,356 | **3,863,618** | 8,557,195 | 11,410,912 |
| 1. Other marginalised groups
 | 23 | 0 | 1,169,581 | 1,380,472 | 1,845,129 | **1,457,248** | 2,479,871 | 3,121,677 |
| **Note**:* Although all countries selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators.
* Effective zero baselines allow UNDP to demonstrate “actual/cumulative” achievements during 2018-21.  Proportion indicators retain a baseline to demonstrate incremental coverage results.
* Countries provided disaggregated BMTs by target group(s) and where UNDP supported programmes are expected to have outputs. Total values do not necessarily match the sum of sub-components as target groups are not mutually exclusive.
* “Other” marginalized group components are not described here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.
* The original indicator has been adjusted to remove “access to informal justice” as no credible data are available at the country level.
 |
| **2.2.3.3 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened capacities for governance and oversight of rule of law institutions20** | 55 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 14 | **20** | 22 | 31 |
| #3**RESILIENCE** | 2.3.1 Data and risk-informed development policies, plans, systems and financing incorporate integrated and gender-responsive solutions to reduce disaster risks, enable climate change adaptation and mitigation, and prevent risk of conflict[[24]](#footnote-25)  | **2.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with data-informed[[25]](#footnote-26) development and investment plans that incorporate integrated solutions to reduce disaster risks and enable climate change adaptation and mitigation** | 85 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 27 | **23** | 44 | 51 |
| **2.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with data-informed[[26]](#footnote-27) development policies, plans and institutions[[27]](#footnote-28) in place to strengthen social cohesion and prevent risk of conflict** | 17 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 7 | 7 |
| #4**SUSTAINABLE PLANET** | 2.4.1 Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources[[28]](#footnote-29), in line with international conventions and national legislation | **2.4.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems:** |
| 1. Policy frameworks
 | 62 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | **14** | 27 | 38 |
| 1. Legal and regulatory frameworks
 | 51 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | **10** | 24 | 36 |
| 1. Institutional frameworks
 | 54 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | **10** | 25 | 36 |
| 1. Financing frameworks
 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 11 | **6** | 23 | 33 |
| #5**ENERGY** | 2.5.1 Solutions developed, financed and applied at scale for energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy and zero-carbon development, for poverty eradication and structural transformation | **2.5.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with strengthened capacities for achieving energy transformation at scale:** |
| 1. Volume of investment leveraged from public and private sources through UNDP support for national programmes/initiatives
 | 42 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 12 | **10** | 20 | 21 |
| 1. Solutions applied at scale to accelerate transition to improved energy efficiency and clean energy
 | 47 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 15 | **14** | 19 | 21 |
| 1. Growth in installed base of power generation from clean and/or renewable energy sources
 | 39 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 16 | **15** | 21 | 23 |
| #6**GENDER** | 2.6.1 Capacities strengthened to raise awareness on and undertake legal, policy and institutional reforms to fight structural barriers to women’s empowerment | **2.6.1.1 Number of *additional* countries that have adopted, with UNDP support, legal, policy and institutional reforms to remove structural barriers to women’s empowerment:** |
| 1. Discrimination in labour markets (formal and informal sectors)
 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | **5** | 7 | 11 |
| 1. Access to and control over assets and services
 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | **2** | 4 | 6 |
| 1. Regulation of identity, tenancy rights, inheritance, marital status
 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | **5** | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Reduction or redistribution of unpaid care work
 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 | 6 |
| 1. SGBV
 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | **7** | 9 | 12 |
| 1. Others
 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | **7** | 8 | 11 |
| **Note:** This indicator has been slightly modified to better capture UNDP performance. (Original indicator: Number of countries that have been supported to adopt legal, policy and institutional reforms to remove structural barriers to women’s empowerment.) |
| **2.6.1.2 Number of *additional* partnerships across the whole-of-society[[29]](#footnote-30) raising awareness to eliminate discriminatory gender and social norms** | 13 | 0 | 34 | 58 | 67 | **74** | 111 | 142 |

| **Outcome 3: STRENGTHEN RESILIENCE TO SHOCKS AND CRISES** |
| --- |
| **Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Latest data** |  **Direction of progress towards achieving 2030 target** |
| **3.1** | Number of people per 100,000 that are covered by early warning information through local governments or through national dissemination mechanisms (disaggregated by sex) | Data not available | Data not available | Increase |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters; 13.1 Strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator |
| **3.2** | Direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product (GDP), disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, attributed to disasters | 1. Average Annual Loss (AAL) attributed to disasters in relation to GDP: 0.38% (2016)
2. Average Annual Loss attributed to disasters: 293,995 million US dollars (2016)
3. Damaged critical infrastructure, health: 110 (2014)
4. Damaged critical infrastructure, education: 579 (2014)
 | 1. Average Annual Loss (AAL) attributed to disasters in relation to GDP: 0.60% (2018)
2. Average Annual Loss attributed to disasters: 730,789 million US dollars (2018)
3. Damaged critical infrastructure, health: 188 (2018)
4. Damaged critical infrastructure, education: 121,326 (2018)
 | Decrease |
| **Note**: Baseline estimates of component a) and b) were published in “The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017” and in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information” 2017, also known as the “Statistical Annex”. Latest estimates are not published in the progress report or statistical annex. Together with components c) and d), they are calculated using data from the Global SDG Indicator Database <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/?indicator=11.5.2> 102 UNDP programme countries are included in calculation for components a) and b) (latest data year only). For component c) 9 and 11 (baseline and latest year) UNDP programme countries, d) 10 and 12 (baseline and latest year) UNDP programme countries. Disaggregation by age and location is not available. |
| **Corresponding SDG targets**: 1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters; 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 1.5.2/11.5.2 |
| **3.3** | Number of forcibly displaced people (millions), disaggregated by type (refugees, asylum seekers, internally-displaced persons) and by sex and age to the extent possible | World: 65.6 million (2016)Refugees: 22.5 million (2016)Asylum seekers: 2.8 million (2016)Internally displaced persons: 40.3 million (2016)Children: 51% (2016) | World: 70.8 million (2018)Refugees: 25.9 million (2018)Asylum seekers: 3.5 million (2018)Internally displaced persons: 41.3 million (2018)Children: 52% (2018) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in “Global Trends – Forced Displacement in 2016” <http://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2016/> (baseline) and in “Global Trends – Forced Displacement in 2018” <https://www.unhcr.org/globaltrends2018/> (latest year) by UNHCR. Disaggregation by sex is not available. |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations; **Corresponding SDG Indicator**: Non-SDG indicator. |
| **3.4** | Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause  | Data not available | Data not available | Decrease |
| **Corresponding SDG target:** 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere**Corresponding SDG Indicator:** 16.1.2 |
| **3.5** | Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age | 6.0 per 100,000 population (2015) | 6.1 per 100,000 population (2017) | Decrease |
| **Note**: As published in the “Progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals 2019 Report of the Secretary-General Supplementary Information”, also known as the “Statistical Annex.” Disaggregation by age and sex is not available. Baseline estimate is revised in the report. |
| **Corresponding SDG target**: 16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere**Corresponding SDG Indicator**: 16.1.1 |

| **Signature Solution** | **Output** | **Output Indicator** | **No. countries reporting** | **2017****Baseline** | **2018****Milestone** | **2018 Actual** | **2019****Milestone** | **2019 Actual** | **2020****Milestone** | **2021****Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| #1**POVERTY** | 3.1.1 Core government functions and inclusive basic services4 restored post-crisis for stabilisation, durable solutions to displacement and return to sustainable development pathways within the framework of national policies and priorities | **3.1.1.1 Number of crisis affected countries supported by UNDP, upon request, with targeted interventions to strengthen core government functions[[30]](#footnote-31) for sustainable recovery and improved service delivery** | 13 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | **11** | 12 | 13 |
| **Note:** This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |
| **3.1.1.2 Proportion of displaced populations benefitting from durable solutions, disaggregated by target groups** |
| Proportions |
| 1. Total population
 | 11 | 34% | 26% | 23% | 22% | **19%** | 23% | 34% |
| 1. Target group
 | 4 | 59% | 69% | 52% | 72% | **66%** | 76% | 77% |
| Numbers |
| 1. Total population
 | 13 | 5,697,728 | 4,296,405 | 4,015,278 | 3,857,953 | **2,884,445** | 3,992,480 | 5,847,617 |
| 1. Target group
 | 6 | 305,600 | 551,800 | 415,038 | 652,500 | **538,586** | 786,025 | 926,987 |
| **Note**:* Although all countries selected this indicator provided numerical BMTs, some were unable to set BMTs in proportions due to the difficulty in estimating denominator values. In some cases, countries applied inconsistent approaches to populate denominators.
* Number of displaced populations fluctuated within reporting countries over the IRRF period. The total doesn’t have a stable upward or downward trend. “Target groups” varied across reporting countries and are not described here due to space constraints. Information is available upon request.
* This indicator is reported on an annual basis.
 |
| **3.1.1.3 Number of people benefitting from jobs and improved livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings, disaggregated by sex and other characteristics** |
| 1. Total
 | 28 | 1,549,300 | 2,013,903 | 3,840,066 | 4,083,116 | **5,045,912** | 4,672,096 | 9,146,108 |
| 1. Female
 | 26 | 617,268 | 790,225 | 1,207,762 | 1,345,094 | **1,718,820** | 1,551,549 | 2,918,056 |
| 1. Male
 | 27 | 924,928 | 1,212,528 | 2,604,097 | 2,716,722 | **3,275,664** | 3,097,147 | 6,214,502 |
| **Note**:* Not all countries reported sex-disaggregated numbers; therefore, the number of males and females may not add up.
* This indicator is reported on an annual basis.
 |
| **3.1.1.4 Number of crisis-affected countries where critical benchmarks for local economic revitalisation (LER)[[31]](#footnote-32) are met** | 9 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | **6** | 6 | 8 |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |
| #2**GOVERNANCE** | 3.2.1. National capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities | **3.2.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with national plans of action for prevention of violent extremism (PVE) under implementation** | 20 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 7 | **9** | 10 | 14 |
| **3.2.1.2 Number of *additional* countries with plans and strategies under implementation for the reintegration of displaced persons and/or former combatants** | 11 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | **4** | 6 | 7 |
| **3.2.1.3 Number of *additional* countries supported by UNDP, upon request, to establish or strengthen national infrastructures for peace** | 34 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | **7** | 9 | 10 |
| 3.2.2 National and local systems enabled and communities empowered to ensure the restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security  | **3.2.2.1 Number of countries with national and local systems restored or adopted following crises:** |
| 1. Functional justice systems
 | 14 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | **11** | 9 | 13 |
| 1. Victim redress mechanisms including transitional justice
 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 11 | **11** | 11 | 12 |
| 1. Community-oriented security services and oversight mechanisms
 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 12 | **15** | 17 | 18 |
| 1. Across a) – c) utilizing joint UN approaches to rebuilding rule of law and justice sector institutions and services
 | 16 | 7 | 11 | 13 | 15 | **16** | 16 | 16 |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |
| #3**RESILIENCE** | 3.3.1. Evidence-based assessment and planning tools and mechanisms applied to enable implementation of gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention and preparedness to limit the impact of natural hazards and pandemics and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies  | **3.3.1.1 Number of *additional* countries with operational end-to-end multi-sectoral early warning systems (EWS) to limit the gender-differentiated impact of:** |
| 1. Natural hazards
 | 35 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 12 | **7** | 23 | 24 |
| 1. Health shocks (e.g. pandemics)
 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | **0** | 2 | 3 |
| 1. Economic crises
 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | **2** | 5 | 6 |
| 1. Other risk factors
 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | **2** | 3 | 4 |
| **3.3.1.2 Number of *additional* countries requesting the application of tools such as the UNDG conflict and development analysis (CDAs) to inform planning and programming in key sectors** | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | **2** | 2 | 2 |
| **3.3.1.3 Number of *additional* countries with sub-national mechanisms for mitigating risks to urban centres[[32]](#footnote-33)**  | 19 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | **4** | 7 | 9 |
| 3.3.2 Gender-responsive and risk-informed mechanisms supported to build consensus, improve social dialogue and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies | **3.3.2.1 Proportion of women in leadership positions within social dialogue and reconciliation mechanisms that promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies** | 15 | 22% | 25% | 25% | 26% | **35%** | 30% | 36% |
| **Note**: The baseline is kept as reported to indicate the intended and actual status under each reporting year. |
| **3.3.2.2 Number of *additional* countries with improved capacities for dialogue, consensus-building and reconciliation around contested issues, with equal participation of women and men** | 31 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 13 | **13** | 17 | 18 |
| 3.3.3 Health systems enhanced, inclusive and integrated crisis management enabled and social and economic impact assessment conducted for agile and effective responses to COVID-19  | IndicatorsTBD | TBD | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD | TBD |
| **Note**: A new output for UNDP’s response to COVID-19 pandemic was introduced during the midterm review of the Strategic Plan. Indicators are being developed and will be included in the IRRF in due course.  |
| #4**SUSTAINABLE PLANET** | 3.4.1 Innovative nature-based and gender-responsive solutions developed, financed and applied for sustainable recovery | **3.4.1.1 Number of countries in special situations implementing innovative solutions at scale for sustainable recovery:** |
| 1. Nature-based
 | *0* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | **0** | 0 | 0 |
| 1. Gender-responsive
 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | **2** | 2 | 2 |
| **Note**:* No country reported on component a)
* This indicator is reported on an annual basis.
 |
| #5**ENERGY** | 3.5.1 Energy access re-established for crisis-affected populations, with a focus on gender-sensitive, risk-informed and sustainable recovery | **3.5.1.1 Number of crisis-affected people with energy access restored, disaggregated by sex of head of household and other relevant characteristics** |
| 1. Total
 | 2 | 4,800 | 13,000 | 182,000 | 262,000 | **549,656** | 502,000 | 532,000 |
| 1. People in women-headed households
 | 2 | 1,920 | 4,600 | 35,515 | 78,600 | **188,333** | 150,600 | 159,600 |
| 1. People in men-headed households
 | 2 | 2,880 | 8,400 | 134,385 | 183,400 | **352,998** | 351,400 | 372,400 |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |
| #6**GENDER** | 3.6.1 Women’s leadership and participation ensured in crisis prevention22 and recovery planning and action | **3.6.1.1 Percentage of women in leadership positions within prevention and recovery mechanisms** | 4 | 3% | 13% | 3% | 22% | **3%** | 22% | 22% |
| **Note**: This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |
| **3.6.1.2 Number and proportion of women among beneficiaries of recovery programmes** |
| Proportion | 15 | 53% | 54% | 54% | 53% | **50%** | 52% | 51% |
| Number | 17 | 827,625 | 798,622 | 1,379,950 | 842,109 | **1,283,020** | 875,730 | 913,199 |
| **Note***:* This indicator is reported on an annual basis. |

# Tier Three: Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency Performance

| **Results Statement** | **Indicator** | **2017** | **2018** | **2018** | **2019** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | **Milestone** | **Actual** | **Milestone** | **Target** |
|  | **Outcome 1: Accelerated delivery of top quality programmatic results for the SDGs** |
| 1.1 Evidence based performance analysis and decision making at all levels | **1.1.1** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track.  | 91.8% | N/A | N/A | 92% | **92%** | N/A | 93% |
| **Note:** Data is collected through the Project Quality Assurance exercise every other year. |
| **1.1.2** | Percentage of programme governments who perceive that UNDP: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) plays a relevant role in the development of countries, and reflects the development priorities of its partners | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **81%** | N/A | 83% |
| b) tailors its activities and capacities to national context and needs | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **76%** | N/A |  78%  |
| **Note:** UNDP conducted the Partnership Survey in January-February 2020, reflecting perceived level of collaboration and support to UNDP partners in 2019.  |
| **1.1.3** | IATI Publishing Statistics Score **[QCPR related]** |  [T] Very Strong (88) [C] Very Strong (87) | [T] Very Strong[C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)****[C] Very Strong (87)** | [T] Very Strong[C] Very Strong | **[T] Very Strong (100)****[C] Very Strong (87)** | [T] Very Strong[C] Very Strong | [T] Very Strong[C] Very Strong |
| **Note:** The data source of this indicator has been adjusted to the IATI Publishing Statistics for the stability of methodology and comparability with other development agencies. It measures two components of the IATI Standard: Timeliness [T] and Comprehensiveness [C]. The 0-100 scale for the IATI Statistics Score is converted into four performance ratings: ‘Very strong’ (75-100), ‘Strong’ (50-74), ‘Weak’ (25-49) and ‘Very weak’ (0-24). |
| 1.2 Cross-cutting approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects | **1.2.1** | Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective **[QCPR related]** | 48% | 50% | **55%** | 55% | **59%** | 58% | 60% |
| **Note:** The indicator is based on Gender Marker ratings and measures the percentage of project expenditures that are rated either GEN2 (significant contributions to gender equality) or GEN3 (gender equality as a principal objective. In 2019, out of the total provisional programme expenditure of $4,419 million, $2,224 million (or 50%) was for GEN2 and $372 million (8%) was for GEN3. |
| **1.2.2** | Percentage of UNSWAP minimum standards met or exceeded **[QCPR related]** | 80% (SWAP 1.0) | 70% | **88%** | 72% | **88%** | 72% | 75% |
| **Note:** Baseline data is based on the United Nations System-wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) 1.0 and included for information only, and hence, it is not comparable to indicator data for 2018 and onwards, which is based on UN-SWAP 2.0. In 2019, 11 performance indicators exceeded, and 3 performance indicators met the SWAP minimum standard out 16 that are applicable to UNDP.  |
| **1.2.3** | Percentage of new country programme planning documents that address the needs and rights of people with disabilities [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) At least one output statement that aims to address the needs and rights of Persons with Disabilities  | 11% (3 out of 27 CPDs) | 13% | **13%****(3 out of 23 CPDs)** | 15% | **50%****(5 out of 10 CPDs)** | 17% | 20% |
| b) At least one output indicator disaggregated by Persons with Disabilities or is sensitive to the needs and rights of Persons with Disabilities  | 7% (2 out of 27 CPDs) | 7% | **48%****(11 out of 23 CPDs)** | 8% | **60%****(6 out 10 CPDs)** | 9% | 10% |
| **1.2.4** | Percentage of project outputs that use south-south or triangular cooperation to achieve results [**QCPR related]** | 8% | 8% | **13%** | 10% | **12%** | 12% | 15% |
| **Note:** The baseline data is based on 2017 ROAR reporting. The newly introduced South-South Cooperation Maker is used for the data source starting from 2018. The percentage of programme expenditure that used south-south or triangular cooperation in 2019 was 15%.  |
| **1.2.5** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards  | 87% | N/A | N/A | 88% | **85%** | N/A | 90% |
| **Note:** Data is collected through the Project Quality Assurance exercise every other year. |
| **1.2.6** | Percentage of project outputs that use innovative tools and methodologies, of which: | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **13%** |  14% | 16%  |
| a) innovative tools and methodologies are tested or piloted | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **84%** | 92% | 95% |
| b) innovative tools and methodologies are scaled | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | **11%** | 12% | 13% |
| **Note**: The indicator has been enhanced with three layers. The first indicator measures the degree to which UNDP uses innovative tools and methodologies in its development project outputs. Subcomponents a) and b) measure the degree to which innovative tools and methodologies are a) tested or piloted and b) scaled. In 2019, 13% of project outputs (807 out of 6,205) applied innovative tools and methodologies. 88 outputs (11%) are in the scaling stage and 676 outputs (84%) are under testing and piloting.  |
| 1.3 High quality audits and evaluations producing implementable solutions | **1.3.1** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated (including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards) of: **(SWAP-related indicator)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Satisfactory quality | 21% | 23% | **25%** | 25% | **20%** | 27% | 30% |
| b) Moderately satisfactory quality | 53% |  55% | **50%** | 58% | **53%** | 58% | 60% |
| **Note:** Disaggregation components have been adjusted to align with the terminology used in the quality assessment process conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office. The sum of ‘highly satisfactory’ and ‘satisfactory’ ratings are be considered to calculate satisfactory quality (a).  |
| **1.3.2** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Satisfactory | 37% | >30% | **23%** | >30% | **30%** | >30% | >30% |
| b) Partially satisfactory with some improvement needed | 61% | >30% | **45%** | >30% | **40%** | >30% | >30% |
| c) Partially satisfactory with major improvement needed | <35% | **26%** | <35% | **26%** | <35% | <35% |
| d) Unsatisfactory | 2% | <15% | **6%** | <15% | **4%** | <15% | <15% |
| **Note:** Sub-components have been further disaggregated to align with new audit categories. The baseline for b and c were combined as they were not separated in the previous categories. Adjustments were made to the methodology to ensure better alignment with the approach in the UNDP Report on internal audit and investigation, which excludes inter-agency audits. This led to the revised baselines for b, c and d. |
| **1.3.3** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified | 100% | ≥98% | **91%** | ≥98% | **82%** | ≥98% | ≥98% |
| **Note**: While the percentage of unqualified showed a decrease, it should be noted that at the same time the qualified opinion showed a decrease from 1.99% in 2018 to 0.15% in 2019 this implies that the overall impact of the qualifications is lower. The decrease in unqualified expenditure is related to one country in crisis setting. UNDP is taking steps to provide hands-on training to the implementing partners on UNDP accounting rules and regulations to ensure a clean audit in the future. |
| **1.3.4** | Implementation rate of agreed Joint Inspection Unit Report recommendations | 73%  | 73% | **62%** | 73% | **80%** | 73% | 73% |
| **Note**: To align with the Annual Report of The Administrator – Report of UNDP on the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit, this indicator has been modified to reflect UNDP’s three-year cumulative performance of the implementation of the Joint Inspection Unit report recommendations. The baseline, milestones and target have been adjusted accordingly.  |
| **1.3.5** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Decentralized evaluations | 78% | 80% | **86%** | 82% | **86%** | 84% | 86% |
| b) Independent evaluations | 91% | 93% | **84%** | 95% | **85%** | 95% | 95% |
| **Note:** This indicator measures the number of management response key actions that are completed or ongoing divided by the total number of actions planned excluding key actions that are “no longer applicable” over a period of five years. The 2019 actuals are calculated based on the evaluations completed between 2014 and 2019.  |
| **1.3.6** | Implementation rate of agreed upon: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Internal audit recommendations | 92% | ≥85% | **95%** | ≥85% | **91%** | ≥85% | ≥85% |
| b) External audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 96% | ≥85% | **90%** | ≥85% | **88**% | ≥85% | ≥85% |
|  | **Outcome 2. Organisational efficiency and effectiveness for programme delivery** |
| 2.1UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice  | **2.1.1** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organisation | 89% | N/A | N/A | N/A | **80%** | N/A | 82% |
| **Note:** The baseline is based on results reported through the 2017 Partnership Survey. The methodology of the Partnership Survey has been revised. The partnership survey was conducted in January/February 2020, reflecting 2019 perceptions. The partnership survey has not been confirmed for 2021. Target to be determined upon confirmation.  |
| **2.1.2** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by funding stream: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Total | $4,822 | $4,950 | **$5,093** | $5,151 | **$4,732** | $5,325 | $5,483 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +6% |  | **-7%** |  |  |
| b) Regular resources | $612 | $630 | **$624** | $680 | **$629** | $700 | $700 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +2% |  | **+1%** |  |  |
| c) Other Resources (government and non-government partners, excluding government cost sharing): | $3,204 | $3,370 | **$3,439** | $3,471 | **$3,313** | $3,575 | $3,683 |
| c.1) Third party cost-sharing | $1,939 | $2,162 | **$2,101** | $2,148 | **$1,897** | $2,204 | $2,234 |
| c.2) Vertical funds | $858 | $755 | **$914** | $804 | **$861** | $783 | $788 |
| c.3) Funding Windows (thematic funding) | $65 | $65 | **$67** | $72 | **$103** | $79 | $87 |
| c.4.) UN Pooled Funding | $341 | $388 | **$357** | $447 | **$452** | $509 | $574 |
| d) Other Resources (programme country government cost-sharing) | $1,006 | $950 | **$1,030** | $1,000 | **$790** | $1,050 | $1,100 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +6% |  | **-8%** |  |  |
| **Note 1:** The indicator has been clarified that Other Resources in c.) does not include government cost sharing, which is presented separately in d) RSS is not included here**Note 2**: All 2019 financials are preliminary as of March 2020. |
| **2.1.3** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by partner: | $4,822 | $4,950 | **$5,093** | $5,151 | **$4,732** | $5,325 | $5,483 |
| a) Governments | $3,074 | $3,295 | **$3,194** | $3,367 | **$2,894** | $3,478 | $3,543 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +4% |  | **-9%** |  |  |
| b) Private sector (including Foundations, NGOs etc.) | $71 | $78 | **$47** | $86 | **$39** | $95 | $104 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | -34% |  | **-17%** |  |  |
| c) Multilaterals (EU, IFI, and other multilaterals) | $1,677 | $1,577 | **$1,852** | $1,698 | **$1,799** | $1,752 | $1,836 |
| Trend from previous year |  |  | +10% |  | **-3%** |  |  |
| **Note:** All 2019 financials are preliminary as of March 2020. |
| **2.1.4** | Percentage of Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) performance indicator where UNDP scores at least ‘satisfactory’  | 83%(2015/16) | N/A | N/A | N/A | **N/A** | N/A | 85% |
| **Note:** The indicator has been modified to provide a numerical rating. The 2017 baseline is based on the 2015/16 MOPAN Assessment where 10 of 12 KPIs were scored ‘highly satisfactory’ or ‘satisfactory’. Data will be collected when MOPAN results are released (once every four years). UNDP will be assessed in the next cycle, beginning 2020. The target was modified from 90% to 85% due to the uncertainty with the methodology and contents of the upcoming MOPAN assessment.  |
| 2.2. Cost-sharing agreements and projects ensure full cost recovery | **2.2.1** | Use of core and non-core for programme activities: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities | 82% | 80% | **81%** | 75% | **75%** | 78% | 78% |
| b) Percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities | 95% | 95% | **95%** | 95% | **95%** | 95% | 95% |
| **Note:** Milestones and targets for a) have been revised from 82% (2019), 85% (2020) and 85% (2021) to 75% (2019), 78% (2020) and 78% (2021) during the MTR in line with the availability of core resources in relation to the delinking of the Resident Coordinator system, emanating from the UNDS repositioning process. |
| 2.3 Quality and efficient management services to support programme delivery | **2.3.1** | Percentage of country offices meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 94% | 95% | **87%** | 95% | **87%** | 95% | 95% |
| **Note:** The data is based on the Comptroller’s Performance Index. The indicator is modified to reflect country office performance rather than operating units.  |
| **2.3.2** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 6.93% | 6.90% | **6.69%** | 7.65% | **7.55%** | 7.50% | 7.40% |
| **Note:** Changes in the milestones and targets from 6.90% (2019), 6.80% (2020 and 6.60% (2021) to 7.65% (2019), 7.50% (2020) and 7.40% (2021) introduced during the MTR relate to revised core expenditures due to the Resident Coordinator delinking. Refer to the midterm review of the integrated resources plan and integrated budget, 2018-2021 (DP/2020/9) for details.  |
| 2.4 Efficient, professional and transparent procurement and value for money | **2.4.1** | Heads of country office procurement units with relevant procurement certification | 57.7% | 64% | **80%** | 71% | **73%** | 78% | 85% |
| **2.4.2** | a) Percentage of procurement volume spend through LTAs | 17% |  22% | **27%** |  27% | **25%** |  32% |  37% |
| b) Percentage of global procurement value in collaboration with UN and other development partners [**QCPR related]** | 9% | 14% | **19%** | 19% | **20%** | 23% | 28% |
| **Note:** Collaboration with UN includes procurement services provided to and from UN Agencies as well as using UN Agencies’ LTAs.  |
| 2.5 UNDP equipped with talented and diverse workforce | **2.5.1** | Staff satisfaction: |  |   |  |   |  |   |   |
| a) Leadership/direction index (percentage of all employees surveyed who express confidence in leadership and direction)  | 71% (2016) | 75% | **69%** | N/A | **N/A** | 85% | 85% |
| b) Engagement index | 79%(2016) | 82% | **80%** | N/A | **N/A** | 85% | 85% |
| **Note:** Baseline data comes from 2016 reported actuals through the Global Staff Survey conducted in 2017. The staff survey will be conducted on a biannual basis.  |
| **2.5.2** | Percentage of relevant staff who completed: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Informal and formal senior leadership/management programme/activities (P5 and above) | 6.2% | 10% | **16%** | 20% | **32%** | 25% | 30% |
| b) Virtual career management activities | 9% | 10% | **9%** | 20% | **6%** | 25% | 30% |
| c) UNDP Mandatory Course-Learning Plan | 36% | 70% | **71%** | 80% | **42%** | 85% | 90% |
| **Note 1:** The categorization of learning activities has been revised to more accurately reflect UNDP learning programmes. The indicator has been modified for a), b) and c) in order to provide further clarifications, together with the alignment of baselines, milestones and targets. **Note 2**: The decline in the virtual career management activities from 2018 to 2019 is due to the fact that the Career Development function within the Talent Development Unit was not fully in place until Q3-4 in 2019.**Note 3**: The decline in the mandatory course compliance rate from 2018 to 2019 is due to three new mandatory courses added to the portfolio in 2019. *BSAFE* and *Anti-fraud: Fraud and Corruption Awareness and Prevention* were added in the beginning of 2019 and *Greening the Blue* in September 2019. The Greening the Blue course was provided in English only, and is currently undergoing revisions.  |
| **2.5.3** | Percentage of staff/personnel who are female: [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) All staff | 51% | 50% | **51%** | 50% | **50%** | 50% | 50% |
| b) All workforce (staff, SC holders, UNV) | 44% | 44% | **45%** | 45% | **45%** | 46% | 46% |
| c) General Service Staff | 56% | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | 50% |
| d) National Officers (NOA-NOE) | 48% | 49% | **49%** | 50% | **49%** | 50% | 50% |
| e) International professional staff P1-P3 | 52% | 50% | **55%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | 50% |
| f) International professional staff P4 | 44% | 46% | **42%** | 48% | **42%** | 50% | 50% |
| g) International professional staff P5 | 38% | 41% | **39%** | 44% | **41%** | 47% | 50% |
| h) Senior managers (D1 and above) | 39% | 42% | **40%** | 45% | **43%** | 48% | 50% |
| **Note:** The indicator has been further disaggregated to reflect the new People Management Strategy.A specification has been included for b) to provide further clarification. |
| **2.5.4** | Percentage of staff from programme countries [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) All International Professional staff | 51% | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **53%** | 50% | 50% |
| b) International Professional staff P1-P3 | 59% | 50% | **54%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | 50% |
| c) International Professional staff P4 and P5 | 67% | 50% | **53%** | 50% | **54%** | 50% | 50% |
| d) Senior managers (D1 and above) | 63% | 50% | **45%** | 50% | **45%** | 50% | 50% |
| **2.5.5** | Percentage of offices with in-house gender equality expertise: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Country offices | 55% | 56% | **57%** | 57% | **61%** | 58% | 60% |
| b) Regional and Central Bureaux | 80% | 80% | **67%** | 80% | **67%** | 85% | 85% |
| **Note**: Country office[[33]](#footnote-34) 79/129 = 57%, Regional Bureaux and Central Bureaux: 6/9 =67% |
|  | **Outcome 3. Operational Service Arrangements for United Nations system-wide results, coordination and coherence**  |
| 3.1 Common UN approaches facilitate efficient and accelerated joint delivery against sustainable development objectives | **3.1.2** | Percentage of country offices that are applying at least eight elements of the Standard Operating Procedures (Out of 15) **[QCPR related]** | 85% | 88% | **91%** | 90% | **91%** | 92% | 95% |
| **Note**: This indicator has been clarified by including the minimum number of elements to be applied by the country offices. In 2019, 117 out of 129 offices implemented at least eight elements of the SOPs (91%) |
| **3.1.3** | Percentage of country offices which have adopted the following common service lines: **[QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Common procurement services | 50% | 51% | **60%** | 53% | **64%** | 55% | 57% |
| b) Common finance services | 37% | 38% | **48%** | 40% | **50%** | 42% | 44% |
| c) Common information and communication technology services | 63% | 64% | **65%** | 66% | **72%** | 68% | 70% |
| d) Common logistics services | N/A | N/A | **43%** | 45% | **43%** | 47% | 49% |
| e) Common human resources | 40% | 41% | **42%** | 43% | **47%** | 45% | 47% |
| f) Common facility services, including common premises | N/A | N/A | **87%** | 89% | **83%** | 91% | 93% |
| g) Common long-term agreements | 76% | 77% | **86%** | 79% | **84%** | 81% | 83% |
| **Note**: The indicator has been slightly revised by removing the reference to the business operations strategy.  |
| **3.1.4** | Percentage of country offices, which have performed joint analysis and planning with the UN Country Teams in countries affected by disasters or conflicts, including in mission settings   | 12% | 13% | **28%****(14/50 countries)** | 14% | **66%****(33/50 countries)** | 15%   | 15% |
| **Note:** The language of the indicator has been modified to provide clarity of measurement. For 2019 it also includes joint analysis and planning conducted by Peace and Development Advisors in counties affected by disasters or conflicts.  |
| 3.2 UNDP support to integrated SDG delivery | **3.2.1** | Number and percentage of country offices providing a country support platform for integrated solutions |  0 (0%) | 10 (8%) | **46****(36%)** | 25 (19%) | **55****(43%)** |  45 (34%) | 70(53%) |
| **Note**: In 2018, 46 country offices out of 127 were identified as providing country support platform(s) using a methodology which included nascent or emerging platforms as qualifying. The 2019 methodology identified 16 country offices that had nascent platforms but using a methodology which did not included in the total qualified as providing country support platforms. A strictly comparable figure to compare 2018 reporting would therefore be a total of 55 country offices. Several countries have multiple country support platforms reflected in MTR narrative reporting that UNDP has over 60 country support platforms. |
| **3.2.2** | Percentage of UNDP country offices providing common services to non-resident agencies | 97% (2018) | 97% | **97%** | 97% | **96%** | 97% | 97% |
| **Note**: The indicator has been modified from ‘hosting’ to ‘providing common services.’  |
| **3.2.3** | Percentage of UNDP clients satisfied with UNDP provision of operational services (removed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Note**: Due to the difficulty in establishing a data source to properly measure clients’ satisfaction with UNDP provision of operational services, this indicator is removed. |
| **3.2.4** | UNDP non-core resources received from inter-agency pooled funds [**QCPR related]** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Amount (US dollar millions) |  $341 | $388 | **$357** | $447 | **$452** | $509 | $574  |
| b) Percentage of total UNDP non-core resources | 8%  | 9% | **8%** | 10%  | **+11%** | 11%  | 12%  |
| **Note:** The baseline has been revised to be in sync with the 2017 actual reported under 2.1.2 c.4 (pooled funding). |
| **3.2.5** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditures from joint programmes **[QCPR related]** | N/A | 15% | **8.4%** | 10% | **8.4%** | 12% | 15% |
| **Note:** The target was determined in line with the General Assembly Resolution (A/RES/72/279), paragraph 28e: … requests the United Nations development system… to allocate, where applicable, at least 15 per cent of non-core resources for development to joint activities. In 2019, out of the total expenditure for ($4.4 billion), $371.2 million (8.4%) was spent on joint programmes. In terms of non-core resources, out of the expenditure of $4 billion, $328 million (8.2%) was spent on joint programmes. While not marked as Joint Programme, the expenditure of the projects where UN agencies are implementing partners totalled $613 million in 2019, 14% of the total expenditure of $4,419 million. The milestones for 2029 and 2020 and the target for 2021 were adjusted to show incremental improvement towards achieving 15% by the end of 2021.  |
| **3.2.6** | UNCDF: |   |   |  |   |  |   |   |
| a) Number of LDCs where UNCDF has a strategic country presence | 25 | 26 | **27** | 28 | **28** | 30 | 32 |
| b) Number of joint UNDP-UNCDF programmes/projects | 24 | 25 | **26** | 26 | **27** | 27 | 28 |
| **3.2.7** | UNV:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Number of people volunteered per year through UNV | 6,501 | 6,750 | **7,201** | 7,000 | **8,282** | 7,250 | 7,500 |
| b) Number of UN partners engaging UN Volunteers  | 34 | 35 | **38** | 37 | **54** | 39 | 40 |
| **Note**: Disaggregation for indicator 3.2.7.a: 47% female, 53% male UN Volunteers, 55% International UN Volunteers, 43% National UN Volunteers.  |
| **3.2.8** | UNOSSC: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Number of partnership compacts established with relevant United Nations organisations, other intergovernmental organisations, partner countries and other relevant stakeholders. | 20 | 30  | **57** | 40 | **78** | 50 | 60 |
| b) Number of volumes of South-South in Action and other publications launched. | 12 | 20 | **36** | 28 | **63** | 36 | 44 |
| **Note:** A new indicator relating to the United Nations Office for South-South Cooperation is added as per the discussion with the Executive Board during an informal session on 16 August 2018. The data reflects aggregated numbers from previous years, 21 partnership compacts were signed whilst 27 publications were developed in 2019.  |
| **3.3.2** | Total contribution in cash paid by UNDP to the UNDP Resident Coordinator system cost-sharing arrangement **[QCPR related]** | $5.15m | $5.15m | **$5.15m** | $10.3m | **$10.3m** | $10.3m | $10.3m |
| **Note:** Milestones and target are aligned with draft General Assembly resolution A/72/L.52 (9 May 2018), “Repositioning of the United Nations development system in the context of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system.” The milestones for 2019-2021 have been revised based on the 2019 contributions level of $10.3 million (instead of the amount of $10.2 million).UNDP disbursed the $10.3 million contribution to the UNSDG RC system for 2019 in 2018 in response to the request of the UN to make the payment in the 4th quarter of the preceding year.  |

**SECTION II: Report Cards**

SECTION II presents the report cards that summarize UNDP performance against milestones and targets for both development results and organisational effectiveness and efficiency indicators, including a description of the methodology used to generate these metrics.

**Methodology used for assessing performance for development results**

As in the previous years, an assessment of development performance was conducted at output level. First, the data under each output indicator are aggregated on the basis of the milestones and actuals presented in SECTION I of this report. Second, the aggregated data for each indicator are compared with the milestones of a reporting year by calculating the percentage of milestones achieved. Finally, a non-weighted average of resulting percentages was taken across all indicators for an output to calculate the average percentage achievement for that output. This calculation was translated into “traffic light” coding of the report card, with the meaning of the colour codes outlined below. Coding is in line with the harmonized standards agreed upon by UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women for the reporting of the SP.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** **90%** of the milestone.  |
| **Amber** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **between 60% and 89%** of the milestone. |
| **Red** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **less than 60%** of the milestone. |

For output indicators presenting cumulative results over the SP cycle, the progress rate was calculated by comparing the actual progress from the baseline (i.e. cumulative actual results minus the baseline value) with expected progress since the baseline (i.e. cumulative milestone value minus the baseline value). For output indicators showing non-cumulative results, the progress rate was calculated by comparing overall results achieved in the reporting year with overall results expected in the same year without subtracting the baseline. For indicators with both “number and proportion”, the achievement rate was calculated using the indicators with numbers only.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicators showing cumulative results** | **Indicators showing non-cumulative results** |
| $$cumulative percentage achievement (\%)=\frac{2018 actual-2017 baseline}{2018 milestone -2017 baseline}\*100$$ | $$non-cumulative percentage achievement (\%)=\frac{2018 actual}{2018 milestone }\*100$$ |

Output level achievement rate is an average of indicator component achievement rate under the output number. For components where achievement is above 150%, the ceiling of 150% is applied.

In addition to the summary measure of performance against milestones, the report card presents the number of countries reporting on any IRRF indicator values (a baseline, milestones and/or a target) under each output.

**Methodology used for assessing performance for organisational effectiveness and efficiency indicators**

The report card for organisational effectiveness and efficiency results assists readers in understanding achievements against annual milestones as measured by the Tier 3 IRRF indicators.

Assessment of organisational effectiveness and efficiency performance is presented at indicator level rather than output level. As the organisational results are determined by a range of organisational processes, assessing progress against indicator level provides a more meaningful picture of UNDP performance.

Performance against each indicator is calculated based on the milestones and actual results of the reporting year as presented in SECTION I, which are converted into “traffic light” coding for the report card. Thresholds for traffic light coding are aligned with those for the development results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** **90%** of the milestone. |
| **Amber** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **between 60% and 89%** of the milestone. |
| **Red** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **less than 60%** of the milestone. |

The progress rate is calculated on an annual basis. Differentiated formulae are applied to measure the progress rate of two types of indicators, where: 1- success is defined as the actual value equal to or higher than the milestone, and 2- success is defined as the actual value equal to or below the milestone (e.g. management efficiency ratio). The formula for the second type yields a percentage achievement above 100 per cent when the actual is lower than the milestone (performance above expectations) and a percentage achievement below 100 per cent when the actual is higher than the milestone (under performance).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Success is defined as the actual equal to or higher than the milestone** | **Success is defined as the actual equal to or below the milestone** |
| $$percentage achievement \left(\%\right)=\frac{actual}{milestone}\*100$$ | $$percentage achievement (\%)=(\frac{milestone-actual}{milestone}+1)\*100$$ |

Where UNDP strives to achieve a parity, such as the percentage of staff/personnel who are female (2.5.3) and the percentage of staff from programme countries (2.5.4), the performance threshold is applied to both low achievement and over achievement. In a case where milestones are lower than 50% (e.g. 42%), the performance threshold for low performance is set against 42% (green = 38% and above, amber = 25% to 37%, and red 0% to 24%) and against 50% for over achievement (green 50% to 55%, amber = 56%-70%, and red = 71%-100%).

As to indicators with sub-components, a non-weighted average of the performance rate is applied to calculate the average percentage achievement. Component achievements above 150% are kept at the 150% ceiling for aggregation. Where an indicator has only one component and the achievement is above 150%, it is displayed as “>150%” in this table.

For the indicators whose data is not available, the progress is coloured in grey and marked as ‘No data’.

**2018-2019 Development Report Card**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Plan Output** | **Performance against milestones (# of countries)** |
| **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **OUTCOME 1: Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions** |
| **1.1.1** | Integration of the 2030 Agenda and other international agreements in development plans and budgets  | 118% (99) | 97% (103) |  |  |
| **1.1.2** | Universal access to basic services and financial and non-financial assets for sustainable livelihoods and jobs  | 92% (86) | 108% (88) |  |  |
| **1.2.1** | Local economic development and delivery of basic services, including HIV related services  | 121% (98) | 111% (99) |  |  |
| **1.2.2** | Public and private financing for the SDGs  | 125% (39) | 89% (39) |  |  |
| **1.2.3** | Awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures   | 144% (47) | 136% (48) |  |  |
| **1.3.1** | National capacities, evidence-based assessment and investments for crisis response and recovery  | 125% (37)  | 93% (44) |  |  |
| **1.4.1** | Sustainable management of natural resources  | 99% (92) | 88% (95) |  |  |
| **1.5.1** | Universal access to clean, affordable and sustainable energy  | 98% (41) | 89% (40) |  |  |
| **1.6.1** | Country-led measures for gender equality and women’s empowerment  | 98% (31) | 85% (32) |  |  |
| **1.6.2** | Prevention of Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)  | 101% (39) | 115% (40) |  |  |
| **OUTCOME 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development**  |
| **2.1.1** | Integration of low emission and climate resilient objectives in development plans and policies   | 117% (78) | 98% (80) |  |  |
| **2.1.2** | Inclusive social protection systems  | 58% (39) | 77% (43) |  |  |
| **2.2.1** | Digital technologies for public services   | 107% (29) | 108% (31) |  |  |
| **2.2.2** | Strong constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions | 128% (86) | 120% (89) |  |  |
| **2.2.3** | Strong rule of law and human rights institutions and systems   | 125% (100) | 104% (100) |  |  |
| **2.3.1** | Policies, systems and financing for disaster risk reduction, climate change mitigation and conflict prevention  | 84% (82) | 113% (88) |  |  |
| **2.4.1** | Sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources  | 120% (58) | 92% (65) |  |  |
| **2.5.1** | Energy efficiency and transformation to clean energy   | 105% (48) | 95% (53) |  |  |
| **2.6.1** | Fight against structural barriers to women’s empowerment  | 143% (34) | 109% (40) |  |  |
| **OUTCOME 3: Strengthen resilience to shocks and crisis** |
| **3.1.1** | Restoration of core government functions and basic services in post-crisis situations   | 126% (35) | 110% (36) |  |  |
| **3.1.2** | Reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism (PVE)   | 142% (50) | 115% (53) |  |  |
| **3.2.1** | Restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security   | 113% (19) | 113% (19) |  |  |
| **3.3.1** | Gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention of and preparedness for natural hazards and peaceful societies  | 70% (54) | 63% (56) |  |  |
| **3.3.2** | Consensus building and dialogue for peaceful societies  | 138% (33) | 125% (37) |  |  |
| **3.4.1** | Nature-based solutions for sustainable recovery  | 100% (2) | 100% (2) |  |  |
| **3.5.1** | Energy access for crisis-affected populations  | 150% (2) | 138% (2) |  |  |
| **3.6.1** | Women’s leadership and participation for crisis prevention and recovery   | 83% (17) | 82% (19) |  |  |

**2018 - 2021 Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency Report Card**

Asterisks (\*) in the Report Card indicate carryover of previous year’s performance where no new data was available in the reporting year.

| **Results****Statement** | **Indicator** | **Performance against milestones** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **1.1** Evidence based performance analysis and decision making at all levels | **1.1.1** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track | No data | 100% |  |  |
| **1.1.2** | Percentage of programme governments who perceive that UNDP: 1. plays a relevant role in the development of countries, and reflects the development priorities of its partners and
2. tailors its activities and capacities to national context and needs

**[QCPR related]** | No data | No 2019 milestone |  |  |
| **1.1.3** | IATI Publishing Statistics Score **[QCPR related]** | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| **1.2** Cross-cutting approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects | **1.2.1** | Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective **[QCPR related]** | 111% | 107% |  |  |
| **1.2.2** | Percentage of UNSWAP minimum standards met or exceeded **[QCPR related]** | 125% | 122% |  |  |
| **1.2.3** | Percentage of new country programme planning documents that address the needs and rights of people with disabilities [**QCPR related]** | 125% | >150% |  |  |
| **1.2.4** | Percentage of project outputs that use south-south or triangular cooperation to achieve results [**QCPR related]** | >150% | 120% |  |  |
| **1.2.5** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards  | No data | 97% |  |  |
| **1.2.6** | Percentage of project outputs that use innovative tools and methodologies, of which:1. innovative tools and methodologies are piloted
2. innovative tools and methodologies are scaled
 | No data | No 2019 milestone  |  |  |
| **1.3** High quality audits and evaluations producing implementable solutions | **1.3.1** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated (including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards) of: **(SWAP-related indicator)** a) Satisfactory quality b) Moderately satisfactory quality | 100% | 86% |  |  |
| **1.3.2** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as:1. Satisfactory
2. Partially satisfactory with some improvements needed
3. Partially satisfactory with major improvements needed
4. Unsatisfactory
 | 126% | 127% |  |  |
| **1.3.3** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified | 93% | 84% |  |  |
| **1.3.4** | Implementation rate of agreed Joint Inspection Unit Report recommendations | 85% | 110% |  |  |
| **1.3.5** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses:a) Decentralized evaluationsb) Independent evaluations | 99% | 97% |  |  |
| **1.3.6** | Implementation rate of agreed upona) Internal audit recommendationsb) Extenal audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors) | 109% | 105% |  |  |
| **2.1** UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice | **2.1.1** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organisation | No data | No 2019 milestone  |  |  |
| **2.1.2** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by funding stream **[QCPR related]** | 104% | 100% |  |  |
| **2.1.3** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding disaggregated by partner | 95% | 82% |  |  |
| **2.1.4** | Percentage of Multilateral Organisation Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) performance indicator where UNDP scores at least ‘satisfactory’ | No data | No data |  |  |
| **2.2.** Cost-sharing agreements and projects ensure full cost recovery | **2.2.1** | Use of core and non-core for programme activities **[QCPR related]** | 101% | 100% |  |  |
| **2.3** Quality and efficient management services to support programme delivery | **2.3.1** | Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 92% | 92% |  |  |
| **2.3.2** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 103% | 101% |  |  |
| **2.4** Efficient, professional and transparent procurement and value for money | **2.4.1** | Heads of country office procurement units with relevant procurement certification | 124% | 103% |  |  |
| **2.4.2** | a) Percentage of procurement volume spend through LTAsb) Percentage of global procurement value in collaboration with UN and other development partners [**QCPR related]** | 129% | 99% |  |  |
| **2.5** UNDP equipped with talented and diverse workforce | **2.5.1** | Staff satisfaction:a) Leadership/direction indexb) Engagement index | 95% | 95%\* |  |  |
| **2.5.2** | Percentage of relevant staff who completed:a) Informal and formal senior leadership/management programme/activitiesb) Virtual career management activitiesc) UNDP Mandatory Course Learning Plan | 115% | 78% |  |  |
| **2.5.3** | Percentage of staff/personnel who are female [**QCPR related]** | 95% | 95% |  |  |
| **2.5.4** | Percentage of staff from programme countries [**QCPR related]** | 93% | 92% |  |  |
| **2.5.5** | Percentage of offices with in-house gender equality expertise | 93% | 95% |  |  |
| **3.1** Common UN approaches facilitate efficient and accelerated joint delivery against sustainable development objectives | **3.1.2** | Percentage of country offices that are applying at least eight elements of the Standard Operating Procedures (Out of 15) **[QCPR related]** | 103% | 101% |  |  |
| **3.1.3** | Percentage of country offices which have adopted the common service lines **[QCPR related]** | 112% | 108% |  |  |
| **3.1.4** | Percentage of country offices, which have performed joint analysis and planning with the UN Country Teams in countries affected by disasters or conflicts, including in mission settings  | >150% | >150% |  |  |
| **3.2** UNDP support to integrated SDG delivery | **3.2.1** | Number and percentage of country offices providing a country support platform for integrated solutions | >150% | >150% |  |  |
| **3.2.2** | Percentage of UNDP Country Offices providing common services to non-resident agencies | 100% | 99% |  |  |
| **3.2.3** | Percentage of UNDP clients satisfied with UNDP provision of operational services | No data | No data |  |  |
| **3.2.4** | UNDP non-core resources received from inter-agency pooled funds [**QCPR related]** | 90% | 106% |  |  |
| **3.2.5** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditures from joint programmes **[QCPR related]** | 56% | 84% |  |  |
| **3.2.6** | UNCDF:1. Number of LDCs where UNCDF has a strategic country presence
2. Number of joint UNDP-UNCDF programmes/projects
 | 104% | 102% |  |  |
| **3.2.7** | UNV:1. Number of people volunteered per year through UNV
2. Number of UN partners engaging UN Volunteers
 | 108% | 132% |  |  |
| **3.2.8** | UNOSSC:1. Number of partnership compacts established with relevant United Nations organisations, other intergovernmental organisations, partner countries and other relevant stakeholders.
2. Number of volumes of South-South in Action and other publications launched.
 | >150% | >150% |  |  |
| **3.3** UNDP contributes fully to the Resident Coordinator function | **3.3.2** | Total contribution in cash paid by UNDP to the UNDP Resident Coordinator system cost-sharing arrangement **[QCPR related]** | 100% | 100% |  |  |

1. Refers to both countries and territories that receive UNDP programme resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Excludes proportion indicators. More detailed information on the changes to the number of reporting countries and 2021 targets is available upon request. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Includes all parts of national government such as ministries, various commissions, agencies and authorities as well as other state bodies. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Includes Addis, Beijing, Istanbul, Quito, SAMOA and Sendai. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. This applies to all IRRF output indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. SSMART stands for South-South Marketplace. This is the same as the global development solutions exchange referred to in UNDP’s corporate strategy on South-South and Triangular Cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Basic services include social services (e.g. health and nutrition, education, water and sanitation, social housing, vocational training), economic services (including finance), environmental and energy services (e.g. renewables, clean fuels and technology, use of natural resources), and other services (e.g. rule of law and justice). Please note that UNDP focuses primarily on policies and capacities that improve the enabling environment for provision of basic services. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Proportions can be calculated using estimates of coverage populations that are available in many countries using surveys and administrative reporting systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. As defined nationally. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Includes alternative modes of financing such as Islamic finance, social impact investing, and socially responsible investments. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Wherever relevant, IATI data will be used to inform public financing, among other sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Includes Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessments (RPBA) and Post-Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Includes renewable energy as well as clean fuels and technology. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Includes development policies, plans, legislation, regulations and programmes and initiatives that specifically address the issue of women’s leadership. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Includes oceans and marine ecosystems, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, land, and chemicals and waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Includes nationally determined contributions (NDCs). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Includes dialogue with the private sector on policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks as well as measures to boost investment and sustainable development. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Includes youth, people living with HIV, indigenous groups and other traditionally marginalised groups, as relevant in each national context. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. Includes policy, legal and regulatory frameworks and funded programmes/initiatives. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Includes TSMs aiming at creating a conducive environment for women’s participation such as existence of funding or training programmes as well as incentives for political parties to place women in electable positions, quotas, reserved seats and targeted voter education programmes, among possibilities. Based on country responses, it will be possible to estimate and report on the number of countries that have such measures in place. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Includes youth, people with disabilities, people living with HIV and other traditionally marginalised groups, as relevant in each national context. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. As articulated in the ‘Declaration of the High-level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels,’ (A/RES/67/1) which states, *inter alia*, that ‘[...] We recognize the importance of national ownership in rule of law activities, strengthening justice and security institutions that are accessible and responsive to the needs and rights of all individuals and which build trust and promote social cohesion and economic prosperity’ (paragraph 11). [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. As per inter-governmentally agreed norms and standards, e.g. the Paris Principles (UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/48/134 of December 1993). [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. QCPR (GA/RES/71/243) paragraph 24 ‘[…] calls upon the entities of the United Nations development system, in full compliance with their respective mandates, to enhance coordination with humanitarian assistance and peacebuilding efforts at the national level in countries facing humanitarian emergencies and in countries in conflict and post-conflict situations, and in this regard: (a) Emphasizes that in countries facing humanitarian emergencies there is a need to work collaboratively to move beyond short-term assistance towards contributing to longer - term development gains, including by engaging, as appropriate, in joint risk analysis, needs assessments, practice response and a coherent multi - year timeframe, with the aim of reducing need, vulnerability and risk over time, in compliance with international law and in line with resolution 46/182 of 19 December 1991 and the annex thereto and in accordance with national plans and priorities, stressing that this should not adversely affect resources for development; (b) Emphasizes that development is a central goal in itself, and that in countries in conflict and post - conflict situations, the development work of the entities of the United Nations development system can contribute to peacebuilding and sustaining peace, in accordance with national plans, needs and priorities and respecting national ownership, and stresses in this regard the need to improve coordination and synergy to maximize the impacts, results and effectiveness of support for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, stressing that this should not adversely affect resources for development.’ UNDP supports, upon request, national measures on crisis, whether caused by natural or man-made factors, taking a development approach in all its programmatic interventions on prevention and response. An important partnership in this regard is the Joint UNDP-DPA Project on Strengthening National Capacities for Conflict Prevention, implemented since 2004, which includes the deployment of Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs) to Resident Coordinator Offices (RCOs). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Refers to available evidence regarding disaster prone areas and communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Refers to availability of relevant data regarding the most affected groups to be used, upon request, to support national policymaking and action. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Includes, upon request, nationally established infrastructures for peace. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. Includes oceans and marine and freshwater ecosystems, forests, biodiversity and ecosystems, land rights, and management of chemicals and waste. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Including government, civil society, private sector, philanthropies, academic institutions, faith-based organisations and others. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Includes institutional capacities and processes for national and local planning, management and coordination (e.g. executive office management, aid management, human resource management and financial management). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Local economic revitalization (LER) benchmarks relate to infrastructure (e.g. houses, schools, public buildings, power grids, hospitals, health and water facilities), market development, income generation and employment, new and existing enterprises and private sector recovery to address the needs of affected populations. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. Includes, for example, risks from environmental degradation, climate change, natural disasters, violence, breakdown of social cohesion and rule of law, economic distress, and rapid urbanisation, among other factors. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Country offices in this report include the development office in Kosovo (UNSCR 1244) and the Programme of Assistance to the Palestine People. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)