## Annex 1: Development and Institutional Report Cards

**Introduction**

1. Annex 1 responds to Executive Board decisions 2014/10 and 2015/11 by providing report cards that summarize UNDP performance against 2017 targets for both development results and organizational effectiveness and efficiency indicators; this includes a description of the methodology used to generate these metrics.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2015/11 | 6. Suggests **including Report Card tables also for tier three: Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency** and in this regard urges UNDP to ensure good progress against organizational effectiveness indicators in 2015 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2016/4 | 4. Welcomes new **analysis of the percentage of country offices achieving their cumulative milestones** and requests further reporting in the 2017 annual report of the Administrator on **changes in the percentages of country offices meeting or exceeding their cumulative milestones** |

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

1. The report card for development results presented in this annual report follows the enhanced methodology adopted during the midterm review. As in previous years, an assessment of development performance was conducted at the output level. Aggregate results under each output indicator were calculated, on the basis of targets and actual results for 2017, as seen in Annex 2. The second step consisted of comparing the aggregated actual 2017 result for each indicator with the 2017 targets by calculating the percentage of the 2017 targets 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 for the report card, with the meaning of the colors outlined below. Coding is in line with harmonized standards agreed upon by UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women during the midterm review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the average percentage achievement across the output is **equal to or above** the milestone (at or above 100%) |
| **Amber** | If the average percentage achievement across the output is **between 60% and 99%** of the milestone |
| **Red** | If the average percentage achievement across the output is **less than 60%** of the milestone |
| **Grey** | If there is insufficient data to assess average percent achievement for all indicators under the output |

1. The percentage of the 2017 targets achieved was calculated—for output indicators presenting cumulative results over the strategic plan cycle— by comparing actual progress since the baseline (i.e. cumulative 2017 actual results minus the baseline value) with expected progress since the baseline (i.e. cumulative 2017 target value minus the baseline value). For output indicators showing non-cumulative results (3.3.1.b, 3.3.2.a, 3.3.2.b, 5.4.3, 7.7.1, 7.7.2) and/or output indicators where there was no expected change between baseline and 2017 target (i.e. there was no meaningful denominator,[[1]](#footnote-1) for example, indicators 7.1.1.a-c), the percentage achievement was calculated by comparing overall results achieved in 2017 with overall results expected in 2017, without subtracting the baseline. Formulas used were:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicators showing cumulative results** | **Indicators showing non-cumulative results** |
| $$cumulative percentage achievement (\%)=\frac{2017 actual-2013 baseline}{2017 target-2013 baseline}\*100$$ | $$non-cumulative percentage achievement (\%)=\frac{2017 actual}{2017 target}\*100$$ |

1. All relevant indicators and sub-indicators for which a milestone was set in the IRRF were used to calculate the average percentage achievement across an output. There were no indicators with insufficient data available to assess indicator-level performance for 2017, and no outputs where 2017 performance could not be assessed.
2. As agreed at the midterm review, 2017 targets were revised only to reflect additional results expected through new approved programming. Results reported in previous years have been adjusted only in exceptional cases where earlier reporting errors were identified and corrected by programme countries during 2016 reporting.
3. In addition to the summary measure of performance against milestones for 2014, 2015 and 2016 and against targets for 2017, the report card presents the following information:
4. The number of countries supported by UNDP under each output. Countries are counted if they have at least one ongoing development project linked to this Strategic Plan output as at 31 December 2017. This information has been added to the report card for reference from 2017 onwards and corresponds to the ‘Number of countries linked’ shown for each output in the populated IRRF in annex 2.
5. The number of countries reporting on any IRRF indicator under each output. Countries are counted if they have reported a baseline, milestones and target for any indicator under the output, even if they are not reporting expected or actual contributions to additional results in 2017.
6. The percentage of countries that planned to deliver results in 2017 which met or exceeded their 2017 targets: of those reporting an expected contribution to additional results against at least one indicator by 2017, those that met or exceeded their 2016 milestones on average for the output.
7. A comparison of 2017 gender performance with overall performance in 2017. The summary measure of gender performance is calculated in the same way as overall performance but is based only on those indicators that are gender focused or specifically target women. The 32 indicators included in the summary measure of gender performance are: Outcome 1: 1.1.1.a, 1.1.1.c, 1.2.1.b, 1.3.2.a, 1.3.2.c, 1.5.1; Outcome 2: 2.1.1.b, 2.1.3, 2.4.1.a, 2.4.2.a, 2.6.1; Outcome 3: 3.3.1.a.ii, 3.4.1.b, 3.4.1.c, 3.4.2.b, 3.5.2; Outcome 4: all indicators; Outcome 5: 5.1.1, 5.1.2.b, 5.2.1.b, 5.3.1.c; Outcome 6: 6.1.1.a, 6.1.1.c, 6.4.1, and Outcome 7: 7.1.1.c, 7.2.2.

**2014-2017 development performance report card**

| **Strategic Plan Output** | **Performance against milestones** | **Number of countries supported** | **Number of countries reporting** | **% countries with planned results that met/exceeded their milestones** | **2017 gender performance vs. overall performance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **1** | **Sustainable growth and development** |
| **1.1** | Structural transformation of productive capacities | **111%** | **112%** | **113%** | **132%** | **124** | **120** | **70%** | **57%** | **78%** | **77%** | Lower (129%) |
| **1.2** | Social protection | **163%** | **111%** | **98%** | **80%** | **66** | **50** | **100%** | **91%** | **86%** | **76%** | Lower (72%) |
| **1.3** | Sustainable management of natural resources | **91%** | **86%** | **89%** | **113%** | **109** | **115** | **74%** | **75%** | **75%** | **73%** | Lower (90%) |
| **1.4** | Climate change adaptation and mitigation | **109%** | **104%** | **98%** | **96%** | **119** | **120** | **90%** | **86%** | **88%** | **90%** | n/a |
| **1.5** | Inclusive energy efficiency and access | **114%** | **92%** | **112%** | **111%** | **84** | **82** | **72%** | **68%** | **65%** | **68%** | Higher (112%) |
| **2** | **Citizen voice, rule of law, accountability and democratic governance** |
| **2.1** | Parliaments, constitution-making bodies and electoral institutions | **120%** | **104%** | **95%** | **113%** | **88** | **93** | **81%** | **78%** | **72%** | **71%** | Lower (102%) |
| **2.2** | Anti-corruption  | **103%** | **97%** | **103%** | **96%** | **72** | **57** | **70%** | **82%** | **85%** | **75%** | n/a |
| **2.3** | Human rights institutions | **109%** | **106%** | **98%** | **94%** | **58** | **70** | **93%** | **93%** | **89%** | **91%** | n/a |
| **2.4** | Civil society engagement  | **100%** | **95%** | **90%** | **94%** | **80** | **79** | **69%** | **74%** | **85%** | **81%** | Lower (89%) |
| **2.5** | Natural resources and biodiversity/ecosystems | **169%** | **104%** | **100%** | **96%** | **73** | **99** | **82%** | **79%** | **85%** | **82%** | n/a |
| **2.6** | Discrimination and emerging issues | **150%** | **122%** | **86%** | **94%** | **23** | **36** | **44%** | **50%** | **72%** | **65%** | Same |
| **3** | **Strengthened institutions for universal access to basic services** |
| **3.1** | National ownership of recovery and development processes | **150%** | **103%** | **102%** | **90%** | **33** | **27** | **75%** | **50%** | **75%** | **67%** | n/a |
| **3.2** | Sub-national capacity for basic services delivery | **105%** | **98%** | **96%** | **90%** | **79** | **71** | **88%** | **89%** | **94%** | **90%** | n/a |
| **3.3** | HIV and related services | **108%** | **101%** | **96%** | **135%** | **60** | **41** | **90%** | **76%** | **61%** | **70%** | Lower (116%) |
| **3.4** | Rule of law/access to justice | **208%** | **156%** | **133%** | **117%** | **47** | **48** | **74%** | **64%** | **60%** | **70%** | Lower (105%) |
| **3.5** | Citizen security | **133%** | **126%** | **101%** | **92%** | **38** | **47** | **94%** | **89%** | **90%** | **84%** | Lower (85%) |
| **4** | **Gender equality and women’s empowerment** |
| **4.1** | Women’s economic empowerment | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **96%** | **16** | **29** | **86%** | **92%** | **94%** | **88%** | **Same** |
| **4.2** | Sexual and gender-based violence | **192%** | **114%** | **95%** | **95%** | **14** | **37** | **91%** | **80%** | **96%** | **78%** | **Same** |
| **4.3** | Gender evidence | **50%** | **100%** | **100%** | **83%** | **12** | **28** | **67%** | **83%** | **89%** | **83%** | **Same** |
| **4.4** | Women’s participation in decision-making | **86%** | **105%** | **108%** | **101%** | **24** | **41** | **82%** | **68%** | **72%** | **68%** | **Same** |
| **5** | **Risk reduction - conflict and natural disaster, including climate change** |
| **5.1** | Mechanisms to assess natural/man-made risks | **128%** | **115%** | **103%** | **134%** | **51** | **44** | **85%** | **82%** | **84%** | **86%** | Lower (108%) |
| **5.2** | Disaster and climate risk management | **117%** | **106%** | **95%** | **95%** | **64** | **75** | **84%** | **71%** | **79%** | **79%** | Higher (105%) |
| **5.3** | Gender-responsive disaster/climate risk management | **99%** | **109%** | **111%** | **111%** | **20** | **26** | **80%** | **64%** | **75%** | **61%** | Lower (109%) |
| **5.4** | Natural hazard preparedness | **119%** | **118%** | **101%** | **126%** | **49** | **62** | **76%** | **65%** | **65%** | **69%** | n/a |
| **5.5** | Peaceful management of conflicts  | **162%** | **98%** | **98%** | **96%** | **46** | **25** | **82%** | **84%** | **74%** | **81%** | n/a |
| **5.6** | Consensus-building around contested priorities | **100%** | **106%** | **111%** | **100%** | **22** | **30** | **87%** | **100%** | **95%** | **100%** | n/a |
| **6** | **Early recovery in post-conflict and post-disaster settings** |
| **6.1** | Early economic revitalization | **139%** | **103%** | **127%** | **168%** | **30** | **30** | **74%** | **60%** | **89%** | **89%** | Higher (214%) |
| **6.2** | Capacities for early recovery efforts | **100%** | **109%** | **99%** | **92%** | **23** | **28** | **75%** | **89%** | **95%** | **88%** | n/a |
| **6.3** | Innovative partnerships in early recovery | **85%** | **103%** | **139%** | **123%** | **4** | **14** | **45%** | **58%** | **71%** | **50%** | n/a |
| **6.4** | Social cohesion and trust | **150%** | **126%** | **102%** | **96%** | **21** | **21** | **100%** | **100%** | **89%** | **90%** | Higher (100%) |
| **7** | **Thought leadership** |
| **7.1** | Global consensus on MDGs/post-2015 agenda | **182%** | **107%** | **100%** | **Carryover 2016** | **Global** | **Global** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **Same** |
| **7.2** | Progress on MDGs/post-2015 agenda | **114%** | **130%** | **100%** | **96%** | **35** | **41** | **94%** | **100%** | **94%** | **94%** | **Same** |
| **7.3** | National development plans  | **145%** | **111%** | **109%** | **115%** | **37** | **42** | **88%** | **81%** | **85%** | **83%** | n/a |
| **7.4** | Global development financing | **100%** | **94%** | **95%** | **100%** | **22** | **29** | **89%** | **89%** | **90%** | **90%** | n/a |
| **7.5** | South-South and triangular cooperation | **113%** | **107%** | **99%** | **112%** | **17** | **30** | **76%** | **81%** | **86%** | **89%** | n/a |
| **7.6** | Innovative development solutions | **133%** | **157%** | **131%** | **126%** | **17** | **29** | **84%** | **81%** | **86%** | **82%** | n/a |
| **7.7** | Knowledge about development solutions | **101%** | **118%** | **127%** | **128%** | **Global** | **Global** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | **n/a** | n/a |
| **7.8** | MDGs and other global development goals | **55%** | **123%** | **99%** | **100%** | **Global** | **82** | **82%** | **98%** | **88%** | **100%** | n/a |

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

1. The report card for organizational results assists readers in understanding trends in organizational performance as measured by Tier III IRRF indicators, as well as achievements against ambition set in the milestones.
2. Assessment of organizational performance is presented at indicator, rather than, organizational result level. Some results are determined by a range of organizational processes, and assessing progress against each indicator provides a more nuanced picture of achievements, as well as areas where work is still needed. For example, progress in human resource management is measured against hiring times, female staff, and the timely completion of staff performance assessments.
3. Performance against each indicator was recorded based on milestones and actual results for 2017, as seen in Annex 2. Actual values were compared with corresponding milestones by calculating the percentage of the milestone achieved. The calculation result was translated into “traffic light” coding for the report card. Thresholds for traffic light coding were set so that indicators performing below 80 per cent of their milestone value are classified as “red.” The threshold is more ambitious than the one used in the development results report card (60 per cent) due to the need to highlight underperformance, especially in critical organizational processes such as resource mobilization or audit compliance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Traffic light coding** | **Meaning** |
| **Green** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** the milestone (at or above 100%) |
| **Amber** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **between 80% and 99%** of the milestone |
| **Red** | If the indicator percentage achievement is **less than 80%** of the milestone |

1. The percentage of the milestone actually achieved was calculated on a non-cumulative basis.[[2]](#footnote-2) Two types of numeric indicators were utilized to measure organizational performance: indicators where positive achievement meant an actual value equal to, or higher than, the milestone (e.g. indicator 38 on the number of country offices complying with internal transparency standards), and indicators where positive achievement meant an actual value equal to or below the milestone (e.g. indicator 29, the management efficiency ratio, as well as indicator 30 and sub-indicators 20.ii, 20.iii, 31.i, and 32.ii). There was one instance (indicator 12 on the establishment of a lessons learned database) where the assessment was qualitative. Formulas utilized are presented below. The formula for the second type of numeric indicator, shown on the right, 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 (underperformance).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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** |
| $$percentage achievement \left(\%\right)=\frac{actual}{milestone}\*100$$ | $$percentage achievement (\%)=(\frac{milestone-actual}{milestone}+1)\*100$$ |

The application of formulae is demonstrated with IRRF Tier III indicator 20, on the percentage of internal audits that are rated in the following way: i. satisfactory, ii. partially satisfactory, or iii. unsatisfactory. Sub-indicator 20.i can be defined as successful when the actual percentage is above the milestone (30 per cent). Sub-indicators 20.ii and 20.iii, on the other hand, were deemed successful with the actuals being below the milestones (at 65 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively). Actual values for these sub-indicators in 2016 were: 30 per cent for 20.i, 65 per cent for 20.ii and 5 per cent for 20.iii. The indicator achievement was calculated by averaging the sub-indicators achievements in the formula below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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** |
| $$percentage of internal audits rated satisfactory$$$$=\frac{33\%}{30\%}\*100=110\%$$ | $$percentage of internal audits rated partially satisfactory =\left(\frac{65\%-62\%}{65\%}+1\right)\*100=105\%$$ |
| $$percentage of internal audits rated unsatisfactory=\left(\frac{15\%-5\%}{15\%}+1\right)\*100=167\%$$ |

1. All relevant indicators and sub-indicators for which a milestone was set in the IRRF were used to calculate the percentage achievement. For composite indicators, a non-weighted average of sub-indicator percentages was taken to calculate the average percentage achievement for that indicator. The two indicators where data is still not available (44 and 48) are marked in grey. Data for the indicators drawn from the Partnership Survey (2, 36, 37 and 42), Global Staff Survey (24, 25 and 26) and Headquarters Products and Services Survey (7 and 28) is available every two years. Asterisks (\*) in the Report Card indicate carryover of previous year’s performance where no new data was available in the reporting year.

**2014-17 organizational effectiveness and efficiency performance report card**

| **Results Statement** | **Indicator\*** | **2014 progress against milestone** | **2015 progress against milestone** | **2016 progress against milestone** | **2017 progress against target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1** Programme effectiveness enhanced for achieving results at all levels through quality criteria and quality assurance processes | **1** | Percentage of country programme outcomes that are reported as either on-track or achieved (cross checked with evaluation findings) | 101% | 95% | 104% | 109% |
| **2** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as an effective contributor in identified areas | 83% | 83%\* | 81% | 81%\* |
| **3** | Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track. | No 2014 milestone | 101% | 93% | 101% |
| **4** | Percentage of Country Office annual results reports which meet or exceed expected organizational quality standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | 112% | 83% | 100% | 97% |
| **5** | Percentage of projects meeting or exceeding organizational quality standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | No 2014 milestone | No 2015 milestone | 115% | 122% |
| **6** | Percentage of new country programme documents that meet organizational standards in the first submission for internal appraisal **(QCPR related indicator)**  | No 2014 milestone | No 2015 milestone | 69% | 111% |
| **7** | Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with UNDP policy services and programme/project guidelines and support | No data | No data | 81% | 81%\* |
| **1.2** UNDP key development approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects for more durable results  | **8** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate quality standards for capacity development **(QCPR related indicator)** | No 2014 milestone | No 2015 milestone | 138% | 123% |
| **9** | Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective, and the use of gender markers validated by a quality assurance process. **(Common QCPR indicator)** | 84% | 72% | 97% | 83% |
| **10** | Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards **(QCPR related indicator)** | No 2014 milestone | No 2015 milestone | 133% | 124% |
| **11** | Percentage of programmes/projects where south-south or triangular cooperation is used to achieve results **(QCPR related indicator)** | No data | 67% | 40% | 27% |
| **1.3** Knowledge management institutionalized and learning is made part of its performance culture. | **12** | Existence of (and use of) a database of searchable lessons learned from evaluations and project completion reports  | Qualitative Assessment: 100% | Qualitative Assessment: 100% | Qualitative Assessment: 50% | Qualitative Assessment: 50% |
| **13** | Use of UNDP knowledge products | No 2014 milestone | 100% | 80% | 104% |
| **2.1** UNDP is an efficient and cost conscious organization  | **14** | Procurement efficiency | 102% | 102% | 97% | 99% |
| **15** | Compliance with the new cost recovery policy | 116% | 110% | 107% | 101% |
| **16** | Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators | 102% | 130% | 124% | 118% |
| **17** | Percentage of total core and non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities **(Common QCPR indicator)** | 97% | 98% | 98% | 99% |
|
| **18** | UNDP Carbon Footprint (CO2 emissions in tons CO2-equivalent) | 100% | 96% | 96% | 96%\* |
| **3.1** Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP operations improved and development effectiveness enhanced with support from The Evaluation Office and the Office of Audits | **19** | Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory or partially satisfactory quality, including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards **(SWAP-related indicator)** | No data | 127% | 114% | 99% |
| **20** | Percentage of internal audits that are rated as satisfactory, partially satisfactory, and unsatisfactory | 129% | 114% | 127% | 135% |
| **21** | Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified  | 97% | 102% | 102% | 102% |
| **3.2** Management action on evaluation and audit findings taken to improve efficiency and effectiveness  | **22** | Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses | 103% | 105% | 105% | 94% |
| **23** | Rate of implementation of agreed upon internal and external audit recommendations | 104% | 104% | 110% | 111% |
| **4.1** UNDP leaders foster a working environment in which staff are engaged, leading to improved performance and a smooth transition to the new Strategic Plan | **24** | Percentage of all staff surveyed who expressed confidence in leadership and direction | 94% | 94%\* | 93% | 93%\* |
| **25** | Percentage of all staff surveyed who feel empowered in their job | 95% | 95%\* | 100% | 100%\* |
| **26** | Staff engagement index | 96% | 96%\* | 104% | 104%\* |
| **27** | Percentage of project outputs that are aligned to corporate outcomes | 100% | 125% | 111% | 107% |
| **5.1** UNDP policies and procedures fit for purpose to enable staff to carry out their jobs effectively | **28** | Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with UNDP management services | No data | No data | 80% | 80%\* |
| **29** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio) | 99% | 104% | 104% | 114% |
| **30** | Percentage of total UNDP expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs | 94% | 97% | 94% | 101% |
| **6.1** UNDP equipped to attract, develop and retain a talented and diversified workforce | **31** | Average time taken to fill eligible vacancies across specified categories | 107% | 106% | 109% | 115% |
| **32** | Percentage of staff who are female (QCPR related indicator) | 95% | 101% | 91% | 87% |
| **33** | Percentage of annual performance management and development (PMD) processes completed on time. | 60% | 101% | 110% | 104% |
| **7.1** Effective support for the Executive Board provided to enable oversight | **34** | Percentage of Executive Board members who report satisfaction with UNDP support services | No 2014 milestone | 106% | 98% | 104% |
| **7.2** UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice by its partners | **35** | Size (in million US dollars) and trend (in percentage) in funding from government and other non-government partners (including international financial institutions, regional development banks, civil society, private sector). **(Common QCPR indicator)** | 97% | 92% | 97% | 98% |
| **36** | Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organization | 100% | 100%\* | 99% | 99%\* |
| **37** | Percentage of partners satisfied with quality and timeliness of reporting **(QCPR related)** | No 2014 milestone | No 2015 milestone | 95% | 95%\* |
| **38** | Percentage of country offices and headquarters units that are compliant with the internal standards for the international aid and transparency initiative (IATI) and Information Disclosure Policy  | 75% | 95% | 85% | 95% |
| **8.1** UNDP Country Offices are more resilient due to sound business continuity systems and security arrangements  | **39** | Percentage of Country Offices meeting minimum operations security standards (MOSS) | 101% | 101% | 107% | 103% |
| **40** | Percentage of Country Offices and headquarters units meeting Business Continuity Plan requirements | 80% | 91% | 87% | 79% |
| **9.1** Greater progress on coordination, leadership and management of the Resident Coordinator system ensured | **41** | Percentage of actions in the UNDP QCPR Implementation Plan that are achieved. | No 2014 milestone | 144% | 115% | 100% |
| **42** | Percentage of UNDP partners satisfied with UNDP leadership of the Resident Coordinator System | 78% | 78%\* | 93% | 93%\* |
| **43** | Per cent of country offices using common RBM tools and principles (Common QCPR indicator) | No data | No 2015 milestone | 107% | 99% |
| **44** | Per cent of country offices using the common UNDG capacity measurement approach (when fully developed) **(Common QCPR indicator)** | No data | No data | No data | No data |
| **45** | Number of country offices that are applying the Standard Operating Procedures, or components of it. **(Common QCPR indicator)** | No data | No 2015 milestone | 110% | 112% |
| **46** | Number of country offices implementing common services **(Common QCPR indicator)**  | No data | No 2015 milestone | 98% | 95% |
| **47** | UNDP contribution in cash provided to the resident coordinator system **(Common QCPR indicator)**, in million US dollars | 96% | 99% | 100% | 97% |
| **48** | UNDP contribution in kind provided to the resident coordinator system (Common QCPR indicator) | No data | No data | No data | No data |

1. Where there is no expected change between baseline and milestone, subtracting the baseline from the 2017 targets yields zero. It is not possible to divide a number by zero. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The only indicators that track cumulative data are sub-indicator 9.b (gender seal) and indicator 41 (percentage of achieved actions in the UNDP QCPR action plan). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)