Annex 1: Development and Institutional Report Cards

Introduction

1.   Annex 1 responds to Executive Board decisions 2014/10 and 2015/11, below, by providing report cards that summarizes UNDP's performance against its 2015 milestones for both development results and organizational effectiveness and efficiency indicators, and 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

Methodology used for assessing performance for development results.

2.   The report card for development results presented in this midterm review has been further enhanced since the 2014 Annual Report of the Administrator (ARA) through inclusion of additional metrics to assist readers in understanding the composition of performance underlying each Strategic Plan output summary measure of performance, and the level of ambition has increased. Details are provided in the remainder of this section.

3.   As for the 2014 ARA, assessment of development performance in 2015 was conducted at output level. As a first step, aggregate performance under indicator for each output was recorded, on the basis of milestones and actual results for 2015, as presented in Annex 2. The second step consisted of comparing the actual 2015 result for each indicator with its 2015 milestone, by calculating the percentage of the 2015 milestone that was actually achieved. Finally, a non-weighted average of resulting percentages was taken across all indicators under an output, to calculate the average percentage achievement for that output. The result of this calculation was translated into a "traffic light" coding for presentation in the report card, with colors having the respective meanings below. For 2015 onwards, the level of ambition in the development report card has been raised, with indicators performing below 60% of their milestone value now classified as "red" (compared to 50% in 2014), a standard harmonized with UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women.

Traffic light coding	Meaning
Green	If the average percentage achievement across the output is **equal to or above** the milestone (i.e., 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 currently insufficient data to assess average percent achievement for all indicators under the output

4.	The percentage of the 2015 milestone that was actually achieved was calculated, for output indicators presenting cumulative results over the strategic plan cycle, by comparing actual progress since the baseline with expected progress since the baseline. For output indicators showing non-cumulative results (3.3.1.b, 3.3.2.a, 3.3.2.b, 5.4.3, 7.7.1, 7.7.2) and/or output indicators for which there was no expected change between baseline and 2015 milestone (such that there was no meaningful denominator[1] - as in the fourth component of indicator 6.1.2, and indicator 7.1.1), the percentage achievement was calculated by comparing overall results achieved in 2015 with overall results expected in 2015, i.e. without subtracting the baseline. Formulas utilized are presented below:

Indicators showing cumulative results	Indicators showing non-cumulative results
$cumulative\ percentage\ achievement\ (\%)$ $= \dfrac{2015\ actual - 2013\ baseline}{2015\ milestone - 2013\ baseline} * 100$	$non-cumulative\ percentage\ achievement\ (\%)$ $= \dfrac{2015\ actual}{2015\ milestone} * 100$

5.	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. Due to efforts by UNDP to improve the quality and completeness of country level reporting against IRRF indicators during 2015 (see Annex 2), there were no indicators with insufficient data available to assess indicator-level performance for 2015, and no outputs for which 2015 performance could not be assessed.

6.	As described in the paragraph 24 of the midterm review report, UNDP conducted an organization-wide exercise in 2015 to improve the quality of its development evidence. As a one-off update, this annex presents a full and updated set of performance data for 2014, which takes account of country office updates to address gaps and inaccuracies in their previous reporting on 2014 actuals, as well as baselines, milestones and targets where necessary. Such updates are not expected to be made again during the lifetime of the Strategic Plan. The performance analysis presented for 2014 and 2015 is viewed as final, and 2017 targets will be revised only to reflect additional results expected through new approved programming.

7.	In addition to the summary measure of performance against milestones for 2014 and 2015, the report card presents information on the number of countries reporting on any IRRF indicator under each output, as shown in the 2014 ARA. Countries are counted if they have reported a baseline, milestones and target for any indicator under the output, even if they are not reporting an expected or actual contribution to additional results in 2015.

8.	This year the report card also introduces two new dimensions to help give a fuller understanding of over- and under-performance. The first new column shows the percentage of the countries that planned to deliver results in 2015, i.e. those reporting an expected contribution to additional results in 2015, which met or exceeded their milestones for the output.

9.	The second new column presents a comparison of 2015 gender performance with overall performance in 2015. The summary measure of gender performance is calculated in the same way as the overall performance measure, but it is based only on those indicators that are gender focused or specifically target women, for outputs with at least one such indicator. The 32 indicators included in the summary measure of gender performance are as follows. 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; Outcome 7: 7.1.1.c, 7.2.2.

---

[1] Where there is no expected change between baseline and milestone, subtracting the baseline from the 2015 milestone yields zero; it is not possible to divide a number by zero

2014-2015 Development Performance Report Card

	Strategic Plan Output	Progress against 2014 milestones	Progress against 2015 milestones	Number of countries reporting	% countries with planned 2015 results which met/exceeded milestones	2015 Gender performance vs overall performance
1	**Sustainable growth and development**					
1.1	Structural transformation of productive capacities that are sustainable, employment- and livelihoods-intensive	111%	116%	118	57%	Lower (103%)
1.2	Inclusive and sustainable social protection	163%	111%	49	91%	Lower (100%)
1.3	Sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.	91%	89%	115	75%	Lower (71%)
1.4	Climate change adaptation and mitigation	109%	104%	119	86%	n/a
1.5	Increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access	114%	91%	82	68%	Higher (116%)
2	**Citizen voice, rule of law, accountability and democratic governance**					
2.1	Parliaments, constitution making bodies and electoral institutions	120%	105%	93	78%	Higher (108%)
2.2	Anti-corruption awareness, prevention and enforcement measures	103%	97%	57	82%	n/a
2.3	Capacities of human rights institutions	109%	106%	67	93%	n/a
2.4	Civil society engagement in national development	100%	95%	75	74%	Higher (102%)
2.5	Conservation, sustainable use, and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems	169%	104%	96	79%	n/a
2.6	Discrimination and emerging issues	150%	122%	33	50%	Same
3	**Strengthened institutions for universal access to basic services**					
3.1	National ownership of recovery and development processes	150%	103%	26	50%	n/a
3.2	Sub-national level capacity to deliver improved basic services	105%	98%	70	89%	n/a
3.3	HIV and related services	130%	105%	30	76%	Higher (114%)
3.4	Rule of law and access to justice	208%	156%	52	64%	Lower (118%)
3.5	Citizen security	133%	126%	44	89%	Lower (93%)

	Strategic Plan Output	Progress against 2014 milestones	Progress against 2015 milestones	Number of countries reporting	% countries with planned 2015 results which met/exceeded milestones	2015 Gender performance vs overall performance
4	**Gender equality and women's empowerment**					
4.1	Women's economic empowerment	**100%**	**100%**	24	**91%**	**Same**
4.2	Sexual and gender-based violence	**192%**	**118%**	33	**81%**	**Same**
4.3	Gender evidence	**50%**	**100%**	25	**83%**	**Same**
4.4	Women's participation in decision-making	**86%**	**105%**	38	**68%**	**Same**
5	**Risk reduction - conflict and natural disaster, including climate change**					
5.1	Mechanisms in place to assess natural and man-made risks	**101%**	**103%**	42	**82%**	**Lower** *(96%)*
5.2	Disaster and climate risk management	**120%**	**107%**	73	**70%**	**Higher** *(127%)*
5.3	Gender-responsive disaster and climate risk management	**99%**	**109%**	24	**64%**	**Lower** *(102%)*
5.4	Natural hazard preparedness	**99%**	**103%**	60	**65%**	**n/a**
5.5	Peaceful management of conflicts and tensions	**162%**	**102%**	25	**89%**	**n/a**
5.6	Consensus-building around contested priorities	**100%**	**106%**	26	**100%**	**n/a**
6	**Early recovery in post-conflict and post-disaster settings**					
6.1	Early economic revitalization	**139%**	**103%**	29	**60%**	**Higher** *(115%)*
6.2	Capacities for early recovery efforts	**100%**	**109%**	28	**89%**	**n/a**
6.3	Innovative partnerships in early recovery	**85%**	**103%**	13	**67%**	**n/a**
6.4	Social cohesion and trust	**152%**	**126%**	21	**100%**	**Lower** *(109%)*
7	**Thought leadership**					
7.1	Global consensus on MDGs and post-2015 agenda	**182%**	**107%**	n/a	n/a	**Lower** *(100%)*
7.2	Monitor progress on MDGs and post-2015 agenda	**117%**	**133%**	38	**100%**	**Same**

	Strategic Plan Output	Progress against 2014 milestones	Progress against 2015 milestones	Number of countries reporting	% countries with planned 2015 results which met/exceeded milestones	2015 Gender performance vs overall performance
7.3	National development plans on poverty and inequality	145%	111%	41	81%	n/a
7.4	ODA and other global development financing	100%	94%	29	89%	n/a
7.5	South-south and triangular cooperation	113%	107%	27	79%	n/a
7.6	Innovations for development solutions	133%	156%	26	80%	n/a
7.7	Knowledge about development solutions	101%	118%	n/a	n/a	n/a
7.8	MDGs and other internationally-agreed development goals	55%	123%	n/a	n/a	n/a

Methodology used for assessing performance for Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency indicators

10. The report card for organizational results presented here is being introduced for the first time in the midterm review of the Strategic Plan 2014-2017, and it will be included in future Annual Reports of the Administrator to assist readers in understanding trends in organizational performance as measured by Tier III IRRF indicators, as well as achievements against the level of ambition set in the milestones. Details are provided in the remainder of this section. As a one-off update for the midterm review, this annex presents a full set of performance data for both 2014 and 2015.

11. Assessment of organizational performance is presented at indicator rather than at the organizational result level. There are two main reasons for this. The first reason is that a few indicators have been developed after the onset of the Strategic Plan and the lack of baselines and milestones would prevent an accurate assessment at the result level for some of the results. The second reason is that some results are determined by a range of organizational processes, and thus 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 resources management is measured against time for hiring, female staff, as well as the timely completion of staff performance assessment.

12. Performance against each indicator was recorded on the basis of milestones and actual results for 2014 and 2015, as presented in Annex 2. Then, actual values for each year were compared with the corresponding milestones, by calculating the percentage of the milestone that was actually achieved. The result of this calculation was translated into a "traffic light" coding for presentation in the report card, with colors having the respective meanings below. Thresholds for the traffic light coding are set so that indicators performing below 80% of their milestone value are classified as "red". The threshold is more ambitious than the one used in the development results report card (60%) due to the need to raise alerts in case UNDP underperforms even moderately in critical organizational processes such as, for example, resource mobilization, audit compliance, etc.

Traffic light coding	Meaning
Green	If the indicator percentage achievement is **equal to or above** the milestone (i.e., 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

13. The percentage of the milestone that was actually achieved was calculated in all instances on a non-cumulative basis.[2] Two types of numeric indicators are utilized to measure organizational performance: indicators for which positive achievement meant an actual value equal to or higher than the milestone (e.g. number of country offices complying with internal transparency standards); and indicators for which 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). In only one instance (indicator 12 on the establishment of a lessons learned database), the assessment was qualitative. This indicator will also become numeric once the database is established. Formulas utilized are presented below. The formula for the second type of numeric indicator, shown on the right, yields a percentage achievement above 100% when the actual is lower than the milestone (i.e. performance above expectations), and a percentage achievement below 100% when the actual is higher than the milestone (i.e. 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
$$percentage\ achievement\ (\%) = \frac{actual}{milestone} * 100$$	$$percentage\ achievement\ (\%) = (\frac{milestone - actual}{milestone} + 1) * 100$$

The application of the formulae is demonstrated with IRRF tier III indicator 20, on the percentage of internal audits that are rated: i. satisfactory; ii. partially satisfactory; or iii. unsatisfactory. Sub-indicator 20.i can be defined as successful when the actual is above the milestone, or 30%. For sub-indicators 20.ii and 20.iii success is defined as the actuals being below the milestones, 65% and 15% respectively. The actual values for these sub-indicators in 2015 were: 31% for 20.i, 58% for 20.ii and 11% for 20.iii. The indicator achievement was calculated averaging the sub-indicators achievements shown in the formulae 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
$$percentage\ of\ internal\ audits\ rated\ satisfactory$$ $$= \frac{31\%}{30\%} * 100 = 103\%$$	$$percentage\ of\ internal\ audits\ rated\ partially\ satisfactory$$ $$= \left(\frac{65\% - 58\%}{65\%} + 1\right) * 100 = 111\%$$
	$$percentage\ of\ internal\ audits\ rated\ unsatisfactory$$ $$= \left(\frac{15\% - 11\%}{15\%} + 1\right) * 100 = 127\%$$

14. 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. As some

---

[2] The only indicators which track cumulative data are sub-indicator 9.b (gender seal) and indicator 41 (percentage of achieved actions in the UNDP QCPR action plan).

indicators have been calculated in 2015 for the first time, and others are still being developed, it was not possible to calculate achievement against milestones for all indicators. Indicators for which a 2014 or 2015 milestone was not available are marked in white, while the few indicators for which data is still not available are marked in grey. For indicators which cannot be reported every year, such as those based on surveys done every two years (2, 24, 25, 26, 36, 37, 42), the most recent data is presented as the current achievement.

15. In addition to the summary measure of performance against milestones for 2014 and 2015, the report card presents information on the trend for each indicator value. The columns labelled "trend in indicator value" show whether the recorded actual is better or worse compared to the previous available data point, regardless of its percentage achievement against the milestone. This can add some analytical perspective, for example, if a milestone was not available, or if the milestone proved too ambitious and was not achieved even though the indicator showed progress, or if milestone was achieved but the indicator started showing a downward trend.

2015 Organizational Effectiveness and Efficiency Performance Report Card

Results Statement		Indicator*	2013-2014 trend in indicator value	2014-2015 trend in indicator value	2014 progress against milestone	2015 progress against milestone
1. IMPROVED ACCOUNTABILITY OF RESULTS						
1.1 Programme effectiveness enhanced for achieving results at all levels through quality criteria and quality assurance processes	1	Percentage of country programme outcomes that are reported as either on-track or achieved (cross checked with evaluation findings)	↑	↑	101%	95%
	2	Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as an effective contributor in identified areas i. Poverty eradication through inclusive and sustainable development ii. Democratic governance iii. Institutional capacity building for delivery of basic services iv. Gender equality and women's empowerment v. Reducing likelihood of conflict and the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change vi. Early recovery and rapid return to sustainable development in post-conflict/disaster settings vii. Contribution to development debates and international development goals	↑	N/A	83%	83%
	3	Percentage of projects with outputs reported as achieved or on track.	Collected for the first time	↑	No 2014 milestone	101%
	4	Percentage of Country Office annual results reports which meet or exceed expected organizational quality standards (**QCPR related indicator**)	↑	↓	112%	83%
	5	Percentage of projects meeting or exceeding organizational quality standards (**QCPR related indicator**)	Collected for the first time	↓	No 2014 milestone	No 2015 milestone
	6	Percentage of new country programme documents that meet organizational standards in the first submission for internal appraisal (**QCPR related indicator**)	Collected for the first time	↓	No 2014 milestone	No 2015 milestone

Results Statement			Indicator*	2013-2014 trend in indicator value	2014-2015 trend in indicator value	2014 progress against milestone	2015 progress against milestone
	7		Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with: i. UNDP policy services ii. UNDP programme/project guidelines and support	N/A	N/A	No data	No data
1.2 UNDP's key development approaches fully integrated into UNDP programmes and projects for more durable results	8		Percentage of projects that meet corporate quality standards for capacity development **(QCPR related indicator)**	Collected for the first time	↓	No 2014 milestone	No 2015 milestone
	9		a. Percentage of expenditures with a significant gender component and with gender as a principal objective. **(QCPR related indicator)** b. Number of country offices that track and report on expenditures using gender markers validated by a quality assurance process. [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	↑	↑	84%	72%
	10		Percentage of projects that meet corporate social and environmental standards **(QCPR related indicator)**	Collected for the first time	↑	No 2014 milestone	No 2015 milestone
	11		Percentage of programmes/projects where south-south or triangular cooperation is used to achieve results **(QCPR related indicator)**	↑	↑	168%	102%
1.3 Knowledge management institutionalized, learning part of performance culture.	12		Existence of (and use of) a database of searchable lessons learned from evaluations and project completion reports	↑	↑	Qualitative Assessment	Qualitative Assessment
	13		Use of UNDP knowledge products: a. Number of downloads of UNDP publications from UNDP's public website b. Number of citations of HDRs in academic publications	↑	↑	No 2014 milestone	100%
2. FIELD/COUNTRY OFFICE OVERSIGHT, MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT							
2.1 UNDP is an efficient and cost conscious organization	14		Procurement efficiency: a. Percentage of procurement cases submitted to the ACP that are approved upon first review b. Percentage of business units with a consolidated Procurement Plan.	↑	↑	102%	102%
	15		a. Percentage of cost-sharing agreements that comply with the new cost recovery policy (third party contributions only) b. Average cost recovery rate (disaggregated by funding instrument) i. Third party cost sharing ii. Government cost sharing iii. South-South contributions iv. Other trust funds v. GFATM vi. GEF Contributions below $10 million vii. GEF Contributions above $ 10 million viii. LOFTA ix. Thematic contributions x. Montreal Protocol xi. EC	↑	↑	116%	110%

Results Statement		Indicator*	2013-2014 trend in indicator value	2014-2015 trend in indicator value	2014 progress against milestone	2015 progress against milestone
	16	Percentage of operating units meeting financial data quality standards, including IPSAS indicators	Collected for the first time	↑	102%	130%
	17	i. percentage of total core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities ii. percentage of total non-core expenditures on development-related activities directed to programme activities **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]**	↑	↑	97%	98%
	18	UNDP Carbon Footprint (CO2 emissions in tons CO2-equivalent)	↑	↓	100%	88%
3. CORPORATE OVERSIGHT AND ASSURANCE (internal audit, investigations and corporate evaluations)						
3.1 Efficiency and effectiveness of UNDP with support from The Evaluation Office and the Office of Audits	19	Percentage of decentralized evaluations assessed which are rated of satisfactory quality, including having met UNEG gender-related norms and standards (**SWAP-related indicator**).	N/A	N/A	No data	No data
	20	Percentage of internal audits that are rated as: i. Satisfactory ii. Partially satisfactory iii. Unsatisfactory	↑	↓	129%	114%
	21	Percentage of audited expenditures that are unqualified	↑	↑	97%	102%
3.2 Management action on evaluation and audit findings taken	22	Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses i. Decentralized evaluations ii. Independent evaluations	↑	↑	103%	105%
	23	Rate of implementation of agreed upon: a. internal audit recommendations b. external audit recommendations (UN Board of Auditors)	↑	No change	104%	104%
4. LEADERSHIP AND CORPORATE DIRECTION						
4.1 UNDP leaders foster a working for improved performance	24	Percentage of all staff surveyed who expressed confidence in leadership and direction	↓	N/A	99%	99%
	25	Percentage of all staff surveyed who feel empowered in their job	↓	N/A	98%	98%
	26	Staff engagement index	↓	N/A	99%	99%
	27	Percentage of project outputs that are aligned to corporate outcomes	↑	↑	100%	125%
5. CORPORATE FINANCIAL, ICT AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT						
5.1 UNDP policies and procedures fit for purpose to enable efficiency	28	Percentage of UNDP staff surveyed who report satisfaction with UNDP management services	N/A	N/A	No data	No data
	29	Percentage of total UNDP expenditure related to management activities (Management Efficiency Ratio)	↑	↑	99%	104%
	30	Percentage of total UNDP expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs	↓	↑	94%	97%

Results Statement		Indicator*	2013-2014 trend in indicator value	2014-2015 trend in indicator value	2014 progress against milestone	2015 progress against milestone
6. CORPORATE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT						
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 i. Candidate Pools in calendar days ii. RRs/RCs in weeks	↑	↓	107%	106%
	32	Percentage of staff who are female (QCPR related indicator): i. At all levels ii. P4-P5 iii. D1 and above	↑	↑	95%	101%
	33	Percentage of annual performance management and development (PMD) processes completed on time.	↑	↑	60%	101%
7. CORPORATE EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNICATIONS AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION						
7.1 Effective support for the Executive Board	34	Percentage of Executive Board members who report satisfaction with UNDP support services	Collected for the first time	↑	No 2014 milestone	106%
7.2 UNDP recognized as a development partner of choice by its partners	35	Size (in million US$) and trend (in percentage) in funding from government and other non-government partners (including international financial institutions, regional development banks, civil society, private sector). **[COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]** i. Total ii. Regular Resources iii. Other Resources (non-programme country government, multilaterals and other non-government partners) iv. Other Resources (programme country government cost sharing)	↓	↓	97%	92%
	36	Percentage of partners perceiving UNDP as a valued partner to their organization	↑	N/A	100%	100%
	37	Percentage of partners satisfied with quality and timeliness of reporting **[QCPR RELATED]** i. Favourable ii. Neutral iii. Unfavourable	Collected for the first time	N/A	No 2014 milestone	No 2015 milestone
	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%

Results Statement		Indicator*	2013-2014 trend in indicator value	2014-2015 trend in indicator value	2014 progress against milestone	2015 progress against milestone
8. STAFF AND PREMISES SECURITY						
8.1 UNDP Country Offices are more resilient	39	Percentage of Country Offices meeting minimum operations security standards (MOSS)	↑	↑	101%	101%
	40	Percentage of Country Offices and headquarters units meeting Business Continuity Plan requirements	↑	↑	80%	91%
9. UN DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM LEADERSHIP AND COORDINATION						
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.	Collected for the first time	↑	No 2014 milestone	144%
	42	Percentage of UNDP partners satisfied with UNDP leadership of the Resident Coordinator System	↓	N/A	78%	78%
	43	Per cent of country offices using common RBM tools and principles [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	Collected for the first time	No data	No 2015 milestone
	44	Per cent of country offices using the common UNDG capacity measurement approach (when fully developed) [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	N/A	No data	No data
	45	Number of country offices that are applying the Standard Operating Procedures, or components of it. [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR] i. One programme ii. Common budgetary framework iii. One fund iv. One leader v. Operating as one	N/A	Collected for the first time	No data	No 2015 milestone
	46	Number of country offices implementing [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]: i. common services ii. common long-term agreements iii. harmonized approach to procurement iv. common human resources management v. common information and communication technology services vi. common financial management services	N/A	Collected for the first time	No data	No 2015 milestone
	47	UNDP contribution in cash provided to the resident coordinator system [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR], in US$ million	↑	↑	97%	100%
	48	UNDP contribution in kind provided to the resident coordinator system [COMMON QCPR INDICATOR]	N/A	N/A	No data	No data