

UNCDF STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK: 2014-2017

Integrated Results and Resources Matrix

I. Introduction

The Integrated Results and Resources Matrix (IRRM) translates UNCDF’s Strategic Framework 2014-2017 into results that allow UNCDF and stakeholders to monitor and evaluate achievements, learn lessons, and hold the organization accountable for the funds given to it.

It is backed up by a results-focused monitoring and evaluation system which will enable regular internal assessment and external evaluation of progress towards results and allow informed, evidence-based management of the full range of UNCDF’s interventions.

The IRRM consists of a detailed planning matrix covering two distinct categories of results:

- i. Planned development results, starting with three programme outcomes that UNCDF aims to contribute to, and the outputs that will lead to their achievement.
- ii. Improvements in institutional effectiveness within UNCDF, which will support the achievement of the programme outcomes.

These are all measured with indicators, which in turn will guide the development of activities to deliver the outputs.

Both sets of results are also accompanied by a series of indicative budgets disaggregated by programme outcome.

UNCDF Strategic Framework Integrated Results and Resources Matrix Architecture

<u>Impact</u>	Changes in the lives of people living in LDCs thanks to UNCDF and its partner organisations
<u>UNCDF contribution to broader development Outcomes</u>	Increased financing for basic services and sustainable inclusive growth
	Financing mechanisms established to increase resilience to economic and environmental shocks
	Policy environment that is conducive to sustainable financing for sustainable development
<u>Immediate outcomes</u>	(LDF) Effective local institutions for public and private finance of local development (<i>measured via the mobilizing, investing, accounting for results framework</i>) ¹

¹ For UNCDF’s definition of Local Development, see Local Development Finance business plan 2014 -2017 at www.uncdf.org . The indicators are based on global standards such as the sub-national Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) framework (<http://www.pefa.org>), the Local Public Sector initiative (LPS) (www.localpublicsector.org), LAFIA, municipal rating agency criteria and Local Economic Development measurement adapted for LDCs such as that those applied by the Local Economic Development Network for Africa (LEDNA) (<http://www.ledna.org>). The UNCDF LOOKING methodology combines these into a single

	(FIPA) Sustainable, healthy FSPs leveraging UNCDF funds <i>(measured via range of MIX market indicators²)</i>
<u>Outputs</u>	Completed technical assistance and provision of grants and loans to UNCDF's partner organisations in both the public and private sectors in the Least Developed Countries
<u>Institutional Effectiveness</u>	UNCDF is a more effective and efficient organization, with improved systems and business practices and processes, well-managed resources and engaged personnel

The foundation on which the IRRM is built has the following core elements:

1. Based on UNCDF's broader theory of change set out in the Strategic Framework, the results in the IRRM are intended to capture elements of development change that are most relevant to UNCDF's work across its two Programme Areas as well as intended changes in the organisation's internal capacity to allow UNCDF to deliver on its programmatic commitments.
2. The IRRM is organized according to three levels of intended development results: i) UNCDF's outputs in terms of completed technical assistance and grants and credits to UNCDF's partner organisations in the least developed countries; ii) the immediate results of this assistance in terms of more effectively-functioning local institutions for local and public private finance as well as sustainable financial service providers leveraging UNCDF funds and iii) UNCDF's contribution together with relevant partner organisations to three broader development objectives: i) increased financing for basic services and sustainable inclusive growth; ii) new financing mechanisms to increase resilience to economic and environmental shocks and iii) an improved policy environment which is conducive to sustainable financing for sustainable development.

In addition, the IRRM is intended to show clearly how strengthened internal capacity and capability will allow UNCDF to deliver on its programmatic commitments; how the commitments will be achieved and how these will contribute to the work of partner UN entities as well as to overall internationally-agreed development goals.

3. The IRRM will assist UNCDF in monitoring and evaluating the results of its interventions at different points in the results chain, allowing partners to understand the breadth, scope and resource requirements of the work of the organization. In turn, it enables Member States

diagnostic – however LDFP may construct parallel sets of indicators and reporting frameworks to capture the quantitative and qualitative data required for the specific context – eg Climate Change.

² For FIPA, the MIX Market will capture a significant portion, but not all of the performance indicators required. FIPA programmes may need to construct parallel sets of indicators and reporting frameworks to capture the quantitative and qualitative data that are not standard MIX indicators (e.g. for large commercial banks that are piloting downmarket and the lower segments only represent a small percentage of their total portfolio and may not report on the MIX). Also, even for FSPs where the majority of their portfolio is 'microfinance' and they should be required to report to the MIX so UNCDF can track their overall performance, the MIX Market does not easily capture the portfolio of a specific innovation UNCDF is financing, e.g. CleanStart's clean energy portfolio). For Savings Groups (SG), UNCDF requires reporting to SAVIX on standard SG indicators. For more information on the MIX Market, please see: <http://www.mixmarket.org/>

and other partners to see what outcomes and impact the organization is ultimately contributing to.

4. The performance indicators capture to the extent possible data points that are already collected and are based on years of good development practice and/or best available knowledge. This is the case for example of indicators measuring changes in performance of financial service providers which are collected externally by the MicroFinance Information Exchange.
5. The projected results depend on the organisation receiving the resources set out in the sections below. These projected resources are estimated based on projected future demand by programme countries and partners (using past expenditure as a guide) for products and services provided by UNCDF and income projections for the period of 2014-2017. The amounts are indicative only.
6. An accompanying methodological note to the IRRM has been produced and explains how each group of indicators will be measured against baseline and projected targets for 2017. In doing so, UNCDF will attempt where possible to disaggregate data by different variables of interest (for example: gender, geographical region, type of intervention etc). In some cases where indicators are new, baseline figures are still to be defined. These will be added in the coming months.
7. Monitoring and reporting against indicators will be supported by a range of data sources and evidence, using a mixed-methods approach of quantitative and qualitative measurement. Internal monitoring will be complemented and validated by a results-focused system of qualitative internal self-evaluation and external programme and outcome evaluation. This integrated system of performance measurement will allow regular update on progress towards results and allow informed and evidence-based management of the full range of UNCDF's interventions.
8. Finally in line with UNCDF's commitment to continuous improvement, the Strategic Framework itself will be subject to a formal mid-term review halfway through its implementation and an independent evaluation will be carried out at the end of the period to provide lessons learned and to inform strategic decision making ahead of the next programming improvement.

II. Outcomes and Outputs ³

Part A - Development Effectiveness

Outcome 1: Financing increased for basic services and inclusive growth/local economic development		Indicative resources⁴: \$ 117 million
Outcome Indicators: <i>(assess progress against specified outcomes; they help verify that the intended positive change in the development situation has actually taken place)</i>	Baselines <i>(2013, unless noted)</i>	Targets <i>(2017, unless noted)</i>
<u>Inclusive finance</u> 1.a. Net change of domestic savings mobilized by UNCDF-supported Financial Service Providers (FSPs) ⁵	10 to 1 leverage of UNCDF's core resources	10 to 1 leverage of UNCDF's core resources

³ It should be noted that the targeted development and institutional results that are projected below depend on the organisation's projected targets for core and non-core resources of \$25 million and \$75 million being achieved on an annual basis by 2016.

⁴ Indicative resources for the four-year planning period are calculated as follows: from a total projected core starting at \$16 million in 2014, moving to \$20 million in 2015, and culminating in \$25 million in 2016 and 2017, applying a targeted ratio of 1:3 core to non-core as set out in Indicators 1.2.1, 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 in the section Institutional Effectiveness yields a total projected envelope of \$344 million resources available for development activities and institutional activities. Leaving aside 15% of this for management costs as per Indicator 1.2.6, the remaining amount of 292.4 million is split between the three development outcomes on a 40:40:20 basis. These targets and ratios will be revised if necessary following the end of the mid-term review of the Strategic Framework.

⁵ Financial Service Providers (FSPs) include a range of institutions, including but not limited to: commercial banks, Non-bank financial institutions (NBFIs), credit unions, NGO-MFIs, Mobile Network Operators (MNOs), money transfer companies, and also service providers that use 'pay as you go' financing models to provide their products, e.g. clean energy.

<p><u>Local Development Finance</u></p> <p>1.b. Net increase in local fiscal space⁶ available for local development in sub-national territorial jurisdictions supported by UNCDF</p>	TBA ⁷	75% of UNCDF-supported institutions indicating an increase in fiscal space of over 25%
<p>1.c. Gross increase in fixed capital formation⁸ comprised of individual projects/investments under \$20m located within sub-national territorial jurisdictions supported by UNCDF</p>	TBA ⁹	30% increase in fixed capital formation in UNCDF-supported jurisdictions by 2017

⁶ Fiscal space is defined as “the sum of financial resources available for improved delivery of basic social and economic services at the local level as a result of the budget and related decisions by governments at all levels without any prejudice to the sustainability of a governments financial position”. Source: International Monetary Fund, Finance and Development, Vol. 42/2, Back to Basics – Fiscal Space: What is it and How to Get it?, Peter Heller

⁷ As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

⁸ Gross fixed capital formation is defined as in the UN System of National Accounts applied by the IMF, World Bank and United Nations institutions. UNCDF adapts this indicators to the local level. See System of National Accounts, United Nations 2008

⁹ As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

Outputs (UNCDF provides specific support for the following results)	Output Indicators (output indicators measure only those results from schemes, services, plans, actions, etc., which are specifically supported by UNCDF.)	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)
<p><u>Inclusive finance</u></p> <p>Output 1.1</p> <p>Improved performance of sustainable, healthy, responsible FSPs leveraging UNCDF funds (to be measured in terms of sustainability, portfolio quality, outreach, responsible provision of financial services))</p>	Financing for development: effect of UNCDF core funding on resources for inclusive finance		
	1.1.1 Change from baseline in value of loan portfolio of FSPs (numerator) leveraged by UNCDF core contribution (denominator).	Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10	Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10
	1.1.2 Change from baseline in value of savings portfolio of FSPs (numerator) leveraged by total UNCDF core contribution (denominator).	Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10	Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10
	Sustainability: Improvements in FSP profitability/sustainability. Improvements in portfolio quality		
	1.1.3 - % of FSPs that have audited financial statements	81%	90%
	1.1.4 - % of FSPs making progress toward profitability (return on assets)	73%	80%
	1.1.5 - % of FSPs meeting portfolio quality targets (PAR 30 days)	55%	80%
	<p>Responsibly-provided services:</p> <p>1.1.6. - % of FSPs that endorse SMART Campaign Client Protection Principles (CPPs) or equivalent</p>	82%	90%

<p><u>Local Development finance</u></p> <p>Output 1.2</p>	<p>Financing for development: effect of UNCDF core funding on resources for local development (mobilize)</p>		
<p>Improved performance of sustainable, accountable local governments leveraging UNCDF funds and improved performance of revenue-generating projects leveraging UNCDF funds. To be measured in terms of their capacities to mobilise, allocate and invest resources for effective accountable local development</p>	<p>1.2.1. Number of local governments demonstrating increases in gross revenue.¹⁰</p>	<p>TBA¹²</p>	<p>Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10</p>
	<p>1.2.2. Value of domestic private capital invested in projects under \$20m at the local level¹¹</p>		<p>Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10</p>
	<p>1.2.3. Value of fiscal transfers through Government to Person (G2P) systems associated with local institutions¹³</p>		<p>Leverage UNCDF core resources by a factor of 10</p>
	<p>Effective and sustainable resource allocation through local development institutions: increase in number of local governments and local private sector institutions promoting local development.</p>		

¹⁰ Refers to sum of gross fiscal transfers and/or budget allocations together with the value of gross own revenue of local-level institutions mobilised as a result of UNCDF support.

¹¹ Refers to value of domestic investments in local projects under \$20m as a result of UNCDF support

¹² As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

¹³ Refers to value of G2P payments realized through systems designed and implemented with UNCDF support

	1.2.4. Number of local institutions that improve performance against the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) indicators ¹⁴	TBA ¹⁶	75% of institutions supported demonstrating sustainable improvements
	1.2.5. Number of investment projects appraised ¹⁵		TBA ¹⁷
	1.2.6. Number of G2P fiscal transfer systems that incorporate and adopt UNCDF design features involving local-level institutions in planning, targeting, monitoring and redress.		TBA ¹⁸
	Transformative sustainable local investments		
	1.2.7. Number of local investments in infrastructure and services completed ¹⁹		30% increase in gross fixed capital in UNCDF-supported

¹⁴ Refers to the subset of PEFA sub-national indicators appropriate for measuring effective resource allocation processes calculated for institutions benefiting from UNCDF support. See the methodological note for more information.

¹⁵ Refers to revenue-generating projects appraised with support of LDFP staff including LFI Task Force and teams supporting municipalities establishing CIP portfolios for municipal finance.

¹⁶ As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Refers to those public and private investments that directly result from a UNCDF initiative.

			jurisdictions
	1.2.8. Number of UNCDF-supported local institutions that improve performance against investment-related PEFA indicators ²⁰	TBA ²¹	TBA ²²
	1.2.9. Number of local investments in UNCDF-supported revenue-generating private and public/private infrastructure and services meeting financial targets ²³		TBA ²⁴
	Increase in accountability to local citizens. ²⁵		
	1.2.10. Number of local institutions that improve performance against accountability- related PEFA indicators		75% of institutions supported demonstrating sustainable improvements in accountability
	1.2.11. Number of G2P fiscal transfer systems that include locally-accessible redress systems.	TBA ²⁶	TBA ²⁷

²⁰ Refers to sub-set of PEFA sub-national indicators appropriate for measuring effective investment planning and sustainable investments as set out in accompanying methodological note.

²¹ As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

²² Ibid.

²³ Refers to the financial targets set at the time of financial close upon which financing was agreed.

²⁴ As above

²⁵ See methodological note for details of how to calculate these indicators, all refer to performance attributed to UNCDF initiatives.

²⁶ As these are completely new indicators, baselines are still being calculated.

²⁷ Ibid.

	1.2.12 Number of revenue-generating projects with multi-stakeholder boards		TBA ²⁸
--	--	--	-------------------

²⁸ Ibid.

Outcome 2: Effective financing mechanisms established to increase resilience to economic and environmental shocks		Indicative resources:
		\$117 million
Outcome Indicators	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)
Inclusive Finance Programme Area		
2.a. Number of new products to improve client security, resilience against shocks, and extend the frontiers of inclusive finance	45	155 new products (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
2.b. Number of clients served by these new products (see Outputs 2.1.1 – 2.1.4 for details)	0 (for new products)	6,400,000
Local Development Financing Programme Area		
2.c. Number of public and private financing systems (designed and piloted) for local infrastructure and services that improves resilience of local governments and their populations to shocks (increasing resilience of populations, environment, built environment, productive systems) ²⁹	0 (baseline is zero as the measure starts being counted at the beginning of 2014 under the new Strategic Framework)	4 global facilities/systems in place for LDC financing of climate resilience, food security and two other issues (to be decided) through local governments and local institutions (cumulative total

²⁹ The indicator captures systems covered by global/national project documents signed from 1 January, 2014

			2014 - 2017)
2.d. Number of local government jurisdictions served by these new systems as they are upscaled (see Outputs 2.1.1 – 2.1.4 for details)		TBA	TBA
Outputs (UNCDF provides specific support for the following results)	Output Indicators (output indicators measure only those results from schemes, services, plans, actions etc. which are specifically <u>supported</u> by UNCDF.	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)
Inclusive finance 2.1 Improved access to and usage of basic financial services as an effective way to reduce vulnerability and shocks	Indicator 2.1.1 - Total numbers of active clients served via products that strengthen client resilience to shocks in areas such as client savings, Mobile Money for the Poor (MM4P), Better Than Cash Alliance (BTCA), clean energy, micro-insurance	0	6,400,000 new clients benefiting from resilient financial products (50% women)
	Indicator 2.1.2 – Number of product innovations in areas such as youth finance, clean energy finance, agricultural/rural finance, mobile money or cash to electronic transitions	0	155

Local Development Finance 2.2 Improved access to and usage of public and private local investments as an effective way to reduce vulnerability and shocks	Indicator 2.2.1 – Number of new systems targeting vulnerability and shocks in place ³⁰	TBA	TBA
	Indicator 2.2.2 – Volume of government to person (G2P) transfers ³¹	TBA	TBA
	Indicator 2.2.3 – Number of innovations in relevant local development finance systems introduced by UNCDF ³²	TBA	TBA

Outcome 3: Policy environments fostered that enable sustainable financing for development		Indicative resources: \$ 48 million
Outcome Indicators	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)

³⁰ Examples of what LDFP would report on: number financial mechanism for climate resilience investments through fiscal transfers, new types of food security grants, project finance that leads to resilient investments financed by local government debt or by private project finance (disaggregated by product, gender, youth, and by type of mechanism, when possible).

³¹ Covering, for example, the number of beneficiaries of UNCDF-designed social protection schemes, social grants, public social transfers with roles for local institutions in targeting, monitoring and redress to be disaggregated by country.

³² To be measured by the number of new or improved specific designed systems introduced in thematic areas such as climate change finance, food security finance, youth and gender support, social protection, local economic development and private sector for local development. This will be reported on an annual (net and cumulative) basis and based on approved project documents or concept notes.

Inclusive Finance			
3. a. Number of improvements to the policy environment and enabling ecosystem, including client protection, resulting from UNCDF advocacy and support.		11	85 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
Local Development Finance			
3. b. Policy environments fostered that enable increased financing for local development (public and private)		TBA	TBA
Outputs (UNCDF provides specific support for the following results)	Output Indicators (output indicators measure only those results from schemes, services, plans, actions etc. which are specifically supported by UNCDF).	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)
Output 3.1 UNCDF- funded diagnostic tools/advocacy initiatives provide a key contribution to shaping national governments' agendas on financial inclusion	3.1.1 Number of diagnostics on financial inclusion completed ³³	22	55 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.1.2 Number of inclusive finance road maps, action plans or national strategies adopted ³⁴	6	35 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)

33 Examples of what FIPA would report on (cumulative and annual net change): Diagnostics(each country diagnostic: MAP diagnostic: market information; BTCA country digital payment ecosystems improved directly via BTCA initiatives; BTCA: incremental Net Present Value (NPV) of economy-wide electronic payments as encouraged by BTCA; MM4P diagnostic:: identifies activities, initiatives or changes are needed to build more inclusive digital financial services (DFS) ecosystem that is sustainable, affordable and reaches the majority of the population with basic financial services; Financial Diaries that contribute to policy-makers and FSPs understanding of client demand and constraints; Market studies at province or district levels to help commercial banks and MFIs to invest in underseved areas with potential)

34 As a result of UNCDF-led diagnostics (MAP, MM4P, BTCA) that strengthen the capacity of national institutions to meet regional and international goals – e.g. Maya Declaration or the Money Pacific Goals.

	3.1.3. Number of commitments to the Better than Cash Alliance ³⁵ to transition cash to electronic payments	4	35 (Cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.1.4 Number of capacity building activities completed to strengthen the capacity of regulators and supervisors, especially to safeguard poor people’s savings	15	115 (cumulative 2014- 2017)
	3.1.5. Number and quality of approved UNCDF publications (inclusive finance)	19	130 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
Output 3.2: UNCDF-funded diagnostic tools/advocacy initiative provide a key contribution to shaping national governments’ agendas in local development finance	3.2.1 Number of local development diagnostics completed ³⁶	2	20 LOOKING diagnostics (cumulative 2014 – 2017) 75% of LDCs adopting UNCDF-inspired strategies, plans and regulatory changes in 10 approved publications on local

³⁵ Please see www.betterthancash.org for further information

³⁶ Examples of what LDFP would report on (cumulative and annual net change): Diagnostics (each country diagnostic: LOOKING diagnostic; LAFIAS diagnostic; diagnostic of municipal creditworthiness; diagnostic of fiscal decentralisation status; local fiscal space diagnostic; scan of local infrastructure financing market, local procurement diagnostic, local economic development study; diagnostic to define performance based grants criteria; study of local food system; LoCAL scoping study).

			development (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.2.2 Number of national strategies or action plans for local development adopted ³⁷	2	75% of LDCs adopting UNCDF-inspired strategies, plans and regulatory changes in 10 approved publications on local development (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.2.3. Number of policy or regulatory changes on local development finance as a result of UNCDF advocacy on Local Development Finance	0	75% of LDCs adopting UNCDF-inspired strategies, plans and regulatory changes in 10 approved publications on local development (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.2.4. Number of initiatives to strengthen capacities of national and local actors (training, advocacy, peer to peer learning)	0	20 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
	3.2.5 Number and quality of approved UNCDF publications (local development)	0	12 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)

37 As a result of UNCDF-led diagnostics (LOOKING, LAFIAS, Municipal Finance) or as a result of upscaling such as a LoCAL phase III. These strengthen the capacity of local institutions to secure access to sustainable finance for local investments and local development that accelerates SDC targets and increases local fiscal space.

Part B - Institutional Effectiveness

			Indicative resources: \$52 million
Result Statements	Indicators	Baselines (2013, unless noted)	Targets (2017, unless noted)
Output 1.1 Improved quality of programming and accountability for results	Quality of Programming		
	1.1.1 Percentage of programme outcomes that are reported as on-track or achieved	Not reported	80%
	Evaluation and Accountability		
	1.1.2 Annual number of results-based evaluations (project, programme and thematic)	3	6
	1.1.3 Implementation rate of agreed actions in evaluation management responses	70%	80%
	Audit		
	1.1.4 Percentage of UNCDF's programme covered by Office and Audit Investigation (OAI)'s audit annually	40%	40% ³⁸
	1.1.5 Percentage of audits that are unqualified	100%	100%
	1.1.6 Implementation rate of agreed-upon audit recommendations	85%	100%
1.1.7 Gender Mainstreaming			

³⁸ As per UNCDF's audit policy. Please see the methodological note for more information.

	Percentage compliance by UNCDF in at least 'meeting' UN System-Wide Action Plan gender reporting requirements across the 15 performance categories	46%	100%
Output 1.2 Structure of financial resources maximized	Total Resources Mobilized		
	1.2.1 Levels of core+	\$16 million	\$25 million
	1.2.2 Levels of non-core (from development partners)	\$35 million	\$55 million
	1.2.3 Levels of non-core (from private and non-governmental sources)	\$13 million	\$20 million
	1.2.4 % delivery against approved budget	85%	90%
	1.2.5 Optimal mobilisation ratio of non-core resources by core funds for programmes/projects	3 : 1	4 : 1
	Optimised Cost Structure		
	1.2.6 Percentage of total UNCDF expenditure related to management activities (management-efficiency ratio)	15%	15%
	1.2.7 Percentage of total UNCDF expenditure on management activities spent on travel costs	10%	10%
	Percentage of total resources going to capital grants:		
1.2.8 Core	30%	40%	
1.2.9 Non-Core	44%	50%	
Output 1.3 Strengthened human resource	1.3 Percentage of staff who are female		

management to attract, develop and retain a diversified and productive workforce	1.3.1 At all levels	27%	50%
	1.3.2 At P5 and above	28%	50%
Output 1.4 Improved perception of staff working in UNCDF	1.4.1 Percentage of staff surveyed who expressed confidence in leadership and direction	70%	75%
	Percentage of staff surveyed who rate UNCDF favorably on:		
	1.4.2 Empowerment	66%	75%
	1.4.3 Engagement	67%	75%
Output 1.5 Stronger corporate positioning based on robust internal policies, rigorous analytical work, active engagement in multi-lateral processes (including post-2015) and effective corporate KM	1.5.1 Number of multi-partner initiatives in which UNCDF is involved globally or regionally where the organisation can influence debate and policy on the basis of its investment mandate (e.g. Inclusive Finance : cash to electronic payments; responsible digital finance; youth financial services; client protection; Local Development Finance : climate finance, decentralisation and local governance; strengthened productive capacity at the local level)	7	10 (cumulative 2014 – 2017)
Output 1.6 UNCDF's mandate in the LDCs better understood and more widely- communicated to target audiences based on implementation of its communications plans			
	1.6.1 Number of monthly unique visitors to public external website – www.uncdf.org	≈ 6,000	≈ 10,000
	1.6.2 Number of followers on Twitter corporate account	≈ 200	≈ 5,000
	1.6.3 Number of followers on Facebook corporate account	≈ 500	≈ 30,000
Output 1.7 Partnerships strategy implemented with	1.7.1 Number of strategic partnerships effectively managed – and new ones developed –	12	18

a view to extending the scale and scope of UNCDF's work	leading to contributions to UNCDF <i>core resources</i>		
	1.7.2 Number of strategic partnerships effectively managed – and new ones developed – leading to contributions to UNCDF <i>non-core resources</i>	25	35
	1.7.3 Number of UNCDF Stakeholder Consultations (informal Executive Board sessions) arranged per year	2	2