

## **Annex**

# **Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 75/233 on the quadrennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (QCPR)**

## **QCPR Monitoring and reporting framework<sup>1</sup>**

**Department of Economic and Social Affairs  
United Nations**

**6 May 2021**

---

<sup>1</sup> This interim edition of the QCPR Monitoring and reporting framework is undergoing a review in light of the adoption in December 2020 of resolution 75/233 on the QCPR.

## QCPR MONITORING AND REPORTING FRAMEWORK

*Funding Compact commitments are dispersed throughout the framework and are shaded in grey so that they are easily identifiable.*

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR	Latest Value (2021 SGR)	Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source		
<b>I. Aligning planning of the UN development system to the 2030 Agenda</b>								
<b>A. Alignment with national needs and priorities</b>								
1	Fraction of voluntary national reviews by programme countries that were presented at the high-level political forum that have benefited from the support of entities of the UNDS	(2017) 88% (35/40)	93% (53/57)	2019	93% (53/57)	2019	↑	PCG survey
2	Fraction of UN country teams that have assisted Governments in producing a national Sustainable Development Goal report	(2015) 91% (31/34)	92% (44/48)	2019	100% (48/48)	2020	↑	DCO
3	Percentage of programme country Governments that consider the activities of the UNDS to be closely aligned with national needs and priorities	(2015) 86%	81%	2019	87%	2020	→	PCG survey
4	Percentage of UN country teams with a: i. Joint national/UN steering committee chaired by the Government ii. Signed CF/UNDAF at the outcome level with legal text as appropriate or equivalent	(2015) 42% 38%	61% 78%	2019	61% 78%	2019	↑ ↑	DCO
5	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UN country team engages as much as possible with i. Parliamentarians ii. Civil society iii. International financial institutions	(2017) 62% 88% 68%	65% 87% 63%	2019	65% 87% 63%	2019	→ → ↓	PCG survey

<sup>2</sup> “FC” in this column denotes that indicator is part of the Funding Compact.

<sup>3</sup> Baseline refers to the last known value at the time that the 2016 QCPR was adopted. For indicators that were developed after the 2016 QCPR whose value could not be known at that time, the baseline refers the first measurement of the new indicator. The date/year refers to when the measurement was taken.

<sup>4</sup> Trend refers to change in indicator between the baseline value and the latest value.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	iv. Bilateral and multilateral actors	85%	73%		73%		↓	
	v. Private sector	56%	61%		61%		↑	
	vi. Women groups	..	85%		85%		→	
	vii. Youth	..	86%		86%		→	
	viii. People living with disability	..	78%		78%		→	
6	Percentage of UN country teams with result groups (chaired by heads of agencies) aligned with national coordination mechanisms [UN Sustainable Development Group standard operating procedures]	(2015) 53%	75%	2019	72% <sup>5</sup>	2020	↑	DCO
7	Percentage of UN country teams that have supported Governments:	(2017)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. To mainstream the Sustainable Development Goals into national development plans;	99%	97%		97%		→	
	ii. On Sustainable Development Goal measurement and reporting;	98%	99%		96%		→	
	iii. With general orientation on the Sustainable Development Goals;	99%	100%		98%		→	
	iv. With requests on specific SDGs (of those UNCTs that have had support requested from them)	99%	100%		100%		→	
8	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS provides evidence-based policy advice tailored to national needs and priorities:	(2017) 93%	87%	2019	89%	2020	→	PCG survey
9a	Percentage of resident coordinators stating that the UN country team generally provides policy advice that is developed through a:	(2017)		2019		2019		RC Survey
	i. Single-entity process	21%	17%		17%		↓	
	ii. Coordinated process	66%	72%		72%		↑	
	iii. Integrated process	13%	11%		11%		→	
9b FC	Fraction of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS provides <b>integrated</b> policy advice tailored to national needs and priorities [target (2021): 100%]	(2017) 79%	77%	2019	88%	2020	↑	PCG survey

<sup>5</sup> 94 out of 130 UNCTs have Results Groups chaired by heads of Agencies, but no data exists on whether they are aligned with national coordination mechanisms.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
<b>1. Poverty eradication and leaving no one behind</b>								
10a	Fraction of entities of the UNDS (as applicable) that i. outline in their strategic plan how they plan to mainstream poverty eradication ii. address the goal of poverty eradication in their strategic plan	(2017) 92% (22/24)  96% (24/25)	93% (28/30)  ..	2019	100% (27/27)  ..	2020	↑	HQ survey
10b	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that outline how they will target the furthest behind first: i. In their strategic plan ii. In their annual reporting to their governing body	(2017) 96% (23/24) 71% (17/24)	90% (26/29) 86% (25/29)	2019	96% (25/26) 88% (21/24)	2020	→ ↑	HQ survey
11	Percentage of programme country Governments indicating that poverty eradication (SDG 1) is among one of the five SDGs where the contribution of the UNDS has been especially significant over the past two years	(2017) 53%	47%	2019	42%	2020	↓	PCG survey
12	Percentage of CF/UNDAFs that outline how they will target reaching the furthest behind first	(2017) 86%	80%	2019	80%	2019	↓	RC survey
13	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UN ensures adequate attention and resources are given to the development needs of the poorest and most vulnerable in society:	(2017) 91%	79%	2019	79%	2019	↓	PCG survey
14	Fraction (%) of joint programmes that include addressing inequalities (SDG 10)	(2015) 36/365 (10%)	155/493 (31%)	2019	222/644 (34%)	2020	↑	DCO
15	Percentage of CF/UNDAFs that substantively address the needs of persons with disabilities	(2017) 65%	69%	2019	63%	2020	→	DCO <sup>6</sup>
16	Percentage of UN country teams that have in the past year: i. Completed a human rights analysis;	(2015) 47% (61/131) 59% (36/61)	55% (72/130)	2019	75% (99/130)		↑	DCO IMS & OHCHR

<sup>6</sup> Source was the survey of resident coordinators prior to 2020.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	ii. Developed a strategy to address the issues identified in the human rights analysis and taken subsequent action to address the issues set out in the human rights analysis		50% (36/72)		.. <sup>7</sup>		--	
17	Percentage of UN country teams that have in the past year:	(2015)		2019		2020		DCO – IMS & OHCHR
	i. Supported the Government to develop a report for the universal periodic review	63%	55%		41%		↓	
	ii. Facilitated follow-up of the universal periodic review recommendations by the Government	92%	55%		59%		↓	
	iii. Supported the Government to develop a report for the human rights treaty bodies	62%	65%		61%		→	
	iv. Facilitated follow-up of the treaty body recommendations by the Government	74%	76%		72%		→	
	v. Supported the Government in preparing for the visits of special procedures mandate holders	45%	45%		30%		↓	
	vi. Facilitated follow-up of the recommendations of special procedures mandate holders by the Government	44%	49%		48%		→	
18	Percentage of UN country teams that have drawn on human rights recommendations to inform UN analysis, programming and advocacy strategies from the following	(2015)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. Universal periodic review	66%	52%		66%		→	
	ii. Human rights treaty bodies	75%	85%		86%		↑	
	iii. Special procedures mandate holders to inform UN analysis programming or advocacy strategies	34%	58%		61%		↑	
19	Strategy developed for enhanced resident coordinator/UN country team engagement with human rights mechanisms	N/A	Developed	2020	Developed	2020	✓	DCO
20	Percentage of resident coordinators indicating that UNCT members consult with them on exceptional and sensitive cases related to their normative agenda	N/A (new)	88%	2019	88%	2019	→	RC survey
<b>2. Capacity Development</b>								

<sup>7</sup> 64 UNCTs have developed a strategy and 89 have taken action to address the human rights issues identified in the human rights analysis

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
21a	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS uses national systems wherever possible	(2015) 67%	66%	2019	66%	2019	→	PCG survey
21b	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that the UNDS is using parallel implementation units as little as possible	(2015) 62%	69%	2019	69%	2019	↑	RC survey
22a	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS entities have contributed to strengthening of national capacities in: i. Planning ii. Management iii. Evaluation iv. Statistics	(2017) 89% 76% 75% 80%	83% 59% 66% 92%	2019	83% 59% 66% 92%	2019	↓ ↓ ↓ ↑	PCG survey
22b	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that the UNDS entities has contributed to the strengthening of national capacities in: i. Planning ii. Management iii. Evaluation iv. Statistics	(2017) 98% 90% 84% 96%	95% 89% 78% 97%	2019	95% 89% 78% 97%	2019	→ → ↓ →	RC survey
23	Fraction of UN country teams: i. That provide support to national statistical capacity ii. That provide this support through an inter-agency effort	(2015) 95% (125/131) 62% (77/125)	99% (128/130) 76% (97/128)	2019	96% (125/130) 60% (75/125)	2020	→ →	DCO
24	Average number of participating entities in the inter-agency effort on national statistical capacity	6	8	2019	8	2019	↑	DCO
25	Percentage of UN country teams that state they have access to “adequate” official government data on: i. Income level ii. Sex iii. Age iv. Disability v. Ethnicity vi. Religion	(2017) 60% 59% 61% 28% 32% 43%	50% 46% 58% 25% 33% 42%	2019	50% 46% 58% 25% 33% 42%	2019	↓ ↓ → → → →	RC survey

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	vii. Race	30%	30%		30%		→	
26a	Percentage of programme country Governments that state that the UN works “more closely” together to support capacity-building on disaggregated data collection and analysis compared with four years earlier	(2017) 66%	70%	2019	70%	2019	→	PCG survey
26b	Percentage of resident coordinators indicating that entities of the UNDS work closer together on support for capacity-building on disaggregated data collection and analysis compared with four years earlier	(2017) 78%	80%	2019	80%	2019	→	RC survey
27	Fraction of UN country teams that participate in the Government’s formal mechanisms to coordinate statistical development efforts with development partners (of those Governments that have such mechanisms according to the country team)	(2015) 69/79 (87%)	82/90 (91%)	2019	76/81 (94%)	2020	↑	DCO
<b>B. Reinforcing a tailored response to different groups of countries</b>								
28	A review of multi-country offices carried out and presented to ECOSOC	N/A [new]	Completed and presented	2019	Completed and presented	2019	✓	UNDS Transition Team
29	Number of Member States providing at least: i. 0.15% ii. 0.20% of gross national income as ODA to least developed countries	(2014) 8 6	5 5	2018	5 5	2018	↓ ↓	OECD database
30a	Percentage share of <b>total</b> country-level programme expenditures spent in: <sup>8</sup> i. Least developed countries ii. Landlocked least developed countries iii. Middle-income countries iv. Small island developing States v. Africa	(2015) 47.2% 24.2% 58.0% 2.7% 45.8% 48.3%	47.6% 24.9% 51.2% 2.7% 41.4% 51.3%	2018	50.2% 24.1% 50.4% 2.6% 41.9% 56.4%	2019	↑ → ↓ → ↓ ↑	DESA

<sup>8</sup> Disaggregation lists overlap groupings, i.e. some countries will fall into two or more categories.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	vi. Countries with a humanitarian response plan							
30b	Percentage share of <b>core</b> country-level programme expenditures spent in: <sup>9</sup>	(2015)		2018		2019		DESA
	i. Least developed countries	38.5%	49.3%		47.2%		↑	
	ii. Landlocked least developed countries	20.3%	26.3%		24.4%		↑	
	iii. Middle-income countries	63.2%	53.9%		53.7%		↓	
	iv. Small island developing States	3.8%	4.9%		4.9%		↑	
	v. Africa	40.3%	49.5%		47.9%		↑	
	vi. Countries with a humanitarian response plan	40.4%	39.4%		40.2%		→	
31a	Technology Bank for the Least Developed Countries operationalized (yes/no)	N/A	Operationalized	Sept 2017	Operationalized	Sept 2017	✓	Technology Bank
31b	Annual contributions provided to the Technology Bank	(2018) \$3.15 million	\$2.15 million	2019	\$2.00 million	2020	→	Technology Bank
32	Fraction of programme country Governments recently graduated or scheduled to graduate from least developed country status that “agree” that the UNDS has provided effective support in the formulation of their national transition strategies:	(2017)		2019		2019		PCG survey
	i. Agree	5/6	2/2		2/2		→	
	ii. Disagree	1/6	0/2		0/2		→	
33	Total number of filled coordinator positions versus designated positions:	n/a		2019		2020		DCO (i-iii) OCHA (iv)
	i. Deputy Special Representatives of the Secretary-General/Resident Coordinators/Humanitarian Coordinators		11/11		12/12		→	
	ii. Resident coordinators/humanitarian coordinators		15/18 84/97		16/17 87/101		→ →	
	iii. Resident coordinators		0/0		..		--	
	iv. Humanitarian coordinators							

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
34	Fraction of UN missions that have:	(2017)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. an Integrated Strategic Framework with joint structures in place between the Mission and the UNCT;	n/a [new]	16/27		6/11 <sup>10</sup>		--	
	ii. a joint plan for drawdown and/or withdrawal of the UN mission	2/25	5/27		4/11 <sup>11</sup>		--	
33	Fraction of UN country teams (as applicable <sup>12</sup> ) in countries in conflict or post-conflict situations with an institutionalized and government-led mechanism or mechanisms to coordinate development and peacebuilding efforts that are supported by the country team	87% (46/53)	89% (47/53)	2019	89% (47/53)	2019	→	RC survey
34	Fraction of UN country teams that support national mechanisms to coordinate development and peacebuilding efforts (of those country teams for which sustaining peace constitutes part of their activities)	55% (28/51)	56% (30/54)	2019	56% (30/54)	2019	→	RC survey
35a	Fraction of programme country Governments that state there is “close collaboration” among entities of the UNDS engaged across development, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian action and sustaining peace (as applicable <sup>13</sup> ):	(2017)		2019		2019		PCG survey
	i. Close collaboration	88% (96/109)	82% (82/100)		82% (82/100)		→	
	ii. Not close collaboration	12% (13/109)	13% (13/100) <sup>14</sup>		13% (13/100) <sup>15</sup>			
35b	Fraction of resident coordinators that state there is “close collaboration” among entities of the UNDS engaged across development, disaster risk reduction, humanitarian action and sustaining peace (as applicable <sup>16</sup> ):			2019		2019		RC survey
	i. Close collaboration	n/a [new]	97% (95/98)		97% (95/98)		→	
	ii. Not close collaboration				3% (3/98)			

<sup>10</sup> Due to a technical error, in 2020 this data was only collected from those UNCTs with special political missions..

<sup>11</sup> Due to a technical error, in 2020 this data was only collected from those UNCTs with special political missions.

<sup>12</sup> Self-assessed by the respondents of the survey.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid

<sup>14</sup> 5% responded “don’t know”

<sup>15</sup> 5% responded “don’t know”

<sup>16</sup> Self-assessed by the respondents of the survey

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
			3% (3/98)					
36	Fraction of UN country teams that provide: i. Support for national disaster risk reduction efforts ii. Disaster risk reduction support in an inter-agency effort	(2016) 89% (116/131) 81% (94/116)	93% (121/130) 86% (104/121)	2019	88% (115/130) 85% (98/115)	2020	→ ↑	DCO
37	Fraction of UN country teams that participate in the Government's formal mechanism that coordinates disaster risk reduction efforts with development partners	(2016) 95% (87/92)	92% (94/102)	2019	91% (85/92)	2020	→	DCO
38	Percentage of programme country Governments that report annually on progress on disaster risk reduction	(2018) 40%	60%	2019	68%	2020	↑	UNISDR
39	Fraction of UN country teams in countries that had a humanitarian crisis within the past year where UN development and humanitarian actors have worked together to undertake: i. Joint conflict analysis ii. Joint planning for collective outcomes iii. Joint programming iv. Joint monitoring and evaluation v. Joint coordination mechanisms	(2017) 55% (28/51) 78% (40/51) 67% (34/51) 67% (34/51) 78% (40/51)	58% (29/50) 80% (40/50) 82% (41/50) 72% (36/50) 84% (42/50)	2019	24% (20/82) 40% (33/82) 63% (52/82) 30% (25/82) 73% (60/82)	2020	↓ ↓ → ↓ →	DCO
40	Fraction of programme country Governments (as applicable <sup>17</sup> ) that state that the resident coordinator/humanitarian coordinator has provided a joint, impartial, comprehensive assessment of humanitarian and development needs.	(2017) 53% (45/85)	29% (30/103)	2019	29% (30/103)	2019	↓	PCG survey
41	Fraction of multi-year humanitarian response plans with content that are harmonized with CF/UNDAFs	n/a [new]	11/11	2019	11/11	2019 <sup>18</sup>	→	DCO

<sup>17</sup> Ibid<sup>18</sup> As many respondents conflated COVID response plans with humanitarian response plans, information not available for this indicator for 2020.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
42	Percentage of CF/UNDAFs that explicitly incorporate elements relating to sustaining peace and peacebuilding	(2017) 43%	57%	2019	85% (56/65) <sup>19</sup>	2020	↑	DCO
43	Fraction of CF/UNDAFs that substantively address: i. Disaster and climate risk reduction ii. The drivers of needs, risks and vulnerability iii. Sustaining peace (as applicable <sup>20</sup> )	(2017) 92% (94/102) 93% (95/102) 77% (48/62)	92% (103/112) 92% (103/112) 71% (60/85)	2019	92% (103/112) 92% (103/112) 71% (60/85)	2019	→ → ↓	DCO
44	Fraction of resident coordinators in countries with humanitarian assistance needs who “agree” that members of the UN country team regularly report to the resident coordinator in relation to CF/UNDAF, in a way that ensures strong coherence of development and humanitarian activities	(2017) 89/109 (82%)	84/89 (94%)	2019	84/89 (94%)	2019	↑	RC survey
45	Number of new (since 1 Jan 2017): i. Tools ii. Guidelines iii. Monitoring mechanisms (cumulative) issued to enhance coordination between development and peacebuilding efforts.	N/A	2 14 ..	2019	2 14 ..	2019	→ → --	DCO/ OCHA/ UNDP
46	Guidance to support implementation and operational coherence between the sustainable development and sustaining peace agendas developed that cover: i. Integrated multidimensional situation analysis and planning ii. Sustaining peace, prevention, recovery, resilience and peacebuilding at the country level	(2018)  N/A  N/A	Developed  Developed	Dec 2018	Developed  Developed	Dec 2018	✓  ✓	DCO

## II. Improving the functioning of the UN development system to maximize the impact

<sup>19</sup> Includes the 65 UNCTs indicating that “peacebuilding and sustaining peace” is present in their country.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
<b>A. A reconfigured UNDS</b>								
47	Report of the Secretary-General on improving the accountability and overall coordination of the entities of the UNDS and their oversight by Member States: i. Presented to ECOSOC for its consideration by end June 2017 [yes/no – date] ii. Presented to the General Assembly at its seventy-second session for review and further action [yes/no – date]	(2016)  n/a  n/a	Presented	June 2017	Presented	June 2017	✓	EOSG
			Presented	Oct. 2017	Presented	Oct. 2017	✓	
48	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that have planning and budgeting cycles aligned with the time frame of the quadrennial comprehensive policy review: <sup>1</sup> i. Fully aligned ii. Partially aligned iii. Not aligned	(2017)  14/27 5/27 8/27	13/30	2019	11/27	2020	↑	HQ survey
			13/30		13/27			
			4/30		3/27			
49	Fraction of entities of the UNDS reporting to their governing bodies on implementation of the 2016 quadrennial comprehensive policy review i. Funds and programmes ii. Specialized agencies iii. Other entities	(2017)  6/9 5/8 6/12	7/9	2019	7/8	2020	→	HQ survey
			2/8		4/7		→	
			7/13		6/11		→	
50	A system-wide outline of present functions and existing capacities of all entities of the UNDS carrying out operational activities for development with recommendations carried out by June 2017	n/a [new]	Completed	2017	Completed	2017	✓	EOSG
51	Options for aligning funding modalities with the functions of the UNDS developed by end 2017 and presented for consideration at the operational activities for development segment of the 2018 session of ECOSOC	n/a [new]	Completed	2017	Completed	2017	✓	EOSG
52	A system-wide strategic document translating recommendations of the system-wide outline into actions developed by end 2017 and submitted for consideration by	n/a [new]	Completed	2017	Completed	2017	✓	EOSG

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	Member States at the operational activities for development segment of the 2018 session of ECOSOC							
53	Revised system-wide strategic document submitted to ECOSOC in 2019 for consideration by Member States (yes/no – date)	n/a [new]	Completed	2019	Completed	2019	✓	UNDS transition team
54	Implementation plan for the reinvigorated resident coordinator system presented to the General Assembly	n/a [new]	Completed	Sep 2018	Completed	Sep 2018	✓	UNDS transition team
55	Comprehensive proposal on further improvements to resident coordinator system presented to: i. ECOSOC for its recommendations by end 2017 ii. The General Assembly at its seventy-second session for further action	n/a [new]	Completed	Dec 2017	Completed	Dec 2017	✓	EOSG
		n/a [new]	Completed	Dec 2017	Completed	Dec 2017	✓	
56	Functions of the resident coordinator and the UNDP resident representative have been separated	n/a [new]	Completed	Dec 2018	Completed	Dec 2018	✓	EOSG
57	Geographic diversity of resident coordinators from programme countries:	(2016)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. Asia/Pacific	6%	9%		9%		↑	
	ii. Arab States	4%	5%		1%		↓	
	iii. Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States	1%	2%		3%		↑	
	iv. Latin America and the Caribbean	10%	9%		9%		→	
	v. Africa	18%	21%		28%		↑	
	vi. Total	39%	46%		49%		↑	
58	Average number of resident coordinator office staff per country (not including the resident coordinator), by programme country expenditure:	(2016)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. All	1.6	4.6		6.0		↑	
	ii. Large	2.0	4.7		6.0		↑	
	iii. Medium	1.7	4.6		6.0		↑	
	iv. Small	1.4	4.6		6.1		↑	
59	Resident coordinator offices staffing (% recruited) in the following job functions	n/a [new]		2019		2020		DCO

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. strategic planning/RCO team leader</li> <li>ii. economist</li> <li>iii. programme communication and advocacy</li> <li>iv. data management and results monitoring/reporting</li> <li>v. partnerships and development finance</li> </ul>		75%		93%		↑	
			73%		94%		↑	
			72%		59%		↓	
			78%		88%		↑	
			71%		84%		↑	
60	Percentage of resident coordinators that state they have completed their SDG certification (i.e. SDG Primer course)	n/a [new]	SDG Primer launched	Feb 2020	SDG Primer launched	Feb 2020	✓	DCO
<b>B. The Monitoring and Accountability Framework (MAF)</b>								
<b>1. The MAF at Entity level</b>								
61	UNSDG endorsed Management and Accountability Framework <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global level</li> <li>▪ Regional level</li> <li>▪ Country-level</li> </ul>	n/a [new] n/a [new] n/a [new]	To be finalized To be finalized Endorsed	2019	In-progress <sup>21</sup> In-progress Endorsed	2020	→ → ✓	DCO
62	New dispute resolution mechanism developed and implemented [yes/no – date]	n/a [new]	Yes	Mar 2019	Yes	Mar 2019	✓	DCO
63	Annual summary of disputes and resolutions, along with lessons learned, circulated to UNSDG members	n/a [new]	No	2019	No	2019	→	DCO
64	Protocol for country engagement by Secretariat entities and non-resident agencies endorsed by the UN Sustainable Development Group	n/a [new]	Endorsed CF guidance	2019	Endorsed CF guidance	2019	✓	DCO
65	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” they are informed of all in-country activities of non-resident entities:	n/a [new]	91%	2019	91%	2019	→	RC survey
66	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that the resident coordinator has sufficient access to the expertise available within the UNDS:	(2017) 73%	75%	2019	75%	2019	→	RC survey

<sup>21</sup> Global and regional chapters expected to be completed in the first half of 2021.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
67	Percentage of programme country Governments that find it “easy” to access technical expertise from across the UN system: i. Easy ii. Very easy	(2017) 66% 5%	65% 5%	2019	59% 16%	2020	↑	PCG survey
68	Fraction of entities of the UNDS recognizing reporting obligations to the resident coordinator on: i. Planning ii. Resource mobilization iii. Programme implementation performance	14/29 (2017) 12/29 (2017) 17/25 (2015)	12/19 11/19 12/19	2019	12/16 11/16 12/16	2020	→ → →	HQ survey
69	Fraction of entities that have updated the job descriptions of UNCT heads to recognize the role of the resident coordinator, as outlined in resolution 72/279 and the MAF	n/a [new]	11/25	2019	14/19	2020	↑	HQ survey
70	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that UN system field representatives enjoy sufficient delegated authority to respond effectively and efficiently to national needs and priorities	(2017) 86%	85%	2019	85%	2019	→	RC survey
<b>2. The MAF at Country level</b>								
<b>Programme Countries Governments’ perspective</b>								
71 FC	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that there is an improved focus on <b>common results</b> among entities of the UNDS at the country level in the past year [target (2021): 100%]:	(2017) 85%	74%	2019	78%	2020	↓	PCG survey
72	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the resident coordinator has helped to minimize <b>duplication of efforts</b> among the entities of the UNDS:	(2017) 77%	59%	2019	69%	2020	↓	PCG survey
73 FC (ii only)	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the resident coordinator:	(2017) 92%	79%	2019	88%	2020	→	PCG survey

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	i. effectively <b>leads and coordinates</b> the strategic support by the UN country team for national plans and priorities	83%	71%		79%	2020	→	
	ii. has sufficient <b>prerogative</b> to effectively fulfil her/his mandate [target (2021): 100%]	88%	70%		70%	2019	↓	
	iii. has effectively demonstrated <b>impartiality</b>	85%	74%		74%	2019	↓	
	iv. has effectively demonstrated <b>management skills</b> :							
74	Percentage of resident coordinators that agree that, as a general rule, they are invited to participate in meetings with high level delegations and/or events of UNDS entities.	n/a [new]	84%	2019	84%	2019	→	RC survey
	<b>Resident Coordinators' perspective</b>							
	Percentage of resident coordinators who "agree" that they are fully empowered within the UN country team to:	(2017)		2019		2019		RC survey
	i. Make final decisions on the strategic objectives in the CF/UNDAF	86%	96%	9	96%		↑	
	ii. Substantially increase common resource mobilization	66%	72%		72%		↑	
	iii. Distribute common resources	61%	75%		75%		↑	
	iv. Inform country-level presence and leadership profiles of UN country team members	..	..	..	..		--	
75								
76a	Percentage of resident coordinators who "agree" that they have the <b>prerogative</b> to avoid duplication of efforts:	(2017) 48%	57%	2019	57%	2019	↑	RC survey
76b	Percentage of resident coordinators who "agree" that they have the <b>capacity</b> to avoid duplication of efforts:	(2017) 60%	71%	2019	71%	2019	↑	RC survey
	Percentage of resident coordinators that state that:	n/a [new]		2019		2019	→	RC survey
	i. All		9%		9%			
	ii. Most		20%		20%			
	iii. Some		57%		57%			
	iv. Zero		15%		15%			
77	UNCT members involve them in key stages of agency-specific strategic planning and formally solicit their feedback on the alignment of their CPDs to the UN Cooperation Framework.							

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
78	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that they receive sufficiently regular and useful information from UN country team members to ensure effective communication with the Government regarding activities of the UNDS in the field:	(2017) 69%	71%	2019	71%	2019	→	RC survey
79a	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that all UN country team members report to the resident coordinator regularly on:	(2017)		2019		2019		RC survey
	i. Resource mobilization	29%	37%		37%		↑	
	ii. Programme implementation performance of CF/UNDAF elements led by the entity	79%	78%		78%		→	
	iii. Their individual activities	n/a	58%		58%		→	
	iv. Collective results based on the CF/UNDAF	n/a	85%		85%		→	
79b	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that, in general, the reporting they receive from UN country team heads is of:	n/a [new]		2019		2019		RC survey
	i. High quality		66%		66%		→	
	ii. Sufficient scope and depth		65%		65%		→	
	iii. Relevance		86%		86%		→	
	iv. Sufficient frequency		51%		51%		→	
80	Percentage of UN country teams with joint workplans of results groups that are aligned with CF/UNDAF and signed by all involved entities [UN Sustainable Development Group standard operating procedures]	(2015) 24%	58%	2019	58%	2019	↑	RC survey
81	Percentage of resident coordinators that “agree” that there is an improved focus on common results among entities of the UNDS at the country level in the past year:	(2017) 95%	91%	2019	91%	2019	→	RC survey
82	New Cooperation Framework guidelines, in response to General Assembly resolution 72/279, have been endorsed by the UN Sustainable Development Group [yes/no – date]	n/a [new]	Yes	June 2019	Yes	June 2019	✓	DCO
83a	Percentage of resident coordinators indicating that:	n/a [new]		2019		2019		RC survey
	i. All		23%		23%		→	
	ii. At least 75%		79%		79%		→	

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	of the country programme documents are in alignment with the CF/UNDAF or equivalent planning document							
83b	Fraction of resident coordinators that state that i. 100% ii. 75–99% iii. 50–74% iv. 35 to 49% v. 20 to 34% vi. Less than 20% of country programme documents are aligned to CF/UNDAF:	n/a [new]	23% 56% 15% 4% 1% 1%	2019	23% 56% 15% 4% 1% 1%	2019	→	RC Survey
84 FC	Fraction of resident coordinators that state that at least 75% of country programme documents are aligned to the CF/UNDAF in their country [target (2021): 100%]	79% (2019)	79%	2019	79%	2019	→	RC survey
85	Average number of months for the i. CF/UNDAF ii. UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (CF) preparation process (from the finalization of the road map until the date of signature by the Government)	(2016) 14 months n/a	15 months 13 <sup>22</sup> months	2019	13.8 months	2020	→	DCO
86	Percentage of resident coordinators who formally contribute to the performance assessment of: i. Less than one third ii. Between one and two thirds iii. More than two thirds of resident UN country team heads	(2017) 65% 19% 16%	86% 8% 3%	2019	86% 8% 3%	2019	↓	RC survey
<b>C. Country Configuration</b>								
87	Average number of resident UN country team members in countries, disaggregated by programme country expenditure: <sup>23</sup>	(2016) 12.0	11.0	2018	14.9	2020	↑	DCO

<sup>22</sup>The Guidance (issued in June 2019) is piloted in 2020. The planned gradual reduction of the Cooperation Framework design period is expected to materialize gradually and based on country-specific contexts

<sup>23</sup> For analytical purposes, some indicators are disaggregated by country-level operational activities for development programme expenditures in 2018. There are 30 “large” programme countries with expenditures over \$200 million, 46 medium-sized programme countries (more than \$50 million and less than \$200 million in expenditures) and 81 “small” programme countries with expenditures under \$50 million. For a full breakdown of country-level expenditures, see the online statistical annex on funding data <http://...>

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	i. All ii. Large iii. Medium iv. Small	16.4 13.4 9.0	16.0 13.8 7.2		19.4 15.8 10.6		↑ ↑ ↑	
88a	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that: i. The UNDS presence is adequately tailored for meeting the specific challenges of the country ii. There is a clear division of labour among entities of the UNDS at the country level	(2017) 86% 63%		2019 76% 54%		87% 2020 54% 2019	→ ↓	PCG survey
88b	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that: i. The UNDS presence is adequately tailored for meeting the specific challenges of the country ii. There is a clear division of labour among entities of the UNDS at the country level	(2017) 75% 63%		2019 68% 64%		68% 2019 64%	↓ →	RC survey
89	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that: i. The staff in the UN country team has the right mix of capacities and skills to support the country’s development ii. The UN country team heads of agencies have the highest standards of leadership skills	(2017) 76% 85%		2019 84% 77%		85% 2020 77% 2019	↑ ↓	PCG survey
90a	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS presence: i. Is flexible ii. Is cost effective iii. Operates collaboratively	(2017) 86% 67% 86%		2019 75% 57% 80%		90% 2020 70% 93% 2019	↑ → ↑	PCG survey
90b	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that the UNDS presence: i. Is flexible ii. Is cost effective iii. Operates collaboratively	(2017) 70% 56% 89%		2019 83% 61% 91%		83% 2019 61% 91%	↑ ↑ →	RC survey

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
91	Percentage of resident coordinators who “agree” that the UN country team has reduced overlap and duplication of work in the past four years:	(2017) 84%	87%	2019	87%	2019	→	RC survey
92a	Percentage of resident coordinators who indicate that the UN country team has reviewed and reconfigured its profile on the basis of a needs-based tailored country presence dialogue held between the Government and the UNDS, facilitated by the resident coordinator	n/a [new]	23%	2019	23%	2019	→	RC survey
92b	Percentage of programme country Governments that state a dialogue on country presence was held between the Government and the UNDS, facilitated by the resident coordinator	n/a [new]	64%	2019	64%	2019	→	PCG survey
<b>D. Regional Dimension</b>								
93	Options, on a region-by-region basis, for longer-term reprofiling and restructuring of the regional assets of the UN presented to ECOSOC [yes/no – date]	n/a [new]	Presented	2019	Presented	2019	✓	UNDS transition team/ SG’s Special Advisor on UN reform
94	Percentage of resident coordinators who report that CF/UNDAF includes an integrated analysis of regional and transboundary issues	n/a [new]	46%	2019	46%	2019	→	RC survey
95	Percentage of new resident coordinators (in the previous year) who undertook familiarization visits to a regional commission and key regional offices during the first six months of their appointment	n/a [new]	40%	2019	40%	2019	→	RC survey
96	Fraction of regions where regional coordination mechanisms and regional UNSDG teams held meetings jointly or back-to-back	n/a [new]	5/5	2019	5/5	2019	→	RCM/ R-UNSDG
97	Regional commission is a member of the regional UN Sustainable Development Group peer support group	(2018)		2019		2019		RCM/ R-UNSDG

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	mechanism for CF/UNDAF development and review [yes/no]:	Yes	Yes		Yes		→	
	i. Africa	Yes	Yes		Yes		→	
	ii. Arab States	No	Yes		Yes		↑	
	iii. Asia/Pacific	Yes	Yes		Yes		→	
	iv. Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States							
	v. Latin America and the Caribbean							
	Number of UN Sustainable Development Group entities that participated in the most recent Regional Sustainable Development Forum:	(2018)		2019		2019		R-UNSDG/ Regional commissions
	i. Africa	11	15		15		↑	
	ii. Arab States	n/a	22		22		→	
	iii. Asia/Pacific	22	22		22		→	
	iv. Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States	15	23		23		↑	
98	v. Latin America and the Caribbean	n/a	23		23		→	
99	Fraction of regions with a current publicly available repository of inter-agency knowledge products	(2018) 1/5	3/5	2019	3/5	2019		RCM/ R-UNSDG
100	Coordinated publications strategy established at the regional level to reduce duplication of knowledge products [yes/no – date]	n/a	No	2019	No	2019	↑	RCM/ R-UNSDG
	Number of joint regional coordination mechanism/regional UN Sustainable Development Group regional common positions (papers) to advocate on key development issues:			2019		2019		RCM/ R-UNSDG
	i. Total	8 (2015)	13		13		↑	
	ii. Africa	-	0		0		→	
	iii. Arab States	4 (2017)	4		4		→	
	iv. Asia/Pacific	3 (2017)	5		5		↑	
	v. Europe and Central Asia	1 (2017)	3		3		↑	
101	vi. Latin America and the Caribbean	-	1		1		↑	
	Percentage of resident coordinators who stated that the UN country teams benefited “to a moderate extent” from the regional commissions’:	(2017)		2019		2019		RC survey
	i. Normative and policy support work	26% 31%	70% 65%		70% 65%		↑ ↑	

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Technical expertise</li> <li>iii. Platforms for policy discussion and exchange of experience</li> <li>iv. Regional SDGs follow-up and review activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31%</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>58%</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>58%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--</li> <li>→</li> </ul>			
103	<p>Percentage of resident coordinators who stated that the UN country teams benefited “to a moderate extent” from the regional offices of the UNDS entities’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Normative and policy support work</li> <li>ii. Technical expertise</li> <li>iii. Platforms for policy discussion and exchange of experience</li> <li>iv. Regional SDGs follow-up and review activities</li> </ul>	n/a [new]		2019		2019		RC survey	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>67%</li> <li>67%</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>49%</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>67%</li> <li>67%</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>49%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→</li> <li>→</li> <li>--</li> <li>→</li> </ul>			
104	Percentage of UN country teams in which the relevant regional commission is a member	(2015) 24%	31%	2019	36%	2020	↑	DCO	
105 a	Percentage of resident coordinators that “agree” that the regional UN Sustainable Development Group (R-UNSDG) provide effective support on the regional or subregional issues of the greatest relevance to the country:	(2017) 76%	41%	2019		41%	2019	↓	RC survey
105 b	<p>Percentage of programme country Governments stating that the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) regional commission</li> <li>ii) regional offices</li> </ul> <p>provides “effective” support on the regional or subregional issues of the greatest relevance to the country:</p>	(2017)  57% ..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>61%</li> <li>..</li> </ul>	2019		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>61%</li> <li>71%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2019</li> <li>2020</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→</li> <li>→</li> </ul>	PCG survey

## E. Common Business Services & Back-office Functions

### 1. Headquarters and entity-level

106	<p>Fraction of entities of the UNDS with a documented risk assessment policy that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Security risks</li> <li>ii. Medical risks</li> <li>iii. Information technology disaster recovery risks</li> <li>iv. Business continuity risks</li> </ul>	(2017)		2019		2020		HQ survey
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>24/29</li> <li>20/29</li> <li>23/29</li> <li>23/29</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>19/21</li> <li>17/21</li> <li>20/21</li> <li>21/21</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20/21</li> <li>18/21</li> <li>20/21</li> <li>20/21</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→</li> <li>→</li> <li>→</li> <li>→</li> </ul>		

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
107	Median percentage policy compliance rate of risk assessment policy for entities of the UNDS (once policy has been developed)	n/a	n/a	2019	n/a	2019	--	
108	Percentage of entities of the UNDS that report to their respective governing bodies on efficiency gains [target (2021): 100%]	12/29 (41%) (2018)	9/25 (36%)	2019	9/21 (43%)	2020	→	HQ survey
109	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that presented plans to their governing bodies for intra-agency rationalization of business operations	(2015) 10/25	7/21	2019	9/22	2020	→	HQ survey
110	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that report to their respective governing bodies on efficiency savings through collaborative procurement	(2017) 12/29	10/26	2019	10/24	2020	→	HQ survey
111	Percentage of resident coordinators who state that they have received "adequate" support from UNDCO on: i. Change management information on the repositioning ii. Common Country Analysis iii. Interface on the H-D-P nexus iv. The CF development process v. Common business operations vi. Implementation of the MAF vii. RCO staffing viii. UNCT configuration ix. RC performance appraisal x. UNCTs Head of Agency performance appraisal xi. Dispute resolution mechanisms	n/a [new]		2019		2019	→ → → → → → → → → → →	RC survey
112	Percentage of UN country teams that have: i. A country communications group (chaired by a head of agency) ii. A joint communications strategy approved by the UN country team and monitored and reported on in the country results report iii. Operations costs and budgets integrated into the overall medium-term common budgetary framework	(2015) 59% 44%	76% 69%	2019	63% 52% <sup>24</sup>	2020 2020	↑ ↑	DCO

<sup>24</sup> Refers to UNCTs that have endorsed a fully joint communications strategy developed to support the UNDAF. A work plan has been developed and is being monitored.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	[UN Sustainable Development Group standard operating procedures]	11%	25%		25%	2019	↑	
<b>2. Common Premises</b>								
113	Number of: i. Total office premises ii. Single entity office premises (percentage) iii. Common office premises (percentage)	(2018) 2286 83% 17%	tbd <sup>25</sup>	2020	2157 1681 (78%) 476 (22%)	2021	↑	DCO
114 a	Strategy to increase percentage of common premises from 16% to 50% by 2021 endorsed by UN Sustainable Development Group [yes/no – date]	n/a	No strategy	2020	No strategy	2021	→	DCO
114 b FC	Number (and percentage share) of common premises [target (2021): 1,000 (or 50% of all premises)]	430 (17%) (2017)	tbd <sup>26</sup>	2020	476 (22%)	2020	↑	DCO
115 a	Average number of common premises per country, by programme country expenditure: i. All ii. Large iii. Medium iv. Small	(2017) 3.0 7.2 4.0 1.0	2.8 6.1 3.1 1.1	2018	2.4 7.9 2.2 1.1	2021	↓ ↑ ↓ →	DCO
115 b	Average number of entities of the UNDS in each common premises, by programme country expenditure: i. All ii. Large iii. Medium iv. Small	(2017) 4.1 3.7 3.9 5.9	3.6 3.3 3.7 4.0	2020	3.6 3.3 3.7 4.0	2020	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	DCO
116	Average number of single-entity office premises per country, by programme country expenditure: <sup>27</sup> i. All ii. Large	(2017) 16.1 34.3	13.0 30.8	2018	8.6 25.2	2021	↓ ↓	DCO

<sup>25</sup> Data will be available in May 2020

<sup>26</sup> Ibid

<sup>27</sup> A common premise involves the co-location of two or more resident UN entities present in a country. A common premise can be established at national and subnational levels, in accordance with the UN Sustainable Development Group business operations working group definition of common premises adopted in February 2017.

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	iii. Medium iv. Small	22.3 5.7	15.2 4.4		10.0 2.2		↓ ↓	
117 FC	Percentage of common premises covered by additional financial and/or in-kind contributions [target (2020 onwards): 100%]	tbc (2018)	tbd	(2019)	30% (117/396)	2021	--	DCO
118	Fraction of UN Information Centres: i. Co-located with the office of the resident coordinator ii. Integrated with the office of the resident coordinator	(2018) 74% (37/50) 88% (44/50)	61% (27/44) 88% (44/50)	2019	64% (28/44) 88% (44/50)	2021	↑ →	DGC/DCO
<b>3. Common Back-Office</b>								
119	Strategy (including governance, costing and structural proposals) developed to implement common back offices for all UN country teams by 2022 endorsed [yes/no – date]	(2018) n/a [new]	Not developed	April 2020	Endorsed	Aug 2020	✓	DCO
120	Fraction of UN entities that have conducted a high-level review of the business operations services they could offer to (or purchase from) other entities in the system	2018 9/28	20/24	2019	16/25	2020	↑	HQ survey
121	Fraction of entities that have policies or procedures that enable mutual recognition of another entity’s policies and procedures in the following areas: i. Procurement ii. Administration iii. Human resources iv. Logistics v. ICT vi. Finance	n/a [new]		2019		2020		HQ survey
			18/24 10/18 9/18 10/19 9/18 9/18		21/23 14/19 16/21 13/19 11/18 12/18		↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑	
122 a	Framework of mutual recognition policies endorsed [yes/no – date and by whom]	n/a	Yes	Jan 2019	Yes	Jan 2019	✓	HLCM
122 b FC	Percentage of entities of the UNDS that have signed the high-level framework on mutual recognition [target (2021): 100%]	(2017) 11/39 (28%)	44%	2019	97%	2020	↑	HLCM/ DCO

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
123	Service provider models and standardized key performance indicators on customer service, pricing and delivery developed and adopted	(2017) No	Yes	Sept 2019	Yes	Sept 2019	✓	DCO
124	Percentage of UN country teams that have an integrated service centre	(2018) 7%	3% (4/131)	2019	3% (4/131)	2020	↓	DCO
125	Percentage of countries with 25% or more of the annual UN financed procurement volume done by the Government	(2017) 23%	17%	2019	17%	2019	↓	OMT survey
126 a	Percentage of countries implementing five or more common services, based on the implementation of inter-agency agreements and common long-term agreements	5% (2016)	4%	2018	4%	2018	→	OMT survey
126 b	Percentage of countries implementing a minimum of five common long-term agreements	33% (2016)	58%	2018	58%	2018	↑	OMT survey
127	Percentage of resident coordinators who state that they have received “adequate” information and support from headquarters in regard to the implementation of the UN Sustainable Development Group standard operating procedures:	30% (2019)	30%	2019	30%	2019	→	RC survey
128	New business operations strategy guidelines have been developed in response to General Assembly resolution 72/279 [yes/no – date]	n/a [new]	Yes	Oct 2019	Yes	Oct 2019	✓	DCO
129	Percentage of resident coordinators who state that they have received “adequate” information and support from headquarters in regard to the implementation of a business operations strategy:	(2017) 87%	84%	2019	84%	2019	→	RC survey
130 a FC (i only)	Percentage of UN country teams that: i. Have an approved business operations strategy [target (2021): 100%] ii. Have not developed an approved business operations strategy [UN Sustainable Development Group standard operating procedures]	(2015) 12%	55%	2020	79%	2021	↑	DCO
		88%	45%		21%			

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
130 b	UN country teams with an approved business operations strategy, disaggregated by programme expenditure:	(2016)		2020		2021		DCO
	i. All	13%	55%		79%		↑	
	ii. Large	21%	60%		82%		↑	
	iii. Medium	10%	59%		81%		↑	
	iv. Small	10%	49%		76%		↑	
130 c	Percentage of total country-level operational activities for development expenditures delivered in countries with a business operations strategy	(2016) 20%	55%	2020	85%	2021	↑	DESA and DCO
131	Fraction of common service lines adopted within each implemented business operations strategy:	(2016)		2019		2021		DCO
	i. Common procurement services <sup>28</sup>	82% (15/17)	94%		81% (84/104)		↑	
	ii. Common finance services	53% (9/17)	(68/72)		88% (91/104)		↑	
	iii. Common information and communication technology <sup>29</sup> services	94% (16/17)	72%		90% (94/104)		↑	
	iv. Common logistics services	59% (10/17)	81%		45% (47/104)		↑	
	v. Common human resources services	82% (14/17)	(58/72)		88% (92/104)		↑	
	vi. Common administration (including facility services) <sup>30</sup>	77% (13/17)	38%		99%		↑	
			(27/72)		(103/104)			
			79%					
			(57/72)					
			67%					
			(48/72)					
132	Percentage of operations management teams chaired by:	(2017)		2019		2019		OMT survey
	i. A head of agency	31%	43%		43%		↑	
	ii. Resident Coordinator	1%	1%		1%		→	
<b>F. Partnerships to Accelerate Progress</b>								
133	The UN Sustainable Development Group has endorsed a:	(2018)						DCO

<sup>28</sup> The fraction of common services lines has been calculated according to the revised BOS guidance (Oct 2019).

<sup>29</sup> Based on the revised BOS guidance (Oct 2019), the “Common information technology services” service line has been renamed to “Common Information & Communication Technology Services”.

<sup>30</sup> Based on the revised BOS guidance (Oct 2019), the “Common facility services, including common premises” service line has been renamed to “Common Administration Services (Including Facility Services)”.

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. System-wide approach to partnerships</li> <li>ii. Common approach to due diligence for private sector partnerships</li> <li>iii. Minimum standards for multi-stakeholder partnerships within the CF/UNDAF</li> </ul>	No	No		No		→	
		No	Yes	2019	Yes	2019	✓	
		No	Yes	2019	Yes	2019	✓	
134	Percentage of resident coordinators who state that there is a UN country team common approach on partnerships	n/a [new]	18%	2019	18%	2019	→	RC survey
135	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” that the UNDS plays a catalytic role in facilitating partnerships	(2017) 87%	77%	2019	77%	2019	↓	PCG survey
	Percentage of programme country Governments that stated that the UNDS has contributed to building the capacity of the country to engage in partnerships:			2019		2019		PCG survey
136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. To a moderate extent</li> <li>ii. To a large extent</li> </ul>	(2017) 53%	56%		56%		→	
		26%	21%		21%			
	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that have in place a functioning monitoring and reporting partnership platform or mechanism that tracks annually the status and results of each partnership:	(2017)		2019		2020		HQ survey
137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. In general</li> <li>ii. Global</li> <li>iii. Regional</li> <li>iv. Country</li> </ul>	21/29					→	
		..	19/25		20/26		→	
		..	18/27		19/26		→	
		..	15/25		15/24		→	
	Percentage of UN country teams that have:	(2017)		2019		2019		RC survey
138	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Joint assessments</li> <li>ii. Agreements</li> <li>iii. Joint strategic frameworks</li> <li>iv. Joint funding mechanisms with Bretton Woods institutions</li> </ul>	56%	33%		33%		↓	
		29%	16%		16%		↓	
		25%	17%		17%		↓	
		12%	12%		12%		→	
	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that:	(2017)		2019		2020		HQ survey
139	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Integrate South-South cooperation into their strategic plan</li> <li>ii. Actively report on South-South cooperation in their annual reports;</li> </ul>	25/29	23/28		22/26		→	
		21/29	21/27		18/25		→	

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
140	Percentage of CF/UNDAFs that substantively addresses South-South and triangular cooperation	n/a	61%	2019	71% <sup>31</sup>	2020	↑	DCO
141	Percentage of programme country Governments indicating that the UN has undertaken activities in that country to support South-South or triangular cooperation	(2017) 56%	59% <sup>32</sup>	2019	59% <sup>33</sup>	2019	→	PCG survey
142	Percentage of programme country Governments indicating that the UNDS is a preferred partner for supporting South-South cooperation and triangular cooperation	(2017) 55%	68%	2019	68%	2019	↑	PCG survey
<b>III. Funding the UNDS</b>								
<b>A. Quantity and quality of funding</b>								
143	Funding for operational activities for development: i. Total ii. Core iii. Core share of total (per cent)	(2015) \$28.0 billion \$6.6 billion 23.5%	\$36.4 billion \$7.7 billion 21.2%	2018	\$38.1 billion \$8.5 billion 22.3%	2019	↑ ↑ ↓	DESA
144 a	Percentage share of funding for operational activities for development provided by: i. The top 3 Member State contributors ii. The top 5 Member State contributors iii. The top 10 Member State contributors	(2015) 35% 43% 55%	34% 44% 55%	2018	38% 45% 58%	2019	↑ ↑ ↑	DESA
144 b	Percentage share of core funding for operational activities for development provided by: i. The top 3 Member State contributors ii. The top 5 Member State contributors iii. The top 10 Member State contributors	(2015) 25% 37% 55%	29% 40% 58%	2018	25% 36% 60%	2019	→ → ↑	DESA
145	Core share of funding for development-related activities: i. Voluntary funding only [target (2023): 30%]	(2017) 19.4%	20.8%	2018	19.6%	2018	→	DESA

<sup>31</sup> Starting with 2020, this indicator shows percentage of UNCTs that provide support on South-South cooperation.

<sup>32</sup> Or 86% if excluding countries that do not engage in South-South Cooperation.

<sup>33</sup> Or 86% if excluding countries that do not engage in South-South Cooperation.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
FC [i and ii]	ii. All funding, including assessed [target (2023): 30%] iii. Member State contributions only (excluding local resources)	27.0%	28.3%		29.6%		↑	
146 a	Percentage of programme country Governments indicating that <b>core</b> funds are “closely aligned” with the country’s development needs and priorities	(2015) 70%	64%	2019	64%	2019	↓	PCG survey
146 b	Percentage of programme country Governments indicating that <b>non-core</b> funds are “closely aligned” with the country’s development needs and priorities	(2015) 53%	47%	2019	47%	2019	↓	PCG survey
147	Percentage of CF/UNDAFs aligned with the national planning and budgeting cycles of programme countries: i. Aligned ii. Planning to align in the next cycle	(2015) 66% 21%	80% 11%	2019	48% 16%	2020	↓ ↓	DCO
148	Number of Member States providing at least 0.7% of gross national income to ODA	(2015) 6	7	2018	6	2019	→	OECD.Stat
149	Percentage share of funding for UN operational activities for development relative to: i. Total ODA ii. Total multilateral ODA	(2015) 20.0% 32.8%	23.8% 34.3%	2018	25.1% 36.7%	2019	↑ ↑	DESA & OECD.Stat
150	Total contributions to inter-agency pooled funds: i. Country pooled funds ii. Global/regional pooled funds	(2015) \$924 million \$611 million	\$1,337 million \$1,122 million	2018	\$1,504 million \$1,458 million	2019	↑ ↑	MPTF office
151 FC	Annual contributions to the Peacebuilding Fund [target (2020): \$500 million]	(2018) \$129 million	\$135 million	2019	\$180 million	2020	↑	MPTF office
152 FC	Annual capitalization of the Joint Fund for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development [target (2020): \$290 million]	(2018) \$43 million	\$55 million	2019	\$43 million	2020	→	MPTF office

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
153 a	Percentage of programme countries where:	(2015)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Over 10%	24.8%	23.3%		28.4%		↑	
	ii. Over 15%	14.8%	10.0%		16.0%		↑	
	iii. Over 20%	10.7%	6.3%		8.6%		↓	
153 b	Number of Member States that contribute:	(2015)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Over 10%	15	27		23		↑	
	ii. Over 15%	13	17		15		↑	
	iii. Over 20%	10	14		12		↑	
153 c	Number of entities of the UNDS that receive:	(2015)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Over 10%	5	4		6		↑	
	ii. Over 15%	3	2		3		→	
	iii. Over 20%	2	2		2		→	
153 d FC (i only)	Percentage of non-core resources channelled through inter-agency pooled funds:	(2015)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Development-related activities [target (2023): 10%]	4.8%	7.1%		9.0%		↑	
	ii. Humanitarian assistance-related activities	10.3%	9.9%		10.8%		↑	
154 a	Funding channelled to entity-specific thematic funds:	(2015)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Total volume	\$529 million	\$720 million		\$901 million		↑	
	ii. Percentage of total non-core	2.6%	2.5%		3.0%		↑	
154 b FC (ii only)	Funding channelled to development-related entity-specific thematic funds	(2017)		2018		2019		MPTF office & DESA
	i. Total volume	\$393 million	\$452 million		\$720 million		↑	
	ii. Percentage of non-core funding to development activities [target (2023): 6%]	2.8%	3.4%		5.5%		↑	
155 FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS with at least 15% of non-core development-related expenditures constituting part of a joint activity [target (2021): 75%]	(2018)	13/29 (45%)	2019	12/26 (46%)	2020	↑	HQ survey

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR	Latest Value (2021 SGR)	Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source	
156 FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS indicating that at least 50% of their contributions are part of multi-year commitments [target (2023): 100%]:	(2018)	2019	2020		HQ survey	
	i. All entities	12/25 (48%)	12/21 (57%)	9/20 (45%)	→		
	ii. Funds and Programmes	1/6	1/5		→		
	iii. Specialized agencies	5/8	2/5	2/5	→		
	iv. Other entities	6/11	2/6	6/10	→		
			8/10				
157	Funding from programme countries:	(2015)	2018	2019		DESA	
	i. Core	\$0.47 billion	\$0.87 billion	\$1.17 billion	↑		
	ii. Non-core (excluding local resources)	\$1.08 billion	\$0.83 billion	\$1.57 billion	↑		
	iii. Local resources	\$1.41 billion	\$2.05 billion	\$1.40 billion	→		
158 a	Total funding received from non-state partners	(2015)	2018	2019		DESA	
	i. Core	\$0.66 billion	\$0.93 billion	\$1.11 billion	↑		
	ii. Non-core	\$3.24 billion	\$3.98 billion	\$4.49 billion	↑		
158 b	Percentage share of total funding coming from non-state partners	(2015) 14.6%	2018 13.5%	2019 14.7%	→	DESA	
159	Fraction of entities of the UNDS reporting annually to their governing bodies on concrete measures to broaden the donor base	(2015) 23/25	23/28	2019 23/26	2020	→	HQ survey
160 FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS reporting an annual increase in the number of contributors of voluntary core resources [target (2023): 100%]	(2017) 8/12 (67%)	2018 9/13 (69%)	2019 6/12 (50%)	↓	DESA <sup>34</sup>	
161 FC	Number of Member State contributors to development-related:	(2017)	2018	2019		MPTF office & DCO	
	i. Inter-agency pooled funds [target (2021): 100]	59	46	39	↓		
		27	29	24	↓		

<sup>34</sup> Excludes entities whose core resources are primarily in the form of assessed contributions.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	ii. Entity-specific thematic funds [target (2021): 50]							
162	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that in their respective governing bodies	(2017)		2019		2020		HQ survey
FC (i only)	i. Held structured dialogues in the past year on how to finance the development results agreed in the new strategic planning cycle [target (2021):100%]	17/27 (62%)	16/28 (57%)		13/25 (52%)		↓	
	ii. Presented options for improving the functioning and effectiveness of the structured funding dialogues	9/27 (33%)	7/15 (47%)		8/10 (80%)		↑	
163	Fraction of entities of the UNDS reporting resources generated from “innovative funding modalities” as part of their regular financial reporting	(2016) 13/27 (48%)	10/26 (38%)	2019	7/23 (30%)	2020	↓	HQ survey
164	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that have included information about knowledge-sharing and best practices on innovative funding as part of their regular financial reporting	(2017) 10/27 (37%)	23/27 (85%)	2019	21/26 (81%)	2020	↑	HQ survey
165	Median change (percentage) in country-level development-related expenditure after requesting “Delivering as one” (based on average expenditure during the three years before and after) <sup>35</sup>	(2016) 19.6% increase	9.0% increase	2018	6.4% decrease	2019	↓	DESA
166	Funding provided to the RC system (SPTF) through:	(2018)		2019		2020		DCO
FC (iii only)	i. The 1% coordination levy	\$0	\$30 million		\$40.4 million		↑	
	ii. UNSDG cost-sharing	\$29.3 million	\$75.2 million		\$77.5 million		↑	
	iii. Direct voluntary contributions [target (2019 onwards): \$144 mn]	\$46 million	\$144 million		\$100.0 million		↑	
166	Number of Member States contributing financially to the RC system (SPTF):	(2018)		2019		2020		DCO
b	i. The 1% coordination levy	0	30		31		↑	
	ii. Direct voluntary contributions							

<sup>35</sup> The intention of this indicator is not to prove a cause and effect. It specifies only whether or not there is an average change in financial flows to countries that have recently chosen the “Delivering as one” approach.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
FC (iii only)	iii. Overall [target (2021): 100]	28	36		33		↑	
		28	36		45		↑	
167 FC	Variance between amounts collected on the 1% coordination levy and expected amounts based on agreed guidelines [target (2021): 0%]	(2018) ..	21.4%	2019	\$43 million expected / \$30 million expected	2020	--	DCO
168	Shortfall to the UN Sustainable Development Group resident coordinator cost-sharing arrangement	(2016) \$8.4 million	\$2 million	2019	\$0 million	2020	↓	DCO
169	Fraction of UN Sustainable Development Group entities paying their full contribution of the Group's resident coordinator system cost-sharing arrangement	(2016) 13/19	18/19	2019	19/19	2020	↑	DCO
<b>B. Transparency of financial flows</b>								
170 FC	Fraction of UNDS entities individually submitting financial data to CEB:	(2016)		2019		2020		DESA
	i. Funds and programmes	9/9	9/9		9/9		→	
	ii. Specialized agencies	13/13	13/13		13/13		→	
	iii. Other entities of the UNDS	5/17	21/21		21/21		↑	
	iv. All [target (2021): 100%]	27/39	43/43		43/43		↑	
171 a FC	Fraction of UNDS entities with ongoing activities at the country level that report expenditures disaggregated by country to CEB:	(2017)		2019		2020		DESA
	i. Funds and programmes		9/9		9/9		→	
	ii. Specialized agencies		9/12		9/9		→	
	iii. Other entities of the UNDS		4/9		10/12		↑	
	iv. All [target (2021): 100%]		22/30		8/10		↑	
		18/39 (46%)	(73%)		27/31 (87%)		↑	
171 b FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that report on expenditures disaggregated by the Sustainable Development Goals [target (2021): 100%]	(2018) 6/29 (21%)	10/43 (23%)	2019	12/43 (28%)	2020	↑	DESA

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
172 FC	Fraction of new Cooperation Frameworks designed each year that include funding frameworks disaggregated by i. funding type ii. funding source [target (2020 onwards): 100%]	(2018) ..	Methodolog y roll out in 2020 <sup>36</sup>	Apr 2020	2020 data i) 2/11 ii) 2/11	2020 <sup>38</sup>		DCO
					2021 data <sup>37</sup> i) 2/32 ii) 3/32		↑ ↑	
173 FC	Funding gaps in Cooperation Frameworks funding frameworks [target (2021): tbd]	(2018) ..	Methodolog y roll out in 2020	Apr 2020	52%	2021	↑	DCO
174 a FC	Percentage of UN country teams that have a fully operational common budgetary framework that is: i. Medium term and aligned to the CF/UNDAF ii. Updated annually (i.e. annual CBF) [target (2021): 90%]	(2015)  37% 19%	 63% 43%	2019	 .. 49%		-- ↑	DCO
174 b	Percentage of total country-level development-related expenditures delivered in countries with a i. Medium term CBF that is aligned to the CF/UNDAF ii. Annual CBF	(2017)  62% 42%	 46% 31%	2019	 46% 31%	2019	↓ ↓	DCO & DESA
175	Number of UN country teams that have supported the Government to map overall financing flows of the country (i.e. public, private, domestic and international) as part of the support to the national Government in delivering the Sustainable Development Goals	(2017) 11	18	2019	18	2019	↑	RC survey
176	Percentage of UN country teams with an approved joint resource mobilization strategy that is reported on in the UN country results report.	(2015) 13%	21%	2019	10% (3/29) <sup>39</sup>	2020	--	DCO

<sup>36</sup> To be reported on in 2021 following roll-out of funding strategy methodology by DCO in 2020

<sup>37</sup> Data as at March 2021. As per Cooperation Framework guidelines, the funding framework follows signature, and therefore these fractions are expected to increase throughout 2021

<sup>38</sup> Starting in 2020, this indicator shows the fraction of country teams with a signed Cooperation Framework that contains a funding framework.

<sup>39</sup> 29 UNCTs have a joint resource mobilization strategy, of which 3 were reported on in the results report.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
177 FC	Funding gaps in UNSDG strategic plan funding frameworks [target (2021): tbd]	(2018) ..	n/a	2019	n/a <sup>40</sup>	2019	--	DCO
178 a	Fraction of entities of the UNDS consolidating all projected core and non-core resources within an integrated results and resources framework	(2017) 27/29	27/28	2019	25/26	2020	→	HQ survey
178 b	Average percentage fulfilment of integrated budgets of entities of the UNDS (actual versus indicative)	(2016) 96%	(2018) 101%	2018	102%	2019	→	DESA
179 a FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS publishing data in accordance with the International Aid Transparency Initiative data standard:	(2016)		2019		2020		DESA
	i. All entities [target (2021): 100%]	10/39 (26%)	19/43 (44%)		20/31 (65%)		↑	
	ii. Funds and programmes	5/9	9/9		9/9		↑	
	iii. Specialized agencies	3/13	9/9		6/8		↑	
	iv. Other entities	2/17	5/13		5/14		↑	
			5/21					
179 b	Percentage share of total operational activities for development expenditures published in the International Aid Transparency Initiative data standard	(2017) 92%	96%	2019	94%	2020	→	DESA
180 FC	Centralized, consolidated and user-friendly online platform in place with disaggregated data on funding flows at:	(2018)	Methodology roll out in		2021			
	i. Entity-level [target (2020): yes]	n/a	2020	Apr	On-going		→	DCO & CEB
	ii. System-wide level [target (2020): yes]	n/a		2020				
181 FC	Online platform providing real-time tracking of sources and uses of the special purpose trust fund [target (2021): yes]	(2018) n/a	Yes	Early-2020	Yes	Early-2020	✓	DCO
182	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that have adopted cost recovery frameworks:	(2015)		2019		2020		HQ survey
	i. All entities	17/25	25/27		21/24		→	
	ii. Funds and programmes		8/8		7/8		→	
	iii. Specialized agencies		5/7		5/5		→	
	iv. Other entities		12/12		9/11		→	

<sup>40</sup> Not yet possible to aggregate at the system-wide level as entities currently do not capture these funding gaps using the same methodology.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)	Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
183 FC (i only)	Cost recovery support fee waiver granted: i. Average number per entity [target (2019 onwards): zero] ii. Volume of total non-core resources affected <sup>41</sup>	(2018) 17 \$1,262 million	14 \$800 million	2019	2020 8 \$531 million	↓ ↓	HQ survey
184	Percentage of total expenditures directed to programme activities (as opposed to administration and other non-programme costs) i. Core ii. Non-core	(2015) 68% 92%	60% 93%	2018	2019 58% 89%	↓ ↑	HQ survey
185 FC	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that report annually on the implementation of their approved cost recovery policies and rates to their respective governing bodies [target (2021): 100%]	(2015) 17/29 (59%)	23/25 (92%)	2019	2020 16/18 (89%)	↑	HQ survey
186 FC	Development by the UN Sustainable Development Group of a system-wide approach on cost definitions and classifications (yes/no) [target (2021): yes]	(2018) n/a	In progress	2020	In progress	2021 →	DCO
187 a FC	Specific mention of voluntary core fund contributors, pooled and thematic fund contributions and programme country contributions in UN country team annual results reporting and entity-specific country and global reporting (yes/no) [target (2020): yes]	(2018) No	Yes	2020	Yes	2021 ↑	DCO
187 b FC	Specific mention of individual contributors in all results reporting by pooled fund and thematic fund administrators and UN Sustainable Development Group recipients (yes/no) [target (2020): yes]	(2018) No	Yes – at HQ level	2020	Yes – at HQ level	2021 ↑	MPTF office
188 FC	Common management features across all inter-agency pooled funds <sup>42</sup> (yes/no) [target (2021): yes]	(2018) No	In progress	2020	In progress	2021 →	FMOG

## IV. Accountability and Oversight

<sup>41</sup> Refers to total amount of agreements that include such a waiver, not the amount of fees waived.

<sup>42</sup> Including a well-articulated strategy, comprising innovation features where relevant, clear theories of change, solid results-based management systems, well-functioning governance bodies supported by effective secretariats, quality assurance on matters related to United Nations norms and values, risk management system and strategies, operational effectiveness, reporting, visibility and transparency standards, and planning and funding for joint and system-wide evaluations that meet the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)	Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
<b>A. Ensuring a gender responsive UNDS</b>							
189	System-wide evaluation of the effectiveness, value added and impact of the UN System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women completed	(2017) No	Yes	2019	Yes	2019	↑ JIU
190	Fraction of UNDS entities that meet or exceed: i. All ii. 75% of the minimum standards set out in the System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women	0/26 (2015) 9/26 (35%) (2015)	0/39 20/39 (54%)	2019	2/39 (5%) 22/39 (56%)	2020	↑ ↑ UN-Women
191	Fraction of UN entities that meet or exceed minimum standards set out in the System-wide Action Plan on Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women concerning: i. Policy plan ii. Gender responsive performance management iii. Strategic planning iv. Reporting and data analysis v. Evaluation vi. Gender responsive auditing vii. Programme review viii. Resource tracking ix. Resource allocation x. Gender architecture and parity xi. Equal representation of women	(2016) 34/38 32/38 31/38 33/37 21/31 35/37 29/35 19/32 8/31 10/38 n/a	34/39 37/39 29/38 27/38 25/32 37/38 n/a 20/36 11/35 25/39 4/39	2019	32/39 37/39 29/36 29/36 29/33 37/37 n/a 19/38 11/35 23/39 6/39	2020	↓ ↑ ↓ ↓ ↑ ↑ -- → ↑ ↑ ↑
192 FC (iii only)	Fraction of UN country teams that have conducted: i. A gender equality scorecard (UNCT-SWAP) in the past year ii. A gender scorecard (UNCT-SWAP) in the past year, and met or exceeded requirements in at least half of the performance indicators iii. A gender scorecard exercise in the past four years, and met or exceeded requirements in at least half of	(2016) 5% (6/131) 1/6 n/a	26% (34/130) 9/17 <sup>43</sup> 54% <sup>44</sup>	2019	29% (38/131) 7/17 <sup>45</sup> 52% <sup>46</sup>	2020	↑ ↑ → UN-Women

<sup>43</sup> Of the 33 gender equality scorecards conducted in the past year, 17 periodic comprehensive reports, which is the denominator. The remaining 16 were annual progress reports.

<sup>44</sup> 26 of 48 (54%) UNCTs that prepared UNCT-SWAP reports in 2016-2019 met or exceeded requirements in at least half of the performance indicators.

<sup>45</sup> Of the 38 UNCT-SWAP assessments submitted, 17 comprised comprehensive assessments, which is the denominator. The remaining 21 were annual progress reports.

<sup>46</sup> 31 out of 60 UNCTs (51.7%) that prepared comprehensive UNCT-SWAP reports in 2017-2020 met or exceeded requirements in at least half of the performance indicators.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
the performance indicators [target (2020 onwards): 75%								
193	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that track and report on allocations and expenditures using gender markers	11/26 (2015)	20/39	2019	19/39	2020	↑	UN-Women
194	CF/ UNDAF gender marker methodology piloted through UN-INFO	n/a [new]	Yes	2019	Yes	2020	✓	DCO/ UN-Women
195	Percentage of CF/ UNDAFs that feature gender results at the outcome level	61% (2015)	72%	2019	65.9%	2020	↑	UN-Women
196 a	Percentage of UNDS women staff among all staff	(2017) 48.9%	47.9%	2018	47.9%	2019	↓	CEB
196 b	Percentage of UNDS women staff among international professional staff	(2017)		2018		2019		CEB
	All international professional staff:	46.0%	47.3%		48.1%		↑	
	i. P-1	65.5%	67.1%		73.4%		↑	
	ii. P-2	59.4%	59.5%		59.5%		→	
	iii. P-3	47.6%	49.3%		49.6%		↑	
	iv. P-4	44.2%	45.2%		46.1%		↑	
	v. P-5	38.1%	39.5%		40.4%		↑	
196 c	Percentage of UNDS women staff among national staff	(2017)		2018		2019		CEB
	All National Officers:	46.7%	46.1%		46.1%		↓	
	i. National Officer-A	50.3%	47.9%		46.8%		↓	
	ii. National Officer-B	45.3%	44.8%		45.6%		↑	
	iii. National Officer-C	46.3%	46.3%		46.1%		↓	
	iv. National Officer-D	44.7%	48.9%		48.5%		↑	
	v. National Officer-E	33.3%	0.0%		0.0%		--	
196 d	Percentage of UNDS women staff among high-level posts	(2017)		2018		2019		CEB
	All high-level posts:	34.1%	37.8%		38.5%		↑	
	i. D-1	34.7%	37.8%		38.3%		↑	
	ii. D-2	33.7%	36.4%		37.6%		↑	
	iii. ASG	29.4%	37.2%		41.25%		↑	
	iv. USG	28.6%	50.0%		47.6%		↑	

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>		Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source		
196 e	Percentage of UNDS women staff among General Service staff	(2017)		2018		2019			CEB		
		53.2%		49.7%		48.9%		↓			
	All General Service staff:	3.7%		3.8%		3.6%		→			
	i. G-2	22.9%		20.9%		22.1%		↓			
	ii. G-3	58.2%		54.7%		53.4%		↓			
	iii. G-4	68.2%		64.4%		64.1%		↓			
	iv. G-5	62.6%		59.3%		59.0%		↓			
v. G-6	60.2%		58.8%		57.3%		↓				
vi. G-7											
197	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that have high-level posts (D-1 and above) filled by nationals of programme countries, disaggregated by gender:	Female (2017)	Male (2017)	Female	Male	2018	Female	Male	2019		CEB
	i. Less than 25%	16/39			5/41		14/41	4/41		--	
	ii. Between 25% and 50%	14/39	6/3	19/41	23/4		15/41	21/41		--	
	iii. More than 50%	9/39	9	22/39	15/41		10/41	16/41		--	
			11/39	7/4							
			39	1							
198	Percentage of resident coordinators who are:	(2016)		2019		2020			DCO		
	i. Female	43%		49%		53%		↑			
	ii. Female and from programme countries	19%		21%		23%		↑			
	iii. Female and from non-programme countries	24%		28%		31%		↑			
199	Percentage of UNDS inter-agency staff transfers <sup>47</sup>	(2016)		0.88%	0.73%	2018	0.85%	2019	→	CEB	
<b>B. Maximizing results</b>											
<b>1. Results-Based Management and Reporting</b>											
200 FC	Aggregated information on system-wide support to the Sustainable Development Goals and system-wide results presented to ECOSOC [target (2021): yes]	No (2018)		Due in 2021	2019	Due in 2021	2019	→	DESA & DCO		

<sup>47</sup> Inter-agency moves are based on a comparison of data of one year with data of the previous year, comprising all movement of staff across organizations (moves across departments of the United Nations Secretariat are not counted as inter-agency moves). The value reported in the report of the Secretary-General of 2018 was revised after further validation of the data.

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
201	Results-based management and system-wide results reporting across UNDS reviewed	In progress (2015)	Yes	Dec 2017	Yes	Dec 2017	✓	JIU
202	UN Sustainable Development Group results-based management handbook revised reflecting common methodologies for:	(2017)		2019		2020		DCO
	i. Results-based planning [yes/no]	No	No		In-progress <sup>48</sup>		→	
	ii. Results-based reporting [yes/no]	No	No		In-progress		→	
	iii. Integrated result and resource frameworks [yes/no]	No	No		In-progress		→	
203 FC (iii only)	Fraction of UN country teams that have: i. Prepared a joint UN country results report ii. Submitted a joint country results report to the Government in the past year iii. Made this report publicly available	24% (31/131) (2016) 75% (56/75) (2017) 64% (48/75) (2017)	64% (83/130) 74% (61/83) 54% (45/83)	2019	69% (90/131) 51% (46/90) <sup>49</sup> 58% (52/90)	2020	↑ ↓ ↓	DCO
204 a FC	Fraction of programme country Governments that confirmed receipt of a report on the results achieved by the UN country team as a whole in the last annual cycle [target (2021): 90%]	61/128 (48%) (2015)	46/92 (50%)	2019	49/105 (47%)	2020	→	PCG survey
204 b FC	Percentage of programme country Governments that “agree” in respect of annual reports provided to them that: i. They receive reports regularly enough to meet their needs [target (2021): 90%] ii. The information is up to date [target (2021): 90%] iii. The results of the whole UN system are included [target (2021): 90%] iv. Sufficient financial data is included [target (2021): 90%] v. Reporting is structured around CF/ UNDAF outcomes [target (2021): 90%]	(2017) 63% 68% 58% 45% 74% 63%	51% 62% 51% 55% 61% 56%	2019	57% 61% 57% 63% 64% 63%	2020	↓ ↓ → ↑ ↓ →	PCG survey

<sup>48</sup> In 2021, the UN Strategic Planners Networks and DCO will work together to revise the 2011 UNDG results-based management handbook

<sup>49</sup> Starting with 2020, this indicator measures fraction of joint UN country results reports presented to and endorsed by the joint national UN-Steering Committee.

#2	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
	vi. Reporting is linked to national development results [target (2021): 90%]							
205 FC	Percentage of resident coordinators who report an increase in Member State harmonization of reporting and visibility requirements on development-related contributions at the country level [target (2020 onwards): 50%]	n/a	n/a	2019	36%		→	DCO
<b>2. Evaluation</b>								
206	Fraction of entities that have included provisions for knowledge management strategies in their strategic plans	(2017) 22/29	23/27	2019	21/26	2020	→	HQ survey
207	Independent review of independent system-wide evaluations considered by ECOSOC [yes/no]	(2018) n/a [new]	No	2019	No	2020	→	DESA
208	Fraction of entities of the UNDS that: i. Meet UN Evaluation Group standards for independence ii. Have an evaluation tracking system that includes the status of evaluations and management responses	(2017) 25/29 27/29	24/27 25/27	2019	21/26 24/25	2020	→ →	HQ survey
209	Number of independent system-wide evaluations of results achieved undertaken in the past 12 months at the: i. Global level ii. Regional level iii. Country level	(2018) 1 0 2	3 0 1	2019	3 0 1	2019	↑ → ↓	UNEG
210 FC	Percentage of UN Sustainable Development Group evaluation offices engaging in: i. Joint evaluations [target (2021): 75%] ii. Independent system-wide evaluations [target (2021): 50%]	(2019) 29% 20%	49% 31%	2020	55% 35%	2021	↑ ↑	UNEG
211 FC	Percentage of entities of the UNDS authorized within disclosure provisions and policies that have made their corporate evaluations available on the UN Evaluation Group website [target (2019): 100%]	(2018) 21%	71%	2019	71%	2020	↑	DCO

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
212 FC	Percentage of internal audit reports issued in line with the disclosure provisions and policies set by the relevant governing bodies that are available on a dedicated searchable the platform/website of the Representatives of Internal Audit Services of the UN Organizations, pending availability of resources [target (2021): 100%]	(2018) 0%	0%	2019	0% <sup>50</sup>	2020	→	DCO
213 FC	Percentage of inter-agency pooled funds posting evaluation reports on the UN Evaluation Group website [target (2021): 100%]	(2018) 0%	..	2020	.. <sup>51</sup>	2021	--	DCO
214	Percentage of UN country teams that have conducted an annual CF/ UNDAF review in the past 12 months	(2016) 45%	40%	2019	39%	2020	↓	DCO
215	Fraction of most recently completed CF/ UNDAFs for which: i. An evaluation was conducted ii. A management response was prepared	(2016) 47% (62/131) 37% (23/62)	71% (92/130) 37% (34/92)	2019	10% (13/131) 61% (8/13)		-- ↑	DCO
216 a FC	Percentage of CF/UNDAF evaluations that contain all of the following: actionable recommendations, with a clear target audience and time frame for implementation, and a management response [target (2021): 100%]	(2016) 28% (10/36)	37%	2019	62% <sup>52</sup>	2020	↑	DCO
216 b FC	Percentage of CF/UNDAF evaluations with a good or excellent rating on methodology used [target (2021): 75%]	(2016) 28% (10/36)	tbd	2019	n/a <sup>53</sup>	2021	--	DCO
<b>3. Data Management</b>								
217 FC	Number of programme countries with UN INFO operational [target (2021): 100]	(2018) 32	69	2019	131	2020	↑	DCO

<sup>50</sup> No such website or platform exists yet.

<sup>51</sup> UNEG guidance on CF evaluation expected to be finalized in first quarter of 2021

<sup>52</sup> Data refers to management response only as UNEG guidance on CF evaluation expected to be finalized in first half of 2021..

<sup>53</sup> UNEG guidance on CF evaluation expected to be finalized in first half of 2021.

# <sup>2</sup>	Name	Baseline value <sup>3</sup>	Value reporting in 2020 SGR		Latest Value (2021 SGR)		Trend <sup>4</sup>	Source
218	Fraction of entities of the UNDS using the CEB data management platform for the system-wide data gathering and reporting needs of the CEB secretariat (once launched)	(2018) Not yet developed	100%	2019	100%	2020	↑	CEB
219	Number of UNDS entities implementing common standards for machine readability of data (once developed)	(2018) Not yet developed	8	2019	9 <sup>54</sup>	2020	↑	DCO
220	Fraction of entities of the UNDS using a common authentication system	(2017) 15/29	21/26	2019	20/26	2020	↑	HQ survey
221	Strategy of the Secretary General for “Data Action by Everyone, Everywhere: For Insight, Impact and Integrity” adopted by UNSDG and CEB	n/a [new]	Not yet adopted	2020	Adopted	2020	✓	EOSG

\*\*\*

<sup>54</sup>The Secretary-General presented common identifiers intended to help create a homogeneously classified information space and allow for automatic retrieval, processing and integration of information related to the SDGs. As of 2020, nine UN entities adopted the identifiers [https://unsceb.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/SS1%20statement%20-%20signed\\_as%20of%2026%20Feb%202020.pdf](https://unsceb.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/SS1%20statement%20-%20signed_as%20of%2026%20Feb%202020.pdf)