



INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE DOCUMENTATION STATUS

Key IMDIS records as of 1 February 2011

28 February 2011

Assignment No. IED-COM-11-001

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

FUNCTION

“The Office shall evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the programmes and legislative mandates of the Organization. It shall conduct programme evaluations with the purpose of establishing analytical and critical evaluations of the implementation of programmes and legislative mandates, examining whether changes therein require review of the methods of delivery, the continued relevance of administrative procedures and whether the activities correspond to the mandates as they may be reflected in the approved budgets and the medium-term plan of the Organization,” (General Assembly [Resolution 48/218 B](#)).

Project team members include:

NISHTA JOGOO
CATHERINE NYAWIRE

CONTACT INFORMATION

OIOS/IED Contact Information: Tel: (212) 963-8148; Fax: (212) 963-1211
e-mail: ied@un.org

BETH OSBORNE DAPONTE, CHIEF OF SECTION

Tel: +212-963-1583, Fax: +212-963-1211
e-mail: daponte@un.org

DEMETRA ARAPAKOS, ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Tel: +917-367-6033, Fax: +212-963-1211
e-mail: arapakos@un.org

(EDDIE) YEE WOO GUO, ACTING DIRECTOR

Tel: +917-367-3674, Fax: +212-963-1211
e-mail: guoy@un.org

A. Introduction

1. The Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) periodically monitors the status of programme performance documentation as entered into the “Integrated Monitoring and Documentation Information System” (IMDIS).¹
2. The “Programme Performance Documentation Status” report is produced by OIOS semi-annually. Its objective is to provide a measure of interim status of the item listed as a ‘Special objective’ on programme monitoring in Senior Managers’ 2010 compacts with the Secretary-General²: “*Effective monitoring of all programmes and subprogrammes on a regular basis*”.
3. The current report gives the status of all Secretariat programmes’ programmatic performance data as recorded in IMDIS as of 1 February 2011, 13 months into the 2010-2011 biennium. The previous OIOS report in this series was provided to the Secretariat of the Management Performance Board on 17 August 2010. That report gave an interim status of programme performance documentation eight months into the 2010-2011 biennium.

B. Background

4. IMDIS is an online reporting system developed and managed by the Information Support Unit of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), in partnership with the Department of Management (DM). It is intended as a management tool for Programme Managers to facilitate monitoring of and reporting on the implementation of their programme of work for the biennium and results attained, in accordance with the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (ST/SGB/2000/8).
5. In IMDIS, programmes are required to report on progress pertaining to their objectives, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement, as articulated in their proposed programme budget for the biennium.³ Programmes are instructed to define one overall objective for each of their subprogrammes and no more than three expected accomplishments for each objective.

¹ Accepted as the Secretariat-wide system for programme performance monitoring and reporting.

² Senior Managers’ compacts capture the highest-priority goals and associated performance measures for individual senior officials in a given year, and include a mix of programmatic and managerial objectives which cross-reference the objectives included in the biennial programme budget and the annual Human Resources Action Plan (HRAP).

³ Approved by the General Assembly.

Table 1: Number of Expected Accomplishments and Indicators of Achievement by Programme

	PROGRAMME	# EA	# IoA
1.	Overall policy-making, direction and coordination	0	0
2.	General Assembly affairs and conference services	50	87
3.	Political affairs	21	36
4.	Disarmament	20	35
5.	Peacekeeping operations	24	36
6.	Peaceful uses of outer space	4	10
7.	International Court of Justice	0	0
8.	Legal affairs	17	34
9.	Economic and social affairs	36	57
10.	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States	10	16
11.	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development	8	12
12.	Trade and development	30	52
13.	International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO)	3	8
14.	Environment	32	53
15.	Human settlements	22	57
16.	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice	16	42
17.	Economic and social development in Africa	39	59
18.	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific	33	45
19.	Economic development in Europe	30	50
20.	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean	30	55
21.	Economic and social development in Western Asia	24	44
22.A.	Sectoral advisory services	0	0
22.B.	Regional and subregional advisory services	0	0
23.	Human rights	39	45
24.	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees	5	17
25.	Palestine refugees	12	25
26.	Humanitarian assistance	18	30
27.	Public information	11	16
28.A.1.	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management	8	16
28.A.2.	Programme planning, budget and accounts	20	32
28.A.3.	Human resources management	18	31
28.A.4.	Support services	10	12
28.B.	United Nations Office at Geneva	19	30
28.C.	United Nations Office at Vienna	16	26
28.D.	United Nations Office at Nairobi	21	31
29.	Office of Information and Communications Technology	10	14
30.	Internal oversight	11	17
34.	Safety and security	33	71
SUMMARY STATISTICS			
Average		18	32
Median		18	31
Minimum		0	0
Maximum		50	87

6. Expected accomplishments (EAs) are defined as the intended changes as a result of the programme's intervention.⁴ They:
 - (a) are the direct consequence or effect of the generation of outputs and services within a two year period;
 - (b) should reflect a positive change for the end-users/beneficiaries of the programme's outputs;
 - (c) are at a lower level than objectives and should lead to the fulfilment of an objective (expected accomplishments occur before attainment of objective).
7. Each expected accomplishment also has Indicators of Achievement (IoAs) which provide a quantitative measurement of the extent to which expected accomplishments have been achieved as a result of the subprogramme's intervention. Programmes are instructed to have no more than two IoAs for each expected accomplishment.
8. Table 1 provides a summary of the number of expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement by Secretariat programme.

C. Methodology

9. Reports in this series use different indicators for determining the status of programme performance documentation in IMDIS, depending on how far one is into the biennium and what one expects to observe at each stage. Examples of indicators used in past reports are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Indicators used in past OIOS Programme Performance Documentation Status reports

Report covering:	Indicators used:				
	Percentage of IoAs which have a corresponding data collection plan	Percentage of IoAs which have performance measures (baselines and targets)	Availability of a "description of results" at the IoA level	Availability of a "statement of results" at the EA level	Percentage of all outputs completed or in-progress
1st 7 months of 2010-11	✓	✓			✓
Entire 2008-09 biennium	✓		✓	✓	✓
1st 18 months of 2008-09	✓		✓	✓	✓
1st 12 months of 2008-09	✓		✓	✓	✓
1st 10 months of 2008-09	✓	✓	✓		✓

10. After several consultations since the last report in this series, OIOS and DM mutually agreed to drop the indicator "IoAs which have a corresponding data collection plan" from the series as it related to planning and not programme performance. Agreement was also reached on disaggregating the percentage of all outputs "completed" and "in-progress".

⁴ Instructions for the preparation of the 2012-2013 strategic framework pp.8-9 (<http://imdis.un.org/>)

11. The current report is based on statistics downloaded from IMDIS as of 1 February 2011 for four particular indicators:

- I. **SR** reflects the availability of statements of results. This shows the effort made by the programme to assess progress on overall goals. OIOS reports on **the percentage of EAs which have an attached “statement of results”** as of 1 February 2011. The statistic is calculated as follows:

$$SR = \frac{\# \text{ EAs with an attached statement of results}}{\# \text{ EAs}} * 100$$

- II. **DR** reflects the availability of a “description of results” at the Indicator of Achievement level, which reflects programmes’ observations of the results achieved for each IoA. OIOS reports on **the percentage of IOAs which have an attached “description of results”** as of 1 February 2011.

$$DR = \frac{\# \text{ IoAs with an attached description of results}}{\# \text{ IoAs}} * 100$$

Example from OIOS programme performance documentation	
Expected Accomplishment (b)	Increased ability of Member States and the Secretariat to make decisions, based on findings and recommendations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services pertaining to the cross-cutting practices within the Secretariat.
Statement of results	At this interim stage of the biennium, the percentage of inspection and evaluation findings of a thematic nature and recommendations that have been fully implemented by the Secretariat is 46.3%. This percentage is expected to increase by the end of the biennium. In addition, while IED’s biennial report only rated 29.4% of programmes as conducting “good” quality self-evaluation, a further 58.8% of programmes were rated as “fair” and only 11.8% as “poor”. An assessment of the results from IED’s 2010-2011 “Inspection of Programme Level Monitoring and Evaluation” reports will also be included.
Indicator of Achievement 1	Increased percentage of programmes that are assessed to be conducting good quality self-evaluation as determined by established evaluation norms and standards.
Description of results	IED’s biennial report assessed a total of 45 self-evaluation reports (out of 155 that met our definition of evaluation reports) according to 27 standards. An overall numeric rating was given to each of the self-evaluation reports analysed. The rating scale used was as follows: 1= excellent, 2=good, 3=fair, 4=poor, 5=very poor. 7 out of 17 programmes with self-evaluation reports received an average rating of “good”.
Indicator of Achievement 2	...(and so on)

Percentage of outputs, either originally planned or subsequently added,

- III. **C** reflects the degree to which outputs have been “completed.” Completed includes outputs with implementation status in IMDIS as “implemented”, “reformulated”, “postponed” or “terminated.” OIOS calculates the percent of outputs that have been completed as follows:

$$C = \frac{(\# \text{ implemented} + \# \text{ reformulated} + \# \text{ postponed} + \# \text{ terminated})}{\# \text{ total outputs}} * 100$$

IV. **IP** reflects the degree to which outputs are **in-progress** as of 1 February 2011. OIOS calculates IP, the percent of outputs in-progress as follows:

$$IP = \frac{\# \text{ in-progress}}{\# \text{ total outputs}} * 100$$

12. Together, these indicators provide a measure of the extent to which programmes monitor and report the implementation of their programme of work in IMDIS on a regular basis.
13. An additional simple average⁵ of the four indicators provides a fifth composite indicator, called the **IMDIS Performance Status Index, IPSI**, which reflects IMDIS performance status. For this report, IPSI reflects performance at 13 months into the biennium.

That is,

$$IPSI = \frac{(SR + DR + IP + C)}{4}$$

14. The analysis and data provided relate to nominal reporting about performance (that is, the status of documentation on performance) and address compliance with reporting expectations, not underlying substantive performance. OIOS is unable to provide any assurance with respect to whether IMDIS data are relevant and sufficient evidence of progress towards the Organisation's programme objectives and EAs, or whether the IoA targets have actually been met. These issues can only be resolved using in-depth programme evaluations or results validations; as has been done in the OIOS Inspection of Programme Level Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) reports.

D. Results

15. Table 3 shows the status of programme performance documentation as of 1 February 2011. In addition, programmes are ranked in descending order of IPSI. While OIOS does not express any value judgment regarding what constitutes good or bad performance relating to the status of IMDIS reporting, clearly, some programmes have a higher IPSI than others.

⁵ OIOS also performed weighted averages; giving for example the percentage of outputs completed a greater weight than the percentage of outputs in-progress. While this lowered the magnitude of the IPSI, it did not change the results in terms of the ranking of the programmes.

Table 3: Programmes Ranked by IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI)

Rank	Programme	DR (description of results)	SR (statement of results)	C (outputs completed)	IP (in- progress)	IPSI (overall performance)
1	United Nations Office at Geneva	100	100	0	100	75
2	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States	100	100	57	33	73
3	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees	100	100	50	35	71
4	Public information	100	100	41	44	71
5	United Nations Office at Nairobi	77	100	0	100	69
6	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean	100	100	44	32	69
7	Internal oversight	82	100	37	54	68
8	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development	100	100	51	17	67
9	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific	100	100	44	23	67
10	Economic and social development in Western Asia	100	100	31	32	66
11	Environment	100	100	29	33	66
12	Trade and development	100	100	42	18	65
13	Human settlements	89	95	53	23	65
14	Palestine refugees	96	100	4	60	65
15	Office of the Under-Secretary- General for Management	100	100	52	5	64
16	Office of Information and Communications Technology	57	100	16	84	64
17	Peaceful uses of outer space	100	100	52	0	63
18	Safety and security	93	91	45	22	63
19	Disarmament	100	100	44	4	62
20	Economic and social affairs	88	100	45	12	61
21	Programme planning, budget and accounts	94	100	43	4	60
22	Peacekeeping operations	67	92	52	24	59
23	Economic development in Europe	96	90	39	7	58
24	Human rights	84	92	51	3	58
25	Political affairs	72	81	46	17	54
26	General Assembly affairs and conference services	46	52	59	41	50
27	United Nations Office at Vienna	23	63	0	100	47
28	International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO)	0	100	11	69	45
29	Economic and social development in Africa	42	44	50	32	42

30	Legal affairs	38	76	46	7	42
31	Human resources management	26	72	37	26	40
32	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice	31	50	36	16	33
33	Humanitarian assistance	3	67	45	7	31
34	Support services	25	30	28	17	25
SUMMARY STATISTICS						
Average		67	79	34	29	52
Median		91	100	44	24	63
Minimum		0	30	0	0	25
Maximum		100	100	59	100	75

16. Results across biennia can be compared. OIOS calculated IPSI for data downloaded 13 months into the 2008-09 biennium⁶. Table 4 shows the “IMDIS fully updated” score at 13 months of 2008-09 biennium *vis-à-vis* the score at 13 months of the current biennium. On average, compliance with programme performance documentation reporting in IMDIS has not changed significantly.

Table 4: Change in IPSI between biennium at 13 months into biennium

Rank	Programme	IPSI at 13 months of 2008-09 biennium	IPSI at 13 months of 2010-11 biennium	Change (Current minus previous IPSI)
1	United Nations Office at Geneva	92	75	-17
2	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States	45	73	28
3	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees	41	71	30
4	Public information	97	71	-26
5	United Nations Office at Nairobi	88	69	-19
6	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean	60	69	9
7	Internal oversight	61	68	7
8	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development	66	67	1
9	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific	86	67	-19
10	Economic and social development in Western Asia	74	66	-8
11	Environment	84	66	-19
12	Trade and development	79	65	-14

⁶ Using the same four indicators (SR, DR, C and IP) to calculate the IPSI at 13 months into the 2008-09 biennium.

Rank	Programme	IPSI at 13 months of 2008-09 biennium	IPSI at 13 months of 2010-11 biennium	Change (Current minus previous IPSI)
13	Human settlements	62	65	3
14	Palestine refugees	95	65	-30
15	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management	11	64	53
16	Office of Information and Communications Technology	N/A	64	N/A
17	Peaceful uses of outer space	78	63	-15
18	Safety and security	80	63	-17
19	Disarmament	65	62	-3
20	Economic and social affairs	75	61	-14
21	Programme planning, budget and accounts	48	60	12
22	Peacekeeping operations	64	59	-5
23	Economic development in Europe	82	58	-24
24	Human rights	30	58	28
25	Political affairs	54	54	0
26	General Assembly affairs and conference services	43	50	7
27	United Nations Office at Vienna	53	47	-7
28	International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO)	9	45	36
29	Economic and social development in Africa	70	42	-28
30	Legal affairs	49	42	-7
31	Human resources management	2	40	38
32	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice	46	33	-13
33	Humanitarian assistance	10	31	21
34	Support services	6	25	19
SUMMARY STATISTICS				
Average		58	58	0
Median		62	63	1
Minimum		2	25	23
Maximum		97	75	-22

E. Conclusion

17. With an IPSI of 75 percent, the United Nations Office at Geneva is the programme which scored the highest as of 1 February 2011 in terms of updating its performance documentation in IMDIS on a timely basis. United Nations Support Services is the programme that scored the lowest with 25 percent. However, the Support Services programme made great strides, increasing from a score of 6 at this point in the previous biennium. A number of other programmes showed tremendous increases in their IPSI score between biennia.

18. Only 1 programme scored 25 percent or below on “IMDIS fully updated”. A total of eight programmes scored between 26 and 50 percent, and the remaining 25 programmes scored between 51 and 75 percent.
19. At this stage of the biennium, one can expect programmes to have reported on their IoA and EA results to date. In fact, Monitoring and Evaluation focal points across all programmes were requested to update their programme performance data in IMDIS by 31 January 2011.⁷ However, as of 1 February 2011, less than a third of programmes had completed “statements” and “descriptions” of results for all their EAs and IoAs.
20. Moreover, only 5 out of 34 programmes report their scheduled outputs to be completed or in-progress as of 1 February 2011. Nine programmes report at least 75 percent of their outputs completed or in-progress, 16 programmes report between 50-74 percent of their outputs completed or in-progress, and 4 programmes report more than half of their outputs as “not started.”
21. While a programme may regularly enter voluminous programme performance information into IMDIS (thus yielding high ‘scores’ on indicators reported by OIOS), further scrutiny or evaluation could reveal in fact poor progress towards underlying objectives. It is also conceivable that there are programmes which have evidence to credibly document excellent underlying performance, but which have not yet entered such data into IMDIS (yielding, as well, low ‘scores’ on indicators reported by OIOS). This highlights the importance of regular in-depth programme evaluations or results validations, and of sustained efforts to improve the online management tool for monitoring and reporting United Nations Secretariat programmes’ work and results achieved.

⁷ Email sent from the DM Office of the Under-Secretary-General to all Programme Monitoring and Evaluation focal points on 10 December 2010. The data collected from IMDIS on this date was to be used for an interim report on Programme Performance and presented to the Management Performance Board for assessment in conjunction with the senior managers' compacts.