



INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE DOCUMENTATION STATUS

Key IMDIS records as of 15 July 2011

25 July 2011

Assignment No. IED-COM-11-002

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:

TEAM LEADER

JUAN CARLOS S. PEÑA

TEAM MEMBER:

CATHERINE NYAWIRE

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

ARILD HAUGE, CHIEF OF SECTION

Tel: +212-963-1471, Fax: +212-963-1211

e-mail: hauge@un.org

DEMETRA ARAPAKOS, OFFICER-IN-CHARGE

Tel: +917-367-6033, Fax: +212-963-1211

e-mail: arapakos@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 the interim status pertaining to the item listed as a ‘Special objective’ on programme monitoring in Senior Managers’ 2011 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’ performance data as recorded in IMDIS as of 15 July 2011, 18 months into the 2010-2011 biennium. The previous OIOS report in this series was provided to the Secretariat of the Management Performance Board on 28 February 2011. 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 and results attained for the biennium, 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.
6. Expected accomplishments (EAs) are defined as the intended changes resulting from the programme’s intervention.⁴ These EAs:

- (a) are the direct consequence or effect of the generation of outputs and services within a two year period;

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.

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

- (b) should reflect a positive change for the end-users/beneficiaries of the programme's outputs; and,
- (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 EA also has Indicators of Achievement (IoAs) which provide a quantitative measurement of the extent to which that EA has been achieved as a result of the subprogramme's intervention. Programmes are instructed to have no more than two IoAs for each EA.

8. In order to achieve the desired results, subprogrammes are also required to report on the implementation of planned and additional outputs that would support the realization of such results. These three elements - EAs, IoAs and outputs - are at the core of programme performance reporting for this cycle.

9. There are a total 700 EAs and 1,210 IoAs that are reported against in the current biennium. A summary of the number of these, by Secretariat programme, that are expected to be reported upon for the current biennium are available through the following link: (http://imdis.un.org/textFiles/IS_14783_4975.doc?key=9907).

C. Methodology

10. Based on consultations that took place after the issuance of the last report in this series, OIOS and DM agreed to make a few adjustments to the methodology used to calculate the output indicator. The output indicators which were previously presented as "completed" and "in progress" will now be consolidated into a single indicator that reflects that outputs have been reported as either "completed" (C) or as "in progress" (IP). This is being done because the intention of the report is to reflect whether outputs have been updated in the system or not, rather than to validate the status of implementation. The other indicators related to results statements and indicator of achievement data will remain unchanged.

11. The revised methodology will, therefore, have only three indicators reflected in the current analysis: (1) a results indicator that reflects data on the "statement of results" provided (SR), (2) a description indicator for IoAs that reflects the "description of results" for indicators (DR) and (3) an output indicator (CIP) which consolidates the earlier "completed" and "in progress" output status.

12. The current report is based on statistics downloaded from IMDIS as of 15 July 2011 for three 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 15 July 2011. The statistic is calculated as follows:

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

Example from OIOS programme performance documentation to support the SR indicator	
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 (SR)	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 per cent. This percentage is expected to increase by the end of the biennium. In addition, while IED's biennial report only rated 29.4 per cent of programmes as conducting "good" quality self-evaluation, a further 58.8 per cent of programmes were rated as "fair" and only 11.8 per cent as "poor". An assessment of the results from IED's 2010-2011 "Inspection of Programme Level Monitoring and Evaluation" reports will also be included.

- II. **DR** reflects the availability of a "description of results" at the IoA 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 15 July 2011.

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

Example from OIOS programme performance documentation to support the DR indicator	
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.
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 (DR)	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)

- III. **CIP** reflects the degree to which outputs have been "completed" or reported as "in progress". "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:

$$CIP = \frac{(\# \text{ implemented} + \# \text{ reformulated} + \# \text{ postponed} + \# \text{ terminated} + \# \text{ in progress outputs})}{\# \text{ Total outputs}} * 100$$

13. As referenced in para. 10, since “completed” and “in progress” outputs are intended to reflect the status of implementation that corresponds to a set of the work programme related to outputs, these two have been integrated to show the extent to which programmes monitor and report the implementation of their programme of work in IMDIS on a regular basis. No assessment is made in this report with regard to the validity of the implementation rates. DM ascertains actual implementation rates through the Programme Performance Report (PPR).

14. An additional simple average of the three indicators provides a fourth composite indicator, called the **IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI)**, which reflects IMDIS performance status. For this report, IPSI reflects performance at 18 months into the biennium.

$$\text{IPSI} = \frac{(\text{SR} + \text{DR} + \text{CIP})}{3}$$

15. The analysis and data provided relate to the status of documentation on performance (nominal reporting) and address compliance with reporting expectations, not underlying substantive performance. This OIOS report is not intended to provide assurance with respect to whether IMDIS data are relevant and sufficient evidence of progress towards the Organisation’s programme objectives or EAs, or whether the IoA targets have actually been met. Assessment of these questions require in-depth programme evaluations or results validations, as has been done in the programme level monitoring and evaluation inspections and programme evaluations conducted by OIOS.

D. Results

16. Table 1 shows the status of programme performance documentation as of 15 July 2011 ranked by IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI). Programmes are ranked in descending order of their IPSI scores. The second column reflects the budget section number assigned to each programme.

17. In comparison to the last reporting cycle, subprogramme 2 of DESA -- “Gender issues and advancement of Women,” has been excluded because this programme of work became part of the new programme United Nations Women, which will start its IMDIS monitoring and reporting work in the next biennium.

Table 1: Programmes Ranked by IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI)						
Rank	Budget Section	Programme	DR (description of results)	SR (statement of results)	CIP (outputs reported)	IPSI (overall performance)
1	10	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (OHRLLS)	100	100	100	100
2	25	Palestine refugees (UNRWA)	100	100	100	100
3	28.B	United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)	100	100	100	100
4	28.C	United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)	100	100	100	100

5	28.D	United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)	100	100	100	100
6	20	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)	100	100	96	99
7	27	Public information (DPI)	100	100	94	98
8	30	Internal oversight (OIOS)	100	100	93	98
9	9	Economic and social affairs ⁵ (DESA)	100	100	90	97
10	18	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)	100	100	90	97
11	5	Peacekeeping operations (DPKO)	100	100	87	96
12	6	Peaceful uses of outer space (OOSA)	100	100	89	96
13	11	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (UN-NEPAD)	100	100	87	96
14	21	Economic and social development in Western Asia (ESCWA)	100	100	87	96
15	24	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees (UNHCR)	100	100	85	95
16	12	Trade and development (UNCTAD)	100	100	79	93
17	14	Environment (UNEP)	100	100	80	93
18	15	Human settlements (UN-HABITAT)	93	100	87	93
19	17	Economic and social development in Africa (ECA)	85	97	98	93
20	28.A.3	Human resources management (OHRM)	94	100	86	93
21	33	Safety and security (DSS)	100	100	80	93
22	19	Economic development in Europe (ECE)	100	100	77	92
23	3	Political affairs (DPA)	94	100	74	89
24	4	Disarmament (ODA)	100	100	58	86
25	28.A.1	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management (OUSG-DM)	100	100	57	86
26	28.A.2	Programme planning, budget and accounts (PPBD)	94	90	73	86
27	29	Office of Information and Communications Technology (OICT)	57	100	100	86
28	2	General Assembly affairs and conference services (DGACS)	49	98	100	82
29	23	Human rights (OHCHR)	84	92	68	81
30	8	Legal affairs (OLA)	38	100	66	68
31	26	Humanitarian assistance (OCHA)	23	100	76	66
32	28.A.4	Support services (OCSS)	33	60	89	61
33	13	International Trade Centre (ITC))	0	100	80	60
34	16	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice (UNODC)	38	88	53	60
UN Secretariat Totals			87	98	77	87

18. These same results can be reviewed ranked by budget section number and in the order in which they appear in the United Nations Secretariat budget through the following link: (http://imdis.un.org/textFiles/IS_14783_4976.doc?key=9399).

⁵ DESA's overall programme performance reporting calculation excluded subprogramme 2 on gender issues and advancement of women, due to its transfer to the new programme UN Women.

19. Results across biennia can be compared to give a sense of programmes' progress on IMDIS reporting. OIOS calculated IPSI for data downloaded 18 months into the 2008-2009 biennium.⁶ Table 2 shows the "IMDIS fully updated" scores at the 18 month mark of 2008-2009 biennium as contrasted against the score at the 18 month mark of the current biennium. Overall, compliance with programme performance documentation reporting in IMDIS has improved by 11 per cent this biennium, when compared to 2008-2009. The largest increase comes from UNHCR (budget section 24), which enhanced its reporting by 64 per cent, followed by OHRLLS, which reported 60 per cent more, and UNOV, which reported 40 per cent more than last biennium. The largest decrease in programme performance reports comes from ITC, which reported 31 per cent less information this biennium, followed by UN-HABITAT with 3 per cent less information, and DSS with 2 per cent less information. Overall, 29 programmes either maintained or improved their reporting when compared to the previous biennium. Table 2 below shows the changes in reporting from last biennium following the order of the budget sections.

Table 2: Change in IPSI between biennia at 18 month mark in the biennial cycle				
Budget Section	Programme	IPSI at 18-months of 2008-09 biennium	IPSI at 18-months of 2010-11 biennium	Change (Current minus previous IPSI)
2	General Assembly affairs and conference services (DGACS)	79	82	▲ 3
3	Political affairs (DPA)	72	89	▲ 17
4	Disarmament (ODA)	64	86	▲ 22
5	Peacekeeping operations (DPKO)	88	96	▲ 8
6	Peaceful uses of outer space (OOSA)	96	96	▬ 0
8	Legal affairs (OLA)	67	68	▲ 1
9	Economic and social affairs (DESA)	80	97	▲ 17
10	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (OHRLLS)	40	100	▲ 60
11	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (UN-NEPAD)	71	96	▲ 25
12	Trade and development (UNCTAD)	83	93	▲ 10
13	International Trade Centre (ITC))	91	60	▼ 31
14	Environment (UNEP)	92	93	▲ 1
15	Human settlements (HABITAT)	96	93	▼ 3
16	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice (UNODC)	52	60	▲ 8
17	Economic and social development in Africa (ECA)	81	93	▲ 12
18	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)	95	97	▲ 2
19	Economic development in Europe (ECE)	87	92	▲ 5
20	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)	98	99	▲ 1
21	Economic and social development in Western Asia	85	96	▲ 11

⁶ Using a similar format for the reporting to calculate the IPSI at 18 months into the 2008-2009 biennium.

	(ESCWA)			
23	Human rights (OHCHR)	56	81	▲ 25
24	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees (UNHCR)	31	95	▲ 64
25	Palestine refugees (UNRWA)	97	100	▲ 3
26	Humanitarian assistance (OCHA)	46	66	▲ 20
27	Public information (DPI)	99	98	▼ 1
28.A.1	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management (OUSG-DM)	56	86	▲ 30
28.A.2	Programme planning, budget and accounts (PPBD)	64	86	▲ 22
28.A.3	Human resources management (OHRM)	86	93	▲ 7
28.A.4	Support services (DSS)	60	61	▲ 1
28.B	United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)	88	100	▲ 12
28.C	United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)	60	100	▲ 40
28.D	United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)	65	100	▲ 35
29	Office of Information and Communications Technology (OICT)	--	86	--
30	Internal oversight (OIOS)	80	98	▲ 18
33	Safety and security (DSS)	95	93	▼ 2
<i>UN Secretariat Totals</i>		76	87	▲ 11

E. Conclusion

20. The overall United Nations Secretariat IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI) for the 18 month reporting cycle was 87 per cent for all 34 programmes which are part of the programme performance reporting cycle. As of 15 July 2011, five programmes - Least Developed Countries, Landlocked developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (OHRLLS), Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG), United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV), and United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON) - attained the highest possible score (100 per cent), indicating that they have fully updated all of their IMDIS programme performance information. On the overall IPSI figures, only five programmes scored below 75 per cent on "IMDIS fully updated" which is the approximate benchmark for this time of the biennium. A total of seven programmes scored between 80 and 89 per cent, and the remaining 17 programmes scored between 90 to 99 per cent. The International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice programme (UNODC) and the International Trade Centre programme (ITC) scored the lowest during this reporting period. While UNODC show an improvement of 6 per cent in this reporting cycle as compared to the previous biennium, ITC, with a 60 per cent score, showed one of the largest decreases in reporting - 31 per cent - as contrasted against its previous biennia score.

21. At this stage of the biennium, programmes can be expected to have reported on the bulk of their planned and discretionary outputs. At least three quarters of their work programme should be either "implemented," "reformulated," "terminated," "postponed," or "in progress". Similarly, with regard to results, programmes' IoAs and preliminary results statements should have some preliminary data to allow for a final analysis and data collection to close the biennium

and produce a final contribution for the Programme Performance Report (PPR) of the organization.

22. In this regard, the monitoring and evaluation focal points across all programmes were requested to update their programme performance data in IMDIS by 15 July 2011.⁷ However, as of this date, more than one-third of programmes (13) had not completed their “description of results” for all their IoAs and six programmes had not completed their “result statements” for all their EAs, as per the programme performance reporting instructions. Overall, still six programmes had not completed their reporting for both their “result statements” and their “description of results” data as per requirement.

23. With regard to outputs, the vast majority of programmes have reported more than 75 per cent of their outputs to date, as required. Only 7 out of 34 programmes reported less than 75 per cent of their scheduled outputs, accounting for approximately 21 per cent of all programmes. Fourteen programmes reported between 75-89 per cent of their outputs “completed” or “in-progress” (40 per cent), six programmes reported between 90-99 per cent of their outputs as “completed” or “in-progress” (18 per cent), and 7 programmes reported 100 per cent of their programme as “completed” or “in-progress” (21 per cent).

24. While a programme may regularly enter programme performance information into IMDIS (thus yielding high ‘scores’ on indicators reported by OIOS), further evaluation could, in fact, reveal poor progress towards underlying objectives, or a lack of proper, valid data to substantiate programme result statement claims. 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 low ‘scores’ on indicators and results reported by OIOS). This highlights the importance of regular in-depth programme evaluations, including results validations and verification, as well as the need for sustained work 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 13 June 2011. The Programme Performance data available as of this date will be presented to the Management Performance Board for assessment in conjunction with the senior managers' compacts sometime in September 2011