



INSPECTION AND EVALUATION DIVISION

PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE DOCUMENTATION STATUS

Key IMDIS records as of 18 January 2012

24 January 2012

Assignment No. IED-COM-12-001

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:

JUAN CARLOS S. PEÑA, TEAM LEADER
CATHERINE NYAWIRE, TEAM MEMBER

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

DEBORAH RUGG, DIRECTOR
Tel: +917-367-8516, Fax: +212-963-1211
e-mail: rugg@un.org

A. Introduction and Background

1. The “Programme Performance Documentation Status” report is produced by the [Office of Internal Oversight Services \(OIOS\)](#) semi-annually based on monitoring the status of programme performance documentation as entered into the “[Integrated Monitoring and Documentation Information System \(IMDIS\)](#)”, 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](#)).¹ All Secretariat departments and programmes (as well as their subprogrammes or divisions) are required to report through IMDIS on progress pertaining to their objectives, “expected accomplishments”, “indicators of achievement” together with status of implementation outputs, as articulated in their approved strategic framework and programme budget for the biennium².

2. The primary purpose of the current reports is to aid the marshalling of timely departmental inputs to the compilation of the Secretary-General’s Programme Performance Report (PPR). The current report gives the status of all Secretariat programmes’ performance data as recorded in IMDIS as of 18 January 2012, covering the final reporting cycle at the end of the 2010-2011 biennium. In this respect, all programmes were requested by the Department of Management to update their programme performance data in IMDIS by 16 January 2012.³

3. For the organization as a whole, there are a total 700 EAs and 1,210 IoAs that are reported against the biennium 2010-2011. A summary of the number of these, by Secretariat programme, that were expected to be reported upon are available through the following link: (http://imdis.un.org/textFiles/IS_14783_4975.doc?key=9907). Further instructions for preparation of Strategic Frameworks; expected accomplishments (EAs) are framed as the intended changes resulting from the programme’s intervention. Indicators of Achievement (IoAs) provide a quantitative measurement of the extent to which that EA has been achieved. Subprogrammes are also required to report on the implementation of planned and additional outputs that would support the realization of such desired results. At the end of the biennium, all of the programme’s work programme should be reported as either “implemented,” “reformulated,” “terminated,” “postponed”. Similarly, with regard to results, programmes’ quantitative data and narrative material should be available for final analysis and in contribution to the Programme Performance Report (PPR) of the organization.

B. Methodology

¹ Also, the current report provides a measure that corresponds to status pertaining to the item listed as a ‘Special objective’ on programme monitoring in Senior Managers’ compacts with the Secretary-General through 2010 cycle; “*Effective monitoring of all programmes and subprogrammes on a regular basis*”.

² Instructions for the preparation of the 2012-2013 strategic framework pp.8-9 (<http://imdis.un.org/>).

³ Email sent from the DM Office of the Under-Secretary-General to all Programme Monitoring and Evaluation focal points on 25 October 2011 and as per Advisory Note # 3 from DM. 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 the first quarter 2012

1. The current report is based on statistics downloaded from IMDIS as of 18 January 2012, which is two days after the deadline given by the Department of Management for all programmes to report on performance data using three particular indicators, as follows:
 - I. **SR** reflects the availability of statements of results. This shows the effort made by the programme to assess progress on overall expected accomplishments. OIOS reports on **the percentage of EAs which have an attached “statement of results”** as of 18 January 2012 covering the whole biennium. The statistic is calculated as follows:

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

- II. **DR** reflects the availability of a “description of results” at the IoA level, which reflects programmes’ observations and analysis of the results achieved for each IoA. OIOS reports on **the percentage of IoAs which have an attached “description of results”** for the relevant IoAs as of 18 January 2012 covering the whole biennium.

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

- 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:

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

2. 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) which will be issued at the end of March for the biennium under review.
3. 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 the end of the biennial cycle.

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

4. Based on consultations between OIOS and DM, the same methodology used to calculate the output indicator, integrating the “completed” and “in progress” outputs under one figure has remained unchanged to reflect whether or not outputs have been updated. Similarly, the other

indicators related to results statements and indicator of achievement data has remained unchanged.

5. In line with the above, the methodology used reflects three indicators for 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) that consolidates outputs reported as “completed” and “in progress” under one figure. More details and examples of the methodology and the criteria used to calculate SR, DR and CIP can be found in Annex I of this report.

6. 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.

C. Results

7. Table 1 shows the status of programme performance documentation as of 18 January 2012 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.

8. In line with the previous reporting cycle, subprogramme 2 of DESA -- “Gender issues and advancement of Women,” has been excluded from overall calculations because this programme of work became part of the new programme United Nations Women, which will start its IMDIS monitoring and reporting in the biennium 2012-2013.

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	3	Political affairs (DPA)	100	100	100	100
	4	Disarmament (ODA)	100	100	100	100
	6	Peaceful uses of outer space (OOSA)	100	100	100	100
	9	Economic and social affairs (DESA)	100	100	100	100
	10	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (OHRLLS)	100	100	100	100
	11	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)	100	100	100	100
	12	Trade and development (INCTAD)	100	100	100	100
	13	International Trade Centre (UNCTAD/WTO) – (ITC)	100	100	100	100

	14	Environment (UNEP)	100	100	100	100
	18	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)	100	100	100	100
	19	Economic development in Europe (ECE)	100	100	100	100
	20	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)	100	100	100	100
	21	Economic and social development in Western Asia (ESCWA)	100	100	100	100
	24	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees (UNHCR)	100	100	100	100
	25	Palestine refugees (UNRWA)	100	100	100	100
	26	Humanitarian assistance (OCHA)	100	100	100	100
	27	Public information (DPI)	100	100	100	100
	28.B	United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)	100	100	100	100
	28.D	United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)	100	100	100	100
	30	Internal oversight (OIOS)	100	100	100	100
	33	Safety and security (DSS)	100	100	100	100
2	5	Peacekeeping operations (DPKO)	97	100	100	99
	16	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice (UNODC)	98	100	100	99
	15	Human settlements (UNHABITAT)	96	100	100	99
	28.A.1	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management (OUSG-DM)	100	100	98	99
	28.C	United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)	96	100	100	99
3	28.A.3	Human resources management (OHRM)	97	100	96	98
4	2	General Assembly affairs and conference services (DGACM)	94	98	100	97
	17	Economic and social development in Africa (ECA)	92	100	100	97
5	23	Human rights (OHCHR)	91	92	98	94
6	29	Office of Information and Communications Technology (OICT)	79	100	100	93
7	28.A.2	Programme planning, budget and accounts (PPBD)	91	90	95	92
8	8	Legal affairs (OLA)	70	100	100	90
9	28.A.4	Support services (OCSS)	58	60	89	69
UN Secretariat Totals			95	97	99	97

9. 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_14815_5430.doc?key=7783).

10. Results across biennia can be compared to give a sense of programmes' progress on IMDIS reporting. OIOS calculated IPSI for data downloaded at the end of the biennium or at the 24 month mark.⁴ Table 2 shows the "IMDIS fully updated" scores at the 24 month mark of 2008-2009 biennium as contrasted against the score at the 24 month mark for the biennium that just ended, i.e. 2010-2011. Overall, compliance with programme performance documentation

⁴ Using a similar format for the reporting to calculate the IPSI at 24 months into the 2008-2009 biennium.

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 52 per cent, followed by OCHA, which reported 49 per cent more performance data, and UNON, which reported 35 per cent more than last biennium. Since this is the last reporting deadline in the biennium when all the performance information is expected to be in place ready for the preparation of the Programme Performance Report (PPR), OIOS noted only one programme had a slight decrease in reporting. UNHABITAT fell its performance reporting by 1 per cent from full reporting achieved previous biennia. Overall, all programmes either maintained or improved their reporting when compared to the end of 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 the end of the biennial cycle				
Budget Section	Programme	IPSI at 24-months of 2008-09 biennium	IPSI at 24-months of 2010-11 biennium	Change (Current minus previous IPSI)
2	General Assembly affairs and conference services (DGACS)	87	97	▲ 10
3	Political affairs (DPA)	85	100	▲ 15
4	Disarmament (ODA)	80	100	▲ 20
5	Peacekeeping operations (DPKO)	91	99	▲ 8
6	Peaceful uses of outer space (OOSA)	100	100	▬ 0
8	Legal affairs (OLA)	81	90	▲ 9
9	Economic and social affairs (DESA)	98	100	▲ 2
10	Least developed countries, landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (OHRLLS)	99	100	▲ 1
11	United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (UN-NEPAD)	98	100	▲ 2
12	Trade and development (UNCTAD)	97	100	▲ 3
13	International Trade Centre (ITC)	96	100	▲ 4
14	Environment (UNEP)	97	100	▲ 3
15	Human settlements (HABITAT)	100	99	▼ 1
16	International drug control and crime prevention and criminal justice (UNODC)	76	99	▲ 23
17	Economic and social development in Africa (ECA)	90	97	▲ 7
18	Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)	100	100	▬ 0
19	Economic development in Europe (ECE)	100	100	▬ 0
20	Economic and social development in Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)	100	100	▬ 0
21	Economic and social development in Western Asia (ESCWA)	91	100	▲ 9
23	Human rights (OHCHR)	77	94	▲ 17
24	International protection, durable solutions and assistance to refugees (UNHCR)	48	100	▲ 52
25	Palestine refugees (UNRWA)	97	100	▲ 3
26	Humanitarian assistance (OCHA)	51	100	▲ 49

27	Public information (DPI)	100	100	≡ 0
28.A.1	Office of the Under-Secretary-General for Management (OUSG-DM)	69	99	▲ 30
28.A.2	Programme planning, budget and accounts (PPBD)	64	92	▲ 28
28.A.3	Human resources management (OHRM)	85	98	▲ 13
28.A.4	Support services (OCSS)	61	69	▲ 8
28.B	United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)	91	100	▲ 9
28.C	United Nations Office at Vienna (UNOV)	73	99	▲ 26
28.D	United Nations Office at Nairobi (UNON)	65	100	▲ 35
29	Office of Information and Communications Technology (OICT)	--	93	--
30	Internal oversight (OIOS)	100	100	≡ 0
33	Safety and security (DSS)	98	100	▲ 2
<i>UN Secretariat Totals</i>		86	97	▲ 11

D. Conclusion

11. The overall United Nations Secretariat IMDIS Performance Status Index (IPSI) for the 24 month reporting cycle or the end of the biennium was 97 per cent for all 34 programmes which are part of the programme performance reporting cycle. However, more than one-third of programmes (12) had not fully completed all their reporting requirements including their “description of results” for all their IoAs and four programmes had not completed their “result statements” for all their EAs, as per the programme performance reporting instructions. Overall, still four programmes had not completed their reporting for both their “result statements” and their “description of results” data as per requirement and instructions. Twenty one programmes – representing 62 per cent of the total - DPA, DDA, OOSA, DESA, OHRLLS, NEPAD, UNCTAD, ITC, UNEP, ESCAP, ECE, ECLAC, ESCWA, UNHCR, UNRWA, OCHA, DPI, UNOG, UNON, OIOS, and DSS - attained the highest possible score (100 per cent), indicating that they have fully updated all of their IMDIS programme performance information.

12. With regard to outputs, the vast majority of programmes (29) have reported on 100 per cent of their outputs to date, as required. Only 5 out of 34 programmes reported on less than the 100 per cent of their scheduled outputs, namely OUSG-DM, OHRM, OHCHR, PPBD.

13. 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, or M & E inspections, 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.