

## Methodological note

### QCPR Monitoring – Surveys of Agency Headquarters, Programme Country Governments, UN Resident Coordinators and Operations Management Teams in 2015

In regard to monitoring the implementation of GA resolution 67/226, the Assembly called on the Secretary-General to regularly assess and report on a comprehensive and quantitative basis on progress in furthering programme and operational coordination at the country level; and in particular to carry out, in cooperation with United Nations resident coordinators, a survey of programme country governments once every two years, on the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the United Nations system. In pursuit of this mandate, the Secretary-General has instituted an annual survey of the Headquarters of UN agencies, operations management teams and UN resident coordinators, and a biennial survey of governments<sup>1</sup>.

#### Survey of agency headquarters

The 2015 survey of the headquarters of UN entities, administered by DESA, was carried out over the period 2 July to 2 September 2015. Responses were received from 25 entities, representing some 97 per cent of UN operational activities for development, by volume of funding<sup>2</sup>. In addition to the principal UN funds and programmes, responses were received from seven UN specialized agencies and four of the five UN Regional Commissions.

#### Survey of programme country governments

The 2015 survey of programme country governments carried out from 8 June 2015 to 18 August 2015. The survey was initiated through a message from DESA to the Permanent Representatives of all programme countries. The overall response rate to the 2015 survey was 87%. Compared with 50% in 2014, and 74% in 2012, the response rate in 2015 was unprecedentedly high. In particular, responses were received from 129 programme country governments; an increase from 110 in 2012. The credibility of the results is further enhanced in that over 60% of the government respondents reported they had worked on UN coordination for 5 years or more.

#### Survey of UN Resident Coordinators

The 2015 survey of UN resident coordinators was carried out from 15 June to 18 August 2015. The overall response rate to the 2015 survey was 89%. Compared with 60% in 2014, and 85% in 2013, the response rate in 2015 was unprecedentedly high. In particular, responses were received from 116 resident coordinators; an increase from 109 in 2013. The survey was initiated through a message from the UN DOCO Director to all resident coordinators. Follow up with the resident coordinators was conducted through DESA, DOCO and the regional UNDG.

#### Survey of Operations Management Teams

---

<sup>1</sup> In anticipation of the QCPR in 2016, a survey of programme country governments was conducted in 2015 even though there had been a survey conducted in 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Based on 2013 expenditure data.

This 2015 survey was launched to all country offices on June 15 and closed on August 14, 2015. Within this timeframe, Operations Management Teams (OMTs) from 119 countries completed the survey, corresponding to a response rate of 92%. After a relatively low response rate of about 65% (84 countries) in 2014, the survey achieved the highest response rate since its implementation in 2012. The survey aimed to collect standardized information about the status and progress made in the simplification and harmonization of business practices. This includes the establishment common services in all functional areas of business operations, the management structure of business operations at the country level and the implementation of common premises. The collected data serves to support the analysis of progress made in line with the QCPR process and those provisions of General Assembly resolution 67/226 that address the harmonization of business practices.

### [UNDG Information Management System \(IMS\)](#)

The UNDG Information Management System (IMS) was launched in 2015 and replaces the Resident Coordinator Annual Report (RCAR) and the UNDG Coordination Support Survey (CSS). Prior to launching the surveys of resident coordinators and operations management teams, DESA revised these surveys from previous years to avoid overlap with the UNDG IMS and additional reporting burdens. As these instruments used different collection methodology and protocols, caution should be applied when comparing feedback emanating from the IMS with data obtained through the DESA surveys in previous years.

The UNDG IMS contains data from 132 UN Country Teams, representing a response rate of 100%. Data entry was based on the perceptions of the Regional Coordination Offices in consultation with the UN Country Teams. The data were entered during the period of May and July 2015.

### [QCPR Monitoring and Reporting Framework and the UNDG IMS](#)

The following includes information on the data and methodology of four indicators in the monitoring and reporting framework of the 2016 Secretary General's Report on implementation of the QCPR. The data for these four indicators (36, 45, 46 and 99) were previously collected through the survey of Resident Coordinators. However, the UNDG IMS was launched in 2015, and DESA, after consultation with DOCO, revised its RC and OMT surveys to avoid duplication and additional reporting burdens on RC offices. The respective instruments used different collection methodology and protocols, therefore caution should be applied when comparing data for the same indicator across different data sources, this was reflected in the monitoring framework through use of a dotted-line.

#### ***Indicator 36: % of countries conducting the gender scorecard that meet minimum standards (rating 4) in at least half of the gender score card areas***

The following questions were included in the 2014 RC survey but not in the 2015 RC survey: *"Has the UNCT completed the gender scorecard in your country in the last three years?" "Does the UNCT have plans to complete the gender scorecard in the next 12 months?" "How many of the scorecard areas received a rating of 4 or above?" and "Did the UNCT discuss and endorse a management response to the scorecard findings?"* The following information was reported through the IMS: 25 out of 132 UNCTs implement a Gender Equality Scorecard (19%); 5 of these 25 UNCTs gave a rating of 4 or above in at least half of the scorecard areas (of which there are 8).

These questions sought to inform indicator 36 of the QCPR monitoring and reporting framework. As below for indicator 99, these questions were not asked in the 2015 Survey of Resident Coordinators as they were covered in UNDG's IMS

Further analysis of the IMS data, with the assistance of UN WOMEN, found that 10 of the 25 UNCTs who stated that they were implementing a Gender Equality Scorecard had not completed a scorecard since 2012, and so these were removed from the DESA analysis. Of the remaining 15 UNCTs with a scorecard that had been completed in the last three years, 4 met requirements of indicator 36. That is, they scored 4 or above (in a scale of 1 to 5) in at least half of the scorecard areas (of which there are 8). These countries were Cambodia, Ecuador, India, and Vietnam. Therefore, indicator 36 was calculated to be 27% (4/15).

***Indicator 45: % of countries with country-led and inclusive mechanisms to coordinate support to national priorities for transition***

This was another indicator sourced from UNDG's IMS rather than the Survey of Resident Coordinators, as had been the case in previous years. To source data on indicator 45, in previous years the Survey of Resident Coordinators asked the following question: "Are there country-led and inclusive mechanisms to coordinate support to national priorities?" The resulting data was then broken down according to whether the country was deemed to be in transition from relief to development. Given that this information was covered in the UNDG's IMS in 2015, the data for the 2016 Secretary-General's report was sourced from the IMS, which provided the following information: 15 out of 132 UNCTs that responded to the IMS stated that they have 'country-led and inclusive mechanisms to coordinate support to national priorities for transition'. As mentioned in the RC survey report, in the absence of a formal classification of countries in transition from relief to development, the designation of a UN Humanitarian Coordinator has been used in all the DESA surveys as a proxy for transition status. This was also the case when indicator 45 was sourced from the Survey of Resident Coordinators in previous years.

While the data between the two different sources are not comparable given different means of collection and methodology (the DESA surveys typically seek the views of survey respondents while UNDG's IMS aims to report on specific actions taken), the same proxy – to limit the question to countries/UNCTs with a Humanitarian Coordinator – was applied to the IMS data in order to calculate indicator 45. Further analysis of the IMS data found that of the 15 UNCTs that responded to the IMS stated that they have 'country-led and inclusive mechanisms to coordinate support to national priorities for transition', 5 of these did not have a Humanitarian Coordinator. Given that there were 30 Humanitarian Coordinators in 2015, all of which were respondents to the IMS, indicator 45 was calculated to be 33% (10/30).

***Indicator 46: % of programme countries where a joint national Steering Committee (or similar group) conducted annual UNDAF (or equivalent) review in the past 12 months***

Given the wording of the indicator, '*% of programme countries where a joint national Steering Committee (or similar group) conducted annual UNDAF (or equivalent) review in the past 12 months*', the calculation of indicator 46 should use the number UNCTs with a joint national steering committee as the denominator. According to IMS data, 41 UNCTs reported that they have a joint national steering committee. Further analysis of the IMS data found that not all of the 36 that stated that the Joint National/UN Steering Committee conducted an annual review of the One Programme (or equivalent) in the past 12 months were included in the 41 that said that they had a joint

national steering committee. In total, 9 of the 36 UNCTs reported that they did not have a joint national steering committee, which leaves 27 UNCTs that stated that they a) have a joint national steering committee, and b) that the joint steering committee (or similar body) conducted an annual review of the UNDAF in the past 12 months. Indicator 46 therefore was found to be 66% (27/41).

***Indicator 99: % of UNDAF evaluations for which management response was prepared (from UNDAF group)***

For the 2016 Secretary General's Report on implementation of the QCPR, indicator 99 was sourced from the UNDG's IMS rather than the RC survey, as had been the case in previous years. The following questions were included in the 2014 RC survey but not in the 2015 survey: "*Was there a formal evaluation of the UNDAF (or equivalent instrument) during the last five years?*", and "*Was a formal management response prepared on the evaluation of the UNDAF (or equivalent instrument)?*" The UNDG IMS, carried out in 2015, provided the following results: 122 out of the 132 UNCTs that reported through the IMS had an UNDAF or equivalent; 50 out of these 122 UNCTs had conducted an UNDAF evaluation within the past five years; and, 14 of these 50 had prepared a management response. Thus, indicator 99, which reads "*% of UNDAF evaluations for which management response was prepared (from UNDAF group)*", is calculated to be 28% (14/50).