

Chapter 2

RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT IN UNDP

2.1 THE EVOLUTION OF RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT IN UNDP

The history of results-based management in UNDP can be traced to the mid 1990s. Many people in the organization see the process as a logical evolution of earlier initiatives, such as programme planning. For the purposes of this evaluation, the Administrator's Annual Report of 1997,¹⁷ which calls for the establishment of "an overall planning and results management system in UNDP" is taken as a defining point. Box 2 highlights some characteristics of the approach to results-based management taken by specialized funds and programmes.

The Administrator's Annual Report clearly states the intention to develop plans that would "be aligned with the budget for the 1998-1999 biennium, and the organization would be able to

manage results against planned goals and targets and with the appropriate resources assigned to achieve those results."¹⁸ However, there is no single document in which the organization described how its overall approaches and systems would be changed to institutionalize a results-based management culture, or how the organization would measure the degree to which the intended changes in management practice had been achieved. The various tools and systems that comprise results-based management emerged over several years and are set out in detail in Tables 1 and 2 in Annex 5.¹⁹ The main building blocks are summarized in Table 1.

UNDP has invested heavily in the development of new results-based management relevant systems between 1998 and 2007 and the period is characterized by a high degree of change.

Table 1. Key events in the development of results-based management

| Year | Key Event |
|-----------|--|
| 1998-1999 | Strategic results frameworks piloted then adopted across all country programmes |
| 2000 | First Multi-year Funding Framework (MYFF); First Results Oriented Annual Report (ROAR); Balanced scorecard introduced across all country offices |
| 2002 | Revision of Results and Competency Assessment (RCA); Handbook on M&E for Results; Reorganization of Practice Areas to match the MYFF |
| 2004 | ATLAS (Enterprise Resource Planning Tool) introduced |

17 'Annual Report of the Administrator', DP/1997/16/Add.7, 1997.

18 Ibid, p 36.

19 In the survey conducted for this evaluation, staff identified the following systems to be part of results-based management: MYFF, CPAP results framework, annual work plan targets, ROAR, CO balanced scorecard, outcome evaluations, project evaluations, RCA performance targets and assessment, executive snapshot, Global Staff Survey results, partner survey results, and ATLAS.

Box 2. Managing for results in associated funds and programmes

Within the UNDP group (UNCDF, UNV and UNIFEM), organizations have responded to results-based management in differing ways. The text below reflects interviews held with the funds and a short review of documents on managing for results within their organizations.

UNCDF—A specialized fund within UNDP. For the first time, UNCDF is being incorporated in the same Strategic Plan as UNDP (for the period 2008-2011). In the recent past, UNCDF has developed a strategic view of the Fund's comparative advantage in the context of the One UN vision. This has confirmed the Fund's focus on two areas of work, namely Decentralization and Local Development and Microfinance/Inclusive Finance. There is a conscious sense of wanting to be leading reform, not catching up.

The Fund has a policy of trying to harmonize with UNDP and agree upon joint indicators and targets.²⁰ Internal documents and interviews suggest that the Fund is looking at value-for-money questions, such as 'What are the costs of achieving their targets?' The Fund appears to be using results information: comparing countries, looking for best practices, tracking new issues that arise, and figuring out where to invest—all examples of a results culture. A proposal to move towards supporting national programmes and sector-wide approaches as an aid modality was circulated in February 2007²¹ and has influenced the formulation of outcome indicators for the Strategic Plan. The paper describes the two focal areas of the programmes in a results framework that has five core results and 15 outcomes groups. The outcomes are realistic, specific and measurable. In support of these objectives, the Fund has set out planned intervention maps that show how financial and technical support from the Fund can lead to Programme Purpose (Outcomes).

UNIFEM—The United Nations Fund for Women.²² In 1998, UNIFEM adopted several standardized tools to put results-orientation into practice including the mandatory requirement of developing logical frameworks for all programmes, and the revision of the guidelines for periodic reporting to focus on results. Terminology is not identical to UNDP but draws on their definitions and others such as the OECD-DAC and specialist organizations including Save the Children. UNIFEM shares some characteristics with UNDP. UNIFEM's work in empowering women and promoting women's human rights means that processes or 'how things are done' can be as important as the final results of a project or programme. In addition, much of the 'soft assistance' that UNIFEM provides in terms of advocacy, policy advice/dialogue, and facilitation/brokerage of information, etc. is geared towards creating or consolidating processes that can facilitate women's empowerment.

An independent review in 2002 identified degrees of ambiguity and/or fragmentation among UNIFEM practices and policies in terms of what, when and how progress should be tracked. This led to simplification of the existing results framework, but the main change came with the 2004-2007 MYFF. The strategic results framework has just four goals and four outcomes (the outcomes cut across all four goals) that are realistic, specific and measurable. These are accompanied by a set of indicators that are to a large extent linked back to the MDGs and identify international sources such as UNAIDS and UNFPA. An evaluation of the programme was underway during fieldwork for this evaluation.

UNV—The United Nations focal point for promoting and harnessing volunteerism for effective development.

UNV has possibly been more closely allied to the UNDP approach than the other two organizations. The second MYFF influenced how UNV reports results, as the annual reports to the Board structure discussion around the five goals found in the MYFF.²³ UNV has been involved in both reporting against the MYFF and developing the new strategic plan, where their main concern was to ensure that 'civic engagement' was included as one of the 'operational principles for development effectiveness.' One challenge has been that UNV cannot report against significant aspects of its work (i.e. promotion of volunteerism) because the MYFF does not cater for that as an objective.

In 2005 and 2006, UNV developed its own business model and supporting results framework, which have been aligned with the MYFF and were approved by the June 2006 UNDP/UNFPA Executive Board. They were developed in a participatory manner with staff and partners. The UNV results framework is currently designed at the corporate level and needs further work to ensure consistent understanding of the results across staff within the organization and internal coherence. The focus is now shifting to how to operationalize the framework at the business unit and project levels, which will include definition of suitable indicators and strengthening analysis of how UNV contributes to achievement of results. Major technical challenges will include the fact that UNV's contribution is mostly at the community level and therefore not ordinarily picked up by national monitoring systems and the fact that UNV volunteers work within projects administered by others, making it more difficult to identify UNV's contribution.

20 'Proposed Partnership Framework for UNDP and UNCDF', DP/2007/11; 'Progress Report on the UNDP-UNCDF Strategic Partnership', DP/2007/34.

21 UNCDF, 'Moving to Sector-wide Approach for Decentralization and Local Development and Inclusive Finance—A Strategic Shift for UNDP and UNCDF in a Direct Budget Support Environment', 2007.

22 The work of UNIFEM is mandated through two international agreements: the Beijing Platform for Action resulting from the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination

Annex 5 Table 1 shows that at least one key initiative relevant to results-based management has been launched across the organization every year. Each of these initiatives has demanded that country offices do at least one of the following:

- Participate in the design of new systems
- Change their business processes to reflect new systems introduced
- Change the information that is reported to corporate level on their performance

2.2 INTENDED EFFECTS ON THE ORGANIZATION

In the absence of a single statement of strategy that results-based management can be evaluated against, the approach taken here is to identify the following various themes of reform as a structure for analysis: setting strategic goals, aligning results and resources with those goals, monitoring for results, adjustment and learning, and evaluation and accountability.

2.2.1 SETTING STRATEGIC GOALS

The intended purpose for setting strategic goals has been to allow greater focusing of the programmes at the country level. This has been consistent during the past 10 years, as reflected in the quotes below from 1997 and 2007:

“To be effective, UNDP cannot attempt to do everything, even within its SHD [sustainable human development] framework. Given the diversity of national situations in programme countries, achieving focus within the framework must be accomplished primarily at the country level. While respecting the need for country-level

flexibility, broad parameters and corporate strategic objectives must be established globally to maximise the capabilities, impact and substantive accountability of the organisation as a whole.”²⁴

“The Strategic Plan, 2008-2011, seeks to take results-based management a step further by providing an instrument that: (a) clearly articulates UNDP priorities, objectives, targets and performance indicators; (b) creates a solid basis for internal resource allocation; and (c) sets a stronger platform for comprehensive results management. ... This simplified framework will increase UNDP’s focus, clarify its areas of comparative advantage, and facilitate the measurement and reporting on results. For each focus area, UNDP will spell out its key results areas and outcomes, with a view to further strengthening alignment.”²⁵

These quotes clearly recognize that the focus of programmes emanate from country-level needs, yet the instrument to implement this focus was the global strategic framework. This creates a tension between corporate and country offices, and an effective results-based management system has to balance these conflicting pressures. Annex 6 addresses this issue in more detail under a note on working in a decentralized structure.

The MYFFs, and presumably the new Strategic Plan, are also reported to have a prominent secondary role in communicating with external stakeholders, as a concise explanation of the programme. Intended uses include addressing:

- Questions from the differing Executive Board constituencies over which goals UNDP should focus upon. For example, the

Against Women (CEDAW), known as the women's bill of rights. The spirit of these agreements has been affirmed by the Millennium Declaration and the eight MDGs for 2015, which combat poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy and gender inequality, and build partnerships for development. In addition, Security Council resolution 1325 on women, peace and security is a crucial reference for UNIFEM's work in support of women in conflict and post-conflict situations.

23 UNIFEM, 'How Are We Doing? Tracking UNIFEM Progress in Achieving Results for Management and Learning', A Briefing Note, 2002; UNIFEM, 'Multi-year Funding Framework 2004-07', DP/2004/5.

24 'Annual Report of the Administrator', DP/1997/16/Add.7, 1997, p 30.

25 From 'Frequently Asked Questions about the Strategic Plan', internal guidance on UNDP intranet site concerned with development of the new Strategic Plan.

fact that the MYFFs and Strategic Plan, to some degree, reflect where the demand for UNDP services is, allows the organization to work in areas that some Executive Board members consider sensitive. The clearest example quoted has been the use of the MYFFs in supporting UNDP's increased focus in the governance area.

- Concerns within the wider UN family over whether UNDP was moving into areas that would be better served by other organizations within the United Nations.
- Donors' questions about the 'value added' of UNDP and, accordingly, a need to demonstrate results to donors. This was particularly important given the relative decline in UNDP funding during the 1990s and thus the need to demonstrate to donors the value of increasing their commitments to the organization.

2.2.2 ALIGNING RESULTS

Within the broad goals set within the MYFFs and the Strategic Plan, UNDP has embarked on two (until recently) parallel strands of work related to definition of results by the organization.

The first has been the move at the country programme level from managing project inputs to managing a portfolio of projects and other UNDP support²⁶ to deliver at the outcome level. This move started in 1998, with the piloting of strategic results frameworks, which were structured around delivery of outcomes, in a limited number of country programmes. This tool was then rolled out across all country programmes in early 1999. All those interviewed during this evaluation who were involved in development of strategic results frameworks stated that the intended purpose of the tool was to foster a strategic management approach at the country programme level, in which programme managers

would clearly be aware of how they expected UNDP projects and other support to contribute to delivery of the agreed outcome. This intention is also clearly set out in the quote below:

*"A further general lesson that emerged was the importance of **stressing management over measurement**. The fundamental goal of results-based management is to improve development effectiveness, which requires helping managers to better manage. In comparing RBM [results-based management] systems, the distinction is sometimes made between managing by results and managing for results. The former is principally oriented towards accountability and external reporting; the latter focuses on a cycle of planning, periodic performance and organizational learning. In implementing RBM, UNDP made a deliberate decision to emphasise management and learning.... RBM must explicitly aim at changing the way the organization is managed, fostering a strategic orientation and culture of performance. Improved external reporting was approached as very important, but a secondary benefit."²⁷*

Support for a strategic approach at the county level has also come from reforms to the UNDAF process, which have started to work through UNDP country programmes in recent years. The introduction of the UNDP CPD and CPAP, using a format common to the Executive Committee (ExCom) agencies,²⁸ has helped to clarify the alignment of UNDP's country programme with national policies and harmonization with partner UN organizations. In particular, joint programming for the UNDAF provides a stimulus for UNDP to ensure that its programmes reflect strategic areas from the MYFF and do not conflict with those of other UN organizations.

The second strand of work has been the introduction and use of the balanced scorecard in 2000. This tool was originally introduced for

26 Advocacy, policy dialogue and institutional strengthening, and field presence.

27 UNDP, 'Development Effectiveness Report', 2000, p 23-24.

28 The ExCom Agencies are UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF and WFP.

monitoring implementation and the results of the internal management reforms proposed in the Administrator’s Business Plans, 2000-2003, which were intended to drive cultural change within UNDP, as summarized in Table 2.²⁹ These changes complement results-based management and support an environment that focuses on results.

2.2.3 ALIGNING FUNDING

The concept of results-based management assumes that resources will follow results—in other words, as results are aligned with goals, resources would be managed to achieve those results. In practice, the extent to which alignment with goals and results from the results-based management system was intended to influence the allocation of financial resources was severely limited. This

partly reflects the view of significant constituencies within the Executive Board that funding should primarily reflect needs rather than results. Major sources of funds during the period under evaluation are shown in Table 3.

The sources and uses of funds in UNDP at the country office and corporate levels is complex, with limitations on management flexibility. The main distinction is first between core and non-core. The targeting and allocation of core resources is managed as a resource supply to programmes and operations. Shortfalls in funding to achieve development results have to be made up by extra-budgetary income and non-core sources.³⁰

Taking core funding first, there are three core programmatic budgets: TRACs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3.³¹

Table 2. Prospective cultural changes in UNDP

| Today | | Tomorrow |
|--|---|--|
| Project driven | ➡ | Policy driven |
| Process orientation | ➡ | Results orientation |
| Low-level specialized expertise | ➡ | Clear competency profile |
| Low knowledge-based capacity | ➡ | Innovative and information technology networked capacity |
| Risk aversion | ➡ | Risk taking |
| Introverted, sceptical of partnerships | ➡ | Outward looking, partnerships oriented |
| Cumbersome decision making | ➡ | Flexible and real-time decision making |
| Bureaucratic culture | ➡ | Merit-rewarding and initiative-driven culture |
| Weak management accountability | ➡ | Responsive leadership management |

29 UNDP, ‘The Way Forward. The Administrator’s Business Plans, 2000-2003’, 1999, para 28.

30 ‘Assessment of Programming Arrangements, 2004-2007’, paper presented to the Executive Board DP/2007/8, available online at: <http://www.undp.org/execbrd/word/dp07-8.doc>.

31 More commonly spoken of as TRACs 1, 2 and 3, for simplicity.

Table 3. Percentage of programmatic funding by source

| Source of Funds | 2000 | 2006 |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Core Funding | | |
| TRAC 1 & 2 | 17 | 11 |
| TRAC 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 3 | 1 |
| <i>Subtotal</i> | 21 | 13 |
| Non-core Programmatic Funding | | |
| Thematic trust funds | 0 | 1 |
| Trust funds | 17 | 24 |
| Government cost sharing | 47 | 35 |
| Donor cost sharing | 10 | 21 |
| Other | 5 | 6 |
| <i>Total</i> | 100 | 100 |
| Total value (USD, million) | 1,862 | 4,049 |

Source: Compiled by Bureau of Management, UNDP

- The TRAC 1.1.1 budget represents the minimum level of resources targeted to be available for an individual programme country during a given financial period. It is calculated in accordance with the board-approved distribution methodology, using per capita gross national income and population as the primary criteria.
 - TRAC 1.1.2 resources are in the first instance earmarked by region. These are subsequently allocated by the regional bureaux on an annual basis between country programmes. In theory, allocation should be on the basis of the quality of the planned UNDP assisted programmes. TRAC 1.1.2 earmarking for a given region is equal to two-thirds of the total TRAC 1.1.1 earmarking for all countries in that region. The allocation formula for TRAC 1.1.2 assignment for an individual country was initially expressed as a percentage of the country's TRAC 1.1.1 earmarking, and ranged from 0 to 100 percent (averaging 66.67 percent).³²
 - The TRAC 1.1.3 facility was established to provide the Administrator with the capacity to respond quickly and flexibly to the needs of countries in special development situations. This budget, which has grown significantly, is mostly used to support work in crisis situations.
- There is no prior prescription on how TRAC 1.1.1 funds are allocated between programmes at

³² Temporary changes were made to the TRAC 1.1.2 allocation system through an Executive Board decision 2005/26.

the country level, but it is only for TRAC 1.1.2 resources that the possibility of assigning resources against country level results exists.

Non-core resources are all earmarked, such as in the case of the Thematic Trust Funds and donor cost sharing, or allocated at the country level, as in the case of partner government cost sharing.

UNDP's overall financial framework reflects a complex mix of funding allocations according to: substantive programming components at the country, global and inter-country levels; line item inputs (i.e. economist lines); and organization unit funding (e.g., the Human Development Report Office and the Office of Development Studies). As such, the financial framework is not directly aligned with the UNDP goals or practices, as defined in the MYFFs.

It is only at the lower levels of budgeting and programme planning, principally at the country programme level and below, that alignment with the MYFF goals and results takes place. However, UNDP does not actively monitor or set targets at the country programme level for the degree to which programmatic resources are aligned around delivery of outcomes or the programme as a whole.

2.2.4 ALIGNING HUMAN RESOURCES

There are three areas in which UNDP could have aligned human resources with delivery of its intended results. These are:

- Structuring within operational units to deliver specific outcomes
- Aligning the staff performance appraisal system, the RCA, with delivery of results
- Aligning the practice areas with delivery of specific goals within the MYFFs

During the period under evaluation, there were no central prescriptions on how the country offices

should be structured, although guidance issued in 2002 suggests organizing programme staff around outcomes. The current approach of the Management Change Team (an internal change-management service) is to help country offices align with the strategic plan and work efficiently with office-wide systems such as ATLAS.

The annual RCA was revised in 2002 to strengthen linkage with delivery of results in a logical sequence:

1. Annual strategic targets are set for the country office based on the strategic results framework and objectives and indicators in the balanced scorecard.
2. Once annual strategic results have been defined, the team or sub-unit level develop work plans that aim to deliver against the defined strategic targets.
3. Staff members agree upon a number of individual results against which they will be judged. Those most relevant to the results-based management system are:
 - a. Five key individual results that are supposed to identify the primary contributions of that staff member: resource mobilization, resource delivery, learning, support to policy and output delivery
 - b. A key result relating to 'learning and growth' for individual staff members³³

The RCA is intended to focus the work of staff around strategic outcomes but is designed and used on an individual basis and not as an input to team management.

The development of practice-area expertise was originally intended to ensure that UNDP had substantive policy capacity in the thematic areas where demand is greatest. Practice areas aligned with the demands identified in the MYFF 2000-2003 were launched in 2002.³⁴

33 It is important to note that these are self-selected results.

34 Executive Board decision 2003/8.

2.2.5 MONITORING FOR RESULTS

Monitoring is the conduit by which information about results is fed back to management. During the evaluation period, there was a significant expansion in the number of tools that report on performance at country level. In fact, the focus of monitoring was primarily for an external audience.

At headquarters, strategic results frameworks assist managers to judge whether the overall results of UNDP assistance worldwide meet the goals, principles and standards set out in the Mission Statement, Business Plans and Executive Board decisions as well as in operational and thematic policies. As such, they are intended to improve UNDP's substantive accountability to national stakeholders and the Executive Board and, for the first time, lay the

basis for a funding strategy to support approved programmes based on results that are clearly identified and monitored."³⁵

The first clear directive about monitoring under results-based management was given in 2002. Corporate guidance and prescriptions on M&E systems were significantly revised to enhance their results orientation. These changes included:

- Removal of many of the previous mandatory M&E requirements at the project level, shifting attention to programme outcomes
- Publication of the Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (commonly referred to as the Yellow Book)

Table 4 shows the planned shift of emphasis this new policy brought.

| Table 4. Key features in implementation versus outcome monitoring ³⁶ | | |
|--|---|--|
| Elements of Implementation Monitoring (Traditionally used for projects) | | Elements of Outcome Monitoring (Used for a range of interventions and strategies) |
| Description of the problem or situation before the intervention | ➔ | Baseline data to describe the problem or situation before the intervention |
| Benchmarks for activities and immediate outputs | ➔ | Indicators for outcomes |
| Data collection on inputs, activities and immediate outputs | ➔ | Data collection on outputs and how/whether they contribute towards achievement of outcomes More focus on perceptions of change among stakeholders and more focus on 'soft' assistance |
| Systematic reporting on provision of inputs, etc. | ➔ | Systematic reporting with more qualitative and quantitative information on the progress of outcomes |
| Directly linked to a discrete intervention (or series of interventions) | ➔ | Done in conjunction with strategic partners |
| Designed to provide information on administrative, implementation and management issues as opposed to broader development effectiveness issues | ➔ | Captures information on success or failure of UNDP partnership strategy in achieving desired outcomes |

35 UNDP, 'RBM in UNDP: Overview and General Principles', 2000, p 7.

36 UNDP, 'Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results', 2002, p 11.

The changes summarized in Table 4 were pre-empted by the ROAR, which was introduced in 2000. The subsequent M&E policy revision in 2002 was a radical but belated attempt to cater to the ROAR as the primary country office reporting tool for results and ameliorate rising concerns about the apparent expansion of reports and systems in country offices. Furthermore, other changes were taking place in the architecture of planning and reporting systems that were driven as much by UN reform as by UNDP's approach to results. Annex 5 Table 2 brings together the full range of planning and reporting tools currently in use.

2.2.6 ADJUSTMENT AND LEARNING

Within the logic of programme management, there are two main occasions when the country office would take a structured approach to adjustment of the programme. The first would be during the development of the CPD, which includes development of the strategic results framework covering the forthcoming programming period. Inclusion of the strategic results framework in the new CPD is a direct response to the introduction of results-based management. The second is during the annual review process for the outcomes, which is a review process directly introduced in response to the introduction of results-based management.

The greatest change in approaches to learning derived from introducing results-based management was the move from M&E mainly at the level of the project to M&E at the level of the outcome. This shift is neatly encapsulated in the following quote from the UNDP's Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators:

“An outcome evaluation aims to improve understanding of the outcome itself—its status and the factors that influence or contribute to its change. It does not look at the process of inputs, activities and other bureaucratic efforts but shifts

attention to the substantive development results (outputs and outcomes) that they are aimed at affecting. It also provides real-time answers about the outcome rather than waiting until a project is completed and the outputs produced to ask questions. These answers may be part of a ‘questioning continuum’.”³⁷

The institution of the UNDP ‘practices’ enable the organization to provide substantive support to programme countries. The objective is to encourage an internal culture of knowledge sharing and substantive skills development, capitalizing on the experience inherent in its network. As UNDP increasingly oriented itself towards policy advisory services and capacity development, it recognized the need to strengthen its substantive knowledge base in its key practice areas. Key initiatives were to:

- Establish practices in areas of need and enhance staff participation in the practices
- Strengthen and sustain policy and substantive support services
- Increase learning and training
- Upgrade ICT for knowledge management

2.2.7 ACCOUNTABILITY

Results-based management asks managers to focus on the outcomes to be achieved, track the outputs and sequence of outcomes being achieved and, based on a theory of change for the programme, adjust their activities and outputs to maximize the likelihood that the desired outcomes are realized. It recognizes that outcomes by definition are results over which managers do not have control.

The organizational structure of UNDP with corporate headquarters, regional bureaux and country offices suggests that management arrangements would reflect that structure in terms of control and accountability. In 1996, the

³⁷ UNDP, ‘Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators’, Monitoring and Evaluation Companion Series, #1, UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, NY, 2002.

Executive Board accepted the recommendations in the 1997 Annual Report of the Administrator,³⁸ including the shift to an ex-post accountability framework, in which country offices managed programmes, finances, administration and personnel. This was in turn based on the accountability review.³⁹ Regional bureaux were to assume a new role of holistic oversight of country office performance—assembling and maintaining a complete, up-to-date overview of UNDP operations and providing corporate management with consolidated monitoring reports and monitoring country office compliance with defined indicators of management performance, including delivery, resource mobilization and the Resident Coordinator function.

In 2007, UNDP implemented a new Accountability Framework as an integral part of its Strategic Plan. The Framework addresses accountability at the organizational level, manager’s level and individual level. The roll-out of the Accountability Framework provides an opportunity to support a stronger results-based management focus in UNDP by moving accountability beyond process and outputs.

2.2.8 GUIDANCE AND CAPACITY BUILDING FOR RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT

A range of guidance has been issued to support implementation of the various components of the results-based management system.

- Initial guidance issued in 2000 included:
 - Results-based management in UNDP: Overview and General Principles

- Results-based management in UNDP: Technical Note
- Results-based management in UNDP: Selecting Indicators
- The Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (2002)
- Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators (2002)
- UNDP’s Programme Management Guide, which has now been superseded with the new Results Management Guidance (2006). On-line training on results-based management has been available since 2006 but is not yet a mandatory and integral part of the orientation programme of new or incumbent staff.
- Guidance issued on an annual basis on how to enter data into the computerized reporting system for the ROARs. Such guidance often included rules on definition of outcomes, etc. and tended to act to reinforce how the system was supposed to operate.
- Access to technical advice from the corporate level through Sub-regional Facilities (SURFs), now called Regional Support Centres (RSCs).
- A course called Managing for Development Results run by the Virtual Development Academy.

The practice has been for UNDP to run workshops to assist in the introduction of new tools. Thereafter, the practice networks support further implementation.

38 ‘Annual Report of the Administrator (1997)’, DP/1997/16/Add.7

39 ‘Successor Programming Arrangements, Report of the Administrator (1995)’ Annual Session of the Executive Board, 5-16 June, New York, DP/1995/32.

Key points

- The tools and systems for results-based management evolved without a comprehensive design, creating a 10-year period of rolling innovation, redesign and change.
- The primary purpose of strategic objectives has been to help focus the programme, whilst also improving communication with external stakeholders.
- Alignment of programmes to strategic goals was promoted by a shift of results focus from outputs to outcomes. In parallel, the balanced scorecard was a response to the Administrator's Business Plans to change the culture of the organization and report against a broad range of physical and financial indicators of operational change.
- Very little flexibility was given in core financial resources to manage for results.
- Greater flexibility and closer linkages to results were created through scope to change country office organizational structures, the adoption of the RCA, and development of practice areas to foster thematic skills.
- Developments in reporting were led by the ROAR, but monitoring lagged behind in terms of policy and tools to help monitor progress towards country outcomes.
- Adjustment of programmes was expected to take place mainly through annual and country programme cycles. No specific provisions were made for more frequent interventions.
- Links to learning were supposed to occur through the shift from project to programme outcome evaluations and interactions with the practice areas and networks.
- An accountability framework is under development with provisions for individual, managerial and organizational accountability.