

Annex 2

Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the 2006-2009 MTSP

The Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (IMEF) focuses on information needs required to manage the MTSP and determine its overall success. Such frameworks are proven tools for prioritizing and collecting information related to learning, management and accountability requirements. The need for a coherent overall approach to M&E reflects the complexity and integrated nature of the MTSP and the accountability expectations of stakeholders. The IMEF includes research in recognition of its important role in learning, programme development and advocacy.

Relationship to Other Sections of the MTSP

Other sections of the MTSP address related M&E and research themes in far more detail than is captured in this Annex. In particular:

- Many Focus Areas have specific emphases on research and learning related to their theme; Focus Area 5 is especially rich in the areas of monitoring and social policy research
- The “Results-Based Management, Knowledge Management, and Evaluation” cross-cutting strategies address management roles and results-based targets for the Evaluation function.

IMEF Components

1. *Measuring Key Results Area Achievements.* The organizational targets of the Key Results Areas must be measured; indicators are presented in the Results Matrices, and whenever possible, will measure impact on children and their families using MDG indicators and other globally collected data that is expected to be available. Since much of this data will be available at given intervals, some elements of this reporting to stakeholders will occur at the mid-term stage and end of the MTSP period, or when feasible, on an annual basis. (See Results Matrices, Annex I).

2. *Monitoring Programme Progress.* The Executive Director’s Annual Report (EDAR) will continue to be the main report to the Executive Board on MTSP progress, focusing on the targets and interventions listed in the Matrices. Both financial information and qualitative and quantitative indicators are under development, and will be finalized as part of the Operational Guidance notes for each Focus Area. This information will be collected principally through UNICEF field reports and will be reported annually.

3. *Evaluation, Global Monitoring, and Research Priorities.* In early 2005 an IMEF development exercise was conducted to identify global priorities. Regional-level priorities are being developed by each Regional Office. The range of country-level M&E and Research efforts will continue to be presented through evaluations at the Country Programme level. Country-level evaluation and research efforts will be examined during evaluations of global priorities. (See box below for indicative selection of global priorities).

4. *Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)*. KPIs have been developed for organizational performance areas and related cross-cutting strategies to measure the strength of underlying systems and human capacities. For each KPI, baseline and organizational targets will be set and progress towards achievement will be monitored. Results will be available annually, or in some cases more frequently (see below for KPIs).

Management

All IMEF components will be implemented by the MTSP, starting in January 2006. Annual IMEF updates will be presented to the Executive Board and other stakeholders, both within the EDAR and through regional presentations.

The IMEF will be jointly managed by members of UNICEF's Programme, including the evaluation, strategic information and strategic planning functions, and the Innocenti Research Centre. In addition to ensuring plan fulfillment, managers will make adjustments in the priorities as conditions evolve and reviews are conducted of the M&E and research functions.

Joint evaluations with partners and using independent external consultants will be employed to ensure the objectivity of major evaluations.

Global Monitoring, Evaluation and Research

IMEF CATEGORY	Scope or Time Frame	
Global reporting or monitoring efforts: Special or recurrent efforts requiring major resources and that impact on policies of UNICEF, states parties, or other development partners.	<i>Support to states parties or multi-lateral reports</i>	<i>UNICEF-led data collection or review efforts</i>
	1. MDG Reports (periodic) 2. CRC Reports (periodic) 3. Education for All monitoring (periodic) 4. HIV-AIDS UNGASS Report (annual) 5. ECOSOC resolution on gender mainstreaming (2006-07)	1. Multi-Indicator Cluster Surveys (estimated 75 over MTSP time period) 2. Mid-term review of the World Fit for Children global commitments (2006) 3. Mid-Term-Review of the MTSP (2008)
Programmatic evaluations : To determine if a programming strategy central to MTSP success has an evidence basis of impact or is being implemented with maximum effectiveness; using well-developed examples of UNICEF programming in a range of countries	<i>2006-07</i>	<i>2008-09</i>
	1. Evaluate UNICEF's contribution to improving Infant and Young Child feeding, including the Baby-Friendly Hospital Initiative (FA 1) 2. Quality assessment of community early childhood dev. centers (FA 1) 3. Impact of child-friendly schools (FA2) 4. Life skills education and HIV/AIDS transmission (FA 3) 5. Impact of psychosocial support in emergencies programming (FA 4) 6. Impact of children's participation on UNICEF policies/programs (FA 5)	1. Vitamin A supplementation impact (FA-1) 2. UNICEF's contribution to newborn outcomes (FA 1) 3. Education response in emergencies and transition (FA 2) 4. Sustainability of child marriage and female genital cutting interventions (FA 4) 5. UNICEF advocacy impacts on legislative reform/child-friendly budgeting (FA 5)
Research themes: Knowledge-building	1. Parenting program effects (FA 1) 2. Impact and systemic requirements of	1. Preventing young child injuries (FA 1)

<p>efforts important for developing effective future strategies; will include a rigorous effort to assess lessons learned by other partners</p>	<p>of school fees abolition (FA 2) 3. Impact of suppressive ARVs on breastfeeding (FA 3) 4. How Child Protection is reflected in national development plans (FA 4) 5. Methods to measure advocacy impact (FA 5)</p>	<p>2. Educational delivery models for the hard-to-reach (FA 2) 3. ARV impact on perceived risk to HIV among adolescents(FA 3) 4. National budget impacts of child protection inaction (FA 4) 5. Adolescent participation in crisis settings (FA 5)</p>
<p>Corporate-level topical or operational effectiveness evaluations : To determine if a cross-cutting programming theme is successful or if the organization is internally efficient; requires well-developed set of examples from lengthy corporate engagement</p>	<p>1. UNICEF participation in budget processes for children (SWAPS, PRS) 2. Effectiveness of child-to-child programs 3. Corporate performance in gender mainstreaming 4. Corporate performance in humanitarian response 5. UNICEF human resource management 6. The UNICEF supply function 7. UNICEF program management guidelines/procedures/systems</p>	<p>1. Impact of UNICEF Tsunami recovery programming. 2. UNICEF and joint programming (incl. within the UN reform context) 3. Efficiency in going to scale from pilot interventions 4. Linking social policy/support systems to family empowerment 5. UNICEF's management information systems. 6. Decentralization and the regional office role in UNICEF. 7. UNICEF and partnerships to leverage resources for children</p>

MTSP 2006-2009 Key Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicator(s) – KPIs	Baseline or Plan/date for setting value	Target (2009 unless stated)
Human Resources		
Maximum % of funded IP posts vacant at any time in the year	March 2005: 11%	Max. 7% at any time
% of recruitment (closing date to offer letter) for regular and emergency posts completed in under 30, 31-60, 60-90, over 90 days	2004 average (days): a. regular: 92 b. emergency: 78	a. regular posts <90 days: 100% b. emergency: TBD
% staff indicating a sense of well-being in different functional areas	Survey due 2006	TBD (2008)
% PERs signed by all 3 parties by February of the following year	2003 (2002 PERs): 59%	100%
% total staff costs spent on learning and staff development	2004: 1.4%	2007: 2% ; 2009: 3%
% staff who spent more than 10 working days on planned learning	36% in 2004	50%
Average composite score and range of scores on 6 principles of UN Organisational Learning Framework	2004: 5.2 out of 10 Range from 4.8 to 6.1	Avg. score of 6.5 None <5.5
Number of staff successfully completing Basic, Programme Excellence and the Leadership & Management Learning Programmes	Baselines TBD 2006	Basic LP 400/yr; Prog. Exc. 300/yr; Mgt 150/yr
Finance		
Management/administration/programme support costs: total RR and OR	2004: 19.7%	18.7% from 2007
% of allocated RR for programme expended at end of year	2004: 91%	2009: 95%
% outstanding cash assistance to national partners above nine months	2004: 8%	2009: 5%
Information Technology		
# IT-related business process improvements initiated	2004:	
# business process improvements implemented	2004:	
Supply		
% of programme countries in which UNICEF worked with government to produce a plan to address shortages of essential commodities	0%	75% of LDCs
\$ value of procurement services at country level	2004: \$235m globally	2009: \$500m
UNICEF HQ Supply achievement of ISO9000 in contracting and quality assurance services	Non-existent	By end 2007
% orders delivered at port of entry at or within agreed target arrival dates	To be set 2006	80%
% rapid response orders shipped within 48 hours of sales order release	To be set 2006	80%
Programme		
% field offices with annually updated Emergency Prep & Response Plan	2004: 81%	2009: 100%
% of donor reports submitted on time	2004: 62% (est.)	2007: > 80%
% new CP documents referring to CRC and/or CEDAW committee observations	2004: 77%	2009: 100%
Joint programmes (to be developed)		
Policy and Procedure Manual with annually updated developments in UN reform, joint programming and emergency preparedness/response	2005: 100%	Annual: 100%
% CP documents submitted to the Executive Board independently assessed as adequate or better against criteria for "SMART" results	Baseline: 2006	2007 90% 2009 100%
Programme Funding		
Per capita contribution to UNICEF compared with GNI per capita and level of RR	Ref: 2004 Annual Report	Ref: 2009 Annual Report
Income (US\$m):	2004:	2009: TBD
RR	791	933
ORR	796	804
ORE	391	523
RR: OR	2004: 40:60	2009: TBD
% CAP/Flash/HAR funded against appeal amounts	2004: 65%	2009: 65%
% of use of standard agreements	2004: 18 standard agreements for 24 major donors	2009: Use of standard agreements for all major and new donors
% of total income that is thematic funding	2004: 8%	2009: 15%
Audit and Evaluation		
% of audit recommendations closed by 1 st July of following year	1 July 2004: 82%	1 July 2009: 90%

Key Performance Indicator(s) – KPIs	Baseline or Plan/date for setting value	Target (2009 unless stated)
% of evaluations with a formal management response	To be established 2006	2009 75%
Evaluations rated as satisfactory or better based on UN standards	2004: 67%	2009: 80%

Key to Acronyms: IP – International Professional; TBD – to be discussed ; PER - Performance Evaluation Review;