



United Nations Population Fund

Delivering a world where every pregnancy is wanted, every childbirth is safe and every young person's potential is fulfilled.

OFFICE OF AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION SERVICES

FOLLOW-UP REVIEW

Report N° OED 113, dated 8 February 2013

**AUDIT OF THE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL PROGRAMME
(GRP)**

FINAL REPORT

N° OED-114

17 September 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
I. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	5
II. BACKGROUND	7
A. PROGRAMME DESIGN	9
<i>Overall Progress</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Improvements noted</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Areas for further improvement identified</i>	<i>10</i>
B. PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT	13
<i>Overall Progress</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Improvements noted</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Areas for further improvement identified</i>	<i>14</i>
C. PROGRAMME EXECUTION	15
<i>Overall Progress</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Improvements noted</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Areas for further improvement identified</i>	<i>18</i>
D. MONITORING AND REPORTING	20
<i>Overall Progress</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Improvements noted</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Areas for further improvement identified</i>	<i>20</i>
ANNEX 1 – FOLLOW-UP REVIEW RATING CRITERIA	22
ANNEX 2 – LESSONS LEARNED, GRP AUDIT REPORT DATED 8 FEBRUARY 2013	23
ANNEX 3 – INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED	25
ANNEX 4 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	26
ANNEX 5 – GLOSSARY	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Office of Audit and Investigation Services (OAIS) of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) performed a follow-up review of the degree to which issues raised in its report number OED 113 on the audit of the Global and Regional Programme 2008-2011 (GRP), dated 8 February 2013 (referred to later as the GRP audit), had been addressed by Management in the design and first year of implementation of the Global and Regional Interventions 2014-2017 (GRI), the GRP's successor.

Background

2. In 2011, the then Division for Oversight Services engaged KPMG LLP (KPMG) to conduct an audit of the GRP (the GRP audit). The audit covered GRP activities in the period from 1 January 2008 to 15 July 2011, focusing on the areas of: (i) programme design; (ii) programme governance and management; and (iii) programme execution (including programme results; risk management, control and compliance; operations; and monitoring and reporting).

3. The GRP audit assessed the performance of the GRP in the above areas as '*Unsatisfactory*', meaning that the related processes were either not established or not functioning well, but issues were identified by the audit that needed to be addressed as a matter of priority in order not to compromise the achievement of the objectives of the GRP. The audit report, issued on 8 February 2013, included one strategic recommendation to be implemented by UNFPA Management to address the issues raised by the audit, giving consideration to 21 related lessons learned also identified in the report.

4. Implementation of the GRP concluded in 2013. The GRI, approved by the Executive Board in September 2013, with estimated regular resources² of USD 275 million for the four-year period, were designed as the GRP's successor, as part of the new UNFPA Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (Strategic Plan).

Methodology and scope

5. The follow-up review was conducted in accordance with the relevant *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

6. The follow-up review of the status of implementation of the recommendation included in the GRP audit report is not an audit of the GRI and therefore was neither designed to provide, nor does it provide, an opinion on the governance, risk management and internal controls in place over the GRI.

7. The scope of the follow-up review was limited to reviewing and analyzing, on a test basis, information obtained through interviews, review of programme documents and financial data, with the sole objective of assessing the extent to which UNFPA made progress, in the design and first year of implementation of the GRI, in addressing the issues identified by the GRP audit, in the areas of GRI design, governance and management, execution, as well as monitoring and reporting.

Results of the follow-up review

8. The follow-up review indicates that UNFPA made progress in addressing the issues identified by the GRP audit in the design and first year of implementation of the GRI. Progress assessed for each area within the scope of the review is summarized in the following table.

¹ Approved by the Executive Board in June 2008 and subsequently extended through 31 December 2013, in line with the extension of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011

² Per the UNFPA Financial Regulations and Rules, regular resources are also referred to as 'un-earmarked', 'unrestricted' or 'core' resources; conversely, other resources are also referred to as 'earmarked', 'restricted' or 'non-core' (such as the Thematic Trust Funds)

Table 1 -

Summary of progress in addressing GRP issues in the design and first year of GRI implementation

Area	Significant progress achieved	Progress achieved	Limited progress achieved	No progress achieved
A. Programme design	✓			
B. Programme governance and management			✓	
C. Programme execution		✓		
D. Programme monitoring and reporting		✓		

Note: rating definitions are included in Annex 1 to this report.

Key findings of the follow-up review

9. UNFPA Management made significant efforts to address the issues identified by the GRP audit in the design and first year of implementation of the GRI.

10. There is evidence of significant progress with respect to programme design. Progress was also noted in the areas of programme execution and programme monitoring and reporting, and as regards programme governance and management, in a more limited way. This reflects Management’s focused efforts on enhancing programme design, as well as the progress in the implementation of key corporate initiatives such as the Strategic Information System and the Global Programming System which were initiated towards the end of 2014 and will provide the foundation for more effective execution, monitoring and reporting on the GRI. Management also made progress in “mainstreaming” the GRI within the Organization, placing these interventions under the umbrella of its overall policies and procedures, internal control framework and key management systems.

11. Progress achieved, as well as areas for improvement noted, are summarized in the following table:

Table 2 - Summary of progress and areas for improvement

Area	Overall progress	Areas for improvement
Programme design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is clearer alignment of the GRI to the UNFPA Strategic Plan ▪ The Programme Review Committee provided a clear quality assurance and review process for GRI action plans and Results and Resources Frameworks ▪ The intended recipients of, and needs for, capacity building are better defined ▪ Baselines and targets were established across all interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some indicators should be enhanced to better measure incremental results to be achieved by the GRI ▪ GRI indicators could be “SMART-er”³ ▪ Where supplementary non-core resources may be required to achieve GRI outputs, this need should be explicitly identified and quantified ▪ Target setting could be improved to ensure maximum benefits are realized

³ Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant and Time-bound

Area	Overall progress	Areas for improvement
Programme governance and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New processes help provide an improved framework for GRI governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decision-making and general oversight /supervision of the GRI remains an area for improvement ▪ The GRI could benefit from an overall coordination and management mechanism
Programme execution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GRI resource allocations are aligned to the GRI strategic framework ▪ There was progress in removing management costs from the GRI ▪ There is potential to use multi-year work-plans to enhance GRI implementation ▪ System improvements have potential to provide increased controls over GRI implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resource distribution for the Global Interventions should be better aligned to the achievement of GRI outcomes ▪ Workplans should be better aligned with the GRI action plans and their Results and Resources Frameworks; ▪ GRI programme management practices could be further improved
Programme monitoring and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A GRI reporting structure is in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting processes and quality should continue to be enhanced

12. It should be acknowledged that, at the time follow-up review work was performed, the GRI had been in place for just over one year. Management indicated that it plans to further refine over the course of the four-year GRI cycle the structures and processes put in place for the GRI, particularly with respect to governance and management as well as monitoring and reporting. Going forward, Management should further consider the opportunities for improvement identified in this report, a number of which relate to organization-wide improvement areas, not necessarily specific to GRI, to ensure that the issues identified by the GRP audit are fully addressed and/or mitigated in the GRI. Finally, Management must also remain vigilant over the full GRI period, 2014-2017, to help ensure that the progress achieved to-date is sustained and the GRI provides the intended contribution towards achieving the UNFPA results as per the Strategic Plan Integrated Results Framework.

Management response

13. Management acknowledges with thanks the follow-up review of the degree to which issues raised in report number OED 113 on the audit of the Global and Regional Programme 2008-2014 (GRP), dated 8 February 2013, have been addressed by Management in the design and first year of implementation of the Global and Regional Interventions 2014-2017 (GRI), the GRP’s successor.

14. Management notes with appreciation that this review has identified that significant progress has been made in the area of programme design. Management further notes that the Review has found that while good progress has been made in the fields of programme execution and programme monitoring, further action may enable even greater progress. On this basis, Management commits to undertake follow-up steps as per the details provided below in the management response. Management also takes note of the observation made on weaknesses in programme management and governance and more specifically management considers that:

⁴ Approved by the Executive Board in June 2008 and subsequently extended through 31 December 2013, in line with the extension of the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011

- a) The Review's findings and suggestions related to the *design* of the GRI are well founded. The key suggestions offered are to be addressed as part of the midterm review of UNFPA's strategic plan, which will take place in 2016. This midterm review will also seek to improve the quality of indicators and target setting. Management will also examine the feasibility of identifying and estimating any non-core resources required to achieve GRI results.
- b) A majority of findings and suggestions related to the GRI's *execution* (including GRI monitoring and reporting) are also well founded, and Management commits to addressing these immediately. Actions to be taken include better alignment of work plans with action plans, and improved GRI programme management practices. Management also takes note of the perceived lack of alignment between resource distribution for global Interventions and the achievement of GRI outcomes, but stresses that utilization is in line with the original estimates in the strategic framework.
- c) In regard to the *governance and management* of the GRI, Management agrees with the recommendation made that the GRI would benefit from establishing an overall coordination and management mechanism. Further, it agrees that there is a need to further develop reporting on the GRI to the Executive Committee. The implementation thereof will be further examined in depth.
- d) Management further agrees that - as is recognized in the Review's findings - a number of issues identified by the Review have implications beyond the GRI itself. Management will examine these matters closely with a view to their resolution, noting that more comprehensive solutions require concerted action by several of the organization's implementing units.

15. The internal audit team would like to thank the management and staff of the different Headquarters units and the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office who were involved in this exercise, for their cooperation and assistance throughout the follow-up review.

I. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

16. The GRP follow-up review assessed the degree to which issues raised in the report on the GRP audit dated 8 February 2013 had been addressed by Management in the design and first year of implementation of the GRI.

17. The follow-up review focused on the extent to which Management addressed the key issues raised in the GRP audit report in the areas of GRI design, governance and management, execution, and monitoring and reporting. The follow-up review also assessed the extent to which the 21 lessons learned reflected in the GRP audit report were taken into account for GRI design and implementation purposes. It should be noted that a significant number of organizational and operational improvements have taken place at UNFPA since the GRP audit was performed. Therefore, certain aspects of the lessons learned reflected in the GRP audit report may no longer be directly relevant to the GRI; for this reason, the follow-up review did not attempt to map progress for each lesson learned, focussing instead on progress achieved in the key areas covered by the GRP audit.

18. The scope of the follow up review covered the following interventions:

- a) Global Interventions: *Technical and Programme Divisions*; and
- b) Regional Interventions: *Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) Region*.

19. Work performed as regards the implementation in 2014 of the action plans for the above interventions focused on the following programme outcomes, which were judgementally selected based on materiality considerations:

- a) Outcome 1: *Increased availability and use of integrated sexual and reproductive health services (including family planning, maternal health and HIV) that are gender-responsive and meet human rights standards for quality of care and equity in access*; and
- b) Outcome 3: *Advanced gender equality, women's and girls' empowerment, and reproductive rights, including for the most vulnerable and marginalized women, adolescents and youth*.

20. The follow-up review consisted of the following activities:

- a) Interviews with key personnel involved in the conceptualization, design and planning of the GRI (a list of interviews is provided in *Annex 3*);
- b) Review of documentation related to GRI design, governance, and monitoring and reporting;
- c) Review of programme financial data and documentation related to the first year of implementation of the GRI (a list of documentation reviewed is provided in *Annex 4*);
- d) Walk-through of the Global Programming System (GPS) used to support GRI annual planning processes as from 2015; and
- e) Walk-through of the Strategic Information System (SIS) which will be used to support GRI monitoring and reporting as from 2015.⁵

21. The follow-up work was conducted at the UNFPA Headquarters in New York, United States, and the ESA Regional Office located in Johannesburg, South Africa. The follow-up review team comprised senior professionals from KPMG who had participated in the GRP audit together with OAIS staff. Field work performed as regards the ESA regional intervention was completed between 3 and 21 November 2014, concurrently with a planned audit of the ESA Regional Office. The review at Headquarters started on 25 March 2015, with field work taking place through 10 April 2015. The findings and recommendations resulting from the review were discussed with Management at the time of completion of field work, and subsequently at meetings with Headquarters Management held on 27 and 28 July 2015, based on

⁵ GRI is not yet fully integrated into the SIS, which is expected to happen later in 2015

a preliminary draft follow-up review report. The final draft report was submitted to Management on 17 August 2015, and a management response was received on 9 September 2015. The management response is provided in the Executive Summary of this report.

II. BACKGROUND

22. In 2011, the then Division for Oversight Services engaged KPMG to conduct an audit of UNFPA's GRP (the GRP audit). The audit report was issued on 8 February 2013.

23. The GRP audit covered GRP activities in the period from 1 January 2008 to 15 July 2011, focusing on the areas of: (i) programme design; (ii) programme governance and management; and (iii) programme execution (including programme results; risk management, control and compliance; operations; and monitoring and reporting).

24. The GRP audit assessed the performance of the GRP in the above areas as '*Unsatisfactory*', meaning that the related processes were either not established or not functioning well, and issues were identified by the audit that needed to be addressed as a matter of priority in order not to compromise the achievement of the objectives of the GRP.⁶

25. The GRP audit report included the following strategic recommendation addressed to UNFPA Management:

"Management should consider the most appropriate model for the GRP or any other programme that may replace it beyond 2013 to help UNFPA achieve the goals of its strategic plan, ensuring that the issues identified by the audit related to programme design, programme governance and management, and programme execution are addressed in an effective and sustainable manner."

26. The recommendation was accompanied by 21 lessons learned, across the main areas covered by the audit, to be considered by UNFPA for the management and execution of the GRP or any successor mechanism, the full list of which is provided in *Annex 2*.

27. Implementation of the GRP was concluded in 2013. The GRI was approved by the Executive Board in September 2013 as the successor to the GRP, while the GRI strategic framework, including the Results and Resources Frameworks (RRFs), was approved by the Executive Board in June 2014.

28. The GRI consist of eight global and six regional components. Each component is defined by a four year action plan (2014-2017) which describes the set of interventions to achieve the priorities of the concerned Headquarters units or regions. The interventions were developed to be the catalyst in the provision of integrated technical, programmatic and management support at global and regional levels, and to enable countries to achieve their national development priorities. The design of the GRI was informed by: (i) lessons learned throughout the GRP experience, including management improvements introduced during the life cycle of the programme; and (ii) the findings of the GRP audit.⁷

29. The GRI are intended to complement in-country interventions and are essential for cohesion across programmes at different levels. In particular, these interventions are intended to:

- a) Promote international norms and standards;
- b) Provide state of the art policy advice and technical advisory services to governments and intergovernmental processes;
- c) Ensure integrated, innovative and often cross regional programming solutions, including for humanitarian situations and other matters that transcend national boundaries; and
- d) Foster cost effectiveness in programmatic support.⁸

⁶ The GRP audit report acknowledged that since October 2011, and independent of the audit, UNFPA had commenced the implementation of a number of initiatives intended to address observations identified in the audit. However, due to the period covered by the audit and the timing of the audit fieldwork, it was not possible to consider those initiatives, and the resulting impact on the GRP, at the time of the audit report.

⁷ DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 3

⁸ DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 9

30. Since 2011, Management has developed and begun to implement a number of significant changes to the Organization, from development of the new Strategic Plan 2014-2017 to operational changes, such as integrated budgeting and clarification/revision of cost categorization; multi-year work planning; and new operational systems, such as the GPS and the SIS, all of which, while not specific to the GRI, have a significant impact on the design, execution, monitoring and reporting of the GRI.

III. DETAILED FINDINGS

A. PROGRAMME DESIGN

SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS ACHIEVED

31. Key issues identified by the GRP audit in this area were:
- a) Weak linkages between the UNFPA Strategic Plan 2008-2011, the GRP document submitted to the Executive Board, and the GRP strategies, outcomes, activities and indicators;
 - b) Lack of precision with respect to capacity development interventions, including needs assessment, strategy and measurement metrics; and
 - c) Delays in establishing baselines and targets.
32. As part of its follow-up review work in this area, the internal audit team placed special focus on understanding how lessons learned from the GRP audit were taken into account for purposes of GRI design, giving consideration to the following documents: (i) UNFPA Strategic Plan 2014-2017; (ii) GRI strategic framework and corresponding RRFs; (iii) global and regional intervention action plans; and (iv) the 2014 work-plans for the GRI outcomes (outcomes 1 and 3) selected for testing. The review focused on assessing:
- a) Whether there were clear linkages from the Strategic Plan to the GRI strategic framework, GRI action plans and workplans;
 - b) Whether capacity development interventions were clearly defined, i.e., established who the intended beneficiaries were, how capacity needs were identified and how increased capacity would be measured; and
 - c) Whether baselines and targets were in place, and the processes and data used to establish and verify these.

Overall Progress

33. Based on the work performed, the follow-up review found that there has been significant progress in addressing the issues identified by the GRP audit in the design of the GRI. Key highlights of improvements noted, as well as areas for further development identified, are presented below.

Improvements noted

There is clearer alignment of the GRI to the UNFPA Strategic Plan

34. The GRI uses the same results architecture as the UNFPA Strategic Plan, clearly demonstrating how the GRI is expected to contribute to achieving the Strategic Plan outcomes and outputs and ensuring consistency in UNFPA's strategic reporting framework. In order to reflect regional and global priorities as well as areas of expertise/capabilities, some interventions include additional outputs (and supporting indicators) to measure their specific focus and priority areas. These additional outputs are aligned to the Strategic Plan outcomes.

The Programme Review Committee provided a clear quality assurance and review process for GRI action plans

35. The GRI action plans and their corresponding RRFs were subject to a clear review process undertaken by the Programme Review Committee (PRC).

36. The PRC review process was implemented as from 2012 to ensure that country programme documents meet predefined quality criteria, including strategic alignment, results based management, financial resources and application of lessons learned.

37. The PRC process is well established and supported by guidance documents, scoring/review tools, orientation for reviewers and a methodology to allow resolution of conflicting review results. The process was tailored for its application to the GRI in 2013 and had a significant impact on the overall quality of GRI action plans, as well as contributing toward organizational knowledge sharing and alignment.

The intended recipients of, and needs for, capacity building are better defined

38. The GRI Strategic Framework clearly defines capacity building of UNFPA regional and country offices as a core strategy of the GRI. Under the GRP, capacity building at national level versus that of UNFPA offices was not distinct and therefore, related strategies were unclear.

39. The GRI defines capacity building as efforts to augment the capacity of UNFPA regional and country offices in specific areas, such as integrated sexual and reproductive health and family planning, so that they are better positioned to achieve their own programme outputs, such as building the capacity of implementing partners. This is one way in which the GRI intends to serve as a catalyst to regional and country programmes.⁹ Specific capacity building interventions and activities are defined by each intervention under their respective outputs, as they reflect the needs assessment of the region or global intervention focus area.

Baselines and targets were established across all interventions

40. Baselines and targets were established across all interventions for all indicators, and there was supporting evidence available for the sample of baselines selected for testing as part of the follow-up review. This represents a significant improvement in comparison to the GRP, for which baselines and/or targets were not established at the onset or during the course of the programme.

41. Further, targets were supported by estimates of resources required to achieve the incremental year-over-year change. Estimated resources were provided by each Headquarters unit and Regional Office, and aggregated in the RRFs of the GRI strategic framework.

Areas for further improvement identified

Some indicators should be enhanced to measure the incremental results to be achieved by the GRI

42. Almost half of the indicators used in the GRI are the same as those used in the Strategic Plan Integrated Results Framework (IRF) and may not be adequate enough to capture the incremental impact made by the GRI towards the achievement of the Strategic Plan results, over and above what is achieved through the country programmes.

43. As an example:

- a) The indicator, baseline and target for the Global Interventions Output 5 (*Increased national capacity to provide sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian settings*) are the same as in the IRF:
 - ***Indicator:*** *Number of countries that have capacity to implement MISP¹⁰ at the onset of a crisis*
 - ***Baseline:*** *30*
 - ***Target:*** *34 (2014); 41(2015); 48 (2016); and 51(2017)*

⁹ The global intervention intends to provide catalytic support to regional and country programmes; the regional interventions intend to provide catalytic support to country programmes

¹⁰ MISP: Minimum Initial Service Package

- b) Similarly, the indicator, baseline and target for the ESA Regional Interventions Output 1 (*Increased national capacity to deliver integrated sexual and reproductive health services*) are also the same as in the IRF:
- *Indicator: Number of ESA countries that have a costed integrated national sexual and reproductive health action plan*
 - *Baseline: 15*
 - *Target: 16 (2014); 18 (2015); 20 (2016); and 21(2017)*

44. The above indicators do not allow measuring the incremental support provided by the respective global or regional intervention towards achieving the intended results, i.e., it is unclear whether these results would be achieved through planned country programme strategies and activities, independent of the GRI.

45. Examples of GRI indicators that do measure the incremental support provided by the GRI include:

- a) *Global Interventions indicator for Output 1 (Increased national capacity to deliver integrated sexual and reproductive health services):*
- *Indicator: Number of countries or regional offices where tools and guidance notes are rolled out....to support regional and country programmes for the provision of integrated SRH services and for evidence based policy dialogue*
 - *Baseline: 6*
 - *Target: 5 (2014); 6 (2015); 6 (2016); and 7(2017)*
- b) *Global Interventions indicator for Output 2 (Increased national capacity to strengthen enabling environments, increase demand for and supply of modern contraceptives and improve family planning services that are free of coercion, discrimination and violence):*
- *Indicator: Number of countries, regional offices and partners oriented on the use of programmatic tools developed (...) to support the implementation of the family planning strategy*
 - *Baseline: 37*
 - *Target: 22 (2014); 21 (2015); 21 (2016); and 21(2017)*

GRI indicators should be “SMART-er”¹¹

46. Approximately a third of the indicators¹² tested as part of the sample selected for the follow-up review were insufficiently “SMART”, as they did not clearly define the intended result.

47. As an example, while the indicators referred to in paragraph 45 above measure incremental GRI contributions towards achieving Strategic Plan results, they do not clearly define the GRI result to be achieved, i.e. what is defined as ‘rolled out’ or ‘oriented’, how this would be consistently measured across different offices and partners, and what would constitute relevance of tools to the subject matter (e.g., integrated sexual and reproductive health and family planning).

48. This appears to be particularly prevalent for indicators which measure capacity development. While metadata is a useful tool for helping ensure quality reporting, it is only available for the Strategic Plan IRF indicators, but not for GRI-specific indicators.

¹¹ Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Relevant and Time-bound

¹² The sample tested included the indicators for all outputs under Strategic Plan Outcomes 1 and 3 and Operational Efficiency and Effectiveness for the Technical Division, Programme Division, and IERD

Any supplementary non-core resources that may be required to achieve GRI outputs should be explicitly identified and estimated

49. The achievement of certain GRI outputs may rely on other resources, primarily from thematic trust funds, additional to the allocation of regular resources approved by the Executive Board.

50. As an example, the follow-up review noted that, while the ESA Regional Interventions RRF indicated GRI (regular) resources amounting to USD 45,000 to achieve planned 2014 results for its Output 2 (*Increased national capacity to improve family planning services*), the budget reflected in the related 2014 ESA workplan totalled USD 861,450, with the difference corresponding primarily to thematic trust fund resources required to achieve the output.

51. Similarly, the Technical Division Global Interventions RRF allocated core resources amounting to USD 254,000 to achieve planned 2014 results for its Output 2. However, the corresponding 2014 workplan for this output provided for an additional USD 1,815,000 of non-core resources, indicating that the GRI output could not be achieved through GRI (regular) resources alone.

52. A detailed estimation of the attribution of results by funding source is not necessary, or even feasible, as multiple programmes and mechanisms, including the GRI and the different thematic trust funds, are designed to contribute to the same Strategic Plan results, and there are synergies among them. However, these synergies should be made explicit in planning and reporting documents and there should be more clarity on the overall level of financial resources required to achieve GRI outputs, including the non-core funding sources -where they are in addition to GRI core resources- that would contribute to the achievement of such outputs. Alternatively, Management should consider removing from the scope of the GRI, any outputs for which achievement may be contingent upon a larger proportion of non-core funding compared to the allocated regular resources.

Target setting could be improved to ensure maximum benefits are realized

53. A large number of GRI output targets were exceeded in 2014, often significantly, and/or were achieved part-way through the year when implementation rates reflected low budget utilization. For example, the 2014 second quarter GRI monitoring and reporting presentation (September 2014) to the Executive Committee (EC) indicated that 42 per cent of global and 46 per cent of regional interventions were above target whereas the overall implementation rate was approximately 41 per cent across the GRI.

54. There may be different root causes which explain this situation, of which Management is clearly aware, including inaccurate baselines, overly-cautious target setting, misalignment of indicators, synergies with other programmes and mechanisms that contribute to the same results, as well as lack of quantification of other resources contributing to the achievement of outputs. It is not unusual to observe this type of situation arise in the first year of a large programme implementation. Good programme management practices advocate that lessons learned from implementation in any given year be used to refine and adjust planning and implementation for subsequent years, in order that programmes maximize their intended benefits.

55. Management should ensure that targets for the four-year GRI cycle are sufficiently ambitious in order to maximize the impact of GRI resources. Issues and challenges related to target achievement and implementation rates were communicated to the EC in the 2014 second and third quarter GRI monitoring as well as reporting presentations (September and December 2014, respectively); however, no actions were evident as a result, such as modifications to 2015 targets, which in some cases are cumulative of 2014 results. While the planned GRI mid-term review is intended to help Management analyze progress and refine the GRI as necessary, the quarterly GRI results reporting process has already provided feedback which can help make adjustments to resources and targets and help ensure the impact of the GRI is maximized across the full four-year cycle.

B. PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT**LIMITED PROGRESS ACHIEVED**

56. Key issues identified by the GRP audit in this area were:
- a) Programme governance and management were not clearly delineated and separated;
 - b) Management accountability for the programme(s) was not clearly defined; and
 - c) Roles and responsibilities across Headquarters units and Regional Offices may not have been clear in relation to GRP implementation.
57. As part of its follow-up review work in this area, the internal audit team placed particular focus on accountability, roles and responsibilities, and processes which support programme oversight, considering: (i) feedback from Management interviews; (ii) presentations and reports on GRI provided to the EC; along with (iii) minutes of the corresponding EC meetings discussions and actions taken. Particular focus was put on:
- a) The extent to which there is clear delineation between GRI governance and management; and
 - b) Clarification of accountability, roles and responsibilities with respect to the GRI as a whole and each of its seven component interventions (the eight global and six regional interventions).

Overall Progress

58. Overall, based on the work performed, the follow-up review noted limited progress in addressing the issues identified in the GRP audit in this area. Key highlights of improvements noted as well as areas for further development identified are presented below.

Improvements noted***New processes help provide an improved framework for GRI governance***

59. Unlike the GRP, the GRI strategic framework describes the proposed accountability for the programme as follows:
- a) The UNFPA Executive Director is ultimately and directly accountable for approval of the plans and results of the GRI¹³; and
 - b) The EC, led by the Executive Director, is explicitly designated as the definitive decision making body. The EC makes decisions on resources, which cannot be allocated to GRI without a review of the proposal by the PRC¹⁴.
60. The EC, as governance body for the GRI, is informed by two new processes that were not in place for the GRP:
- a) The PRC process has been expanded to include review over the GRI. This provides quality assurance over the GRI design and planning phase and serves as an input to EC governance and decision making; and
 - b) The EC now receives quarterly monitoring and reporting presentations on GRI, unlike under the GRP, where there was no reporting on progress and performance to the EC.
61. In developing the GRI, Management sought to ensure that the GRI were “mainstreamed” within the Organization’s activities, placing them under the umbrella of UNFPA’s overall policies and procedures, internal control framework and key management systems. As an example, whereas the GRP was governed

¹³ Strategic framework for UNFPA Global and Regional interventions 2014/2017, DP/FPA/2014/8, P7, para.21

¹⁴ Ibid

by a set of separate GRP Guidelines, the GRI is governed by the corporate programme and operational guidelines included in UNFPA's Policies and Procedures Manual.

Areas for further improvement identified

The GRI would benefit from an overall GRI coordination and management mechanism/role

62. The GRI consists of 14 components, i.e. 8 global and 6 regional components, each containing a set of specific interventions related to the achievement of the Strategic Plan, managed by different Headquarters units and the Regional Offices, as appropriate.

63. Headquarters Division Directors are responsible for the global interventions managed by the units they lead, whereas Regional Directors are accountable for effective management of their respective regional interventions. Management of interventions includes, inter-alia, the following:

- a) Developing and managing adequate workplans to achieve the results foreseen by the action plans and their corresponding RRFs;
- b) Monitoring progress against targets and use of resources in accordance with the approved action plan and RRF;
- c) Identifying and escalating issues; and
- d) Making real time decisions as part of programme implementation in order to achieve the strategic objectives of the intervention.

64. There is, however, no designated or defined mechanism or role responsible for coordinating and managing the GRI as a whole. While the GRI was designed as a series of distinct interventions, there would be several benefits to establishing a central role or mechanism to ensure a more holistic and comprehensive management of the GRI. The responsibilities of such a role/mechanism would include, inter-alia, the following:

- a) Identifying areas of complementarity and synergies across interventions, which might better support sharing of best practices and reduce potential duplication of effort;
- b) Monitoring GRI implementation and utilization rates, as well as identifying areas of under-spend in one intervention which might be used to support and increase progress and results in other interventions;
- c) Monitoring implementation by outcome to help ensure that different interventions planned to support the same strategic goal indeed converge, i.e. improving the ability to manage by results, rather than by business unit; and
- d) Identifying and escalating issues and proposed actions to the EC for guidance, feedback and ultimate decision-making.

65. The EC decided to extend the scope of the Portfolio Review process to include the GRI. The latter process allows to monitor, through a set of performance indicators, the performance of country offices in implementing the programmes they are responsible for. Hence, further to "mainstreaming" the GRI into the Organization's activities, this decision will also help bring a more holistic and coordinated perspective, through improved analysis of GRI progress, enhanced risk identification and strengthened recommendations for action related to the GRI. This process will therefore complement and support the GRI programme coordination and management role/mechanism in fulfilling the responsibilities outlined above.

Decision-making and oversight of GRI remains an area for improvement

66. Despite the progress noted previously, decision-making and oversight over the GRI remains an area for improvement. Unlike the GRP, the EC now receives quarterly reports on: (i) GRI indicator results to-date; and (ii) GRI implementation rates. While issues have been raised in quarterly reporting presentations to the EC based on aggregate trends, there is neither documented evidence that decisions or corrective actions were proposed to the EC, nor that the EC made decision or provided guidance to the implementing units, as appropriate.

67. This may be due to a lack of clear distinction between the management and the overall oversight roles for the GRI. While many of the individuals on the EC are responsible for the management of specific global or regional interventions, collectively, the EC is the ultimate oversight body for the GRI. In order to help the EC fulfil the latter responsibility, GRI reporting to the EC should consist of issue analysis as well as of specific recommendations for action, to be discussed and approved by the EC. The proposed GRI programme coordination and management role/mechanism and the expansion of the Portfolio Review process to cover the GRI could help ensure a clearer delineation between GRI management and oversight functions, as well as contribute to an improved, more transparent and better documented decision-making process.

68. Such improvements to GRI management and oversight would help ensure the GRI achieve its objective 'to be a dynamic mechanism, with regular review and systematic reporting on progress to enable adjustments that reflect changes in the development landscape'.¹⁵

C. PROGRAMME EXECUTION**PROGRESS ACHIEVED**

69. Key issues identified by the GRP audit in this area were:

- a) The GRP lacked a strong programme management methodology;
- b) The intended resource allocation (40 per cent to global programme, 60 per cent to regional programmes) was not adhered to;
- c) The approach to plan, execute, and report on an annual basis may have limited the effectiveness of the GRP; and
- d) The GRP became a hybrid of programmatic and operational/management costs.

70. Year one (2014) of GRI implementation was reviewed with a particular focus on resource allocation, work-plan alignment and overall programme/project management. In reviewing these aspects of the GRI, the internal audit team: (i) considered feedback from Management's interviews, (ii) reviewed GRI work-plans; and (iii) GRI financial data and reports; and (iv) performed a walk-through of the GPS, used by UNFPA to develop and manage work-plans as from 2015.

Overall Progress

71. Overall, the follow-up review noted progress in addressing the issues identified in the GRP audit in this area. Key highlights of improvements noted as well as areas for further development identified are presented below.

¹⁵ DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 21

Improvements noted

GRI resource allocations are aligned to the GRI strategic framework

72. As specified in the GRI strategic framework, the GRI are based on an allocation of USD 275 million from regular resources for the four-year period. Of this amount, 60 per cent was allocated to the regional interventions and 40 per cent to the global interventions.¹⁶

73. As shown in Table 3 below, GRI 2014 funding allocations, both planned and actual, broadly adhered to this requirement for the first year of implementation. In addition, while not specified as ceilings, the 2014 proportional distribution of regional intervention resources by region was aligned with the GRI strategic framework.

Table 3 - Planned and actual resource allocations (2014) (USD millions)

Interventions	GRI strategic framework (Approved)		GRI action plans (Planned)		2014 Actual		Executive Director's Annual Report – 2014 - (Annex 5)	
	USD	%	USD	%	USD	%	USD	%
Total Global Interventions	29.1	41%	27.9	41%	26.9¹⁷	44%	26.9	43%
▪ <i>Division for Management Services</i>	n/a ¹⁸		0.6	2%	0.5	2%	n/a ¹⁹	
▪ <i>International Conference on Population and Development</i>			4.0	14%	3.8	14%		
▪ <i>Internal and External Relations Division</i>			7.4	27%	6.5	24%		
▪ <i>Management Information Services</i>			0.2	1%	0.2	1%		
▪ <i>Office of the Executive Director</i>			0.8	3%	0.6	2%		
▪ <i>Programme Division</i>			5.5	20%	5.2	19%		
▪ <i>Procurement Services</i>			0.5	2%	0.4	1%		
▪ <i>Technical Division</i>			8.9	32%	8.8	33%		
Total Regional Interventions	41.2	59%	40.3	59%	34.9	56%	35.5	57%
▪ <i>Asia Pacific</i>	8.7	21%	8.7	22%	6.3	18%	6.3	18%
▪ <i>Arab States</i>	5.8	14%	5.6	14%	5.3	15%	5.4	15%
▪ <i>Eastern Europe and Central Asia</i>	7.5	18%	7.5	19%	7.0	20%	6.9	19%
▪ <i>Eastern and Southern Africa</i>	5.8	14%	5.4	13%	5.1	15%	5.4	15%
▪ <i>Latin America and the Caribbean</i>	6.6	16%	6.6	16%	6.1	17%	6.1	17%
▪ <i>Western and Central Africa</i>	6.8	17%	6.5	16%	5.1	15%	5.4	15%
Total GRI	70.4	100%	68.2	100%	61.8	100%	62.4	100%

Sources: GRI strategic framework (pages 11-12), global and regional interventions action plans and RRFs, ATLAS data, 2014 Annual Report of the Executive Director to the Executive Board. **Note:** percentage by region expressed in comparison to the total for regional interventions.

¹⁶ DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 34

¹⁷ Total includes USD 0.9 million for Ethiopia Liaison Office

¹⁸ The GRI strategic framework document did not provide a breakdown of the global interventions by Headquarters unit

¹⁹ The Executive Director's Annual Report on GRI (Annex 5) did not provide a breakdown of the global interventions by Headquarters unit

74. The follow-up review noted a small discrepancy of USD 0.6 million between the 2014 GRI actual regional intervention expenses and the amount presented in the Executive Director's Annual Report to the Executive Board. The difference corresponds to the Liaison Office to the African Union, the cost of which was apportioned to the regional interventions of the ESA, Western and Central Africa and Arab States Regional Offices, but was not removed from the Global Interventions under which it was initially reported - which constitutes a double reporting. The follow-up review noted, however, that the Liaison Office intervention is not included in the regional interventions mentioned above.

75. While expense ceiling controls in ATLAS²⁰ prevent over-spending by any single intervention, under-spending by interventions could cause deviations in the overall proportional distribution of resources across all GRI components. Management should actively monitor and manage any areas of potential or actual under-spending in any year of the GRI cycle.

There is potential to use multi-year work-plans to enhance GRI implementation

76. In response to the constraints and challenges created by the use of annual work-plans, UNFPA has supported the use of multi-year work-plans since 2012. However, so far these appear to be used more for planning with implementing partners than as regards UNFPA-implemented activities, as no multi-year plans were used for the GRI for 2014. Thus, this could be an area for further improvement in UNFPA's execution of the GRI. The follow-up review noted that the ESA Regional Office indicated its intention to use biennial work-plans as from 2015.

System improvements have potential to provide increased control over GRI implementation

77. UNFPA made significant progress in the introduction of new systems such as the GPS and the SIS, primarily in the first half of 2015. Over time, these systems will help provide additional controls over programme execution for all UNFPA programmes, including the GRI.²¹ Some important capabilities include:

- **GPS:**
 - a) Electronic, rather than manual, creation of work-plans and budget set-up – which helps ensure accuracy and alignment with financial data in Atlas;
 - b) A work-plan revision and approval history – to help understand the timeline for work-plan development and finalization, as well as the level of changes introduced throughout the implementation period; and
 - c) A mandatory tagging system – to ensure that each programme activity and the related costs are mapped to different attributes of relevance for results reporting, including, for example, Strategic Plan and GRI outputs, intervention areas and modes of engagement (e.g. capacity development, advocacy/policy dialogue).
- **SIS:**
 - a) Reporting of results indicators, milestones, baselines, targets and actual results for each Headquarters unit and regional office;
 - b) Documentation of qualitative feedback including risks and issues; and
 - c) Ability to link and align organizational targets and results to individual performance plans.

78. These system enhancements increase transparency and strengthen decision-making, as well as encourage data sharing and use across programmes. GPS has been used for developing the GRI workplans for 2015. GRI results reporting will be incorporated into SIS later in 2015, once the full requirements for

²⁰ UNFPA's Enterprise Resource Planning system

²¹ Testing of these systems was not within the scope of this follow-up review. A walkthrough of both systems was completed as a basis to understand the functionality available to support a more effective management and monitoring of the GRI

GRI reporting, e.g. quarterly rather than annually, have been established.

Areas for further improvement identified

Resource distribution for Global Interventions may not align to the achievement of GRI outcomes

79. The follow-up review noted variations between the resource allocations by outcome²² reflected in the GRI strategic framework, the global interventions action plans RRFs, and the actual 2014 expenses, as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4 - Global interventions resource allocation by outcome (2014) (USD millions)

Outcome	GRI strategic framework (Approved)		Global interventions action plan RRFs (Planned)		2014 actual (Utilized)	
	USD	%	USD	%	USD	%
1 – Increased integrated sexual and reproductive health services	4.2	14%	4.0	14%	6.1	23%
2 – Increased priority on adolescents	1.5	5%	1.3	4%	1.1	4%
3 – Advanced gender equality and reproductive rights	4.5	15%	10.3	38%	3.8	14%
4 – Population dynamics	7.2	25%	2.3	8%	6.4	24%
OEE - Organizational effectiveness and efficiency	11.7	41%	10.0	36%	9.5	35%
Total	29.1	100%	27.9	100%	26.9	100%

80. The GRI proposed global resource allocation by outcome²³ (second column in Table 4 – ‘Approved’) was not set as a ceiling in the GRI strategic framework, as it was acknowledged that distributions by outcome may need to be adjusted based on changing priorities in the development landscape. The global interventions action plans RRFs subsequently developed and submitted to the Executive Board in June 2014 (third column in Table 4 – ‘Planned’) already showed a redistribution of resources from that anticipated in the strategic framework, increasing the proportion of resources available for the achievement of Outcome 3 (*Advanced gender equality and reproductive rights*), with less resources allocated to Outcome 4 (*Population dynamics*). In turn, 2014 actual expenses (fourth column in Table 4 – ‘Utilized’) reflect a different distribution to that of the global interventions RRFs, albeit more aligned to the GRI strategic framework.

81. While the variations reflected in Table 4 do not represent over-spending — resource allocations, which were made by Headquarters unit instead of by outcome area, were adhered to — these variations do suggest an opportunity to better coordinate and manage the global interventions to help ensure they would achieve their intended results. Without a holistic management approach, there is a risk that issues potentially impacting a particular outcome area are not timely identified and corrected. In an extreme scenario, this could result in more limited or no progress being achieved for a particular outcome across the different global interventions, potentially reducing the GRI ability to support the achievement of the Strategic Plan goals. Even where changes to planned and actual expenditures and activities by outcome are necessary and appropriate, these changes should have been reported to and approved by the EC as part of its GRI decision making and oversight role.

²² DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 37, Table 1

²³ DP/FPA/2014/8, UNFPA, Strategic framework for UNFPA global and regional interventions, 2014-2017, para. 37, Table 1

Work-plans may not align with the GRI action plans and their RRFs

82. The follow-up review noted that the ESA regional intervention action plan for Output 9 (*Strengthened national capacity for production, analysis and utilization of quality disaggregated data on population and development issues*) includes as an indicator, the “number of ESA countries that have humanitarian contingency plans that include elements for addressing sexual and reproductive health needs” [abbreviated]. While the ESA regional intervention RRF indicates a baseline of 14 countries and a target of 16 countries for 2014, the 2014 ESA work-plan did not reflect any activities planned which could contribute to achieving the stated target of 16 countries.

83. This could be an indication of gaps in the work planning process which are not mitigated by the workplan quality assurance and approval processes. This creates therefore a risk of misalignment of implementation workplans to GRI actions plans and their corresponding RRFs, which could prevent eventually the achievement of targets.

GRI Programme management practices could be further improved

84. Further improvements are needed as regards the GRI programme management practices and tools to allow the GRI to be managed as a ‘dynamic mechanism’ (the intention stated in the GRI strategic framework).

85. Based on its review of 2015 workplans, the follow-up review noted that, while the majority of GRI targets for 2014 were exceeded at less cost than planned (as indicated by financial implementation rates per the management results reports), no adjustments were made to the 2015 targets or resource requirements. Good programme management practices suggest that real time programme implementation data and results should be used to adjust and refine the programme ‘in flight’ in order that maximum benefits can be realized.

86. While not necessarily unique to GRI, the tools used to implement the GRI could benefit from application of programme management best practices. Key GRI documents such as action plans, RRFs and work-plans do not, separately or in totality, provide the required information to support strong project management of GRI. For example:

- a) GRI documents are not required to provide milestones, or an understanding, of the critical path and dependencies within the interventions. Output indicators (used over the four-year action plan cycle) are not always the best measure of progress to date and, alone, may be insufficient for managing GRI implementation. Milestones would help support analysis of progress to date, and the SIS contains a milestone functionality which could support this; and
- b) GRI documents do not identify the risks that may prevent the achievement of output targets. There are neither risk logs, nor consideration of mitigating actions. There does not appear to be a formal process for identifying and escalating risks and issues within GRI.

87. The system improvements noted in paragraph 77 may help improve programme management of the GRI going forward.

D. MONITORING AND REPORTING**PROGRESS ACHIEVED**

88. The key issue identified by the GRP audit in this area was that reporting processes and tools were not appropriate to allow Management to report on and monitor GRP performance and expenditures and to link financial decisions to GRP results.

89. In reviewing monitoring and reporting of the GRI, the internal audit team: (i) considered feedback from Management interviews; (ii) reviewed data collection processes and (iii) GRI reports, including the quarterly reports to the EC on GRI progress, results and challenges, GRI related information included in the Executive Director's annual report to the Executive Board, and Headquarters unit annual reports.²⁴

Overall Progress

90. Overall, the follow-up review noted progress in addressing the issues identified in the GRP audit. The areas for further improvement are relevant not only to the GRI but have applicability broadly to all UNFPA programmes. Key highlights of improvements noted as well as areas for further development identified are presented below.

Improvements noted***A GRI reporting structure is in place***

91. There is a reporting structure in place for the GRI to collect quarterly information on GRI indicators, progress against targets, and key issues and challenges. A system has been created whereby Regional Offices and Headquarters units report their progress on a quarterly basis, and this information is aggregated and provided quarterly to the EC. This data also informs the end-of-year reporting on the GRI which is part of the Executive Director's Annual Report to the Executive Board. While there are opportunities to enhance the relevance of the reporting, this is an improvement compared to the GRP.

92. Management recently developed and will implement the use of an 'issues log tool' for GRI reporting to help highlight matters requiring EC attention. Further, as referenced in the previous section on programme execution, it is expected that the introduction of the GPS and the SIS will have a further positive impact on monitoring and reporting of the GRI.

Areas for further improvement identified***Reporting processes and quality should continue to be enhanced***

93. The follow-up review identified some gaps in the GRI reporting processes requiring management attention.

94. The annual reports completed by the Regional Offices and Headquarters units, which provide a narrative overview of key performance highlights by output, do not report on, or clearly link the activities to, GRI targets.

95. The Annual Report of the Executive Director to the Executive Board includes an annex which reports progress against the GRI strategic framework RRFs, i.e., a combined and highly summarized version of the global and regional interventions RRFs.

²⁴ No detailed testing was performed of the accuracy and completeness of the information reported

96. Reporting against such a version of the six regional interventions RRFs could distort results achieved, as it is not always possible or appropriate to aggregate regional outputs. Not all regional interventions intend to implement all outputs: regional interventions were permitted to prioritize the UNFPA Strategic Plan outputs that were most relevant to their region. Similarly, regional interventions may use different indicators by region to measure the incremental results of their regional intervention; it is therefore not possible to aggregate these indicators across all six regions at once. In some instances, the aggregation becomes inaccurate or unclear, as demonstrated for the following example:

- *Output: 5 – Increased national capacity to deliver integrated sexual and reproductive health services in humanitarian settings*
- *Indicator: Number of countries that have capacity to implement the minimum initial service package (MISP) at the onset of a crisis*
- *Baseline: 20*
- *Target: 28 (2014); 43 (2015); 53 (2016); and 60 (2017)*

97. The reported baseline of 20 countries is not fully accurate: the ESA regional intervention reported a baseline of 11 countries; the Latin America and Caribbean regional intervention, 11 countries; and the Western and Central Africa regional intervention, 6 countries, i.e. a total of 28 countries. Even if the baseline were accurate, the report format does not specify how many regional interventions are working towards this target, hence it is unclear to the reader whether the country baseline relates to one, several or all regions.

98. Further, as with all UNFPA reporting (e.g. country programme annual reports), results are self – reported except where these stem from external data sources. To increase the reliability of the reported information, it would therefore be advisable to include some guidance on which supporting evidence is expected to be retained, and to conduct some spot-checks thereof. The lessons learned from this exercise over time would inform a more robust reporting mechanism through a ‘virtuous circle’ of learning and improvement.

ANNEX 1 – FOLLOW-UP REVIEW RATING CRITERIA

The following rating criteria was developed by OAIS and used to assess the level of progress achieved by Management in addressing the issues raised in the report on the audit of the GRP, in the design and first year of implementation of the GRI.

Rating	Description
Significant progress achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issues identified in the GRP audit have been substantially addressed by Management; ▪ Areas for improvement reflect potential for refinement going forward
Progress achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of efforts undertaken to address issues identified in the GRP audit, but full benefits not yet realized; ▪ Medium to low risks remain that need to be monitored or addressed in the remaining programme period.
Limited progress achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of efforts undertaken to address issues identified in the GRP audit but benefits not yet realized; ▪ Medium to high risks remain that need to be addressed in the remaining programme period to prevent issues that could affect the achievement of the objectives of the GRI.
No progress achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No progress made in addressing issues identified by the GRP audit; resulting risks could affect the achievement of the objectives of the GRI.

ANNEX 2 – LESSONS LEARNED, GRP AUDIT REPORT DATED 8 FEBRUARY 2013

A. Programme Design

- 1) Enhance guidance and tools for defining outputs, indicators and activities, and checklists and other aids to facilitate the review of tools such as action and work-plans, including criteria to assess the feasibility, effectiveness, and efficiency of proposed activities and evidence of situational/needs assessments.
- 2) Include clear definitions of organizational strategies and define how to assess performance against those strategies, where possible quantifying metrics related to the use of such strategies. Map outputs and outcome areas against strategies to help identify whether there may be gaps or imbalances between the Programme as implemented and GRP strategies.
- 3) Ensure that all capacity development activities (whether targeted at national capacity, i.e., government and other partners, or at UNFPA Country Office staff) be based on capacity assessments, and define metrics (baselines, targets, and indicators) to demonstrate the needs and to measure progress.
- 4) Implement processes for measuring benefits realized from the application of the skills, knowledge, and other resources acquired by national institutions, NGOs and partners through UNFPA funded capacity building activities. This is particularly important to measure the performance and results of the GRP or similar programmes, given the relevance of capacity development as a strategy for achieving UNFPA's mission.
- 5) Collect feedback from Cos regarding the relevance of the support received from global and regional levels with respect to capacity development to identify what worked well, preferred and most effective methods, etc. and use this feedback to plan capacity development activities globally and regionally.
- 6) Ensure that baselines and targets are defined on a timely basis, progress tracked and reported, and adjustments made as necessary (e.g., changes to targets as a result of funding changes) to help management better manage by results.

B. Programme Governance and management

- 7) Separate programme governance and management functions to help ensure there is an appropriate level of oversight to those implementing programmes.
- 8) Enhance reporting to governance and management bodies by presenting progress in terms of both expenditures (including budget to actual comparisons) and progress against goals and indicators, linking these where possible. In addition to donor or programme specific reports, report on both regular and noncore resources to provide a more holistic view of how the organization is allocating resources against priorities.
- 9) Share best practices in the use of Regional Advisory Groups to help encourage consistency and use across regions where these are not currently in full effect.
- 10) Clearly define management roles and responsibilities and accountability for the programme as a whole and for sub-programmes and consider whether the level of authority and time required for each role is appropriate to provide the desired level of management attention and oversight. Clarify the role and input of key management functions in programme implementation including those in operational/support roles, such as those under the Management Directorate. Also consider how roles and responsibilities inter-relate across HQ, ROs, and SROs.

C. Programme Execution and Monitoring and Reporting

- 11) Strengthen processes for the allocation of funds across GRP components to create an environment that supports clear, rational, and objective criteria, as well as transparency in the funding allocation process.
- 12) When additional funding is received or when anticipated funding amounts change, consider and document the potential impact on the achievement of the intended results.
- 13) Undertake a mapping of all current reporting mechanisms (the 'as-is' status) and compare to an analysis of comprehensive reporting requirements addressing the information needs of all key stakeholders. Enhance the usefulness and consistency of results reports by including standard components such as: actual results achieved, i.e., the indicator against the baseline and the target; commentary on any shortfalls or factors that have impacted the result; expenditure data, compared to budget, for all funding sources to ensure transparency; and lessons learned in a format that can be compiled and shared.
- 14) Consider introducing appropriate assurance controls over results reporting. The assurance control requirements will vary according to the type of report, and could include external audits or reviews; peer reviews; Regional Office reviews; and/or internal audits.
- 15) Consider strengthening the processes and systems that impact the quality of programmatic and financial reporting of programme activities and expenditures to help ensure that data is consistent, accurate, and complete, and that analytic tools can provide meaningful analysis and management decision-making data.
- 16) Enhance the budgeting process and budgetary controls, as well as reporting and analysis of budget to actual comparisons. Monitor the allocation of GRP funds across HQ and regions to help ensure allocations are in accordance with Executive Board expectations and justifications for variations are documented (e.g., change in need/priority).
- 17) Consider establishing an indirect cost allocation system (e.g., based on headcount) to provide transparency as to how costs for administrative, management, and support functions are funded, and link such functions to the programs that they support, e.g., Global Programme, Regional Programmes or Country Programmes
- 18) Introduce multiyear, rather than annual, implementation plans and budgets, with interim assessments and adjustments as appropriate. This will also complement implementing partners who often utilize multiyear implementation plans themselves.
- 19) Review programme/project methodologies and tools and identify ways to address those limitations that currently constrain their effectiveness. Improvements to methodologies and tools may not only benefit the GRP, but also the Country Programmes and any future programmes UNFPA may decide to implement in the future.
- 20) Ensure that all audits, evaluations, mid-term reviews, and monitoring reports of global and regional programmes are tracked and reported on to the appropriate bodies, including status of corrective actions.

Consider regular, periodic performance audits of key areas within the Global and Regional Programmes. For example, the Division for Oversight Services should consider establishing an audit plan specific to programmatic activities at HQ and RO/SRO levels, covering areas such as a review of programme results, and compliance with GRP Guidelines.

ANNEX 3 – INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

Name	Unit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Anne-Birgitte Albrechtsen, Deputy Executive Director (Management) – (at the time follow-up work was completed) ▪ Ms. Kate Gilmore, Deputy Executive Director, (Programme) 	Office of the Executive Director
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Ramiz Alakbarov, Director 	Programme Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Rune Froseth, Chief, Strategy Policy and Standards Branch, Programme Division ▪ Mr. Oliver Buder, Policy Adviser, Strategy Policy and Standards Branch, Programme Division 	GRI Secretariat (and previously GRP Secretariat)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Farah Usmani, Chief, Operational Support and Quality Assurance Branch, Programme Division 	Programme Review Committee Secretariat
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Bruce Campbell, Director (at the time follow-up work was completed) ▪ Ms. Mona Kaidbey, Deputy Director 	Technical Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Elizabeth Benomar, Officer-in-Charge ▪ Ms. Lynn Collins, Adviser 	HIV/AIDS Branch, Technical Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Jaqueline Mahon, Senior Policy Adviser, Global Health & Health Systems ▪ Mr. Sennen Hounton, Technical Adviser, Reproductive Health 	Sexual and Reproductive Health Branch, Technical Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ms. Laura Laski, Branch Chief ▪ Ms. Rita Columbia, Reproductive Health Adviser 	Commodity Security Branch, Technical Division
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr. Subhash Gupta, Director ▪ Mr. Andrew Saberton, Chief Finance Branch ▪ Ms. Iva Goricnik Christian, Chief Resource Planning and Budgeting Branch ▪ Mr. Daniel Mora, Special Assistant to the Director 	Division for Management Services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dr. Julitta Onabanjo, Regional Director ▪ Dr. Akinyele Dairo, Practice Manager, Sexual and Reproductive Health ▪ Mr. Hicham Nahro, Operations Manager (at time of fieldwork) ▪ Ms. Mady Biaye, Regional Technical Advisor ▪ Mr. Seth Broekman, Regional Programme Specialist 	Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office

ANNEX 4 – DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UNFPA Strategic plan and annexes
UNFPA Strategic framework and Results and Resources Frameworks
Aligning to the Strategic Plan, 2014 – 2017: Toolkit for UNFPA offices and annexes
Submission, Processing and Approval of Strategic Plan and Implementation Business case
GRI Action plans (2014 – 2017)
Annual Report of the Executive Director 2014 and annexes
PRC review of GRI Action Plans (2014 – 2017)
PRC reviewer summary sheet for Regions and Divisions
Report of the Director, Evaluation Office, annexes and Management response
Road map to integrated budget: cost classification and results-based budgeting
UNFPA conference room paper – September 2013
Annual Reports 2014, Technical Division branches
Briefing note on building synergies in planning regular resources and non-core resources
Initial regular resource distribution plan 2014 and all revisions
2014 Office Management Plans and Workplans

ANNEX 5 – GLOSSARY

Atlas	UNFPA’s ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning) system
EC	Executive Committee
ESA	East and Southern Africa
GPS	Global Programming System
GRI	Global and Regional Interventions
GRP	Global and Regional Programme
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HQ	Headquarters
IRF	Integrated Results Framework
MISP	Minimum Initial Service Package
OAIS	Office of Audit and Investigation Services
OEE	Operating Effectiveness and Efficiency
PRC	Programme Review Committee
RO	Regional Office
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SIS	Strategic Information System
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound
SRH	Sexual and Reproductive Health
SRO	Sub-Regional Office
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
USD	United States Dollars