



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/67/16  
20 June 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Sixty-seventh Meeting  
Bangkok, 16-20 July 2012

**EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2011 BUSINESS PLANS**

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issuance of the document.

## Introduction

1. This document presents the evaluation of the 2011 business plans of the implementing agencies, based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weightings in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2011 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 63/7 to 63/10, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 67<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee. It also presents a trend analysis for each of the nine performance indicators used in previous years' evaluations and the results of the qualitative assessment of the performance of implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers. It concludes with the Secretariat's observations and recommendations.

### Analysis of quantitative performance indicators in decision 41/93 with revised weightings adopted in decision 47/51

2. Table 1 presents the quantitative performance indicators and the weightings that were adopted in decisions 41/93 and 47/51 and are applied to all agencies. It also presents the short titles that are used in this document to describe the indicators.

Table 1

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ADOPTED IN DECISION 41/93, THE NEW WEIGHTINGS ADOPTED IN DECISION 47/51 AND THEIR SHORT TITLES

Type of indicator	Approved performance indicator	Short title	New weighting
Approval	Number of annual programmes of multi-year agreements approved vs. those planned	Multi-year tranches approved	15
Approval	Number of individual projects/activities (investment projects, RMPs, halon banks, TAS) approved vs. those planned	Individual projects/activities approved	10
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>25</b>
Implementation	Milestone activities completed (e.g., policy measures, regulatory assistance)/ODS levels achieved for approved multi-year annual tranches vs. those planned	Milestone activities completed	20
Implementation	ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	15
Implementation	Project completion (pursuant to decision 28/2 for investment projects) and as defined for non-investment projects vs. those planned in progress reports	Project completion	10
Implementation	Percentage of policy/regulatory assistance completed vs. that planned	Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>55</b>
Administrative	Speed of financial completion vs. that required per progress report completion dates	Speed of financial completion	10
Administrative	Timely submission of project completion reports vs. those agreed	Timely submission of project completion reports	5
Administrative	Timely submission of progress reports and responses unless otherwise agreed	Timely submission of progress reports	5
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>20</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

3. The performance of the implementing agencies during 2011 is assessed against the targets that were established in their business plans or against targets determined by decisions of the Executive Committee. Table 2 presents the approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the number of targets achieved.

Table 2

## 2011 PERFORMANCE INDICATOR TARGETS AND ACHIEVEMENT

Item	UNDP				UNEP				UNIDO				World Bank			
	Target	Agency achievement	Secretariat assessment	Met target	Target	Agency achievement	Secretariat assessment	Met target	Target	Agency achievement	Secretariat assessment	Met target	Target	Agency achievement	Secretariat assessment	Met target
Multi-year tranches approved	38	31	31	No	81	61	61	No	44	38	38	No	8	5	5	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	21	15	15	No	79	38	37	No	12	12	12	Yes	3	2	1	No
Milestone activities completed	2	5	5	Yes	3	3	3	Yes	6	32	32	Yes	2/2	2/2	2/2	Yes
ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	1.7	4.7	1.7	Yes	13.3	0.0	0.0	No	594.0	462.0	462.0	No	697.0	250.0	250.0	No
Project completion	28	21	21	No	26	138	66	Yes	19	11	11	No	5	6	6	Yes
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	N/A	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	N/A	106 countries	106 countries	106 countries	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On Time (104)	85	85	No	On Time (99)	82	82	No	12 months after operational completion	6 months	6 months	Yes	11 months	33.4 months	33.9 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On Time (16)	16	16	Yes	On Time (74)	30	33	No	On time (11)	12	12	Yes	100%	85%	85%	No
Timely submission of progress reports	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On time	On Time	On Time	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Number of targets achieved				4/8				4/9				5/8				4/9

4. Overall, agencies have met the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of eight targets, UNDP has fully met four (50 per cent) and partially achieved four;
  - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully met four (44.4 per cent) and partially achieved five;
  - (c) Out of a total of eight targets, UNIDO has fully met five (62.5 per cent) and partially achieved three; and
  - (d) Out of a total of nine targets, the World Bank has fully met four (44.4 per cent) and partially achieved five.

5. The overall assessment is based on fully meeting the target of 100 per cent. Therefore, if there are eight targets and an agency meets 99 per cent of the targets, the overall assessment would still be a zero. For this reason a more accurate assessment might take into account partially achieved or almost-fully achieved indicators.

6. Some aspects of the implementing agencies' assessments of their achievements differed from those of the Secretariat. The Secretariat counted one project less than the number stated by UNEP for the performance indicator "individual projects/activities approved", 72 projects less for "project completion", and 3 projects more for "project completion report". The results of the Secretariat's calculations for "individual projects/activities approved" were lower than the World Bank's calculations by one project. Regarding the performance indicator for the "ODS phased out for individual projects", the Secretariat calculated 3 ODP tonnes less than the number stated by UNDP.

#### Weighted assessment of performance

7. As noted above, data provided by the implementing agencies on their achievements for certain performance indicators differed from the Secretariat's assessment in only a few cases. For the sake of consistency, the achievement of performance indicators presented in Table 3 is based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 3

#### **WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES PERFORMANCE IN 2011**

Item	UNDP			UNEP			UNIDO			World Bank		
	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points
Multi-year tranches approved	15	82%	12	15	75%	11	15	86%	13	15	63%	9
Individual projects/activities approved	10	71%	7	10	47%	5	10	100%	10	10	33%	3
Milestone activities completed	26	250%	26	20	100%	20	26	533%	26	20	100%	20
ODS phased-out for individual projects	17	100%	17	15	0%	0	17	78%	13	15	36%	5
Project completion	12	75%	9	10	254%	10	12	58%	7	10	120%	10
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	82%	8	10	83%	8	10	150%	10	10	0%	0

Item	UNDP			UNEP			UNIDO			World Bank		
	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100%	5	5	45%	2	5	109%	5	5	85%	4
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5
<b>2011 Assessment</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>89</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>71</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>89</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>66</b>
<i>2010 Assessment</i>			74			72			95			76

8. For UNDP and UNIDO, the weightings have been pro-rated. Eighty points are allocated for approval and implementation indicators together, and 20 points for each administrative indicator. Points earned are rounded to the nearest whole number.

9. Table 3 indicates that UNIDO exceeded three targets, UNDP exceeded one, UNEP exceeded one and the World Bank exceeded one. The assessment for 2011 is as follows: UNDP: 89; UNEP: 71; UNIDO: 89; and the World Bank: 66. Compared to 2010, the quantitative assessments for 2011 were higher for UNDP (an increase of 15 points) and lower for the World Bank, UNIDO and UNEP (a decrease in points of 10, 6 and 1, respectively).

#### Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

10. Decision 41/93 also requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring the following performance indicators on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies: ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out, cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement, speed of completion, and net emissions due to delays.

11. The targets covering ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out and net emissions due to delays can be determined based on projections in business plans, progress reports, and studies agreed with the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. For the other indicators, namely cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement and speed of completion, implementing agencies do not set targets or projections in either their progress reports or business plans. The actual achievements of these indicators are, therefore, presented for each year.

12. It should also be noted that previous performance indicators were divided between investment and non-investment projects. All of the nine indicators are applicable to investment projects, but only the “funds disbursed”, “speed of first disbursement” and “speed of project completion” indicators are applicable to non-investment projects. Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment and non-investment projects, respectively. Annex I shows, *inter alia*, that agencies have had various levels of success in different years.

13. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO in 2011 and the World Bank met 43 per cent of its planned disbursements for that year. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 85 per cent of its target.

14. The cost of project preparation varied from 1.51 per cent of the cost of the project for the World Bank to 2.71 per cent for UNIDO and 3.0 per cent for UNDP. In general, it was below the cost in previous years for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” increased for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank.

15. The cost-effectiveness of projects increased for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank in 2011 due to the large number of HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) projects approved. The speed of

delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from 8 to 14 months for the first disbursement and 35 months for completion. The World Bank’s speed of delivery for the first disbursement is 25 months and 40 months for project completion.

16. The indicator “net emissions due to delays” is a cumulative figure. Up until 2011 the total amount had been decreasing for all implementing agencies except UNIDO. The data shown in Annex I for this indicator takes into account partial phase-out that was not accounted for in previous years.

17. Annex II includes a limited number of indicators that can be tracked. These cover the targets for “disbursement for non-investment projects” and “speed of delivery”. Prior to 2004, UNEP had achieved a disbursement rate of 93 to 100 per cent for six consecutive years. Since 2004, UNEP’s disbursement rate amounts to 54 per cent (in both 2004 and 2005), 51 per cent (in 2006), 49 per cent (in 2007), 64 per cent (in 2008), 69 per cent (in 2009), 60 per cent (in 2010) and 63 per cent (in 2011).

18. With respect to the “speed” of making the first disbursement UNEP, as in previous years, was the fastest (9.6 months). This was followed by UNIDO (10.3 months), UNDP (11.8 months), and the World Bank (14.6 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 30 to 37 months.

### UNEP’S CAP Performance in 2011

19. Decision 41/93 also established revised performance indicators that are related to UNEP’s CAP. At its 48<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee decided to change these indicators beginning with the 2006 business plans (decision 48/7). Table 4 presents the targets, and the achievements in 2011 measured against those indicators.

Table 4

### UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR 2011

Indicator	Target	UNEP Assessment
Efficient follow-up to regional network/thematic meetings	90% implementation rate	Target met. Major recommendations followed up.
Effective support to NOUs in their work, particularly guidance to new NOUs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 such ways/means/products/services;</li> <li>• All new NOUs receive capacity building support;</li> <li>• 10 additional countries submit CP reports using the Multilateral Fund Secretariat’s online data reporting system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target met. More than seven ways/means to support new NOUs used;</li> <li>• CAP provided capacity building services to 21 new Ozone Officers and assistants;</li> <li>• Online reporting by countries increasing.</li> </ul>
Assistance to countries in actual or potential non-compliance (as per MOP decisions and/or as per reported Article 7 data and trend analysis)	All such countries	Target met – all countries received assistance. CAP assisted 24 countries in actual non-compliance or in potential non-compliance. (as reported in MOP 23)
Innovations in production and delivery of global and regional information products and services	7 such products and services	Target met. More than 7 products and services delivered.
Close cooperation between CAP regional teams and IAs and BAs working in the regions	5 in each region	Target met. At least 5 joint missions /joint undertakings conducted with other IAs/BAs in each region.

**Analysis of qualitative performance indicators**

20. On 29 May 2012, the Fund Secretariat sent requests to all Article 5 countries for the completion of the questionnaire to assess the qualitative performance of the implementing agencies. The due date for responses was 5 June 2012. By 9 June 2012, 28 countries had provided 51 responses, which were sent to implementing agencies for their comments.

21. Subsequent to the dispatch of those responses to the agencies from countries, an additional six countries provided 14 assessments, which were received by 13 June 2012. Only the agencies who received low ratings from these additional assessments were sent an update for their comments. However, the additional responses are included in the analysis below.

22. A total of 65 questionnaires were processed because multiple responses were provided by countries in which more than one agency had implemented projects. The number of questionnaires by agency was: Germany (7), UNDP (17), UNEP (24), UNIDO (12) and the World Bank (5). Annex III presents the detailed results for each question, by agency. Table 5 presents a summary of the overall ratings. It should be noted however that several countries did not provide overall ratings for one or more of the categories, although they did provide responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III.

Table 5

**OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES**

<b>Overall Ratings</b>	<b>Highly satisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Less satisfactory</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>No Assessment</b>
<b>Impact</b>	32	15	0	1	17
<b>Organization and cooperation</b>	30	14	0	1	20
<b>Technical assistance/training</b>	24	19	1	0	21

23. Agencies indicated several possible reasons for the low ratings largely due to changes in NOUs, misunderstandings about the evaluation timeframe as issues raised related to previous years, delays assigned to the agency but which were a result of data inconsistencies by the country, comments on the lead agency when the agency concerned was not the lead agency, dissatisfaction expressed on the agency’s performance that related to the funding received from the Executive Committee for the HPMP, ratings were withdrawn, comments on the hiring of national consultants when no consultants were hired or were to be hired, and delays assigned to the agency but which were the result of changes in the Government.

24. UNDP received less than satisfactory ratings from Haiti with respect to the role of the lead agency although it is not the lead agency in Haiti. It also received less than satisfactory ratings from the United Republic of Tanzania. Although UNDP indicated that it had different views on some of the ratings, it acknowledged that procurement challenges related to ODS multi-gas analysers were experienced during 2011 and 2012. UNDP followed up with the United Republic of Tanzania who subsequently indicated to UNDP that it wished to withdraw its comments. No further discussions are warranted for these ratings.

25. No country gave UNIDO an “unsatisfactory” rating but UNIDO indicated that it had met with the country that had given it a “less than satisfactory” rating.



26. The World Bank was given “less satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” ratings from India for several categories. The World Bank indicated that it noted the expression of dissatisfaction by the Government of India and took its concerns and comments quite seriously. The Bank also indicated that there was a difference in perspective on circumstances leading to delays, but that it will continue to work with India to improve their common understanding of implementation challenges. The Executive Committee may wish to request the World Bank to discuss with the NOU of India to resolve any issues addressed in the evaluation of the performance of the implementing agency and to report to the 68<sup>th</sup> meeting on the outcome of that dialogue.

27. The Secretariat requested explanations from Germany about “less than satisfactory ratings” from Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Namibia, but as of this writing, the Secretariat has not received a response.

28. The Secretariat also requested explanations from UNEP for the “less than satisfactory” ratings from Afghanistan, Gambia (the), Haiti, Namibia, Tuvalu, Togo, and the United Republic of Tanzania, as well as for the “unsatisfactory” rating from Haiti. As of this writing, the Secretariat has not received a response. The Executive Committee may wish to request Germany and UNEP to provide the missing explanations to the 68<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee.

## **SECRETARIAT’S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **OBSERVATIONS**

29. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNDP met 89 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators), UNIDO met 89 per cent, UNEP met 71 per cent, and the World Bank 66 per cent. Overall, in 2011 the agencies’ performance was slightly lower than it had been in 2010 due largely to not meeting the targets for multi-year tranches approved, individual projects approved, ODS phased out for individual project, project completion, speed of final completion, and timely submission of project completion reports.

30. Implementing agencies have been able to resolve issues in cases where they have had dialogues with countries that provided less than satisfactory ratings on some indicators. Additional dialogue is suggested in the case of the World Bank and responses to ratings are still pending from Germany and UNEP.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

31. The Executive Committee may wish to:

(a) Note:

- (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies’ performance against their 2011 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/67/16;
- (ii) The quantitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies for 2011 on a scale of 100 as follows: UNDP (89), UNEP (71), UNIDO (89), and the World Bank (66);

(b) Request:

- (i) The World Bank to have an open and constructive discussion with the National Ozone Unit (NOU) in India about the areas where the Bank’s services were perceived to be “less than satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory”, and to report to

the 68<sup>th</sup> meeting on the results of its consultations with the country on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments;

- (ii) Germany to provide explanations about “less than satisfactory” ratings from Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Namibia; and
- (iii) UNEP to provide explanations for the “less than satisfactory” ratings from Afghanistan, Gambia (the), Haiti, Namibia, Tuvalu, Togo, and the United Republic of Tanzania, as well as for the “unsatisfactory” rating from Haiti.

-----

## Annex I

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR  
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1996-2011)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4	3	2.7	2.7	1.1	2.54	1.6	3.61	1.44	0.54	3.58	1.5	14.7	14.4	3.0
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.1	6.3	9.14	6.74	8.3	10.35	7.1	6.27	8.24	4.99	5.76	5.61	6.09	59.84	146.85
Speed of first disbursement (months)		13	13	12	13	12.84	12.8	12.8	12.91	12.9	13.0	13.1	13.2	13.4	13.6	13.7
Speed of completion (months)	24	29	29.5	32	33	33.6	32.7	32.4	32.41	32.9	33.6	33.9	33.8	33.9	34.2	34.6
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				8,995	11,350	11,727	9,023	6,466	3,607	4,538	6,619	2,674	1,312	92	113	101
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2	4.2	2.7	3.8	2.73	3.28	3.64	2.01	0.86	1.83	2.09	1.32	11.91	5.68	2.71
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.11	6.27	7.78	6.71	5.67	7.28	9.79	3.58	3.10	7.13	6.51	9.34	3.26	22.58	187.59
Speed of first disbursement (months)		10	9	8	9	9.29	9.16	9.2	9.06	8.97	9.0	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.4
Speed of completion (months)	20	24	28	26	29	29.85	30.89	31.7	32.35	32.98	33.2	33.5	33.4	33.7	34.1	35.0
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				4,667	5,899	5,727	5,960	3,503	13,035	1,481	3,864	4,470	3,431	6,970	8,918	14,583
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%

Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.9	2.7	2.9	5.5	1.26	0.43	0.64	0.16	0.39	0.4	0.02	0.59	2.18	74.84	1.51
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		3.6	1.9	2.83	2.96	3.85	4.57	6.12	3.74	1.04	3.33	3.29	9.36	1.43	1.12	545.23
Speed of first disbursement (months)		26	26	25	25	25.33	26.28	26	26.02	25.7	25.3	25.0	24.8	24.8	24.6	24.6
Speed of completion (months)	37	34	40	37	39	40.09	41.35	41	40.88	40.7	40.3	40.2	39.8	39.8	40.2	40.2
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				7,352	16,608	21,539	22,324	18,021	8,338	4,843	5,674	2,316	1,303	182	1,680	801

## Annex II

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR  
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1997-2011)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	12	6	11	11.29	12	11.4	11	11.44	11.5	11.8	11.7	11.7	11.8	12.2	11.8
Speed until project completion (months)	31	24	33	34.16	36	34.7	35	35.36	35.4	36.6	37.3	37.1	37.3	37.7	37.1
<b>UNEP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	5	3	5	6.33	6.87	7.3	7.6	8.49	8.4	8.4	8.7	9.0	9.0	9.5	9.6
Speed until project completion (months)	20	15	25	27.9	29.66	30.4	31	31.8	32.4	32.9	33.2	33.6	32.9	33.9	34.3
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	7	6.5	6	8	9.15	9.85	9.4	9.34	8.9	9.8	10.2	10.6	10.4	10.4	10.3
Speed until project completion (months)	24	11	29	31	33.66	33.84	33.7	33.89	31.9	33.1	33.0	32.9	32.0	31.9	31.4
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	16	17	5	12	11.95	12.05	13.7	14.58	13.6	14.6	14.3	14.4	14.4	14.9	14.6
Speed until project completion (months)	28	32	26	30	29.24	28.85	30	30.39	31	31.5	31.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	30.1



Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES  
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Rating	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total		
IMPACT	General	Has cooperation with the implementing agency substantially contributed and added value to your work or organization in managing compliance in your country?	Highly satisfactory	4	2	8	19	6	39		
			Satisfactory	3	2	8	5	5	23		
			Less satisfactory			1		1	2		
			Unsatisfactory		1				1		
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	5	2	7	11	7	32		
			Satisfactory	2	1	6	3	3	15		
			Unsatisfactory		1				1		
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	5	3	8	18	7	41		
			Satisfactory	2	1	8	6	4	21		
			Less satisfactory			1		1	2		
			Unsatisfactory		1				1		
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	6	3	10	21	8	48
					Satisfactory	1	1	5	3	4	14
Less satisfactory					1	1			2		
Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory			5	1	6	18	7	37		
	Satisfactory			2	3	10	6	4	25		
	Less satisfactory					1		1	2		
	Unsatisfactory				1				1		
Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory			3	1	5	12	6	27		
	Satisfactory			3	2	11	7	3	26		
	Less satisfactory					1	2	1	4		
	Unsatisfactory				1				1		
Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory			5	3	8	20	6	42		
	Satisfactory			1	1	8	4	5	19		
	Less satisfactory			1		1		1	3		
	Unsatisfactory				1				1		
Has the use of funds been directed effectively to reach the targets and was it agreed between the national ozone unit and the implementing agency?	Highly satisfactory			2	2	11	20	8	43		
	Satisfactory			5	2	4	3	4	18		
	Less satisfactory				1		1		2		
	Unsatisfactory					1			1		
If there was a lead agency for a multi-agency project, did it coordinate the activities of the other implementing agencies satisfactorily?	Highly satisfactory			1		5	7	3	16		
	Satisfactory			1	1	5	8	5	20		
	Less satisfactory					1			1		
	Unsatisfactory				1	1	1		3		
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory			2	1	8	13	6	30		
	Satisfactory			3	2	3	3	3	14		
	Unsatisfactory				1				1		
Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory			4	1	11	15	8	39		
	Satisfactory			3	3	5	9	2	22		
	Less satisfactory					1		1	2		
	Unsatisfactory				1				1		
Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory			4	1	9	17	7	38		
	Satisfactory			3	3	7	7	3	23		
	Less satisfactory			1			1				

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Rating	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	4	3	10	19	8	44
			Satisfactory	3	1	6	5	2	17
			Less satisfactory			1		1	2
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	6	15	5	32
			Satisfactory	1	3	9	9	6	28
			Less satisfactory	1		1		1	3
			Unsatisfactory		1	1			2
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Satisfactory				1		1
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Satisfactory				1		1
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory				1		1
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory				1		1
	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	7	12	5	27
			Satisfactory	5	2	8	6	5	26
			Less satisfactory	1	1	1	3	1	7
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	3		7	17	5	32
			Less satisfactory			1	1		2
			Satisfactory	4	4	8	5	7	28
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
		Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Highly satisfactory	3	3	7	16	7	36
			Satisfactory	4	1	6	5	4	20
			Less satisfactory			2	3	1	6
			Unsatisfactory		1	1			2
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	3	3	5	12	6	29
			Satisfactory	3	1	10	6	6	26
			Less satisfactory			1	1		2
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	3	11	6	23
			Satisfactory	4	3	10	13	5	35
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
			Less satisfactory			1		1	2
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	4	2	3	10	5	24
			Satisfactory	2	1	8	6	2	19
			Less satisfactory		1				1
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5	12	7	27
			Satisfactory	5	1	8	7	5	26
			Less satisfactory		1	1	2		4
			Unsatisfactory			1			1
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	5	12	4	26
			Satisfactory	3	3	10	7	7	30
			Less satisfactory		1	1	2		4
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	2	2	5	8	7	24
			Satisfactory	3	2	10	6	3	24
			Less satisfactory					1	1
			Unsatisfactory			1			1
Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties		Highly satisfactory	3	1	3	9	6	22	
	Satisfactory	2	2	12	4	4	24		



Category	Sub-category	Questions	Rating	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total
		that may have been encountered subsequent to the provision of non-ODS technology?	Less satisfactory			1	2	1	4
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	7	6	8	25
Satisfactory				2	5	7	3	17	
Less satisfactory			1		2	2		5	
Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?		Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	10	5	21	
		Satisfactory	5	3	9	8	5	30	
		Less satisfactory			2	2		4	
Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?		Highly satisfactory	2	3	5	9	8	27	
		Satisfactory	3	1	9	6	3	22	
		Less satisfactory			1	2		3	
Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?		Highly satisfactory	4	1	5	15	8	33	
		Satisfactory	3	3	9	3	3	21	
		Less satisfactory			1	2		3	
		Unsatisfactory		1				1	
Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?		Highly satisfactory	4	2	6	12	7	31	
		Satisfactory	3	2	8	10	4	27	
		Less satisfactory		1	2	1		4	
Regulatory assistance projects		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	2	2	3	11	3	21
			Satisfactory	2	1	7	8	4	22
	Less satisfactory				2	2		4	
	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	3		2	10	3	18	
		Satisfactory	1	3	11	12	4	31	
		Less satisfactory					1	1	
	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	2		1	7	3	13	
		Satisfactory	2	2	11	12	3	30	
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	4		2	13	6	25
Satisfactory			3	2	11	7	2	25	
Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?		Highly satisfactory	4		2	13	6	25	
		Satisfactory	3	2	10	6	2	23	
		Less satisfactory			1	1		2	

-----