



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/16
9 October 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventy-third Meeting
Paris, 9-13 November 2014

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2013 BUSINESS PLANS

Introduction

1. This document presents:
 - (a) The quantitative evaluations of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2013 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 73rd meeting¹;
 - (b) A trend analysis for each of the nine performance indicators;
 - (c) The qualitative assessment of the performance of implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers; and
 - (d) Secretariat's comments and recommendations.

Analysis of quantitative performance indicators

2. Table 1 presents the approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the number of targets achieved.

¹ Based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weightings in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2013 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 69/7 to 69/10.

Table 1: 2013 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 | 27 | 21 | 21 | No | 49 | 37 | 37 | No | 26 | 22 | 22 | No | 7 | 6 | 6 | No |
| Individual projects/activities approved | 12 | 16 | 16 | Yes | 60 | 56 | 56 | No | 11 | 12 | 12 | Yes | 2 | 2 | 2 | Yes |
| Milestone activities completed | 25 | 20 | 20 | No | 46 | 44 | 37 | No | 26 | 33 | 33 | Yes | 6 | 6 | 6 | Yes |
| ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes | 58.0 | 47.5 | 47.5 | No | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Yes | 55.4 | 60.5 | 60.5 | Yes | 240.4 | 242.15 | 242.15 | Yes |
| Project completion | 18 | 18 | 18 | Yes | 36 | 115 | 51 | Yes | 6 | 10 | 10 | Yes | 4 | 3 | 3 | No |
| Policy/regulatory assistance completed | 2 | 2 | 2 | Yes | 100% of countries | 100% | 100% | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | Yes |
| Speed of financial completion | On time (233) | 205 | 212 | No | On time (54) | On time | 47 | No | 12 months after operational completion | 8.1 months | 8.1 months | Yes | 30 months | 74 months | 74 months | No |
| Timely submission of project completion reports | On time (8) | 12 | 10 | Yes | On time (66) | On time | 51 | No | On time (3) | On time | On time (11) | Yes | On time (3) | On time | On time (6) | Yes |
| 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 | On time | On time | On time | Yes |
| Number of targets achieved | | | | 5/9 | | | | 4/9 | | | | 7/8 | | | | 6/9 |

Weighted assessment of performance

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2013 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2013

| 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 | 78 | 12 | 15 | 76 | 11 | 15 | 85 | 13 | 15 | 86 | 13 |
| Individual projects/activities approved | 10 | 133 | 10 | 10 | 93 | 9 | 10 | 109 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 10 |
| Milestone activities completed | 20 | 80 | 16 | 20 | 80 | 16 | 26 | 127 | 26 | 20 | 100 | 20 |
| ODS phased-out for individual projects | 15 | 82 | 12 | 15 | 100 | 15 | 17 | 109 | 17 | 15 | 101 | 15 |
| Project completion | 10 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 142 | 10 | 12 | 167 | 12 | 10 | 75 | 8 |
| Policy/regulatory assistance completed | 10 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 10 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 10 | 100 | 10 |
| Speed of financial completion | 10 | 91 | 9 | 10 | 87 | 9 | 10 | 133 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Timely submission of project completion reports | 5 | 125 | 5 | 5 | 77 | 4 | 5 | 367 | 5 | 5 | 200 | 5 |
| Timely submission of progress reports | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 |
| 2013 Assessment | 100 | | 89 | 100 | | 89 | 100 | | 98 | 100 | | 86 |
| <i>2012 Assessment</i> | | | <i>87</i> | | | <i>89</i> | | | <i>100</i> | | | <i>71</i> |

*For 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 number.

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

4. Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment² and non-investment³ projects, respectively, using performance indicators existing prior to decision 41/93. An analysis of the performance for investment projects indicates that for 2013:

- (a) The indicator "ODS phased out" was achieved by UNDP (100 per cent) and the World Bank (98 per cent); UNIDO achieved 27 per cent of its target suggesting that the expected level of phase-out was projected to be almost four times more than what was achieved. UNIDO should assess carefully estimated phase-out as it also did not achieve its targeted phase-out in 2012.
- (b) The target for the amount of "funds disbursed" and "project completion reports" were fully achieved (100 per cent) by UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank.
- (c) No agency achieved 100 per cent of the indicator "distribution among countries⁴". UNDP (81 per cent) had the highest achievement, followed by UNIDO (72 per cent) and the World Bank (67 per cent).

² Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

³ Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

⁴ This indicator identifies the extent to which countries had projects in the business plan approved for them.

- (d) The indicator “value of projects approved⁵” was achieved by about 90 per cent of their targets with the World Bank achieving the highest percentage (93 per cent) which was an improvement over its achievement of 29 per cent in 2012.
- (e) The indicator “ODS to be phased out⁶” was achieved by UNDP (100 per cent), while the World Bank achieved 25 per cent and UNIDO 21 per cent. This performance suggests that UNDP more accurately identified the phase-out in its business plan while the other agencies did not.
- (f) The cost of project preparation⁷ varied from 0.22 per cent for the World Bank, to 1.08 per cent for UNIDO, and to 1.8 per cent for UNDP.
- (g) The indicator “cost-effectiveness⁸” of projects show UNDP’s portfolio with a cost-effectiveness of US \$56.92/kg ODP compared to US \$118.26/kg ODP for the World Bank and US \$186.02/kg ODP for UNIDO. This indicator varies significantly from year to year; for example, in 2012, UNDP’s portfolio had a cost-effectiveness of US \$92.53/kg ODP while the World Bank had US \$69.01/kg ODP and UNIDO had US \$35.34/kg ODP.
- (h) The “speed of first disbursement⁹” indicates that UNIDO made its first disbursement in the shortest period of time (8.5 months), followed by UNDP (13.7 months) and the World Bank¹⁰ (24.6 months).
- (i) The indicator “speed of project completion” is roughly three years for all agencies, and has roughly remained the same for UNDP and the World Bank while UNIDO’s project completion has gradually lengthened in months.
- (j) The indicator “net emissions due to delays¹¹” was the lowest in UNDP’s portfolio (538 ODP tonnes emitted) followed by the World Bank (901 ODP tonnes emitted) and UNIDO (8,805 ODP tonnes emitted).

5. An analysis of the non-investment project performance indicates that:

- (a) The indicator “funds disbursed” shows the highest value by UNDP (88 per cent), followed by UNIDO (62 per cent), World Bank (49 per cent) and UNEP (47 per cent). UNEP, with the largest non-investment portfolio has since 2004 underestimated disbursement. The World Bank has also historically underestimated funds disbursed.

⁵ This indicator indicates the extent to which the values in the business plan represent the values approved.

⁶ This indicator indicates the extent to which the actual amount of ODS was phased out.

⁷ This indicator is calculated by the value of projects approved divided by the cost of those projects’ preparation and reflects the change over time in approving projects on an individual basis to MYAs. For most years, the cost of project preparation ranges from 1 to 3 per cent of project value. However, starting around 2010 the cost went up to 10 per cent of the approval.

⁸ This indicator is related to the size and phase-out associated with the projects. Prior to 2010, those cost-effectiveness values ranged from \$3 to \$6/kg. However, starting in 2010 the cost-effectiveness reached over \$100/kg reflecting the low ODP values of HCFCs.

⁹ This indicator is a cumulative measurement that takes into account all projects approved since the inception of the Fund, and reflects how fast funds are used in the beneficiary country.

¹⁰ The larger time required for the World Bank’s first disbursement is a result of its internal approval process.

¹¹ This indicator is based on ongoing projects only and measures the latest impact of delays and is a cumulative figure. It was established prior to the accelerated HCFC phase-out agreed in 2007 and should be expressed in metric tonnes to more accurately reflect the impact on HCFC emissions.

- (b) The indicator “speed of delivery until first disbursement” shows that first disbursement was achieved first by UNEP (9.8 months) followed by UNIDO (10.2 months), UNDP (11.9 months) and the World Bank (14.7 months).
- (c) The indicator “speed until project completion” was as follows: World Bank (30 months), UNIDO (33 months), UNEP (35 months) and UNDP (37 months).

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

6. A total of 74¹² questionnaires received from Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the implementing agencies were processed. Annex III presents the detailed results for each question, by agency. Table 3 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 send responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III.

Table 3: Qualitative performance of implementing agencies by category

| Category | Highly satisfactory | Satisfactory | Less satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Impact | 24 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| Organization and cooperation | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| Technical assistance/training | 17 | 28 | 1 | 0 |

7. The NOUs answer a questionnaire divided into three categories, then into several sub-categories and questions by sub-category. NOUs may provide any rating to any question. Table 4 summarizes the comments by the NOU and response by the relevant agency to those questions or categories for which the agency received either a less satisfactory or unsatisfactory rating from the NOU.

Table 4: Countries’ comments on and agencies’ responses to qualitative performance assessments ratings of less satisfactory or un-satisfactory

| Agency | Country | Comment by NOU | Comment by agency |
|--------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| UNDP | Belize | NOU to be more involved in the decision-making process. | Agreed. It will do its utmost to make sure involvement of the NOU. |
| UNDP | Dominican Republic (the) | Issues with coordination with local UNDP office. | Addressing this issue to Montreal Protocol unit based in Panama. A mission has been planned. |
| UNEP | Afghanistan | Level of consultation with national stakeholders on the feasibility to enforce regulatory tools proposed in the HPMP. NOU is very content with UNEP's overall assistance. | Clarification has been provided that the policy instruments can be adjusted as per the Government priorities. UNEP offered to assist in the review, if needed. |
| UNEP | Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | Coordination of multi-year, policy development and training projects. | The issues are related to Germany as the lead agency of the HPMP. UNEP is only assisting with the institutional strengthening project. |
| UNEP | Guyana | Return of unspent HPMP preparation fund. | Funds were returned in line with decisions by the Committee. The issue will be clarified with the NOU. |
| UNEP | Sao Tome and Principe | Technical advice on equipment specifications. | The country had been advised on the type of refrigeration identifiers to purchase and the composition of the technicians’ tool kit. |

¹² Germany (7), UNDP (18), UNEP (33), UNIDO (15) and the World Bank (1).

| Agency | Country | Comment by NOU | Comment by agency |
|---------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| UNIDO | Egypt | Time for processing of payments and local expenses. | NOU was informed that this was related to the introduction of a new financial system/software. The NOU had no negative observations regarding project implementation matters. |
| UNIDO | Madagascar | Time for processing of payments. | Minimum timelines for various administrative procedures (e.g., procurement, processing of financial transactions) which are communicated to the countries in advance. The issue will be further discussed with the NOU to address their expectations. |
| UNIDO | South Africa | Funding criteria and involvement in decision making with respect to regulations and training. | Partly due to the country's low exposure to the Fund; the NOU was facing significant challenges (such as frequent staff changes and lack of internal support). UNIDO will further increase its efforts to develop institutional capacity and to elevate the issue within the Government in order to strengthen its capacity for compliance with the Protocol. |
| Germany | Afghanistan | Coordination and communication with NOU. | As of this writing, the Secretariat has not received a response. |
| Germany | Bolivia (Plurinational State of) | Extent of technical support. | As of this writing, the Secretariat has not received a response. |

SECRETARIAT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENTS

8. The quantitative performance indicators show that all agencies achieved over 85 per cent of their targets. Overall, in 2013 the agencies' performance was slightly higher than it had been in 2012.

9. The trend analysis of nine investment projects' performance indicators indicated improvements in most indicators in 2013 from 2012. However, assessment of the performance indicators "ODS phased out" (UNIDO), "ODS to be phased out" (UNIDO and the World Bank) and "net emissions due to delays" (UNIDO) might be improved by giving further consideration when setting the targets. The indicators "cost-effectiveness" and "cost of project preparation" are inconclusive with respect to any trend due to the differences in ODP of CFCs and HCFCs and the approval of MYAs instead of individual projects. First disbursement ranged from 8 to 25 months after approval but also reflected the historical performance of the agencies with different internal approval policies. Investment project completion ranged from 34 to 40 months and reflected the historical three-year project completion timeframe.

10. The trend analysis of non-investment project shows that UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank should further consider "fund disbursement" targets in their future business plan taking into account their 2013 performance for that indicator. In 2013, the speed of first disbursement ranged from 10 to 15 months and completion from 30 to 37 months.

11. 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 qualitative performance indicators.

12. The Executive Committee may wish to request relevant implementing agencies to have an open and constructive discussion with the respective NOUs to address their observations as shown in Table 4.

This would apply to UNDP for the ratings from Belize and the Dominican Republic, UNEP from Afghanistan and Sao Tome and Principe, and UNIDO from Madagascar and South Africa. Responses to ratings are still pending from Germany with respect to Afghanistan and Bolivia (Plurinational State of).

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2013 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/16;
 - (ii) With appreciation that all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2013 exceeding 85 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis performance improved in 2013 over that in 2012, noting that the performance for indicators such as "ODS to be phased out", "ODS phased out", "net emissions due to delays" and "funds disbursed for non-investment projects" might be improved from careful targeting in future;
- (b) To request the following implementing agencies to report to the 74th meeting on their open and constructive discussion with the respective national ozone unit (NOU) as follows:
 - (i) UNDP for the ratings on the qualitative performance assessment from Belize with respect to a status on involving the NOU in decision-making and the Dominican Republic with respect to the service provided by the UNDP country office;
 - (ii) UNEP for the ratings on the qualitative performance assessment from Afghanistan with respect to consultation on how policy tools could be adjusted; with respect to return of unspent project preparation funds in Guyana; and with respect to the choice of refrigeration identifiers and technicians' tool kits in Sao Tome and Principe;
 - (iii) UNIDO for the ratings on the qualitative performance assessment from Madagascar with respect to administrative procedures; and with respect to funding criteria and decisions on regulations and training in South Africa; and
- (c) To request the Government of Germany to provide by the 74th meeting responses to ratings on the qualitative performance assessment with respect to Afghanistan and Bolivia (Plurinational State of).

Annex I

**INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2013)**

| UNDP | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 24% | 93% | 100% | 76% | 41% | 99% | 92% | 100% | 79% | 91% | 85% | 100% | 86% | 100% | N/A | 0% | 94% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 59% | 100% | 95% | 90% | 100% | 95% | 77% | 64% | 100% | 96% | 66% | 76% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 38% | 93% | 86% | 87% | 100% | 97% | 79% | 30% | 82% | 74% | 100% | 54% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 65% | 61% | 63% | 58% | 38% | 72% | 44% | 75% | 64% | 66% | 83% | 51% | 79% | 94% | 81% |
| Value of projects approved | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 80% | 100% | 99% | 65% | 73% | 82% | 83% | 77% | 100% | 100% | 38% | 87% | 100% | 87% |
| ODS to be phased out | 74% | 100% | | 100% | 92% | 96% | 77% | 44% | 89% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 61% | 100% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) | | 4.4% | 3% | 2.7% | 2.7% | 1.1% | 2.5% | 1.6% | 3.6% | 1.4% | 0.5% | 3.6% | 1.5% | 14.7% | 14.4% | 3.0% | 2.8% | 1.8% |
| 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 | 92.53 | 56.92 |
| 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 | 13.7 | 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 | 34.9 | 34.9 |
| 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 | 520 | 538 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIDO | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| ODS phased out | 73% | 80% | 100% | 57% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 88% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 86% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 27% |
| Funds disbursed | 81% | 88% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 91% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 83% | 66% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 83% | 74% | 89% | 73% | 78% | 67% | 79% | 69% | 75% | 82% | 61% | 81% | 83% | 100% | 72% |
| Value of projects approved | 99% | 99% | | 100% | 93% | 99% | 97% | 68% | 82% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 59% | 78% | 100% | 79% | 88% |
| ODS to be phased out | 42% | 85% | | 100% | 72% | 100% | 100% | 37% | 89% | 100% | 47% | 91% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 36% | 81% | 21% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) | | 2.2% | 4.2% | 2.7% | 3.8% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 3.6% | 2% | 0.9% | 1.8% | 2.1% | 1.3% | 11.9% | 5.7% | 2.7% | 3.9% | 1.1% |
| 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 | 35.34 | 186.02 |
| 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 | 8.6 | 8.5 |
| 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 | 35.9 | 36.8 |
| 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 | 17,144 | 8,805 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| World Bank | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 32% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 69% | 31% | 84% | 47% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 20% | 98% |
| Funds disbursed | 64% | 77% | 88% | 97% | 100% | 74% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 64% | 43% | 15% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 61% | 98% | 74% | 100% | 84% | 84% | 100% | 84% | 74% | 69% | 25% | 20% | 85% | 10% | 100% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 75% | 79% | 67% | 79% | 65% | 71% | 93% | 79% | 92% | 77% | 67% | 50% | 57% | 100% | 67% |
| Value of projects approved | 94% | 87% | | 100% | 75% | 92% | 100% | 82% | 94% | 83% | 87% | 83% | 93% | 98% | 3% | 93% | 29% | 93% |
| ODS to be phased out | 34% | 100% | | 100% | 83% | 72% | 91% | 65% | 59% | 100% | 66% | 93% | 35% | 100% | 89% | 11% | 7% | 25% |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) | | 2.9% | 2.7% | 2.9% | 5.5% | 1.3% | 0.4% | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 0.02% | 0.6% | 2.2% | 74.8% | 1.5% | 5.6% | 0.2% |
| 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 | 69.01 | 118.26 |
| 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 | 24.7 | 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 | 40.2 | 40.3 |
| 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 | 901 | 901 |

Annex II

**NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2013)**

| UNDP | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 61% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 88% |
| 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 | 11.9 | 11.9 |
| 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 | 37.4 | 37.2 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNEP | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Funds Disbursed | 49% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 93% | 99% | 54% | 54% | 51% | 49% | 64% | 69% | 60% | 63% | 55% | 47% |
| 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 | 9.8 | 9.8 |
| 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 | 34.4 | 34.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIDO | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Funds Disbursed | 80% | 100% | 49% | 100% | 48% | 89% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 80% | 89% | 69% | 100% | 84% | 95% | 100% | 62% |
| 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 | 10.3 | 10.2 |
| 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 | 32.8 | 32.8 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| World Bank | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 49% | 35% | 27% | 12% | 38% | 100% | 79% | 100% | 57% | 59% | 59% | 19% | 47% | 75% | 59% | 49% |
| 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 | 15.1 | 14.7 |
| 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 | 30.3 | 30.2 |

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Ratings | Germany | IBRD | 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 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 21 | 9 | 44 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 8 | 12 | 5 | 27 | | |
| | | IMPACT (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 24 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | | 9 | 11 | 3 | 26 | | |
| | | In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 9 | 44 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 9 | 11 | 6 | 28 | | |
| | | ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION | General | Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 1 | 14 | 29 | 11 | 59 |
| | | | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | | | | Satisfactory | 3 | | 3 | 4 | 4 | 14 |
| Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks? | Highly satisfactory | | | 3 | 1 | 8 | 19 | 10 | 41 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 3 | | 9 | 14 | 4 | 30 | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services? | Highly satisfactory | | | 3 | 1 | 7 | 15 | 7 | 33 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 3 | | 8 | 14 | 7 | 32 | | |
| Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding? | Highly satisfactory | | | 4 | 1 | 13 | 26 | 10 | 54 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 4 | 6 | 4 | 16 | | |
| | 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 | | | 3 | 1 | 10 | 22 | 10 | 46 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 6 | 11 | 4 | 23 | | |
| | 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 | | | 2 | | 5 | 15 | 1 | 23 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | | | 10 | 8 | 5 | 23 | | |
| ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | | | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 20 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 6 | 6 | 4 | 18 | | |
| Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development? | Highly satisfactory | | | 5 | 1 | 12 | 25 | 8 | 51 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 5 | 8 | 5 | 20 | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification? | Highly satisfactory | | | 5 | 1 | 11 | 24 | 8 | 49 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 5 | 9 | 5 | 21 | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation? | Highly satisfactory | | | 5 | 1 | 12 | 24 | 8 | 50 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 1 | | 5 | 9 | 5 | 20 | | |
| Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time? | Highly satisfactory | | | 3 | 1 | 3 | 20 | 7 | 34 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 13 | 12 | 6 | 33 | | |
| TECHNICAL | General | | | Did project partners receive sufficient | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 7 | 38 |

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Ratings | Germany | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO | Total | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|-------|-------|---|
| ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING | | technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology? | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | | 10 | 10 | 6 | 29 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits? | Highly satisfactory | 5 | | 4 | 19 | 11 | 39 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | | 1 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 29 | |
| | | 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 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 37 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 10 | 14 | 7 | 33 | |
| | | Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 9 | 41 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 7 | 9 | 5 | 23 | |
| | | In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | | 7 | 22 | 7 | 40 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 4 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 24 | |
| | | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | 3 | | 2 | 8 | 4 | 17 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 28 | |
| | | Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 7 | 36 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | | 8 | 10 | 7 | 28 | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 3 | | 7 | 17 | 9 | 36 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | |
| | | Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities? | Satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 9 | 14 | 4 | 31 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 1 | | 7 | 15 | 6 | 29 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | Investment projects | Satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 6 | 32 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 2 | | 7 | 17 | 7 | 33 | |
| | Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties that may have been encountered subsequent to the provision of non-ODS technology? | Satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 28 | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | |
| | | Highly satisfactory | 3 | | 6 | 17 | 8 | 34 | | |
| | National phase-out plans | Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate? | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 26 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 2 | | 3 | 13 | 7 | 25 | |
| | | Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate? | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 11 | 18 | 6 | 38 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 4 | | 8 | 15 | 8 | 35 | |
| | | Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate? | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 4 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 26 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 4 | | 4 | 20 | 7 | 35 | |
| | | Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective? | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 31 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 8 | 33 | |
| | | Were proposed implementation strategies adequate? | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 10 | 12 | 6 | 30 | |
| | | | Highly satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 3 | 22 | |
| | | Regulatory assistance | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | 2 | | 3 |

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Ratings | Germany | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO | Total |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| | projects | circumstances? | Satisfactory | 1 | | 7 | 12 | 6 | 26 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable? | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 26 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | | 8 | 13 | 6 | 28 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable? | Highly satisfactory | 2 | | 2 | 14 | 3 | 21 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | | 8 | 13 | 6 | 28 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | Training projects | Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory? | Highly satisfactory | 5 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 8 |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | Satisfactory | | | 1 | | 11 | 12 | 5 | 29 |
| | Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught? | | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 7 | 32 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Satisfactory | | | 2 | | 12 | 13 | 6 | 33 | |
