



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/18  
21 October 2015

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Seventy-fifth Meeting  
Montreal, 16-20 November 2015

**EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2014 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 2014 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>1</sup>;
  - (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.

<sup>1</sup> Based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weightings in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2014 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 71/20 to 71/23.

**Table 1: 2014 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	21	13	13	No	29	12	12	No	22	14	14	No	5	3	3	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	14	15	15	Yes	65	39	49	No	10	11	11	Yes	3	2	2	No
Milestone activities completed	18	15	15	No	26	12	12	No	19	At least 25	25	Yes	5	5	5	Yes
ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	45.3	45.3	45.3	Yes	0.0	0.0	0.0	Yes	190.7	202.8	202.8	Yes	111.4	115.6	115.6	Yes
Project completion	19	20	20	Yes	49	58	35	No	11	12	12	Yes	3	5	3	Yes
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	1	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 (77)	72	72	No	On time (122)	On time	110	No	12 months after operational completion	8.1 months	12 months	Yes	30 months	28 months	28 months	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	On time (17 including 2 individual and 15 MYA PCR)	100% (6 individual PCRs)	21 (6 individual and 15 MYA PCR)	Yes	On time (39 including 15 individual and 24 MYA PCR)	On time	10 (5 individual and 5 MYA PCR)	No	On time (13 including 5 individual and 8 MYA PCR)	On time	On time (16 including 6 individual and 10 MYA PCR)	Yes	On Time (25 including 6 individual and 19 MYA PCR)	On Time (6 individual PCR)	6 (6 individual PCR and 0 MYAPCR)	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	On time	On time	On time	Yes
Number of targets achieved				6/9				3/9				7/8				6/9

Weighted assessment of performance

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2014 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

**Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2014**

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	62	9	15	41	6	15	64	10	15	60	9
Individual projects/activities approved	10	107	10	10	75	8	10	110	10	10	67	7
Milestone activities completed	20	83	17	20	46	9	26	132	26	20	100	20
ODS phased-out for individual projects	15	100	15	15	100	15	17	106	17	15	104	15
Project completion	10	105	10	10	71	7	12	109	12	10	100	10
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10	200	10	10	100	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100	10
Speed of financial completion	10	94	9	10	90	9	10	100	10	10	107	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	124	5	5	26	1	5	123	5	5	24	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	5	100	5	5	100	5	5	100	5
<b>2014 Assessment</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>90</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>87</b>
<i>2013 Assessment</i>			89			89			98			86

\*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 investment<sup>2</sup> and non-investment<sup>3</sup> projects, respectively, using performance indicators existing prior to decision 41/93. An analysis of the performance for investment projects indicates that for 2014:

- (a) The indicator "ODS phased out" was fully achieved by UNDP and the World Bank (100 per cent); UNIDO achieved 42 per cent of its target suggesting that the expected level of phase-out was projected to be more than twice what was achieved. UNIDO should assess carefully estimated phase-out as it also did not achieve its targeted phase-out in 2013, either;
- (b) The target for the amount of "funds disbursed" was fully achieved by UNDP and the World Bank (100 per cent) and UNIDO (97 per cent);
- (c) The target for submission of "project completion reports" was fully achieved by UNDP and UNIDO (100 per cent). The World Bank only achieved 24 per cent of its target by submitting only PCRs for individual projects (6 projects of 6 planned) and not submitting PCRs for MYA projects (19 PCRs);

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

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

- (d) No agency achieved 100 per cent of the indicator “distribution among countries<sup>4</sup>”. UNDP (68 per cent) had the highest achievement, followed by UNIDO (67 per cent) and the World Bank (50 per cent);
- (e) No agency achieved 100 per cent of the indicator “value of projects approved<sup>5</sup>”. UNDP (89 per cent) had the highest achievement, followed by the World Bank (72 per cent) and UNIDO (64 per cent);
- (f) No agency achieved 100 per cent of the indicator “ODS to be phased out<sup>6</sup>”: UNDP (29 per cent), UNIDO (36 per cent) and the World Bank (11 per cent). This performance suggests that implementing agencies did not accurately identify the phase-out in their business plans;
- (g) The indicator “cost of project preparation<sup>7</sup>” varied from 0.2 per cent for the UNDP, to 0.6 per cent for the World Bank, and to 1.3 per cent for UNIDO;
- (h) The indicator “cost-effectiveness<sup>8</sup>” of projects shows UNIDO’s portfolio with a cost-effectiveness of US \$79.01/kg ODP compared to US \$214.04/kg ODP for the World Bank and US \$249.68/kg ODP for UNDP. This indicator varies significantly from year to year; for example, in 2013, UNDP’s portfolio had a cost-effectiveness of US \$56.92/kg ODP while the World Bank had US \$118.26/kg ODP and UNIDO had US \$186.02/kg ODP;
- (i) The indicator “speed of first disbursement<sup>9</sup>” indicates that UNIDO made its first disbursement in the shortest period of time (8.6 months), followed by UNDP (13.7 months) and the World Bank<sup>10</sup> (24.6 months);
- (j) 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; and
- (k) The indicator “net emissions due to delays<sup>11</sup>” was the lowest in UNDP’s portfolio (248 ODP tonnes emitted) followed by the World Bank (1,002 ODP tonnes emitted) and UNIDO (9,939 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 (100 per cent), followed by UNIDO (82 per cent), UNEP (61 per cent) and the World Bank (42 per

---

<sup>4</sup> The extent to which countries had projects in the business plan approved for them.

<sup>5</sup> The extent to which the values in the business plan represent the values approved.

<sup>6</sup> The extent to which the actual amount of ODS was phased out.

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

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

<sup>11</sup> The extent to which ODS continues to be consumed or produced due to project delays.

cent). UNEP, with the largest non-investment portfolio, has since 2004 underestimated disbursement. The World Bank has also historically underestimated funds disbursed;

- (b) The indicator “speed of delivery until first disbursement” shows that first disbursement was achieved first by UNEP (9.9 months) followed by UNIDO (10.1 months), UNDP (11.8 months) and the World Bank (14 months); and
- (c) The indicator “speed until project completion” was as follows: World Bank (30 months), UNIDO (33.7 months), UNEP (35.3 months) and UNDP (36.7 months).

### Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

6. A total of 64<sup>12</sup> 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
<b>Impact</b>	15	19	0	1
<b>Organization and cooperation</b>	18	13	0	1
<b>Technical assistance/training</b>	11	27	0	1

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. Bilateral and implementing agencies provided reasons and the results of discussions with the respective NOUs. Dialogues between NOUs and implementing agencies have not been completed for several countries that identified issues in their qualitative assessments (i.e., ratings of “less satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”).

## SECRETARIAT’S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### COMMENTS

8. The quantitative performance indicators show that all agencies achieved over 86 per cent of their targets except for UNEP (70 per cent). In 2014 the performance for UNDP and the World Bank was slightly higher than it had been in 2013 but slightly lower for UNEP and UNIDO.

9. The trend analysis of nine investment projects’ performance indicators indicated no improvements in most indicators in 2014 from 2013. However, assessment of the performance indicators “ODS phased out” (UNIDO), “ODS to be phased out” (UNDP, 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 9 to 25 months after approval but also reflected the historical performance of the agencies with different internal approval policies. Investment project completion ranged from 35 to 41 months and reflected the historical three-year project completion timeframe.

<sup>12</sup> Germany (4), UNDP (15), UNEP (28), UNIDO (15) and the World Bank (2).

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 2015 performance for that indicator. In 2014, the speed of first disbursement ranged from 10 to 14 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 those issues identified in the qualitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies. This would apply to UNDP for the ratings from Belize, UNEP from the Central African Republic and Panama and UNIDO from Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, and Sierra Leone.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
  - (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies’ performance against their 2014 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/18;
  - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2014 of at least 70 on a scale of 100;
  - (iii) That the trend analysis performance has not improved in 2014 over that in 2013, 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 75<sup>th</sup> 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 timely delivery of services;
  - (ii) UNEP for the ratings on the qualitative performance assessment from Central African Republic (the) with respect to use of training funds, acquisition of equipment, meeting stakeholders expectations, training or technical advice, and the quality of training and their design; and Panama, with respect to involvement of the NOU in project development, implementation, meeting stakeholders expectations, advice on technical difficulties; and
  - (iii) UNIDO for the ratings on the qualitative performance assessment from Bahrain with respect to timely delivery, advice on technology, and capacity building; Egypt, with respect to timely delivery and responsiveness to NOU; Iraq, with respect to unsatisfactory ratings for all categories; and Sierra Leone, with respect to work plan explanation, NOU involvement in project identification, development and implementation.

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

<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%	81%	68%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%
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%	0.2%
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	249.68
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	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	35.2
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	248
<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%	72%	67%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%
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%	1.3%
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	79.01

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	8.6
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	38.3
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	9,939
<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100 %	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100 %		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%
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%	0.6%
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	214.04
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	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	40.8
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	1,002



Annex II

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

<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	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	11.9	11.9	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	37.4	37.2	36.7
<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%
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	9.9
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	35.3
<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%
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	10.1
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	33.7
<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>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%
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	14.0
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	30.0



**Annex III**

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES  
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2014**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Ratings	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	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	8	18	9	2	40
			Satisfactory	1	7	9	4		21
			Less satisfactory			1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	2	3	7	2	1	15
			Satisfactory	1	8	7	3		19
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory				1		1
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	3	8	14	6	2	33
			Satisfactory	1	7	13	7		28
			Less satisfactory				1		1
			Unsatisfactory			1	1		2
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	4	12	23	9
Satisfactory					3	5	5		13
Less satisfactory									
Unsatisfactory							1		1
Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory			3	6	17	8	1	35
	Satisfactory			1	10	10	5	1	27
	Less satisfactory					1	1		2
	Unsatisfactory						1		1
Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory			3	6	14	6	2	31
	Satisfactory			1	8	10	8		27
	Less satisfactory					2			2
	Unsatisfactory						1		1
Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory			3	12	24	9	2	50
	Satisfactory			1	4	4	4		13
	Less satisfactory						1		1
	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	11	16	11	2	42
	Satisfactory			2	3	12	3		20
	Less satisfactory								
	Unsatisfactory					1	1		2
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	6	3		15
	Satisfactory			2	5	11	5	1	24
	Less satisfactory								
	Unsatisfactory						1		1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory			2	5	8	2	1	18
	Satisfactory			1	3	5	4		13
	Less satisfactory								
	Unsatisfactory						1		1
Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory			2	12	21	9	2	46
	Satisfactory			2	3	5	4		14
	Less satisfactory			1	1		2		
	Unsatisfactory				1		1		
Was active involvement of the	Highly satisfactory	2	12	19	9	1	43		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Ratings	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total		
		national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Satisfactory	2	3	8	4	1	18		
			Less satisfactory				1		1		
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	3	11	21	9	2	46		
			Satisfactory	1	4	5	4		14		
			Less satisfactory			1	1		2		
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Unsatisfactory				1		1		
			Highly satisfactory	2	6	13	3	1	25		
			Satisfactory	2	8	14	9	1	34		
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/T RAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Less satisfactory			1	1		2
					Unsatisfactory				1		1
					Highly satisfactory	2	6	16	6	1	31
Satisfactory	2				6	10	6	1	25		
Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Less satisfactory				1	2			3		
	Unsatisfactory						1		1		
	Highly satisfactory			2	8	13	8	2	33		
	Satisfactory			2	5	14	4		25		
Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Less satisfactory				1	1	1		3		
	Unsatisfactory						1		1		
	Highly satisfactory			2	9	10	7	2	30		
	Satisfactory			2	5	13	7		27		
Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Less satisfactory			3			3				
	Unsatisfactory				1		1				
	Highly satisfactory	2	7	13	5	1	28				
	Satisfactory	2	6	13	6	1	28				
In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Less satisfactory				1		1				
	Unsatisfactory				1		1				
	Highly satisfactory	1	3	4	2	1	11				
	Satisfactory	2	8	11	5	1	27				
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Less satisfactory										
	Unsatisfactory				1		1				
	Highly satisfactory	2	7	11	8	2	30				
	Satisfactory	2	7	14	5		28				
Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Less satisfactory			1			1				
	Unsatisfactory				1		1				
	Highly satisfactory	3	6	13	7	2	31				
	Satisfactory	1	9	14	6		30				
Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Less satisfactory				1		1				
	Unsatisfactory				1		1				
	Highly satisfactory	2	4	10	9	2	27				
	Satisfactory	2	9	8	4		23				
Investment projects	Less satisfactory				2		2				
	Unsatisfactory			1	1		2				
	Highly satisfactory	2	6	10	6	1	25				
	Satisfactory	2	8	8	7	1	26				
		Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties that may have been encountered subsequent to the	Less satisfactory			2			2		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Ratings	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		provision of non-ODS technology?	Unsatisfactory			1	1		2
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	5	5	7	1	21
Satisfactory				6	11	6	1	24	
Less satisfactory					1	1		2	
Unsatisfactory					1	1		2	
Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?		Highly satisfactory	1	4	9	4		18	
		Satisfactory	1	8	16	8	2	35	
		Less satisfactory	1	1	1			3	
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?		Highly satisfactory	2	7	8	7	1	25	
		Satisfactory	1	6	12	4	1	24	
		Less satisfactory							
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?		Highly satisfactory	2	6	16	8	2	34	
		Satisfactory	1	7	8	3		19	
		Less satisfactory			1			1	
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	14	6	2	30		
	Satisfactory	1	7	11	6		25		
	Less satisfactory								
	Unsatisfactory			1	1		2		
Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1	3	8	6	2	20	
		Satisfactory	1	6	14	4		25	
		Less satisfactory	1					1	
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	2	4	10	5	1	22	
		Satisfactory	1	5	13	6	1	26	
		Less satisfactory							
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory		3	10	5	1	19	
		Satisfactory	2	5	11	4	1	23	
		Less satisfactory	1					1	
		Unsatisfactory			1	1		2	
Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	2	4	12	6	2	26	
		Satisfactory	2	9	11	4		26	
		Less satisfactory			1			1	
		Unsatisfactory			1	2		3	
	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	4	5	12	7	2	30	
		Satisfactory		8	11	3		22	
		Less satisfactory			1			1	
		Unsatisfactory			1	2		3	