



联合国
环境规划署

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/17
3 November 2016

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第七十七次会议
2016年11月28日至12月2日，蒙特利尔

关于 2015 年业务计划执行情况的评价

导言

1. 本文件介绍：

- (a) 关于各执行机构在 2015 年业务计划所确定的各项绩效指标的绩效和提交第七十七次会议的进度报告和财务报告的量化评价；¹
- (b) 关于 8 项绩效指标的各项指标的趋势分析；
- (c) 根据自国家臭氧机构干事收到的意见，对各执行机构所作的量化评价；以及
- (d) 秘书处的评论和建议。

量化绩效指标分析

2. 表 1 介绍各项核准指标、实现各项指标的进度措施以及已实现指标的数目。

¹ 根据第号决定通过并经第 47/51 号和第 71/28 号决定修正的绩效指标，执行委员会经第 73/29 号至第 73/32 号决定通过的 2015 年业务计划的指标。

表 1：2015 年绩效指标的指标和完成情况

| | 开发计划署 | | | | 环境规划署 | | | | 工发组织 | | | | 世界银行 | | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|-------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|---------|----------|--------|
| | 目标 | 机构完成情况 | 秘书处评估 | 是否完成目标 | 目标 | 机构完成情况 | 秘书处评估 | 是否完成目标 | 目标 | 机构完成情况 | 秘书处评估 | 是否完成目标 | 目标 | 机构完成情况 | 秘书处评估 | 是否完成目标 |
| 核准付款 | 36 | 29 | 29 | 否 | 56 | 准时 | 44 | 否 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 是 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 否 |
| 核准项目/活动 | 19 | 39 | 39 | 是 | 69 | 准时 | 139 | 是 | 22 | 50 | 51 | 是 | 4 | 8 | 8 | 是 |
| 已发放资金 (美元) | 19.00 百万 | 32.00 百万 | 32.00 百万 | 是 | 9.51 百万 | 未提供 | 11.95 百万 | 是 | 22.35 百万 | 26.21 百万 | 26.31 百万 | 是 | 27 百万 | 3.95 百万 | 43.95 百万 | 是 |
| 淘汰的 ODS | 500.5 | 418.2 | 418.2 | 否 | 94.5 | 未提供 | 49.9 | 否 | 587.8 | 642.94 | 612.4 | 是 | 1,338.3 | 3,053.3 | 3,053.3 | 是 |
| 活动的项目完成情况 | 75 | 69 | 69 | 否 | 99 | 未提供 | 60 | 否 | 41 | 61 | 61 | 是 | 13 | 4 | 4 | 否 |
| 财务工作完成速度 | 应提交的 70% (32) | 32 | 32 | 是 | 4 个月 | 因2015年实施 UMOJA，造成资金发放延宕 | 20 个月 | 否 | 运作完成后 12 个月 | 6.73 个月 | 16.86 个月 | 否 | 90% | 40% | 40% | 否 |
| 及时提交的项目完成情况报告 | 应提交的 70% (3) | 100% | 100% (3) | 是 | 准时 (70) | 准时 | 未准时 (44) | 否 | 准时 | 准时 | 准时 | 是 | 准时 (25) | 未准时 | 未准时 (6) | 否 |
| 及时提交的进度报告 | 准时 | 准时 | 准时 | 是 | 准时 | 准时 | 准时 | 是 | 准时 | 准时 | 准时 | 是 | 准时 | 准时 | 准时 | 是 |
| 指标数目 | | | | 5/8 | | | | 3/8 | | | | 7/8 | | | | 4/8 |

加权绩效评估

3. 表 2 列出 2015 年根据秘书处的方法以绩效指标显示的加权评估结果。

表 2：2015 年各执行机构加权绩效评估

| 项目 | 开发计划署 | | | 环境规划署 | | | 工发组织 | | | 世界银行 | | |
|-----------------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|-------|-----------|
| | 加权 | 目标完成% | 分数 | 加权 | 目标完成% | 分数 | 加权 | 目标完成% | 分数 | 加权 | 目标完成% | 分数 |
| 核准付款 | 10 | 81 | 8 | 10 | 79 | 8 | 10 | 104 | 10 | 10 | 56 | 6 |
| 核准项目/活动 | 10 | 205 | 10 | 10 | 201 | 10 | 10 | 232 | 10 | 10 | 200 | 10 |
| 已发放资金 | 15 | 168 | 15 | 15 | 126 | 15 | 15 | 118 | 15 | 15 | 163 | 15 |
| 淘汰的 ODS | 25 | 84 | 21 | 25 | 53 | 13 | 25 | 104 | 25 | 25 | 228 | 25 |
| 活动的项目完成情况 | 20 | 92 | 18 | 20 | 61 | 12 | 20 | 149 | 20 | 20 | 31 | 6 |
| 财务工作完成速度 | 10 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 57 | 6 | 10 | 60 | 6 | 10 | 44 | 4 |
| 及时提交的项目完成情况报告 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 63 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 24 | 1 |
| 及时提交的进度报告 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 |
| 2015 年评估 | 100 | | 92 | 100 | | 72 | 100 | | 96 | 100 | | 72 |

对其他量化绩效指标的分析

4. 附件一和附件二根据第 41/93 号决定以前存在的绩效指标，分别列出了关于投资项目² 和非投资项目³ 的历史性分析。对投资项目的绩效分析表明，2015 年：

- (a) 开发计划署、工发组织和世界银行完全实现了“所淘汰的 ODS”的指标（100%）；
- (b) 开发计划署、工发组织和世界银行完全实现了“已发放资金”的指标（100%）；
- (c) 开发计划署和工发组织和世界银行完全实现了“项目完成情况报告”的指标（100%）。世界银行仅实现 24%；
- (d) 工发组织完全实现了“在各国发放⁴”的指标（100%）。工发组织仅实现 85%，世界银行实现了 33%；
- (e) 世界银行完全实现了“已核准项目的价值⁵”的指标（100%）。开发计划署仅实现 91%，工发组织实现了 93%；

² 投资项目包括以项目编号所设定的多年期协定项目。

³ 仅“已发放资金”、“首次发放资金的速度”和“完成项目的速度”的指标适用于非投资项目。

⁴ 国家业务计划中的项目获得核准的情况。

⁵ 业务计划中所体现价值获得核准的情况。

- (f) 工发组织和世界银行完全实现了“将要淘汰的 ODS⁶”的指标（100%）。开发计划署仅实现 83%；
- (g) “项目编制的费用⁷”的指标从世界银行的 0.4%到工发组织的 1.8%到工发组织的 4.3%不等；
- (h) 项目的“成本效益”指标⁸显示，世界银行管理的项目的成本效益为 19.84 美元/ODP 公斤，而工发组织为 56.02 美元/ODP 公斤，开发计划署为 70.89 美元/ODP 公斤。这项指标逐年变化很大；例如，2014 年，开发计划署管理的项目的成本效益为 249.68 美元/ODP 公斤，而世界银行为 214.04 美元/ODP 公斤，开发计划署为 79.01 美元/ODP 公斤。
- (i) “首次资金发放的速度⁹”表明，工发组织首次发放资金的时间最短（9 个月），其次是开发计划署（13.7 个月）和世界银行¹⁰（24.6 个月）。
- (j) 所有机构的“项目完成速度”的指标大约为三年，开发计划署和世界银行一直保持相同的时间，而工发组织的项目完成时间逐渐增加了数月；以及
- (k) “由于拖延而导致的净排放”¹¹在开发计划署的项目中最低”（排放了 238 ODP 吨），其次是世界银行（排放了 275 ODP 吨）和工发组织（排放了 13,389 ODP 吨）。

5. 对非投资项目绩效的分析显示：

- (a) “发放资金”的指标显示，世界银行的数值最高（100%），其次是工发组织（22%）、开发计划署（47%）和环境规划署（44%）。管理最多非投资项目的环境规划署自 2004 年以来一直低估了资金发放的数额；
- (b) “首次资金发放之前交付的速度”的指标显示，工发组织最早实现首次资金发放（10 个月），其次是环境规划署（10.1 个月）、开发计划署（12 个月）和世界银行（14.1 个月）；以及
- (c) “项目完成之前的速度”的指标的情况如下：世界银行（29.8 个月）、工发组织（32.7 个月）、环境规划署（35.3 个月）和开发计划署（36.3 个月）。

⁶ 所淘汰 ODS 的实际数量。

⁷ 由已核准项目的价值除以这些项目的编制费用计算得出，反映的是根据单个的多年期协定核准项目所用时间的变化。对于大多数年份而言，项目编制的费用从项目价值的 1%到 3%不等。但大约从 2009 年起，费用已增至所核准金额的 10%。

⁸ 这项指标涉及与项目有关的规模和淘汰量。2010 年以前，成本效益值从每公斤 3 美元至 6 美元。不过，从 2010 年开始，成本效益值开始超过每公斤 100 美元，这反映出氟氯烃的低 ODP 值。

⁹ 这个指标是累积的衡量结果，将基金成立以来的所有核准项目都计算在内，以反映出在受惠国能多快用到资金。

¹⁰ 世界银行需要更多时间是因为它的首次付款需要经过内部批准程序的缘故。

¹¹ 由于项目拖延，继续消费或生产 ODS 的程度。

定性绩效指标分析

6. 为评估各双边和执行机构的定性绩效，对所收到第 5 条国家总共 56 份调查问卷¹²进行了分析。附件三详细开列了每个机构在每个问题上的评级。表 3 汇总了总体评级。但应指出的是，几个国家没有提供一个或多个类别的总体评级，但对个别问题作出了答复，已将这些答复列入附件三。所有总体评级都是满意或超过满意。

表 3：按类别分列的各双边和执行机构的定性绩效

| 类别 | 非常满意 | 满意 | 不太满意 | 不满意 |
|---------|------|----|------|-----|
| 影响 | 24 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| 组织与合作 | 20 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 技术援助/培训 | 17 | 28 | 1 | 0 |

7. 国家臭氧机构将调查问卷的答案分为 3 类，然后又分为若干分类并根据分类分列各项问题。在分类别中有 31 个不太满意的评级。国家臭氧机构可能对任何问题作出评级。执行机构提供了原因和与各自的国家臭氧机构的讨论结果。

8. 执行机构一直都能解决问题，只要它们能够与一些定性绩效指标的评级不太满意的国家进行对话。

9. 不过，关于德国政府和纳米比亚对话的初步报告中指出了国家臭氧机构给出不太满意评级的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划方面的问题，包括：决定让国家臭氧机构分发设备而不是直接运往培训中心；送货公司在国家臭氧机构至培训中心途中遗失运送的货物；国家臭氧机构的顾问由于静电问题而决定不使用 HC-290；国家臭氧干事的变化。关于剩余的两个不太满意的评级，德国政府表示，国家臭氧机构没有提供任何解释。谨建议执行委员会请德国政府继续与纳米比亚政府进行对话，并向第七十八次会议提供关于这些行动的执行情况，以便解决氟氯烃淘汰管理计划方面的未决问题。

秘书处的评论和建议

评论

10. 量化绩效指标显示，所有机构均实现了其指标的 72% 或以上。

11. 对 9 个投资项目的绩效指标进行的趋势分析显示，大多数指标在 2015 年都比 2014 年有改善。“成本效益”和“项目编制成本”的指标在趋势方面为显示出结果，这是由于氟氯化碳和氟氯烃所含 ODP 的差异和以多年期协定而不是以个别项目的方式得到批准。在项目得到批准后 9 个月至 25 个月资金首次得到发放，这也反映出各机构不同内部批准政策的历史性做法。完成投资项目的从 35 个月至 41 个月不等，这反映出三年完成项目的历史性时间框架。

12. 对非投资项目的趋势分析显示，开发计划署、环境规划署和工发组织应进一步在其业务计划中考虑“资金发放”指标，同时亦顾及其 2016 年在该项指标方面的绩效。2015

¹² 德国（2 份）、开发计划署（11 份）、环境规划署（34 份）、工发组织（14 份）和世界银行（5 份）。

年，首次资金发放的速度从 10 至 14 个月不等，完成时间从 30 至 36 个月不等。

建议

13. 谨建议执行委员会：

(a) 注意到：

(一) UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/17 号文件所载参照 2015 年业务计划对各执行机构的绩效进行的评价；

(二) 在总分 100 分中，所有执行机构 2015 年的绩效的量化评估至少达到了 72%；

(三) 趋势分析显示 2015 年的绩效优于 2014 年的绩效；以及

(b) 请德国政府向第七十八次会议报告其与纳米比亚国家臭氧机构就定性进行评估中确定的涉及纳米比亚氟氯烃淘汰管理计划执行情况的问题进行的公开和建设性讨论。

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2015)

| UNDP | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 24% | 93% | 100% | 76% | 41% | 99% | 92% | 100% | 79% | 91% | 85% | 100% | 86% | 100% | N/A | 0% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 59% | 100% | 95% | 90% | 100% | 95% | 77% | 64% | 100% | 96% | 66% | 76% | 98% | 100% | 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% | 100% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 65% | 61% | 63% | 58% | 38% | 72% | 44% | 75% | 64% | 66% | 83% | 51% | 79% | 94% | 81% | 68% | 85% |
| Value of projects approved | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 80% | 100% | 99% | 65% | 73% | 82% | 83% | 77% | 100% | 100% | 38% | 87% | 100% | 87% | 89% | 91% |
| ODS to be phased out | 74% | 100% | | 100% | 92% | 96% | 77% | 44% | 89% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 61% | 100% | 29% | 83% |
| 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% | 4.3% |
| 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 | 70.89 |
| 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 | 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 | 35.1 |
| 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 | 238 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIDO | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| ODS phased out | 73% | 80% | 100% | 57% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 88% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 86% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 27% | 42% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 81% | 88% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 91% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 83% | 66% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 83% | 74% | 89% | 73% | 78% | 67% | 79% | 69% | 75% | 82% | 61% | 81% | 83% | 100% | 72% | 67% | 100% |
| Value of projects approved | 99% | 99% | | 100% | 93% | 99% | 97% | 68% | 82% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 59% | 78% | 100% | 79% | 88% | 64% | 93% |
| ODS to be phased out | 42% | 85% | | 100% | 72% | 100% | 100% | 37% | 89% | 100% | 47% | 91% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 36% | 81% | 21% | 36% | 100% |
| 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% | 1.8% |
| 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 | 56.02 |
| 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 | 8.6 | 9.0 |
| 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 | 39.5 |
| 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 | 13,389 |

| World Bank | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 32% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 69% | 31% | 84% | 47% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 20% | 98% | 100% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 64% | 77% | 88% | 97% | 100% | 74% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 64% | 43% | 15% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 61% | 98% | 74% | 100% | 84% | 84% | 100% | 84% | 74% | 69% | 25% | 20% | 85% | 10% | 100% | 24% | 24% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 75% | 79% | 67% | 79% | 65% | 71% | 93% | 79% | 92% | 77% | 67% | 50% | 57% | 100% | 67% | 50% | 33% |
| Value of projects approved | 94% | 87% | | 100% | 75% | 92% | 100% | 82% | 94% | 83% | 87% | 83% | 93% | 98% | 3% | 93% | 29% | 93% | 72% | 100% |
| ODS to be phased out | 34% | 100% | | 100% | 83% | 72% | 91% | 65% | 59% | 100% | 66% | 93% | 35% | 100% | 89% | 11% | 7% | 25% | 11% | 100% |
| 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% | 0.4% |
| 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 | 19.84 |
| 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 | 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 | 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 | 275 |

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2015)

| UNDP | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 61% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 88% | 100% | 47% |
| 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 | 12.0 |
| 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 | 36.3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNEP | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Funds Disbursed | 49% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 93% | 99% | 54% | 54% | 51% | 49% | 64% | 69% | 60% | 63% | 55% | 47% | 61% | 44% |
| 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 | 10.1 |
| 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 | 35.3 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIDO | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Funds Disbursed | 80% | 100% | 49% | 100% | 48% | 89% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 80% | 89% | 69% | 100% | 84% | 95% | 100% | 62% | 82% | 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 | 10.0 |
| 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 | 32.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| World Bank | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 49% | 35% | 27% | 12% | 38% | 100% | 79% | 100% | 57% | 59% | 59% | 19% | 47% | 75% | 59% | 49% | 42% | 100% |
| 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 | 14.1 |
| 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 | 29.8 |

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2015**

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Values | GIZ | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|---------------------|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| 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 | | 5 | 9 | 15 | 8 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 2 | 7 | 6 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | IMPACT (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 5 | 10 | 5 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 9 | 15 | 8 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 2 | 8 | 6 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION | General | Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 8 | 20 | 10 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks? | Highly satisfactory | | 4 | 7 | 20 | 8 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services? | Highly satisfactory | | 4 | 7 | 17 | 7 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 8 | 18 | 9 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | 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 | | 5 | 8 | 16 | 9 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 3 | 6 | 5 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | If there was a lead agency for a multi-agency project, did it coordinate the activities of the other implementing | Highly satisfactory | | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | Satisfactory | | | 4 | 4 | 5 |

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Values | GIZ | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO | | |
|---|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|------|------|-------|----|---|
| | | agencies satisfactorily? | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 3 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 10 | 17 | 8 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 1 | 7 | 6 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 10 | 18 | 8 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 1 | 6 | 6 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 10 | 17 | 8 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 1 | 7 | 6 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time? | Highly satisfactory | | 5 | 7 | 16 | 6 | | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | | 4 | 6 | 7 | | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 2 | 1 | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING | General | Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 6 | 12 | 8 |
| | | | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 6 |
| Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits? | Highly satisfactory | | | | 3 | 5 | 13 | 6 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 7 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 6 | 16 | 9 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 5 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | | | |
| Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored? | Highly satisfactory | | | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 7 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 5 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | 1 | | | |
| In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs? | Highly satisfactory | | | | 3 | 7 | 12 | 6 | | |
| | Satisfactory | | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4 | | |

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Values | GIZ | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO |
|--|--------------------------|---|---------------------|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 7 | 12 | 9 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 6 | 10 | 9 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4 |
| | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | Investment projects | Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning? | Highly satisfactory | | 4 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties that may have been encountered subsequent to the provision of non-ODS technology? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | National phase-out plans | Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 4 | 8 | 7 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate? | Highly satisfactory | | 2 | 4 | 11 | 7 |
| | | | Satisfactory | | 3 | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate? | | Highly satisfactory | | 2 | 4 | 8 | 8 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective? | | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 5 | 13 | 7 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | 1 | | |
| Were proposed implementation strategies adequate? | Highly satisfactory | | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 | | |
| | Satisfactory | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 6 | | |

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Values | GIZ | IBRD | UNDP | UNEP | UNIDO | |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|-----|------|------|------|-------|---|
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | Regulatory assistance projects | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 4 | 10 | 5 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | | 2 | 4 | 8 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | 1 | | | | | |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 4 | 11 | 6 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable? | Highly satisfactory | | 3 | 2 | 11 | 5 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | Training projects | Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory? | Highly satisfactory | 1 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 9 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | | 4 | 5 | 3 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught? | Highly satisfactory | 1 | 5 | 5 | 13 | 10 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | | 4 | 7 | 2 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |