



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

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

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventy-seventh Meeting
Montreal, 28 November - 2 December 2016

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2015 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 2015 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 77th meeting¹;
 - (b) A trend analysis for each of the eight 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, as modified by decisions 47/51 and 71/28, the targets that were adopted for the 2015 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 73/29 to 73/32.

Table 1: 2015 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
Tranches approved	36	29	29	No	56	On time	44	No	26	27	27	Yes	9	5	5	No
Projects/activities approved	19	39	39	Yes	69	On time	139	Yes	22	50	51	Yes	4	8	8	Yes
Funds disbursed (US \$)	19.00 million	32.00 million	32.00 million	Yes	9.51 million	Not provided	11.95 million	Yes	22.35 million	26.21 million	26.31 million	Yes	27 million	43.95 million	43.95 million	Yes
ODS phase-out	500.5	418.2	418.2	No	94.5	Not provided	49.9	No	587.8	642.94	612.4	Yes	1,338.3	3,053.3	3,053.3	Yes
Project completion for activities	75	69	69	No	99	Not provided	60	No	41	61	61	Yes	13	4	4	No
Speed of financial completion	70% of those due (32)	32	32	Yes	14 months	Delays in disbursement of funds due to the introduction of UMOJA in 2015	20 months	No	12 months after operational completion	6.73 months	16.86 months	No	90%	40%	40%	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	70% of those due (3)	100%	100% (3)	Yes	On time (70)	On time	Not on time (44)	No	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On Time (25)	Not on time	Not on time (6)	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				5/8				3/8				7/8				4/8

Weighted assessment of performance

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2015 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2015

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
Tranches approved	10	81	8	10	79	8	10	104	10	10	56	6
Projects/activities approved	10	205	10	10	201	10	10	232	10	10	200	10
Funds disbursed	15	168	15	15	126	15	15	118	15	15	163	15
ODS phase-out	25	84	21	25	53	13	25	104	25	25	228	25
Project completion for activities	20	92	18	20	61	12	20	149	20	20	31	6
Speed of financial completion	10	100	10	10	57	6	10	60	6	10	44	4
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100	5	5	63	3	5	100	5	5	24	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	5	100	5	5	100	5	5	100	5
2015 Assessment	100		92	100		72	100		96	100		72

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 2015:

- (a) The indicator "ODS phased out" was fully achieved by UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank (100 per cent);
- (b) The target for the amount of "funds disbursed" was fully achieved by UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank (100 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;
- (d) The target for "distribution among countries⁴" was fully achieved by UNIDO (100 per cent). UNDP only achieved 85 per cent, and the World Bank achieved 33 per cent;
- (e) The target for "value of projects approved⁵" was fully achieved by the World Bank (100 per cent). UNDP only achieved 91 per cent and UNIDO achieved 93 per cent;
- (f) The indicator "ODS to be phased out⁶" was fully achieved UNIDO and the World Bank (100 per cent). UNDP only achieved 83 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 The extent to which countries had projects in the business plan approved for them.

⁵ The extent to which the values in the business plan represent the values approved.

⁶ The extent to which the actual amount of ODS was phased out.

- (g) The indicator “cost of project preparation”⁷ varied from 0.4 per cent for the World Bank, to 1.8 per cent for UNIDO, and to 4.3 per cent for UNDP;
- (h) The indicator “cost-effectiveness”⁸ of projects shows the World Bank’s portfolio with a cost-effectiveness of US \$19.84/kg ODP compared to US \$56.02/kg ODP for UNIDO and US \$70.89/kg ODP for UNDP. This indicator varies significantly from year to year; for example, in 2014, UNDP’s portfolio had a cost-effectiveness of US \$249.68/kg ODP while the World Bank had US \$214.04/kg ODP and UNIDO had US \$79.01/kg ODP;
- (i) The indicator “speed of first disbursement”⁹ indicates that UNIDO made its first disbursement in the shortest period of time (9 months), followed by UNDP (13.7 months) and the World Bank¹⁰ (24.6 months);
- (j) The indicator “speed of project completion” is approximately three years for all agencies, and has 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”¹¹ was the lowest in UNDP’s portfolio (238 ODP tonnes emitted) followed by the World Bank (275 ODP tonnes emitted) and UNIDO (13,389 ODP tonnes emitted).

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

- (a) The indicator “funds disbursed” shows the highest value by the World Bank (100 per cent), followed by UNIDO (82 per cent), UNDP (47 per cent) and UNEP (44 per cent). UNEP, with the largest non-investment portfolio, has since 2004 underestimated disbursement;
- (b) The indicator “speed of delivery until first disbursement” shows that first disbursement was achieved by UNIDO (10 months) followed by UNEP (10.1 months), UNDP (12 months) and the World Bank (14.1 months); and
- (c) The indicator “speed until project completion” was as follows: World Bank (29.8 months), UNIDO (32.7 months), UNEP (35.3 months) and UNDP (36.3 months).

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

6. A total of 56¹² questionnaires received from Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and 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

⁷ 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 2009 the cost went up to 10 per cent of the approval.

⁸ 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 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 The extent to which ODS continues to be consumed or produced due to project delays.

¹² Germany (2), UNDP (11), UNEP (24), UNIDO (14) and the World Bank (5).

they did send responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III. All overall ratings were satisfactory or above.

Table 3: Qualitative performance of bilateral and implementing agencies by category

Category	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Impact	23	14	0	0
Organization and cooperation	18	9	0	0
Technical assistance/training	18	15	0	0

7. The NOUs answer a questionnaire divided into three categories, then into several sub-categories and questions by sub-category. There were 31 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories. NOUs may provide any rating to any question. Implementing agencies provided reasons and the results of discussions with the respective NOUs.

8. 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.

9. However, initial reports on dialogues between the Government of Germany and Namibia identified issues with respect to the HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) for the less than satisfactory ratings given by the NOU including: the decision to have the NOU to distribute equipment instead of direct shipment to the training centre, the loss of equipment by the delivery company from the NOU to the training centre, the decision by the NOU's consultant not to use HC-290 due to static electricity issues, the change in national ozone officer (NOO). With respect to the two remaining less than satisfactory ratings, the Government of Germany indicated that the NOU had not provided any explanation. The Executive Committee may wish to request the Government of Germany to continue its dialogues with the Government of Namibia and provide by the 78th meeting an update on those actions to resolve the outstanding issues with respect to the HPMP.

SECRETARIAT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENTS

10. The quantitative performance indicators show that all agencies achieved 72 per cent of their targets or more.

11. The trend analysis of nine investment projects' performance indicators indicated improvements in most indicators in 2015 from 2014. 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.

12. The trend analysis of non-investment project shows that UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO should further consider "fund disbursement" targets in their future business plan taking into account their 2016 performance for that indicator. In 2015, the speed of first disbursement ranged from 10 to 14 months and completion from 30 to 36 months.

RECOMMENDATIONS

13. The Executive Committee may wish:
- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2015 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/17;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2015 at least at 72 per cent on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis performance had improved in 2015 in relation to 2014; and
 - (b) To request the Government of Germany to report to the 78th meeting on their open and constructive discussion with the national ozone unit of Namibia on the issues identified in the qualitative performance assessment with respect to the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan for Namibia.

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						
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Unsatisfactory						
			Highly satisfactory		3	2	11	5	
			Satisfactory	1	2	5	6	5	
	Less satisfactory						1		
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Unsatisfactory						
			Highly satisfactory	1	4	5	15	9	
			Satisfactory	1		4	5	3	
			Less satisfactory						
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Unsatisfactory						
			Highly satisfactory	1	5	5	13	10	
			Satisfactory	1		4	7	2	
			Less satisfactory						
		Unsatisfactory							