

联合国
环境规划署Distr.
GENERALUNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/79/6
7 June 2017CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第七十九次会议
2017年7月3日至7日，曼谷

执行机构对照其 2016 年业务计划的业绩评价

引言

1. 本文件介绍：
 - (a) 执行机构针对 2016 年业务计划中设定目标的业绩定量评价以及提交第七十九次会议的进展和财务报告¹；
 - (b) 八项业绩指标的逐项趋势分析；
 - (c) 基于国家臭氧机构官员提供的意见对执行机构业绩的定性评估；以及
 - (d) 秘书处的评论和建议。
2. 本文件还包括下列三个附件：
 - 附件一： 机构投资项目业绩
 - 附件二： 机构费投资项目业绩
 - 附件三： 国家臭氧机构对执行机构 2016 年的定性评估

¹ 基于第 41/93 号决定采用的业绩指标，并由第 47/51 和 71/28 号决定修改，以及第七十七次会议报告附件五至八中为 2016 年业务计划所采用的目标（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/76 号文件）。

定量业绩指标分析

3. 表 1 列出核准的目标，实现每个目标的进展措施和实现的目标数量。

表 1：2016 年业绩指标的目标和实现

| 项目 | 开发计划署 | | | | 联合国环境规划署（联合国环境署） | | | | 工发组织 | | | | 世界银行 | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------|----------|------|------------------|-------|---------|------|------------|-------|-------|------|---------|-------|---------|------|
| | 目标 | 机构实现的 | 秘书处评估 | 实现目标 | 目标 | 机构实现的 | 秘书处评估 | 实现目标 | 目标 | 机构实现的 | 秘书处评估 | 实现目标 | 目标 | 机构实现的 | 秘书处评估 | 实现目标 |
| 核准的付款申请 | 29 | 35 | 27 | 否 | 74 | 46 | 46 | 否 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 是 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 否 |
| 核准的项目/活动 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 是 | 59 | 51 | 51 | 否 | 17 | 13 | 13 | 否 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 是 |
| 已发放资金（百万美元） | 26.91 | 25.1 | 28.29 | 是 | 14.89 | 13.72 | 13.86 | 否 | 22.35 | 22.65 | 22.67 | 是 | 30.8 | 42 | 42.2 | 是 |
| 消耗臭氧层物质淘汰 | 394.98 | 360.7 | 360.7 | 否 | 69.86 | 0 | 174.3 | 是 | 667.5 | 572.6 | 555.9 | 否 | 509.5 | 255 | 255.5 | 否 |
| 项目活动完成 | 61 | 24 | 16 | 否 | 119 | 116 | 60 | 否 | 37 | 33 | 33 | 否 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 否 |
| 财务完成速度 | 到期的 70% (57) | 55 | 55 | 否 | 14个月 | 14个月 | 16个月 | 否 | 运营完成后 12个月 | 12个月 | 12个月 | 是 | 90% | 100% | 100% | 是 |
| 及时提交项目完成报告 | 到期的 70% (9) | 100% | 100% (9) | 是 | 按时(77) | 按时 | 未按时 (4) | 否 | 按时 | 按时 | 按时 | 是 | 按时 (24) | 未按时 | 未按时 (2) | 否 |
| 及时提交进展报告 | 按时 | 按时 | 按时 | 是 | 按时 | 按时 | 按时 | 是 | 按时 | 按时 | 按时 | 是 | 按时 | 按时 | 按时 | 是 |
| 实现目标数量 | | | | 4/8 | | | | 2/8 | | | | 5/8 | | | | 4/8 |

业绩加权评估

4. 表 2 列出基于秘书处的方法按照业绩指标进行的 2016 年加权评估结果。

表 2: 2016 年执行机构业绩加权评估

| 项目 | 加权 | 开发计划署 | | 联合国环境署 | | 工发组织 | | 世界银行 | |
|-----------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | | 实现目标的百分比 | 分数 | 实现目标的百分比 | 分数 | 实现目标的百分比 | 分数 | 实现目标的百分比 | 分数 |
| 核准的付款申请 | 10 | 93 | 9 | 62 | 6 | 100 | 10 | 88 | 9 |
| 核准的项目/活动 | 10 | 106 | 10 | 86 | 9 | 76 | 8 | 220 | 10 |
| 已发放资金 | 15 | 105 | 15 | 93 | 14 | 101 | 15 | 137 | 15 |
| 消耗臭氧层物质淘汰 | 25 | 91 | 23 | 249 | 25 | 83 | 21 | 50 | 13 |
| 项目活动完成 | 20 | 26 | 5 | 50 | 10 | 89 | 18 | 29 | 6 |
| 财务完成速度 | 10 | 96 | 10 | 86 | 9 | 100 | 10 | 100 | 10 |
| 及时提交项目完成报告 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100 | 5 | 8 | 0 |
| 及时提交进展报告 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 5 |
| 2016 年评估 | 100 | | 82 | | 78 | | 92 | | 68 |

其它定量业绩指标的分析

5. 根据第 41/93 号决定² 附件一和二分别列出投资³和非投资⁴项目的历史分析。

6. 这些附件表明机构在不同年份有不同程度的成功。对于投资项目，工发组织和世界银行在 2016 年实现了消耗臭氧层物质淘汰目标，而开发计划署当年未实现此目标。只有工发组织实现了发放资金量的目标，而开发计划署实现了 97%，世界银行实现了 78%。开发计划署和工发组织实现了项目完成报告目标，世界银行完成了其目标的 8%。2016 年的交付速度和第一次放款与前些年相似，反映了所有执行机构的历史业绩。“核准的项目价值”目标的实现对于开发计划署有所上升而 对于工发组织和世界银行有所下降。2016 年所有执行机构都未实现“消耗臭氧层物质淘汰”的目标。由于消耗臭氧层物质氯氟烃和氟氯烃的不同以及核准多年期项目而非单个项目，与任何趋势相关的“成本有效性”和“项目准备成本”指标尚无定论。

7. 对于非投资项目，所有执行机构都未实现发放资金量的目标。所有执行机构 2016 年交付速度和第一次放款情况与前些年相似。

定性业绩指标分析

8. 从 43 个第 5 条国家的国家臭氧机构收到的对双边和执行机构进行业绩定性评估的共 76 份⁵ 问卷得到了处理。本文件附件三按机构列出了每个问题的详细结果。

² 要求秘书处基于执行机构业绩未来评价的趋势分析继续监测投资和非投资业绩指标。

³ 投资项目包括按项目编码指定的多年期协定。

⁴ 只有“已发放资金”、“第一次发放速度”和“项目完成速度”适用于非投资项目。

⁵ 德国(8), 开发计划署(11), 联合国环境署(34), 工发组织(21)以及世界银行(2)。

9. 表 3 列出国家臭氧机构对三个主要类别整体评分的概要。应注意到尽管一些国家回答了附件三所包含的单个问题，却未提供对一个或多个类别的整体评分。大多数整体评分是满意或以上水平。

表 3: 双边和执行机构按类别定性业绩的整体评分

| 类别 | 高度满意 | 满意 | 不甚满意 | 不满意 |
|---------|------|----|------|-----|
| 影响 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 1 |
| 组织与合作 | 17 | 14 | 1 | 1 |
| 技术援助/培训 | 23 | 22 | 0 | 0 |

10. 除了三个主要类别，国家臭氧机构分多个子类别以及按子类别的问题提供了评分（附件三）。子类别中有 75 项不甚满意的评分。秘书处将从国家臭氧机构收到的评估发给相应的执行机构进行反馈，强调不甚满意的评分。执行机构提供评论，并在适用时，报告其与国家臭氧机构就低评分展开的对话结果。然而，多个在定性评估中发现问题（即“不甚满意”或“不满意”评分）的国家尚未完成国家臭氧机构和执行机构间的对话。

秘书处的评论与建议

11. 执行机构已收到对其 2016 年业绩定量评估的结果，如上表 2 所示，并与秘书处意见一致。

12. 定量业绩指标显示出所有执行机构目标实现了 68% 或更多。

13. 执行机构能够在与任何定性业绩指标上提出不甚满意评分的国家进行对话的所有情况下解决问题。然而，在本文件最终定稿时，工发组织未能与下列国家展开对话：巴西，格鲁吉亚，伊拉克，肯尼亚和塞内加尔。谨建议执行委员会要求工发组织与相关国家臭氧机构进行开放具有建设性的对话，解决对其业绩评估中出现的任何问题并向第八十次会议报告这些讨论的结果。

建议

14. 谨建议执行委员会：

(a) 注意：

- (i) 执行机构对照其 2016 年业务计划的业绩评价载于 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/79/6 号文件；
- (ii) 所有执行机构 2016 年业绩定量评估都至少获得 100 分的 68%；
- (iii) 趋势分析表明执行机构 2016 年业绩一些指标相比 2015 年没有提高；

- (b) 要求工发组织与巴西、格鲁吉亚、伊拉克、肯尼亚和塞内加尔的国家臭氧机构就服务不甚满意的方面进行开放具有建设性的讨论，并向第八十次会议报告磋商结果；以及
- (c) 注意到 2016 年 144 个国家中仅有 43 个提交了问卷，鼓励国家臭氧机构每年及时提交对协助其政府的执行机构的业绩定性评估。

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2016)

| UNDP | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 24% | 93% | 100% | 76% | 41% | 99% | 92% | 100% | 79% | 91% | 85% | 100% | 86% | 100% | N/A | 0% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 0% |
| Funds disbursed | 59% | 100% | 95% | 90% | 100% | 95% | 77% | 64% | 100% | 96% | 66% | 76% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 38% | 93% | 86% | 87% | 100% | 97% | 79% | 30% | 82% | 74% | 100% | 54% | 100% | 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% | 90% |
| Value of projects approved | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 80% | 100% | 99% | 65% | 73% | 82% | 83% | 77% | 100% | 100% | 38% | 87% | 100% | 87% | 89% | 91% | 100% |
| ODS to be phased out | 74% | 100% | | 100% | 92% | 96% | 77% | 44% | 89% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 61% | 100% | 29% | 83% | 84% | |
| 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% | 2.3% |
| 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 | 108.35 |
| 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 | 13.6 |
| 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 | 34.4 |
| 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 | -881 |
| UNIDO | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| ODS phased out | 73% | 80% | 100% | 57% | 70% | 100% | 100% | 88% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 86% | 100% | 100% | 0% | 27% | 42% | 100% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 81% | 88% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 91% | 100% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 100% | 100% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 83% | 66% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 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% | 76% |
| Value of projects approved | 99% | 99% | | 100% | 93% | 99% | 97% | 68% | 82% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 59% | 78% | 100% | 79% | 88% | 64% | 93% | 71% |
| ODS to be phased out | 42% | 85% | | 100% | 72% | 100% | 100% | 37% | 89% | 100% | 47% | 91% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 36% | 81% | 21% | 36% | 100% | 82% |
| 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% | 3.6% |
| 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 | 65.50 |
| 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 | 8.9 |
| 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 | 40.2 |
| 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 | 6,906 |

| World Bank | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out | 32% | 94% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 100% | 69% | 31% | 84% | 47% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 20% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Funds disbursed | 64% | 77% | 88% | 97% | 100% | 74% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 73% | 64% | 43% | 15% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 78% |
| Project completion reports | | | | 61% | 98% | 74% | 100% | 84% | 84% | 100% | 84% | 74% | 69% | 25% | 20% | 85% | 10% | 100% | 24% | 24% | 8% |
| Distribution among countries | | | | 75% | 79% | 67% | 79% | 65% | 71% | 93% | 79% | 92% | 77% | 67% | 50% | 57% | 100% | 67% | 50% | 33% | 100% |
| Value of projects approved | 94% | 87% | | 100% | 75% | 92% | 100% | 82% | 94% | 83% | 87% | 83% | 93% | 98% | 3% | 93% | 29% | 93% | 72% | 100% | 39% |
| ODS to be phased out | 34% | 100% | | 100% | 83% | 72% | 91% | 65% | 59% | 100% | 66% | 93% | 35% | 100% | 89% | 11% | 7% | 25% | 11% | 100% | 50% |
| 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% | 4.0% |
| 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 | 48.54 |
| 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 | 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 | 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 | 455 |

Annex II

**NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2016)**

| UNDP | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 61% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 92% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 84% | 88% | 100% | 47% | 82% |
| 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 | 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 | 36.7 | 36.3 | 36.0 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UN Environment | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Funds Disbursed | 49% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 93% | 93% | 99% | 54% | 54% | 51% | 49% | 64% | 69% | 60% | 63% | 55% | 47% | 61% | 44% | 91% |
| 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 | 10.5 |
| 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 | 36.1 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIDO | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Funds Disbursed | 80% | 100% | 49% | 100% | 48% | 89% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 80% | 89% | 69% | 100% | 84% | 95% | 100% | 62% | 82% | 82% | 75% |
| 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 | 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 | 32.7 | 33.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| World Bank | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Funds Disbursed | 100% | 49% | 35% | 27% | 12% | 38% | 100% | 79% | 100% | 57% | 59% | 59% | 19% | 47% | 75% | 59% | 49% | 42% | 100% | 88% |
| 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 | 14.8 |
| 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 | 29.8 |

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2016**

| Category | Sub-category | Questions | Values | Germany | UNDP | UN Environment | UNIDO | World Bank |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|---------------------|---------|------|----------------|-------|------------|
| 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 | 6 | 6 | 23 | 11 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 10 | 7 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | IMPACT (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | 5 | 5 | 14 | 7 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results? | Highly satisfactory | 6 | 6 | 20 | 12 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION | General | Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 24 | 14 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 5 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks? | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 19 | 12 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 5 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services? | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 18 | 13 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 6 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---------------------|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 6 | 23 | 14 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | 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 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 12 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 6 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | 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 | 4 | 9 | 5 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| | ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | | |
| | | Satisfactory | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | 1 | | |
| | Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 1 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 1 | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| | Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 7 | 23 | 12 | 1 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 10 | 7 | 1 | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |
| Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 7 | 22 | 12 | 1 | | |
| | Satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 1 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | 2 | | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | | | |
| Were the required services of the | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 2 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---------------------|----|----|----|----|---|
| | | implementing agency delivered in time? | Satisfactory | 5 | 7 | 17 | 7 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 3 | 4 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING | General | Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology? | Highly satisfactory | 5 | 4 | 14 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits? | Highly satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 18 | 9 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 1 |
| | | | 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 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 4 | 5 | 16 | 7 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| | | Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 12 | 11 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 12 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| | | In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs? | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 5 | 16 | 9 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 4 | 2 | 11 | 3 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating) | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 3 | 11 | 5 | | | |
| | Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 1 | | |
| | Less satisfactory | | | | | | | |
| | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | |
| Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency | Highly satisfactory | 2 | 5 | 14 | 10 | | | |
| | Satisfactory | 6 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 1 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---------------------|---|----|----|----|---|
| | | satisfactory? | 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 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 10 | 1 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 3 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 1 | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | | |
| | Investment projects | Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 4 | 9 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | 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 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 4 | 3 | 8 | 4 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | National phase-out plans | Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | 1 | | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 3 | 19 | 11 | 2 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 2 | 4 | 10 | 3 | |
| Less satisfactory | | | | | 1 | 2 | | |
| Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | | |
| Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate? | | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 2 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 4 | 2 | 7 | 5 | | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | | |
| Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective? | | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 4 | 20 | 11 | 2 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 9 | 4 | | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|----|----|----|---|
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Were proposed implementation strategies adequate? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 4 | 18 | 10 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 3 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 2 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | 1 | | |
| | Regulatory assistance projects | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 3 | 16 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | 1 | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 3 | 20 | 8 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | | Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable? | Highly satisfactory | 3 | 2 | 17 | 7 | 1 |
| | | | Satisfactory | 1 | 3 | 11 | 5 | 1 |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| | | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | |
| | Training projects | Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory? | Highly satisfactory | 4 | 3 | 20 | 11 | |
| | | | Satisfactory | 4 | 4 | 9 | 5 | |
| | | | Less satisfactory | | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | | | | | | | | |
| Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught? | | Highly satisfactory | 5 | 3 | 21 | 11 | 1 | |
| | | Satisfactory | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | | |
| | | Less satisfactory | | | | | | |
| | | Unsatisfactory | | | | | | |