



联合国 环境规划署

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/10
20 November 2019

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第八十四次会议
2019年12月16日至20日，蒙特利尔

根据 2018 年业务计划评估执行机构的绩效¹

简介

1. 本文件介绍了：
 - (a) 根据 2018 年业务计划中设定的绩效目标以及第 84 次会议上提交的进度报告和财务报告对执行机构绩效进行的定量评估²；
 - (b) 就八项绩效指标逐一进行的趋势分析；
 - (c) 根据从国家臭氧机构官员处收到的资料，对双边机构和执行机构的绩效进行定性评估；以及
 - (d) 秘书处的评论和建议。
2. 本文件还包括以下三项附件：

附件一：按机构分列的投资项目绩效

附件二：按机构分列的非投资项目绩效

附件三：国家臭氧机构在 2018 年对执行机构的定性评估

¹ 还包括对各双边机构的定性评估。

² 根据第 41/93 号决定（经第 47/51 号和第 71/28 号决定修订）采纳的绩效指标以及第 80 次会议报告的附件 8 至附件 11 中就 2018 年业务计划采纳的目标（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/80/59）。

定量绩效指标分析

3. 表 1 列出了核准目标、每项目标的达成进度以及已达成目标的数量。

表 1：2018 年绩效指标目标和达成情况

项目	联合国开发计划署				联合国环境规划署				联合国工发组织				世界银行			
	目标	机构达成情况	秘书处评估	达成目标与否	目标	机构达成情况	秘书处评估	达成目标与否	目标	机构达成情况	秘书处评估	达成目标与否	目标	机构达成情况	秘书处评估	达成目标与否
已核准拨款申请*	24	20	20	否	50	29	29	否	38	22	22	否	7	4	4	否
已核准项目/活动	39	34	34	否	179	145	145	否	48	52	52	是	6	5	5	否
已拨付资金（百万美元）	31.3	40.67	41.43	是	14.91	17.76	17.83	是	23.57	25.75	25.88	是	13.74	9.08	9.33	否
淘汰的消耗臭氧层物质*	747.2	716.2	716.2	否	141.5	122.1	122.1	否	694.8	472	491.1	否	109.1	98.1	74.87	否
活动的项目完成情况	41	46	46	是	130	108	108	否	57	45	47	否	17	17	17	是
财务完成进度	70% (70)	66	66	否	14个月	14个月	14个月	是	运营完成后 12个月	12个月	11.4个月	是	90%	100%	100%	是
准时提交项目完成报告	准时 (3)	准时 (11)	准时 (11)	是	准时 (20)	不按时	不按时 (9)	否	准时	准时	准时	是	准时 (18)	不按时	不按时 (2)	否
准时提交进度报告	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
已达成目标数量				4/8				3/8				5/8				3/8

*“若由于其他合作机构或牵头机构的原因，某一机构无法提交付款申请”或“执行委员会提交审议的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划由于超出国家臭氧机构和某一机构的控制范围而未获批准”，则将下调该机构的目标。

绩效加权评估

4. 表 2 列出了根据秘书处的方法按绩效指标对 2018 年加权评估的结果。

表 2：2018 年对执行机构绩效的加权评估

项目	权重	联合国开发计划署		联合国环境规划署		联合国工发组织		世界银行	
		已达成目标百分比 (%)	分数	已达成目标百分比 (%)	分数	已达成目标百分比 (%)	分数	已达成目标百分比 (%)	分数
已核准拨款申请	10	83	8	58	6	58	6	57	6
已核准项目/活动	10	87	9	81	8	108	10	83	8
已拨付资金	15	132	15	120	15	110	15	68	10
淘汰的消耗臭氧层物质	25	96	24	86	22	71	18	69	17
活动的项目完成情况	20	112	20	83	17	82	16	100	20
财务完成进度	10	94	9	100	10	105	10	100	10
准时提交项目完成报告	5	100	5	45	2	100	5	11	1
准时提交进度报告	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2018 年评测	100		95		85		85		77

其他定量绩效指标分析

5. 根据第 41/93 号决定³，附件一和附件二分别介绍了对投资项目⁴和非投资项目⁵的历史分析。

6. 这些附件表明，各机构在不同年度取得了不同程度的成功。就投资项目而言，联合国开发计划署于 2018 年达成了淘汰消耗臭氧层物质的目标，而联合国工发组织和世界银行该年度则未达成此项目目标。联合国开发计划署和联合国工发组织仅达成了已拨付资金金额方面的目标，而世界银行达成该目标的 62%。联合国开发计划署和联合国工发组织达成了项目完成报告的目标，世界银行达成该目标的 11%。2018 年的交付速度和首次给付速度与往年相当，反映了所有执行机构的历史绩效。世界银行达成“已核准项目价值”目标的程度有所提高，联合国开发计划署的达成这项目标的程度基本不变，而联合国工发组织就这项目标的达成程度则有所下降。2018 年，所有执行机构均未达成“淘汰消耗臭氧层物质”的目标。由于氟氯化碳和氟氯烃的消耗臭氧潜能值的差异以及批准多年期协定而非个别项目，“成本效益”和“项目准备费用”这两项指标在趋势方面均无定论。

7. 就非投资项目而言，除联合国环境规划署外，所有执行机构均已达成已拨付资金的目标。所有执行机构 2018 年的交付速度和首次给付速度均与往年相当。

定性绩效指标分析

8. 相关机构已对所收到的来自 71 个国家⁶的国家臭氧机构 118⁶份问卷调查进行处理，以评估双边机构和执行机构的定性绩效。

³ 在今后对执行机构绩效的评估中，要求秘书处根据趋势分析继续监测投资绩效指标和非投资绩效指标。

⁴ 投资项目包括由项目代码指定的多年期协定（MYA）。

⁵ 只有“已拨付资金”、“首次给付速度”和“项目完成速度”等指标适用于非投资项目。

⁶ 法国（1）、德国（7）、联合国开发计划署（24）、联合国环境规划署（52）、联合国工发组织（32）和世界银行（2）。

9. 表 3 显示了国家臭氧机构就三项主要类别提供的总体评级概要。应当指出的是，尽管有些国家确实对本文件附件三所载的单项问题做出了答复，但是并未就一项或多项类别提供总体评级。大多数总体评级均为满意或满意以上。

表 3：按类别分列的双边机构和执行机构的质量绩效总体评级

类别	非常满意	满意	不太满意	不满意
影响	55	22	3	1
组织与合作	40	18	1	1
技术援助/培训	46	25	2	1

10. 除了这三项主要类别，国家臭氧机构还提供细分为若干子类别的评级，并按子类别提供问题（附件三）。这些子类别中有 200 个不太满意的评级。

秘书处的评论和建议

评论

11. 各执行机构均已获悉对其 2018 年绩效的定量评估结果，该结果表明所有执行机构均已达成目标的 77% 或更高比例。

12. 秘书处赞赏地注意到，有 71 个国家臭氧机构（2018 年为 40 个）提交了定性评估。秘书处将国家臭氧机构提交的评估分别发送给相应的双边机构和执行机构，征求其意见，并着重于不太满意的评级。双边机构和执行机构均发表了评论，并酌情报告了其与国家臭氧机构的对话结果。

13. 针对在其定性评估中发现问题（即评级为“不太满意”或“不满意”）的所有国家，现已完成国家臭氧机构与双边机构/执行机构之间的对话。所有相关机构均报告称，已与其各自的国家臭氧机构商定前进方向，在大多数情况下，各双边机构和执行机构已经能够解决有关不太满意评级中所确认的问题。

14. 谨建议执行委员会赞赏地注意到，双边机构和执行机构就相关方认为其服务不尽如人意的领域与其各自的国家臭氧机构进行公开且具有建设性的讨论方面所作出的努力，以及其与相关国家臭氧机构进行磋商后取得的令人满意的成果。

建议

15. 谨建议执行委员会：

(a) 注意：

- (i) 根据各执行机构 2018 年的业务计划对其进行的绩效评估，相关内容载于 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/10 文件；
- (ii) 所有执行机构 2018 年的定量绩效评估至少为 77 分（满分为 100 分）；
- (iii) 趋势分析表明，与 2017 年相比，执行机构 2018 年的某些指标绩效并无改善；

- (iv) 赞赏地注意到，双边机构和执行机构就相关方认为其服务不尽如人意的领域与其各自的国家臭氧机构进行公开且具有建设性的讨论方面所作出的努力，以及其与相关国家臭氧机构进行磋商后取得的令人满意的成果；以及
- (b) 赞赏地注意到，在 144 个国家中，有 71 个国家（2018 年为 40 个）已提交针对协助其政府的双边机构和执行机构的定性绩效评估，以鼓励国家臭氧机构每年及时提交该等评估。

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2018)

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
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%	34%	100%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	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%	60%	88%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%
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%	2.71%	0.99%
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	184.95	38.00
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	13.5	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	35.6	35.7
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	416.3	499.6
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	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%	54%	64%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%
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%	61%	71%
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%	2.6%	0.4%
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	53.61	22.83
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	9.0	9.2

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	40.9	41.1
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	8,054.8	7,971.7
World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%
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%	74%	69%
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%	8.64%	1.04%
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	52.66	618.83
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	24.5	24.4
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	41.0	40.1
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	249.9	788.4

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2018)

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funds disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	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	12.0	11.9	11.8	11.7
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	36.8	36.2
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funds disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%
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	10.5	10.9
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	35.3	36.1	36.7	36.7
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funds disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%
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	10.4	10.3
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	33.5	32.7
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funds disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	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	14.8	16.8	16.8
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	29.2	29.3

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2018**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	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	1	6	14	39	22	2		
			Satisfactory			7	13	7			
			Less satisfactory		1	3		2			
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	6	12	25	11			
			Satisfactory			5	9	8			
			Less satisfactory			2		1			
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	15	36	18	1		
			Satisfactory		1	7	16	11	1		
			Less satisfactory			1		3			
			Unsatisfactory								
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory		4	16	42	20	1
					Satisfactory	1	3	7	10	8	1
Less satisfactory						1	1	4			
Unsatisfactory											
Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory				4	11	36	12	1		
	Satisfactory			1	2	10	16	12	1		
	Less satisfactory				1	1		6			
	Unsatisfactory						1	1			
Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory				5	10	29	14	1		
	Satisfactory			1	1	11	17	12	1		
	Less satisfactory					1	1	5			
	Unsatisfactory							1			

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	3	13	42	17	2
			Satisfactory		3	9	10	10	
			Less satisfactory			2	1	3	
			Unsatisfactory		1			2	
		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	13	42	17	2
			Satisfactory	1	2	7	9	9	
			Less satisfactory			1		5	
			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	8	22	9	
			Satisfactory			7	16	8	1
			Less satisfactory				2	3	
			Unsatisfactory				1	1	
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		3	8	20	9	
			Satisfactory	1	1	4	6	6	
			Less satisfactory				1		
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory		5	16	38	18	1
			Satisfactory	1	2	6	13	11	1
			Less satisfactory			1	1	3	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory		5	15	41	18	1
			Satisfactory	1	1	5	11	10	1
			Less satisfactory		1	1		4	
			Unsatisfactory			1			
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	17	40	19	1
			Satisfactory		1	5	12	8	1
			Less satisfactory			1	1	4	
			Unsatisfactory				1	1	
	Highly satisfactory	1	6	9	30	11	1		
	Satisfactory		1	10	20	14	1		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Less satisfactory			4	2	5	
			Unsatisfactory				1	2	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	12	30	15	2
			Satisfactory		1	8	16	11	
			Less satisfactory		1	2		4	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	11	39	14	1
			Satisfactory			8	12	13	1
			Less satisfactory			2		4	
			Unsatisfactory		1				
		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		5	10	37	17	2
			Satisfactory	1	2	10	15	10	
			Less satisfactory					4	
			Unsatisfactory			2		1	
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory		5	12	26	16	
			Satisfactory	1	2	5	14	9	1
			Less satisfactory			2		3	
			Unsatisfactory			2		1	
		In case of need, was troubleshooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory		5	12	33	11	2
			Satisfactory	1	1	6	13	13	
			Less satisfactory		1	4		3	
			Unsatisfactory					2	
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		4	10	20	11	1
			Satisfactory	1	1	5	12	6	
			Less satisfactory					2	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		4	11	32	19	1		
	Satisfactory	1	1	8	13	8			
	Less satisfactory			1		4			
	Unsatisfactory					1			

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	12	34	19	2	
			Satisfactory		1	7	12	7		
			Less satisfactory		1	3		5		
			Unsatisfactory				1			
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	11	24	12	1	
			Satisfactory		2	8	9	11	1	
			Less satisfactory					3		
			Unsatisfactory			1		2		
		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	1	3	11	22	13	2	
			Satisfactory		3	7	8	7		
			Less satisfactory			1		2		
			Unsatisfactory					3		
		National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	10	22	13	
				Satisfactory		2	7	14	10	1
				Less satisfactory				1	4	
				Unsatisfactory					1	
	Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?		Highly satisfactory		2	10	31	16	1	
			Satisfactory	1	2	6	17	10	1	
			Less satisfactory			2		5		
			Unsatisfactory							
	Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?		Highly satisfactory		4	11	26	15	1	
			Satisfactory	1	3	7	10	9	1	
			Less satisfactory			1		5		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
	Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?		Highly satisfactory		5	9	37	15	2	
			Satisfactory	1	2	8	9	11		
			Less satisfactory			1		3		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
				Highly satisfactory		5	12	30	19	2

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank			
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Satisfactory	1	1	8	15	9				
			Less satisfactory		1			2				
			Unsatisfactory									
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory			2	8	27	8	1		
			Satisfactory	1		2	5	18	16	1		
			Less satisfactory				1		2			
			Unsatisfactory									
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory				2	9	29	9	1	
			Satisfactory	1			2	4	16	15	1	
			Less satisfactory					1		2		
			Unsatisfactory									
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory					2	8	25	7	1
			Satisfactory	1			1	1	4	17	14	1
			Less satisfactory						2		3	
			Unsatisfactory									
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory				4	11	34	16	2	
			Satisfactory	1			1	10	15	9		
			Less satisfactory							1		
			Unsatisfactory									
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory					4	12	36	17	2
Satisfactory			1			1	1	9	15	8		
Less satisfactory							1			1		
Unsatisfactory												