



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/9
12 November 2022

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-first Meeting
Montreal, 5-9 December 2022
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda¹

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2021 BUSINESS PLANS²**

Introduction

1. The present document consists of the following sections:
 - I. Analysis of quantitative performance indicators. This section presents the quantitative evaluations of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2021 business plans³ and progress and financial reports submitted to the 91st meeting; and a trend analysis for each of the eight performance indicators.
 - II. Analysis of qualitative performance indicators. This section presents a qualitative assessment of the performance of bilateral and implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers.
 - III. Analysis of the reasons for the agencies not reaching their targets and suggestions about ways to improve their performance. This section was prepared in response to decision 88/8(d).
 - IV. Secretariat's comments
 - V. Recommendation

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/1

² Also includes qualitative assessment of bilateral agencies.

³ Based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, as modified by decisions 47/51 and 71/28, and the targets that were adopted for the 2021 business plans in Annexes XI – XIV to the report of the 86th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/100).

I. 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.

Table 1. 2021 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*	24	19	19	No	64	37	37	No	29	23	23	No	5	3	3	No
Projects/activities approved	49	45	45	No	123	117	98	No	39	22	34	No	8	5	5	No
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	22.42	24.52	24.66	Yes	20.56	19.61	18.48	No	24.8	23.9	23.9	No	5.06	3.92	3.31	No
ODS phase-out*	368.27	348.1	348.1	No	85.64	45.50	71.86	No	617.08	521.29	521.29	No	709.22	843.0	672.67	No
Project completion for activities	49	48	48	No	104	185	133	Yes	107	65	80	No	5	5	2	No
Speed of financial completion	70% (43)	44	44	Yes	14 months	7.6 months	8 months	Yes	12 months after operational completion	12 months	12 months	Yes	90% (2)	100%	2	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	On time (3)	On time (3)	On time (3)	Yes	On time (7)	On time (17)	On time (13)	Yes	On time (1)	On time	On time (1)	Yes	On time (13)	On time	10	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				4/8				4/8				3/8				2/8

* The targets of an agency would be reduced “if it could not submit a tranche owing to another cooperating agency or lead agency” or “if HPMP submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee was not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency”.

Weighted assessment of performance

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2021 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2. Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2021

Item	Weight -ing	UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank	
		% of target achieved	Points						
Tranches approved	10	79	8	58	6	79	8	60	6
Projects/activities approved	10	92	9	80	8	87	9	63	6
Funds disbursed	15	110	15	90	13	96	14	65	10
ODS phase-out	25	95	24	84	21	84	21	95	24
Project completion for activities	20	98	20	128	20	75	15	40	8
Speed of financial completion	10	102	10	143	10	100	10	100	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100	5	186	5	100	5	77	4
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2021 Assessment	100		96		88		87		73

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

4. In line with decision 41/93,⁴ Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment⁵ and non-investment⁶ projects, respectively.

5. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNDP and the World Bank in 2021 while UNIDO did not achieve this target for that year. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP while UNIDO met 87 per cent and the World Bank met 63 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 77 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2021 were similar to previous years reflecting the historical performance for all implementing agencies. The achievement of the target for value of projects approved increased for the World Bank and decreased for UNDP and UNIDO. The target for ODS to be phased out was not achieved by all agencies. 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.

6. Annex II shows that the target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO; and the speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2021 were similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

⁴ The Secretariat was requested to continue monitoring the investment and non-investment performance indicators on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies.

⁵ Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

⁶ Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

II. Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

7. A total of 133⁷ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 75 Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed.

8. Table 3 presents a summary of the overall ratings provided by the NOUs for the three main categories. It should be noted that several NOUs did not provide overall ratings for one or more of the categories, although they did send responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III to the present document. Most of the overall ratings were satisfactory or above.

Table 3. Overall ratings for qualitative performance of bilateral and implementing agencies by category

Category	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Impact	81	28	1	0
Organization and cooperation	65	27	1	0
Technical assistance/training	65	30	3	0

9. In addition to the three main categories, the NOUs provided ratings divided into several sub-categories, and questions by sub-category (Annex III). There were 73 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories.

III. Analysis of the reasons for the agencies not reaching their targets and suggestions about ways to improve their performance (decision 88/8(d))

10. At its 88th meeting, in reviewing the evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies against their 2020 business plans, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to provide, in the subsequent evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies, more comprehensive analysis of the results, including additional information on the reasons for the agencies not reaching their targets and suggestions about ways to improve their performance, as appropriate (decision 88/8(d)).

11. In response to decision 88/8(d), the Secretariat has prepared an analysis of the results based on the historical quantitative assessments of implementing agencies' performance since 2012 as shown in table 4.

Table 4. Historical quantitative assessments of implementing agencies' performance

Agency	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
UNDP	87	89	90	92	82	90	95	94	84	96
UNEP	89	89	70	72	78	76	85	92	70	88
UNIDO	100	98	95	96	92	85	85	83	82	87
World Bank	71	86	87	72	68	78	77	94	68	73

12. In 2021, the quantitative assessments of the performance of implementing agencies are in line with the historical assessments since 2012. The performance of the implementing agencies in 2021 has significantly improved as compared to 2020 where their performance was severely impacted from the COVID-19 pandemic and associated constraints, namely, health regulations, travel restrictions, social distancing requirements, teleworking and the inability to hold physical meetings, all of which have affected data collection, and project submission and implementation. The constraints imposed by the pandemic had resulted in a large number of projects and activities that had not been submitted or completed in 2020 as planned. In 2021, the situation with respect to the pandemic improved, and, with additional efforts from

⁷ France (1), Germany (8), Japan (1), UNDP (27), UNEP (60), UNIDO (33) and the World Bank (3).

implementing agencies, activities are progressing. As a result, the quantitative performance of all implementing agencies in 2021 has increased.

13. Regarding the ways to improve the performance of the implementing agencies, it is noted that the performance indicators targets are currently set at 100 per cent as planned in the business plans and progress reports. As indicated by the implementing agencies, it was impossible for them to achieve 100 per cent of the targets unless they were allowed to set some of the targets connected to those indicators such as, “tranches approved”, “funds disbursed”, “ODS phase-out” and “project completion for activities”, at a lower level.

IV. Secretariat’s comments

14. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2021, showing that all of them achieved 73 per cent or more of their targets.

15. The Secretariat noted that 75 NOUs (as compared to 37 in 2020) submitted qualitative assessments. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from NOUs to the respective bilateral and implementing agencies for their comments, with an emphasis on the five less satisfactory ratings from the main categories and 73 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories.

16. Dialogues between NOUs and bilateral and implementing agencies have been completed for most countries that identified issues in their qualitative assessments (i.e., ratings of “less satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”); most agencies reported that a way forward was agreed during their dialogues with the respective NOUs, and in a majority of cases, they have been able to resolve the issues identified in regard to the less than satisfactory ratings. In this regard, the Executive Committee may wish to note, with appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective NOUs about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned.

17. For those dialogues between the following implementing agencies and NOUs that had not yet been completed regarding the less than satisfactory ratings at the time of finalizing the present document: UNDP with Argentina and Costa Rica, and UNIDO with Algeria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, the Executive Committee may wish to request the aforementioned implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective NOUs to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of their performance and to report to the 92nd meeting on the outcome of the discussions.

18. The Executive Committee may wish to note the improvement of the quantitative assessment of performance for 2021 for all implementing agencies compared to 2020.

Proposed revised performance indicators for all implementing agencies

19. At the 71st meeting, the Executive Committee adopted the current set of performance indicators (decision 71/28). These performance indicators had been used to assess the performance of the implementing agencies since 2014. Since then, the Executive Committee adopted a number of policies that may have an impact on the performance indicators. For example, for the performance indicator on ODS phase-out, with the adoption of the Kigali Amendment, the measurement of control targets is done in CO₂-eq tonnes instead of ODP tonnes as it was the case for ODS. The Secretariat therefore proposes to revise the performance indicators taking into account relevant policies of the Multilateral Fund adopted by the Executive Committee since the 71st meeting and different aspects of the Kigali HFC implementation plans, as well as the views expressed by implementing agencies on ways to better assess their performance.

The Executive Committee may wish to request the Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the implementing agencies, a revised set of performance indicators for its consideration at the 93rd meeting.

V. Recommendation

20. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2021 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/91/9;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2021 of at least 73 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2021 in relation to 2020;
 - (iv) That the quantitative performance of all implementing agencies in 2021 had improved compared to 2020; and
 - (v) With appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective national ozone units (NOUs) about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned;
- (b) To request the following implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective NOUs to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of their performance and to report to the 92nd meeting on the outcome of the discussion: UNDP with Argentina and Costa Rica, and UNIDO with Algeria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia;
- (c) To encourage NOUs to submit, on a yearly basis and in a timely manner, their assessments of the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies in assisting their governments, noting that 75 out of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments for 2021, as compared to 37 in 2020; and
- (d) To request the Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the implementing agencies, a revised set of performance indicators for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 93rd meeting, taking into account ways to better assess the performance of the implementing agencies.

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1998-2021)

UNDP	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
ODS phased out	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports		38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	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%	80%	69%	76%
Value of projects approved		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%	85%	81%	80%
ODS to be phased out		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%	97%	93%	95%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	0.43%	0.74%	1.46%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	45.41	51.97	51.22
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	13.6	13.6	13.6
Speed of completion (months)	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	35.8	35.7	35.8
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	426.1	395.9	268.4
UNIDO	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
ODS phased out	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	55%	87%
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%	86%	87%
Project completion reports		83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	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%	75%	74%	52%
Value of projects approved		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%	73%	85%	52%
ODS to be phased out		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%	61%	71%	82%	86%	84%

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	2.4%	2.8%	3.2%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	119.38	20.96	27.80
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	9.2	9.2	9.1
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.7	42.4	42.7
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	3,372.1	8,137.3	9,458.7
World Bank	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
ODS phased out	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%	70%	63%
Project completion reports		61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%	45%	26%	77%
Distribution among countries		75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%	100%	33%	60%
Value of projects approved		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%	46%	26%	77%
ODS to be phased out		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%	74%	69%	100%	84%	95%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	177.65	2.56	4.55
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	24.5	24.4	24.4
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.2	41.2	41.2
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	812.98	5.5	74.8

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1998-2021)

UNDP	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Funds disbursed	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	100%	100%	109%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.8	11.7	11.7
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.1	36.0	36.0
UNEP	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%	75%	85%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	10.9	11.1	11.6
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.8	36.8	36.7
UNIDO	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Funds disbursed	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	10.0	9.8	9.8
Speed until project completion (months)	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	33.0	34.1	34.1
World Bank	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Funds disbursed	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%	33%	34%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	16.6	16.9	17.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	29.3	29.3	29.6

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2021

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	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	5	1	19	48	20	3
			Satisfactory		2		6	11	11	
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory						1	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	4	1	16	40	16	3
			Satisfactory		4		7	10	7	
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	1	17	51	22	2
			Satisfactory		4		9	9	9	1
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory							
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	20	53	25	2
			Satisfactory		3		5	7	7	1
			Less satisfactory				1		1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	15	47	20	2
			Satisfactory		3		8	13	11	1
			Less satisfactory				1		1	
			Unsatisfactory				1			
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	14	40	18	2
			Satisfactory	1	4		10	14	11	1
			Less satisfactory				1	1	1	
			Unsatisfactory						1	
	Highly satisfactory	1	7	1	18	51	22	3		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Satisfactory		1		5	10	10	
			Less satisfactory				2			
			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		3	1	17	52	23	3
			Satisfactory	1	5		9	8	7	
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory						1	
		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	7	24	13	1
			Satisfactory				4	13	6	
			Less satisfactory						2	
			Unsatisfactory				1			
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		3	1	13	32	13	3
			Satisfactory	1	4		8	8	6	
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	19	48	23	2
			Satisfactory	1	2		6	11	7	1
			Less satisfactory		1				1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	19	45	24	2
			Satisfactory	1	3		6	13	6	1
			Less satisfactory		1				1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	19	46	22	2
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	13	10	1
			Less satisfactory		1					
			Unsatisfactory							
	Highly satisfactory		2	1	12	44	21	1		
	Satisfactory	1	6		9	16	11	2		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Less satisfactory				4			
			Unsatisfactory				1		1	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	14	33	19	1
			Satisfactory	1	6		9	18	11	2
			Less satisfactory				1			
			Unsatisfactory							
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	12	43	18	1
			Satisfactory		3		9	15	13	2
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory				1		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		4	1	12	46	21	
			Satisfactory	1	3		12	15	8	3
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory				1		1	
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	14	31	22	1
			Satisfactory	1	5		6	15	8	1
			Less satisfactory				3		1	
			Unsatisfactory						1	
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	14	42	21	3
			Satisfactory	1	5		8	14	7	
			Less satisfactory				1			
			Unsatisfactory				1		1	
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		4	1	12	30	15	3
			Satisfactory	1	3		8	13	5	
			Less satisfactory				1		2	
			Unsatisfactory							
Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	16	43	23	2		
	Satisfactory	1	5		6	13	8	1		
	Less satisfactory				1	1				

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	
			Unsatisfactory						1		
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	14	42	21	2	
			Satisfactory	1	5		8	15	10	1	
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	13	32	16	1	
				Satisfactory	1	2		7	6	6	1
				Less satisfactory				1		2	
				Unsatisfactory						1	
		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	1	11	27	14		
				Satisfactory		1		8	7	6	2
				Less satisfactory	1	1				2	
				Unsatisfactory							
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	11	28	19	1	
				Satisfactory	1	3		7	14	5	1
				Less satisfactory				1		2	
				Unsatisfactory							
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	3	1	8	39	19	2	
				Satisfactory		1		8	17	8	
				Less satisfactory				1			
				Unsatisfactory							
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	13	31	19	1	
				Satisfactory	1	4		5	12	7	1
				Less satisfactory				2		1	
				Unsatisfactory							
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	12	46	21	1	
				Satisfactory	1	2		5	9	5	1
				Less satisfactory				1		1	
				Unsatisfactory						1	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	13	42	25	2
			Satisfactory	1	3		8	11	5	
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory							
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	7	32	13	2
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	16	8	
			Less satisfactory						1	
			Unsatisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	1	7	38	15	2
			Satisfactory				6	10	6	
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	7	32	14	1
			Satisfactory	1	1		6	15	7	1
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	11	40	19	1
			Satisfactory	1	2		5	13	4	1
			Less satisfactory						2	
			Unsatisfactory							
Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?		Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	11	43	21	1	
		Satisfactory		1		6	11	4	1	
		Less satisfactory						2		
		Unsatisfactory								