



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/9
28 November 2023

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-third Meeting
Montreal, 15-19 December 2023
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda¹

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2022 BUSINESS PLANS AND REVISED SET OF PERFORMANCE
INDICATORS FOR THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES (decision 91/8(c))**

Introduction

1. The present document consists of the following sections:
 - I. Analysis of quantitative performance indicators. This section presents the quantitative evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2022 business plans² and progress and financial reports submitted to the 93rd 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. Revised set of performance indicators for the implementing agencies. This section is prepared in response to decision 91/8(c).
 - IV. Secretariat's comments
 - V. Recommendation

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/1

² 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 2022 business plans in Annexes X – XIII to the report of the 88th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/79).

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. 2022 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*	11	9	7	No	48	38	27	No	30	23	23	No	4	3	3	No
Projects/activities approved	20	17	17	No	100	63	72	No	24	23	23	No	4	5	3	No
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	22.52	26.25	25.93	Yes	21.63	19.09	18.4	No	21.22	22.2	22.3	Yes	5.06	7.83	7.82	Yes
ODS phase-out*	136.82	134.1	93.1	No	83.99	83.9	74.8	No	345.61	242.58	242.56	No	5,362.5	6,045	5,333.8	No
Project completion for activities	40	41	41	Yes	91	162	113	Yes	42	39	41	No	4	1	2	No
Speed of financial completion	70% (53)	57	57	Yes	14 months	9.1 months	8.6 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 (6)	On time (5)	On time (6)	Yes	On time (14)	On time (17)	On time (14)	Yes	On time (10)	On time	On time (10)	Yes	On time (10)	On time	9	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				4/8				4/8				3/8

* 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 2022 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2. Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2022

Item	Weight -ing	UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank	
		% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points
Tranches approved	10	64	6	56	6	77	8	75	8
Projects/activities approved	10	85	9	72	7	96	10	75	8
Funds disbursed	15	115	15	85	13	105	15	155	15
ODS phase-out	25	68	17	89	22	70	18	99	25
Project completion for activities	20	103	20	124	20	98	20	50	10
Speed of financial completion	10	108	10	139	10	100	10	100	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	90	5
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2022 Assessment	100		87		88		91		86

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

4. In line with decision 41/93,³ annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment⁴ and non-investment⁵ projects, respectively.

5. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO in 2022 while the World Bank did not plan any phase-out for this target for that year. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO while the World Bank met 99 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 90 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2022 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 UNIDO and the World Bank and decreased for UNDP. The target for ODS to be phased out was partially 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 2022 were similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

³ 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.

⁴ Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

⁵ 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 137⁶ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 80 Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed.

8. The questionnaire contains three main categories of questions and an overall assessment of the agencies' performance in each category must be provided.

9. 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	73	26	4	0
Organization and cooperation	62	24	2	0
Technical assistance/training	71	25	3	1

10. In addition to the required overall assessments of the three main categories, the questionnaire contains 31 individual questions, for which the NOUs provided 99 ratings below satisfactory as shown in annex III.

III. Revised set of performance indicators for the implementing agencies (decision 91/8(c))

11. 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. Therefore, at the 91st meeting, the Secretariat proposed 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 (KIPs), as well as the views expressed by implementing agencies on ways to better assess their performance.

12. Accordingly, at its 91st meeting, the Executive Committee requested 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, including ways to assess more effectively the performance of the implementing agencies (decision 91/8(c)).

13. In response to decision 91/8(c), the implementing agencies and the Secretariat had detailed discussions at the Inter-agency coordination meeting.⁷ The Secretariat proposed changes to performance indicators that take into account relevant up-to-date Fund policies and facilitate more effective assessment of agencies performance. These proposals included updating the weighting of some indicators and addition of new indicators.

⁶ France (1), Germany (7), Japan (1), UNDP (26), UNEP (64), UNIDO (35) and the World Bank (3).

⁷ Montreal, 3-5 October 2023.

14. The Secretariat proposed reduction of the weighting of two indicators “ODS phase-out for HPMPs” and “Project operational completion” from 25 and 20 points to 10 and 15 points, respectively. In addition, the Secretariat proposed to include two new indicators that take into account relevant up-to-date Fund policies including “HFC phase-down for KIPs” and “Gender mainstreaming” with a weighting of 10 points each. The remaining are editorial changes to provide more clarity which will facilitate more effective assessment of agencies performance.

15. Table 4 presents the proposed performance indicators to the 93rd meeting of the Executive Committee. Annex IV presents how the indicators will be targeted and assessed based on the Secretariat’s proposal. All changes are highlighted with bold and strikethrough. The new performance indicators would apply beginning with the 2025–2027 business plans.

Table 4. Proposed performance indicators

Type of Indicator	Short title	Calculation	Weighting
Planning-Approval	Tranches approved	Number of tranches approved vs. those planned*	10
Planning-Approval	Individual projects/ activities approved	Number of projects/activities approved vs. those planned (including project preparation activities)	10
	Sub-total		20
Implementation	Funds disbursed	Based on estimated disbursement in progress report	15
Implementation	ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects	ODS phase out for the tranche when the next tranche is approved vs. those planned per business plans. ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	25 10
Implementation	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects in CO₂-eq tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	10
Implementation	Project operational completion	Project operational completion vs. planned in progress reports for all activities (excluding project preparation)**	20 15
Implementation	Gender mainstreaming	Operational policy on gender mainstreaming applied for all projects approved	10
	Sub-total		60
Administrative	Speed of financial completion	The extent to which projects are financially completed within 12 months after project operational completion	10
Administrative	Timely submission of project completion reports	Timely submission of project completion reports based on the progress report	5
Administrative	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans and responses unless otherwise agreed	5
	Sub-total		20
	Total		100

* 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 the HPMP or KIP submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee was not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency.

** **The targets of an agency would be reduced if an extension of the completion date was approved by the Executive Committee.**

IV. Secretariat’s comments

16. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2022, showing that all of them achieved 86 per cent or more of their targets.

17. The Executive Committee may wish to note that the quantitative assessment of performance for 2022 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNIDO and the World Bank) compared to 2021.

18. The Secretariat noted that 80 NOUs (as compared to 75 in 2021) 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 109 less than satisfactory ratings (including 10 low ratings for the three main categories and 99 low ratings for the individual questions).

19. Dialogues between NOUs and bilateral and implementing agencies have been completed for all countries except one, that identified issues in their qualitative assessments (i.e., ratings of “less satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”); 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.

20. At the time of finalizing the present document, UNDP had not yet reported on its dialogue with the Dominican Republic regarding the less than satisfactory ratings. In light of this, the Executive Committee may wish to request UNDP to have open and constructive discussions with the Dominican Republic to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 94th meeting on the outcome of the discussions.

V. Recommendation

21. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2022 business plans and revised set of performance indicators for the implementing agencies, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/9;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2022 of at least 86 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2022 in relation to 2021;
 - (iv) That the quantitative performance in 2022 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNIDO and the World Bank) compared to 2021; 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 UNDP to have open and constructive discussions with the Dominican Republic to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 94th meeting on the outcome of the discussions;
- (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 80 out of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments for 2022, as compared to 75 in 2021; and

- (d) To modify the performance indicators established in decisions 71/28, as follows, noting that the new performance indicators would apply starting with the 2025–2027 business plans:

Type of Indicator	Short title	Calculation	Weighting
Planning-Approval	Tranches approved	Number of tranches approved vs. those planned*	10
Planning-Approval	Individual projects/activities approved	Number of projects/activities approved vs. those planned (including project preparation activities)	10
	Sub-total		20
Implementation	Funds disbursed	Based on estimated disbursement in progress report	15
Implementation	ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects	ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	10
Implementation	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects in CO ₂ -eq tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	10
Implementation	Project operational completion	Project operational completion vs. planned in progress reports for all activities (excluding project preparation)**	15
Implementation	Gender mainstreaming	Operational policy on gender mainstreaming applied for all projects approved	10
	Sub-total		60
Administrative	Speed of financial completion	The extent to which projects are financially completed within 12 months after project operational completion	10
Administrative	Timely submission of project completion reports	Timely submission of project completion reports based on the progress report	5
Administrative	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans and responses unless otherwise agreed	5
	Sub-total		20
	Total		100

* 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 the HPMP or KIP submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee was not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency”.

** The targets of an agency would be reduced if an extension of the completion date was approved by the Executive Committee.

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1999-2022)

UNDP	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ODS phased out	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	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%	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%	67%
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%	78%
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%	98%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	6.42%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	59.08
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	13.6
Speed of completion (months)	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	35.9
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	335.3
UNIDO	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ODS phased out	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	55%	87%	100%
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%	86%	87%	100%
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%	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%	62%
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%	90%
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%	70%

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	8.71%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	17.48
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	9.3
Speed of completion (months)	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	42.4
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	8,112.8
World Bank	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
ODS phased out	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Funds disbursed	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%	70%	63%	99%
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%	90%
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%	75%
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%	80%
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%	99%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	0.61%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	3.85
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	24.4
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.3
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	149.5

Annex II

**NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1999-2022)**

UNDP	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	100%	100%	109%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.7
Speed until project completion (months)	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	35.7
UNEP	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%	75%	85%	85%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.9
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.6
UNIDO	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Funds disbursed	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	9.7
Speed until project completion (months)	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	33.9
World Bank	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Funds disbursed	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%	33%	34%	35%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	17.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	29.6

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2022

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
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	16	50	28	2	103
			Satisfactory		1		8	13	6	1	29
			Less satisfactory		1		1		1		3
			Unsatisfactory								
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		4	1	14	34	18	2	73
			Satisfactory		1		7	11	6	1	26
			Less satisfactory		1		1		2		4
			Unsatisfactory								
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	15	49	26	2	99
			Satisfactory		1		9	13	7	1	31
			Less satisfactory		1		1		2		4
			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	19	57	26	2	111
			Satisfactory		1		6	7	7	1	22
			Less satisfactory		1		1		2		4
			Unsatisfactory								
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	1	3	1	16	49	21	2	93
			Satisfactory		4		8	14	12	1	39
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	11	41	22	1	79
			Satisfactory		3		10	14	12	2	41
			Less satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Highly satisfactory	1	4	1	18	53	27	3	107	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Satisfactory		2		7	11	6		26
			Less satisfactory		1		1		2		4
			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		3	1	18	55	25	1	103
			Satisfactory	1	4		5	7	8	2	27
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			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	1	7	25	13	1	48
			Satisfactory		1		5	13	7	1	27
			Less satisfactory		1		1		1		3
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	3	1	9	32	15	1	62
			Satisfactory		3		8	8	3	2	24
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	15	44	25	3	91
			Satisfactory	1	4		9	14	8		36
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory		3	1	16	47	28	3	98
			Satisfactory	1	4		8	11	5		29
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	17	53	26	2	103
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	7	6	1	24
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	12	48	19	1	83
			Satisfactory	1	4		12	16	13	2	48
			Less satisfactory		1		1		2		4

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	11	34	23	3	76
			Satisfactory	1	2		9	23	11		46
			Less satisfactory				3		1		4
			Unsatisfactory								
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	12	51	25	1	96
			Satisfactory				9	11	8	1	29
			Less satisfactory		1		1		1		3
			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	15	40	19	1	80
			Satisfactory	1	1		8	22	14	2	48
			Less satisfactory		1			1	1		3
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	1	12	33	23	1	77
			Satisfactory				8	16	12		36
			Less satisfactory				3				3
			Unsatisfactory								
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	13	46	23	2	90
			Satisfactory	1	1		9	11	9	1	32
			Less satisfactory				1	1			2
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		4	1	11	33	20	2	71
			Satisfactory	1	1		6	13	3	1	25
			Less satisfactory		1		1		1		3
			Unsatisfactory						1		1
Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		5	1	14	45	27	3	95		
	Satisfactory				7	12	6		25		
	Less satisfactory				1				1		
	Unsatisfactory						1		1		
			Highly satisfactory		3	1	15	44	25	1	89

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Satisfactory	1	3		7	16	8	2	37
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory								
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory		2	1	12	31	23	1	70
			Satisfactory	1	1		6	12	7	1	28
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory				1				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		2	1	11	28	22	2	66
			Satisfactory	1	1		8	10	8		28
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	12	29	22	1	69
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	12	10		32
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	3	1	11	36	21	1	74
			Satisfactory		1		7	22	8	1	39
			Less satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory						1		1
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	12	29	24	1	71
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	12	9		31
			Less satisfactory				2				2
			Unsatisfactory								
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	12	46	27	1	91
			Satisfactory	1	1		7	10	5	1	25
			Less satisfactory		1		2		1		4
			Unsatisfactory								
Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	13	47	28	1	94		
	Satisfactory	1	2		7	12	5	1	28		

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
			Less satisfactory				2				2
			Unsatisfactory						1		1
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory		1	1	6	34	18	1	61
			Satisfactory	1	2		7	18	9	1	38
			Less satisfactory				2	1			3
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	1	5	40	19	1	69
			Satisfactory		1		8	14	7	1	31
			Less satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory		1	1	5	31	16	1	55
			Satisfactory	1	2		8	21	10	1	43
			Less satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		4	1	8	45	23	1	82
			Satisfactory	1	2		6	11	5		25
			Less satisfactory				2				2
			Unsatisfactory						1		1
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	1	9	44	23	1	84
			Satisfactory		1		6	12	5		24
Less satisfactory						1				1	
Unsatisfactory								1		1	

Annex IV

HOW THE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS WILL BE TARGETED AND ASSESSED BASED ON THE SECRETARIAT'S PROPOSAL

Type of indicator (Existing, Modified, New)	Short Title	Calculation	Secretariat proposal	Note	Assumptions	2025 target calculation	2025 achievement calculation
Planning-Approval (Existing)	Tranches approved	Number of tranches approved vs. those planned*	10	No change	Include all MYA tranches that are planned in the business plans	Count number of MYA tranches that are planned in the 2025 business plan	Count number of MYA tranches approved in 2025
Planning-Approval (Existing)	Individual projects/ activities approved	Number of projects/ activities approved vs. those planned (including project preparation activities)	10	No change	Include all individual projects that are planned in the business plan (including PRP)	Count number of individual projects that are planned in the 2025 business plan	Count number of individual projects approved in 2025
	Sub-total		20				
Implementation (Existing)	Funds disbursed	Based on estimated disbursement in progress report	15	No change	Include all projects (excluding CLO and TRF)	From 2023 Progress Report: Total Estimated Disbursement in Current Year	2025 Disbursement = Funds Disbursed in 2025 Progress Report - Funds Disbursed in 2024 Progress Report
Implementation (Modified)	ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects	ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	10	Included in previous indicators for all MYA tranches (25 points). Revised indicator applies for all HCFC-related projects including HPMP tranches and individual projects (revised to 10 points)	ODS phase-out for all HCFC-related projects including HPMP tranches and individual projects that are planned to be completed in the progress report	From 2023 Progress Report: Total ODP approved for all HCFC-related projects that are planned to be completed in 2025	2025 ODS phase-out = Total actual ODP phase-out for all HCFC-related projects that are completed in 2025
Implementation (New)	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects	HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects in CO ₂ -eq tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	10	New indicator applies for all HFC-related projects including KIP tranches and individual projects	HFC phase-down for all HFC-related projects including KIP tranches and individual projects that are planned to be completed in the progress report	From 2023 Progress Report: Total CO ₂ -eq tonnes approved for all HFC-related projects that are planned to be completed in 2025	2025 HFC phase-down = Total actual CO ₂ -eq tonnes phase-down for all HFC-related projects that are completed in 2025
Implementation (Existing)	Project operational completion	Project operational completion vs. planned in progress reports for all activities (excluding project preparation)**	15	Included in previous indicators for all projects excluding project preparation (20 points). (revised to 15 points)	For all projects excluding PRP	From 2023 Progress Report: Total number of projects that are planned to be completed in 2025 excluding project preparation	From 2025 Progress Report: Total number of projects that are completed in 2025 excluding project preparation

Type of indicator (Existing, Modified, New)	Short Title	Calculation	Secretariat proposal	Note	Assumptions	2025 target calculation	2025 achievement calculation
Implementation (New)	Gender mainstreaming	Operational policy on gender mainstreaming applied for all projects approved	10	New indicator for operational policy on gender mainstreaming for all Multilateral Fund-supported projects (decision 84/92)	For all projects.	All projects approved in 2025 (100 per cent)	From 2025 Progress Report: Percentage of projects with gender policy applied for projects approved in 2025
	Sub-total		60				
Administrative (Modified)	Speed of financial completion	The extent to which projects are financially completed within 12 months after project operational completion	10	The existing indicator is measured on an average month basis. Since by decision, all projects should be financially completed within 12 months after operational completion, the target for the assessment should be that projects are financially completed 12 months after operational completion	Include all projects.	12 months after operational completion of the project	From 2025 Progress Report: Average of months from operational completion to financial completion for projects that are financially completed in 2025 based on the 2025 progress report
Administrative (Existing)	Timely submission of project completion reports	Timely submission of project completion reports based on the progress report	5	No change		According to the list of outstanding PCRs for individual projects and MYAs based on the 2023 progress report	Actual PCRs submitted in 2025 for individual projects and MYAs
Administrative (Existing)	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans	Timely submission of progress reports and business plans and responses unless otherwise agreed	5	No change		Assume on time	Timely submission of Business Plans, Progress Reports and their responses
	Sub-total		20				
	Total		100				

* 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 the HPMP or KIP submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee was not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency”.

** The targets of an agency would be reduced if an extension of the completion date was approved by the Executive Committee.