



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/64/15
10 June 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-fourth Meeting
Montreal, 25-29 July 2011

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2010 BUSINESS PLANS

Introduction

1. This document presents the evaluation of the 2010 business plans of the implementing agencies, based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weightings in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2010 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 61/7 to 61/10, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 64th meeting of the Executive Committee. It also presents a trend analysis for each of the nine performance indicators used in previous years' evaluations and the results of the qualitative assessment of the performance of implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers. It concludes with the Secretariat's observations and recommendations.

Analysis of quantitative performance indicators in decision 41/93 with revised weightings adopted in decision 47/51

2. Table 1 presents the quantitative performance indicators and the weightings that were adopted in decisions 41/93 and 47/51 and are applied to all agencies. It also presents the short titles that are used in this document to describe the indicators.

Table 1

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ADOPTED IN DECISION 41/93, THE NEW WEIGHTINGS ADOPTED IN DECISION 47/51 AND THEIR SHORT TITLES

Type of indicator	Approved performance indicator	Short title	New weighting
Approval	Number of annual programmes of multi-year agreements approved vs. those planned	Multi-year tranches approved	15
Approval	Number of individual projects/activities (investment projects, RMPs, halon banks, TAS) approved vs. those planned	Individual projects/activities approved	10
		Sub-total	25
Implementation	Milestone activities completed (e.g., policy measures, regulatory assistance)/ODS levels achieved for approved multi-year annual tranches vs. those planned	Milestone activities completed	20
Implementation	ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	15
Implementation	Project completion (pursuant to decision 28/2 for investment projects) and as defined for non-investment projects vs. those planned in progress reports	Project completion	10
Implementation	Percentage of policy/regulatory assistance completed vs. that planned	Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10
		Sub-total	55
Administrative	Speed of financial completion vs. that required per progress report completion dates	Speed of financial completion	10
Administrative	Timely submission of project completion reports vs. those agreed	Timely submission of project completion reports	5
Administrative	Timely submission of progress reports and responses unless otherwise agreed	Timely submission of progress reports	5
		Sub-total	20
		Total	100

3. The performance of the implementing agencies during 2010 is assessed against the targets that were established in their business plans or against targets determined by decisions of the Executive Committee. Table 2 presents the approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the number of targets achieved.

Table 2

2010 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
Multi-year tranches approved	79	17	17	No	105	36	36	No	25	25	25	Yes	8	3	3	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	21	28	28	Yes	88	76	72	No	36	26	26	No	3	5	5	Yes
Milestone activities completed	10	50	50	Yes	26	12	12	No	13	39	39	Yes	5/5	5/5	5/5	Yes
ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	250.5	240.6	240.6	No	0.0	71.6 ODP tonnes	71.6 ODP tonnes	Yes	311.8	321.2	321.2	Yes	240.3	949.7	223.3	No
Project completion	87	55	54	No	33	99	56	Yes	14	14	14	Yes	5	8	8	Yes
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)	Yes	109 countries	109 countries	109 countries	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On Time (111)	30	30	No	On Time (91)	76	76	No	12 months after operational completion	10.7 months	10.7 months	Yes	11 months	24.4 months	24.4 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On Time (24)	13	13	No	On Time (67)	25	25	No	On time (18)	18	18	Yes	100%	20%	20%	No
Timely submission of progress reports	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On time	On Time	Not on time	No	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Number of targets achieved				4/9				4/9				6/8				5/9

4. Overall, agencies have met the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of nine targets, UNDP has fully met four (44.4 per cent) and partially achieved five (of which “ODS phased out for individual projects” has been almost fully achieved);
 - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully met four (44.4 per cent) and partially achieved five;
 - (c) Out of a total of eight targets, UNIDO has fully met six (75 per cent) and partially achieved two; and
 - (d) Out of a total of nine targets, the World Bank has fully met five (55.6 per cent) and partially achieved four (of which “ODS phased out for individual projects” has been almost fully achieved).

5. The overall assessment is based on fully meeting the target of 100 per cent. Therefore, if there are eight targets and an agency meets 99 per cent of the targets, the overall assessment would still be a zero. For this reason a more accurate assessment might take into account partially achieved or almost-fully achieved indicators.

6. Some aspects of the implementing agencies’ assessments of their achievements differed from those of the Secretariat. The Secretariat counted four projects less than the number stated by UNEP for the performance indicator “individual projects/activities approved” and 43 projects less for “project completion”. The results of the Secretariat’s calculations for “ODS phased out for individual projects” were lower than the World Bank calculations by 726.4 ODP tonnes. Regarding the performance indicator for the “project completion”, the Secretariat counted one project less than the number stated by UNDP. The Secretariat’s assessment on the performance indicator “timely submission of progress reports” differed from UNIDO, due to the fact that UNIDO did not provide responses to a number of the Secretariat’s comments and therefore did not provide timely responses.

Weighted assessment of performance

7. As noted above, data provided by the implementing agencies on their achievements for certain performance indicators differed from the Secretariat’s assessment in only a few cases. For the sake of consistency, the achievement of performance indicators presented in Table 3 is based on the Secretariat’s methodology.

Table 3

WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES PERFORMANCE IN 2010

Item	UNDP			UNEP			UNIDO			World Bank		
	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points
Multi-year tranches approved	15	22%	3	15	34%	5	15	100%	15	15	38%	6
Individual projects/activities approved	10	133%	10	10	82%	8	10	72%	7	10	167%	10
Milestone activities completed	20	500%	20	20	46%	9	26	300%	26	20	100%	20

Item	UNDP			UNEP			UNIDO			World Bank		
	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of target achieved	Points
ODS phased-out for individual projects	15	96%	14	15	> 100%	15	17	103%	17	15	93%	14
Project completion	10	62%	6	10	170%	10	12	100%	12	10	160%	10
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10	100%	10	10	100%	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	27%	3	10	84%	8	10	111%	10	10	0%	0
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	54%	3	5	37%	2	5	100%	5	5	20%	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	50%	3	5	100%	5
2010 Assessment	100		74	100		72	100		95	100		76
<i>2009 Assessment</i>			<i>89</i>			<i>85</i>			<i>92</i>			<i>71</i>

8. For UNIDO, the weightings have been pro-rated. Eighty points are allocated for approval and implementation indicators together, and 20 points for each administrative indicator. Points earned are rounded to the nearest whole number.

9. Table 3 indicates that UNIDO exceeded three targets, UNDP exceeded two, UNEP exceeded two and the World Bank exceeded two. The assessment for 2010 is as follows: UNDP: 74; UNEP: 72; UNIDO: 95; and the World Bank: 76. Compared to 2009, the quantitative assessments for 2010 were higher for UNIDO (an increase of 3 points) and the World Bank (an increase of 5 points) and significantly lower for UNDP and UNEP (a decrease in points of 15 and 13, respectively).

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

10. Decision 41/93 also requested the Secretariat to continue to monitor the following performance indicators on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies: ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out, cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement, speed of completion, and net emissions due to delays.

11. The targets covering ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out and net emissions due to delays can be determined based on projections in business plans, progress reports, and studies agreed with the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. For the other indicators, namely cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement and speed of completion, implementing agencies do not set targets or projections in either their progress reports or business plans. The actual achievements of these indicators are, therefore, presented for each year.

12. It should also be noted that previous performance indicators were divided between investment and non-investment projects. All of the nine indicators are applicable to investment projects, but only the “funds disbursed”, “speed of first disbursement” and “speed of project completion” indicators are applicable to non-investment projects. Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment and non-investment projects, respectively. Annex I shows, *inter alia*, that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. In 2010, the level of ODS phased out by UNIDO was higher than it had been in 2009.

13. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP in 2010, UNIDO met 94 per cent and the World Bank met 64 per cent of its planned disbursements for that year. UNIDO reached its target for project completion reports, and UNDP and the World Bank met only 54 per cent and 20 per cent of their targets, respectively.

14. The cost of project preparation varied from 5.68 per cent of the cost of the project for UNIDO to 14.4 per cent for UNDP and 74.84 per cent for the World Bank. In general, it was below the cost in previous years for UNDP and UNIDO and significantly above the cost in previous years for the World Bank. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” increased for UNIDO, decreased for UNDP and the World Bank.

15. The cost-effectiveness of projects increased for UNDP and UNIDO in 2010. However, it decreased from US \$1.43/kg to US \$1.12/kg for the World Bank in 2010 due to the portfolio submitted in 2010. The speed of delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from 9 to 14 months for the first disbursement and 34 months for completion. The World Bank’s speed of delivery for the first disbursement is 25 months and 40 months for project completion.

16. The indicator “net emissions due to delays” is a cumulative figure. Up until 2010 the total amount had been increasing for all implementing agencies. The data shown in Annex I for this indicator takes into account partial phase-out that was not accounted for in previous years.

17. Annex II includes a limited number of indicators that can be tracked. These cover the targets for “disbursement for non-investment projects” and “speed of delivery”. Prior to 2004, UNEP had achieved a disbursement rate of 93 to 100 per cent for six consecutive years. Since 2004, UNEP’s disbursement rate amounts to 54 per cent (in both 2004 and 2005), 51 per cent (in 2006), 49 per cent (in 2007), 64 per cent (in 2008), 69 per cent (in 2009) and 60 per cent (in 2010).

18. With respect to the “speed” of making the first disbursement UNEP, as in previous years, was the fastest (9.5 months). This was followed by UNIDO (10.4 months), UNDP (12.2 months), and the World Bank (14.9 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 30 to 38 months.

UNEP’S CAP Performance in 2010

19. Decision 41/93 also established revised performance indicators that are related to UNEP’s CAP. At its 48th meeting, the Executive Committee decided to change these indicators beginning with the 2006 business plans (decision 48/7). Table 4 presents the targets, and the achievements in 2010 measured against those targets.

Table 4

UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR 2010

Indicator	Target	UNEP Assessment
Efficient follow-up to regional network/thematic meetings	90% implementation rate	Target met. Major recommendations followed up.
Effective support to NOUs in their work, particularly guidance to new NOUs	7 such ways/means/products/services; All new NOUs receive capacity building support	Target met. More than seven ways/means to support new NOUs used; CAP provided capacity building services to new Ozone Officers of 15 countries.

Indicator	Target	UNEP Assessment
Assistance to countries in actual or potential non-compliance (as per MOP decisions and/or as per reported Article 7 data and trend analysis)	All such countries	Target met – all countries received assistance. CAP assisted 7 countries in actual non-compliance and 2 countries in potential non-compliance (as reported in MOP 21).
Innovations in production and delivery of global and regional information products and services	7 such products and services	Target met. 15 products and services delivered.
Close cooperation between CAP regional teams and IAs and BAs working in the regions	5 in each region	Target met. At least 5 joint missions conducted with other IAs/BAs in each region.

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

20. Decision 61/17(b)(ii) requested UNEP to remind countries, at meetings of regional networks, to complete the surveys on the performance of bilateral and implementing agencies. In 2010 UNEP delivered reminders during the meetings of the Regional Networks of Ozone Officers for English-speaking and French-speaking Africa, South Asia, South East Asia, West Asia, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. In 2011, the agency made short verbal presentations on the subject during the meetings of the remaining two networks i.e. Europe and Central Asia (10-13 May 2011, Belgrade, Serbia) and the Pacific Island Countries (26-27 May 2011, Coral Coast, Fiji).

21. On 4 May 2011, the Fund Secretariat sent requests to all Article 5 countries for the completion of the questionnaire to assess the qualitative performance of the implementing agencies. The due date for responses was 16 May 2011. By 20 May 2010, 27 countries had provided 49 responses, which were sent to implementing agencies for their comment.

22. Subsequent to the dispatch of those responses to the agencies from countries, an additional six countries provided 12 assessments, which were received by 3 June 2011. Although there was no time to seek a response from agencies to these questionnaires, the additional responses are included in the analysis below. The Secretariat is recommending that UNDP has a discussion with Argentina about its low rating.

23. A total of 61 questionnaires were processed because multiple responses were provided by countries in which more than one agency had implemented projects. The number of questionnaires by agency was: Germany (5), UNDP (18), UNEP (23), UNIDO (12) and the World Bank (3). Annex III presents the detailed results for each question, by agency. Table 5 presents a summary of the overall ratings. It should be noted however that several countries did not provide overall ratings for one or more categories, although they did provide responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III.

Table 5

OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Overall Ratings	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	No Assessment
Organization and cooperation	9	11	1	1	39
Impact	22	21	1	0	17
Technical assistance/training	12	14	0	0	35

24. Agencies indicated several possible reasons for the low ratings largely due to changes in NOUs, misunderstandings about the ability of the agencies to purchase cars with Fund resources, a desire for an National Ozone Officer (NOO) to be trained as a refrigeration technician trainer although the NOO had no experience as a refrigeration technician, the need to re-advertise requests for proposals due to the lack of sufficient bids from local enterprises, and need for additional technical assistance. UNDP responded to the need for training of the NOU by mounting training missions to Sierra Leone and Swaziland. However, agencies did not contact the country concerned to clarify the rating. In several cases, the agency concerned indicated that it did not understand the rating, for example, because it had thought it had good communication with the NOU, that it felt that rating was related to the work of a different agency, that the rating had to do with a service that was not provided by the agency, or that the agency had provided services that were claimed not to be provided, or that when problems were reported trouble shooting was provided.

25. In the case where the agency contacted the country concerned, it was determined that the rating was often in error as in one case it was with reference to the national level management of equipment and not the agency, the NOU did not understand the question, or the NOU was raising an issue that did not relate to work provided by the agency concerned. The Executive Committee has requested implementing agencies that received ratings below satisfactory to discuss with the countries concerned the rating given and report back to the Executive Committee on the outcome of those dialogues. UNEP reported that it had discussed the ratings with the following countries and had resolved the issue: Sierra Leone, Kiribati, Togo, and Senegal and that it would have additional dialogues with Lesotho and Swaziland. UNIDO indicated that it had discussed and resolved the issues with Mexico. Germany, UNDP, and UNIDO did not report having had dialogues with the following countries for which they had received less than satisfactory evaluations: Lesotho (Germany), Togo, and Trinidad and Tobago (UNDP), and Senegal (UNIDO).

26. The Executive Committee may wish to request the following agencies that have received less than satisfactory evaluations from NOUs to discuss with the respective NOUs to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies and to report to the 65th meeting on the outcome of those dialogues: Germany for Lesotho; UNDP for Togo and Trinidad and Tobago; UNEP for Lesotho and Swaziland; and UNIDO for Senegal.

SECRETARIAT'S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OBSERVATIONS

27. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNIDO met 95 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators) followed by the World Bank (76 per cent), UNDP (74 per cent) and UNEP (72 per cent). Overall, in 2010 the agencies' performance was slightly lower than it had been in 2009 due largely to not meeting the targets for multi-year tranches approved, individual projects approved, milestone activities completed, ODS phased out for individual project, project completion, speed of final completion, and timely submission of project completion reports.

28. Implementing agencies received less than satisfactory qualitative assessments on 64 questions from nine countries some of which gave less than satisfactory ratings to two agencies. Agencies have been able to address several issues already, but there remain some issues that have not been reported as having been addressed and for which dialogues are recommended.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. The Executive Committee may wish to:

(a) Note:

- (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2010 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/64/15;
- (ii) The quantitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies for 2010 on a scale of 100 as follows: UNDP (74), UNEP (72), UNIDO (95), and the World Bank (76);

(b) Request:

- (i) Germany to have an open and constructive discussion with the National Ozone Unit (NOU) in Lesotho about the areas where Germany services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and to report to the 65th meeting on the results of its consultations with the country on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments;
- (ii) UNDP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOUs in Argentina, Togo and Trinidad and Tobago about the areas where UNDP's services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" and to report to the 65th meeting on the results of its consultations with these countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments by the respective countries;
- (iii) UNEP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Lesotho and Swaziland about the areas where UNEP's services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and to report to the 65th meeting on the results of its consultations with these countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments by the respective countries; and
- (iv) UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Senegal about the areas where UNIDO services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and to report to the 65th meeting on the results of its consultations with the country on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments by the respective countries.

Annex I

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2010)**

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4	3	2.7	2.7	1.1	2.54	1.6	3.61	1.44	0.54	3.58	1.5	14.7	14.4
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
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
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
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
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2	4.2	2.7	3.8	2.73	3.28	3.64	2.01	0.86	1.83	2.09	1.32	11.91	5.68
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
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
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
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
World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%

Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.9	2.7	2.9	5.5	1.26	0.43	0.64	0.16	0.39	0.4	0.02	0.59	2.18	74.84
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
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
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
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

Annex II

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2010)**

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	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
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
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%
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
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
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%
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
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
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%
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
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

Annex III

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

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand 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	4	8	13	9	3	37
			Less Satisfactory		1		1		2
			Satisfactory	1	8	10	2		21
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
IMPACT	General	In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	8	12	8	3	34
			Less Satisfactory		1		1		2
			Satisfactory	2	8	10	3		23
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
IMPACT	Overall rating								
			Highly Satisfactory	1	6	5	7	3	22
			Satisfactory	2	7	10	2		21
			Less Satisfactory		1				1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	10	15	8	3	38
			Less Satisfactory		1				1
			Satisfactory	3	6	8	4		21
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	6	11	5	3	27
			Less Satisfactory	1	1		1		3
			Satisfactory	2	10	11	5		28

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	8	13	6	1	31
			Less Satisfactory		2		1		3
			Satisfactory	2	8	8	5	2	25
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	8	12	6	3	32
			Less Satisfactory	1	1		1		3
			Satisfactory	1	8	11	5		25
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	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	9	14	10	2	38
			Satisfactory	2	8	7	2	1	20
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	If there was a lead agency for a multi-agency project, did it coordinate the activities of the other implementing agencies satisfactorily?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	3	6	2		13
			Less Satisfactory		1	1			2
			Satisfactory		4	7	7		18
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	10	13	8	2	35
			Less Satisfactory				1		1
			Satisfactory	3	6	7	2	1	19
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?							
			Highly Satisfactory	1	11	13	8	2	35
			Satisfactory	3	5	8	3	1	20

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	9	14	8	2	35
			Less Satisfactory		1		1		2
			Satisfactory	3	6	5	2	1	17
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	3	8	5	2	21
			Less Satisfactory		1		1		2
			Satisfactory	2	12	15	6	1	36
			Unsatisfactory		2				2
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	Overall rating								
			Highly Satisfactory	1	2	3	2	1	9
			Less Satisfactory		1				1
			Satisfactory	1	4	4	2		11
			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	5	9	4	2	22
			Less Satisfactory		2		1		3
			Satisfactory	3	10	10	5	1	29
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	7	11	5	2	28
			Less Satisfactory	1					1
			Satisfactory	1	9	9	4		23
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?							

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
			Highly Satisfactory	2	5	10	6	3	26
			Less Satisfactory		2	1	1		4
			Satisfactory	3	10	11	4		28
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	4	7	7	1	21
			Less Satisfactory		1	1			2
			Satisfactory	2	12	11	5	1	31
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	5	7	4	2	20
			Less Satisfactory		1	1	1		3
			Satisfactory	2	8	12	5	1	28
			Unsatisfactory		1				1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	7	9	5	1	25
			Less Satisfactory		1	1			2
			Satisfactory	1	9	9	4		23
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	4	10	5	2	24
			Satisfactory	2	14	10	4	1	31
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	5	6	6	1	21
			Less Satisfactory				1		1
			Satisfactory		11	7	5	1	24

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects	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	5	5	5	1	18
			Less Satisfactory		1		1		2
			Satisfactory	1	9	7	5	1	23
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?							
			Highly Satisfactory			1			1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?							
			Highly Satisfactory			1			1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	2	3	5	1	14
			Satisfactory	1	12	13	4	1	31
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	6	9	5	2	25
			Less Satisfactory		1	2			3
			Satisfactory	1	6	9	5	1	22
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	2	7	6	1	19
			Satisfactory	1	12	11	5	2	31
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	6	9	5	2	25
			Less Satisfactory			1			1
			Satisfactory	2	9	8	6	1	26
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans	Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	5	8	6	3	25
			Less Satisfactory			1			1

Category	Sub-category	Question	Rating	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
			Satisfactory	2	8	8	5		23
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	4	8	2	1	18
			Less Satisfactory			1	1		2
			Satisfactory	1	7	9	5		22
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?							
			Highly Satisfactory	3	2	9	4	1	19
			Less Satisfactory			1	2		3
			Satisfactory	1	8	7	4		20
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	1	6	2	1	12
			Less Satisfactory				1		1
			Satisfactory	2	9	9	5		25
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?							
			Highly Satisfactory	2	3	9	6		20
			Less Satisfactory		1				1
			Satisfactory	3	6	8	4		21
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?							
			Highly Satisfactory	4	4	7	6		21
			Satisfactory	1	7	11	4		23
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Overall rating								
			Highly Satisfactory	1	4	3	3	1	12
			Satisfactory	1	6	5	2		14
