



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/52/16/Add.1
9 July 2007



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Fifty-second Meeting
Montreal, 23-27 July 2007

Addendum

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2006 BUSINESS PLANS

This addendum to document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/52/16 contains the section on the Analysis of qualitative performance indicators:

- **Add** the following paragraphs after paragraph 25.

25 (bis). 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. As at 28 June 2007, 12 countries had provided responses. A total of 25 questionnaires were processed because multiple responses were provided by countries in which more than one implementing agency had implemented projects. No questionnaires were completed for the World Bank. Four questionnaires were completed for just one bilateral agency (Germany) and 21 for UNDP, UNIDO and UNEP. Table 5 presents a summary of the overall ratings.

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issue of the document.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to the meeting and not to request additional copies.

Table 5**OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES**

Overall Ratings	Highly satisfactory %	Satisfactory %	Less satisfactory %	Unsatisfactory %
Organization and cooperation	52.6	31.6	15.8	0
Technical assistance/ training	38.9	50	11.1	0
Impact	42.8	47.6	4.8	4.8

25 (ter). Overall, from about 85 to 91 per cent of the questionnaires completed indicated either highly satisfactory or satisfactory performance of the implementing agencies. Two countries (15.8 per cent) rated the organization and cooperation of one implementing agency as “Less satisfactory”. The “Unsatisfactory” rating (representing 4.8 per cent of responses) was related to the lack of implementation of one recovery and recycling project. The “Less satisfactory” ratings were due also to difficulties with the internal procedures of the agency. Implementing agencies were sent copies of the questionnaires for their comment on 28 June 2007. UNDP provided comments noting appreciation and concurring with most assessments, and also noted that difficulties generally related to UNDP procedures and national execution issues. UNEP provided comments in appreciation of the assessments, and advised that the difficulties with disbursement were being addressed in one case and that there had been a high turnover of NOU officers in the other case. UNIDO provided comments concurring with the assessment in one case, and noted the difficulty with changing NOU officers with respect to another country. No comments were received from Germany.

25 (quar). Since only 12 countries provided responses, it is possible that the overall results are not representative. A greater number of responses are needed to enable a more accurate assessment on an agency basis. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNEP CAP, through its regional networks, to include an item in the agenda of its network meetings taking place before next May 2008, assistance in the completion of the qualitative performance questionnaire to ensure a greater response next year.

- **Add** subparagraph (c) in paragraph 28 as follows:
 - (c) Request UNEP CAP through its regional networks to include in the agenda of its network meetings taking place before May 2008 an item on assistance in the completion of the qualitative performance questionnaire.
