



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/16  
2 June 2009

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Fifty-eighth Meeting  
Montreal, 6-10 July 2009

**EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2008 BUSINESS PLANS**

## Introduction

1. This document presents the evaluation of the 2008 business plans of the implementing agencies, based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weighting in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2008 business plans by the Committee through decisions 54/7 to 54/10, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 58<sup>th</sup> 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
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>25</b>
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
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>55</b>
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
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>20</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

3. The performance of the implementing agencies during 2008 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

**2008 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	39	30	30	No	35	35	35	Yes	30	27	27	No	21	16	16	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	24	17	17	No	56	71	35	No	55	47	47	No	6	6	6	Yes
Milestone activities completed	27	47	47	Yes	20	46	46	Yes	19	27	27	Yes	21	16	16	No
ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	514.5	221.5	221.5	No	0	0	226.8	Yes	762.9	801.7	632.0	No	253	20.05	20.05	No
Project completion	61	57	57	No	86	109	109	Yes	19	20	20	Yes	8	20	20	Yes
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	4/6 (67%)	6/6 (100%)	6/6 (100%)	Yes	64 countries	67 countries	67 countries	Yes	9	9	9	Yes	12	All countries with WB MYA projects in compliance and targets met per APs submitted and approved	All countries with WB MYA projects in compliance and targets met per APs submitted and approved	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On Time (163)	47	47	No	On Time (166)	109	85	No	12 months after operational completion	7.8 months	6.8 months	Yes	11 months	16 months	14 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On Time (58)	43	43	No	On Time (30)	14	13	No	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	100%	69%	69%	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	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Number of targets achieved				3/9				6/9				6/9				4/9

4. Overall, agencies have met the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of nine targets, UNDP has fully met three (33.3 per cent) and partially achieved six (of which “project completion” is almost fully achieved);
  - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully met six (66.7 per cent) and partially three;
  - (c) Out of a total of nine targets, UNIDO has fully met six (66.7 per cent) and partially achieved three (of which “multi-year tranches approved” has been almost fully achieved); and
  - (d) Out of a total of nine targets, the World Bank fully met four (44.4 per cent) and partially achieved five (of which “multi-year tranches approved” and “milestone activities completed” have 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 target, 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 36 fewer projects than the number stated by UNEP for the performance indicator “individual project approvals”, 24 fewer projects for “speed of financial completion” and one less project for “timely submission of project completion reports”. The results of the Secretariat’s calculations for “ODS phase-out for individual projects” and “speed of financial completion” were lower than UNIDO’s calculation. Using its own calculation, UNIDO met the phase-out target. However, employing the Secretariat’s calculation, the target was not met. The result of the Secretariat’s calculation for the “speed of financial completion” was lower than the result of the World Bank’s calculation for that indicator, although in both cases the World Bank failed to meet its target.

#### 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 AGENCY PERFORMANCE IN 2008**

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	77%	12	15	100%	15	15	90%	14	15	76%	11
Individual projects/activities approved	10	71%	7	10	63%	6	10	85%	9	10	100%	10
Milestone activities completed	20	174%	20	20	230%	20	20	142%	20	20	76%	15
ODS phased-out for individual projects	15	43%	6	15	Over	15	15	83%	12	15	8%	1
Project completion	10	93%	9	10	127%	10	10	105%	10	10	250%	10
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10	100%	10	10	105%	10	10	100%	10	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	29%	3	10	51%	5	10	100%	10	10	73%	7
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	74%	4	5	43%	2	5	100%	5	5	69%	3
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5
<b>2008 Assessment</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>76</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>88</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>72</b>
<i>2007 Assessment</i>			<i>86</i>			<i>90</i>			<i>87</i>			<i>93</i>

8. Table 3 indicates that UNEP exceeded four targets, UNIDO exceeded two and UNDP and the World Bank exceeded one. The assessment for 2008 is as follows: UNDP: 76; UNEP: 88; UNIDO: 95; and the World Bank: 72. Compared to 2007, the quantitative assessments for 2008 were higher for UNIDO (an increase of 8 points) and slightly lower for UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank (a decrease in points of 10, 2, and 21, respectively).

**Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators**

9. 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 emission due to delays.

10. 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 schedules 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.

11. 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.

12. Annex I shows, *inter alia*, that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. In 2008, the levels of ODS phased out by UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank were lower than they had been in 2007.

13. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by the World Bank in 2008, UNDP and UNIDO met 98 and 91 per cent of their planned disbursements for that year, respectively. UNIDO also reached its target for project completion reports. UNDP and the World Bank met only 74 per cent and 69 per cent of their targets, respectively.

14. The cost of project preparation varied from 0.59 per cent of the cost of the project for the World Bank to 1.32 per cent for UNIDO and 1.5 per cent for UNDP. In general, however, it was below the cost in previous years, except for the World Bank where the cost of project preparation increased from 0.02 per cent in 2007 to 0.59 per cent in 2008. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” increased for all agencies in 2008.

15. The cost-effectiveness of projects decreased for UNDP in 2008. However, it increased from US \$6.51/kg to US \$9.34/kg for UNIDO and from US \$3.29/kg to US \$9.36/kg for the World Bank in 2008. The speed of delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from nine to 13 months for the first disbursement and 33 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 2008 the total amount had been decreasing 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 has achieved a disbursement rate of 54 per cent (in both 2004 and 2005), 51 per cent (in 2006), 49 per cent (in 2007) and 64 per cent (in 2008).

18. With respect to the “speed” of making the first disbursement UNEP, as in previous years, was the fastest (9 months). This was followed by UNIDO (10.6 months), UNDP (11.7 months), and the World Bank (14.4 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 31 to 37 months.

**UNEP’S CAP Performance in 2008**

19. Decision 41/93 also established revised performance indicators that are related to UNEP’s CAP. At its 48<sup>th</sup> 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 2008 measured against those targets.

Table 4

**UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR 2008**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>UNEP Assessment</b>
Efficient follow-up to regional network/thematic meetings	100 % 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. Seven ways/means to support new NOUs used; CAP provided capacity building services new Ozone Officers of 17 countries.
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. As per Annex III, CAP assisted 29 countries in actual non-compliance and 3 countries in potential non-compliance. Two countries had returned to compliance and did not require these CAP services during 2008.
Innovations in production and delivery of global and regional information products and services	7 such products and services	Target met. Ten 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.

Special CAP compliance assistance activities in 2008

20. Completion of these CAP assistance activities is a vital aspect of the Multilateral Fund’s programmatic activities for compliance assistance. There were 295 special CAP assistance activities in UNEP’s 2008 business plan funded from the CAP programmatic budget. Of those that were considered special assistance activities, it appears that UNEP completed 264, did not complete 16, and it was unclear from UNEP’s comments whether or not the remaining 15 activities had been completed. It is difficult to assess UNEP’s achievement based on its report because often it is unclear if activities were unique to 2008 or whether levels of policy assistance provided were over and above general advice provided at regional network meetings.

**Analysis of qualitative performance indicators**

21. On 12 May 2009 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 20 May 2009, 20 countries had provided responses, which were sent to implementing agencies for their comment. The Government of Germany provided feedback indicating appreciation of the remarks made by the countries while noting some difficulties due to communication and misunderstandings. The implementing agencies did not provide feedback.

22. Subsequent to the dispatch of those responses to the agencies from 20 countries, an additional seven countries provided assessments, which were received by 30 May 2009. Although there was no time



to seek a response from agencies to these questionnaires, the additional responses are included in the analysis below.

23. A total of 56 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: Canada (1), France (2), Germany (6), UNDP (14), UNEP (18), 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 and are included in Annex III.

Table 5

### OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Overall Ratings	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
<b>Organization and cooperation</b>	15	12	0	0
<b>Impact</b>	15	17	0	0
<b>Technical assistance/training</b>	14	17	0	0

24. In 2008 the overall performance was similar to overall levels in 2007, although between 93 and 95 per cent of the questionnaires completed indicated either highly satisfactory or satisfactory performances of the implementing agencies. Of the 1,535 responses, only three countries gave an unsatisfactory assessment for the two questions concerning agency trouble-shooting and the active involvement of the NOU in the project with respect to three implementing agencies.

25. Only 27 countries provided responses, although this represented an increase from the 17 countries that responded to the survey last year (which had been an increase over the previous year when only 12 countries responded). Nevertheless, given the low rate of response, it is possible that the overall results are not representative. A larger number of responses are necessary to enable a more accurate assessment on an agency basis.

## SECRETARIAT'S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### OBSERVATIONS

26. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNIDO met 95 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators) followed by UNEP (88 per cent), UNDP (76 per cent) and the World Bank (72 per cent). Overall, in 2008 the agencies' performance was slightly lower than it had been in 2007 due largely to not meeting the targets for ODS phase-out for individual projects, speed of final completion and timely submission of project completion reports.

27. UNEP indicated that it met all of the CAP performance indicators. The Secretariat notes that while 295 were planned for 2008, it appears that 264 were completed, 16 were not completed, and it is unclear for 15 activities.

28. The qualitative assessment of the implementing agencies by the National Ozone Units continued to indicate satisfactory or highly satisfactory performance in the overall assessments for the third consecutive year.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

29. The Executive Committee may wish to:

(a) Note:

- (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2008 business plans as contained in UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/16;
- (ii) The quantitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies for 2008 on a scale of 100 as follows: UNDP (76), UNEP (88), UNIDO (95), and the World Bank (72);
- (iii) That UNEP indicated that it had fully achieved the performance indicators approved in decision 48/7 for its Compliance Assistance Programme; and
- (iv) That the implementing agencies (Canada, France, Germany, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank) received satisfactory or highly satisfactory performance for the qualitative performance assessments by the National Ozone Units in the overall assessments of performance in 2008.

**Annex I**  
**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR**  
**WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY**  
**(1996-2008)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	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
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
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
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
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
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	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
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
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
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
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
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%
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
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
Speed of first disbursement (months)		26	26	25	25	25.33	26.28	26	26.02	25.7	25.3	25.0	24.8
Speed of completion (months)	37	34	40	37	39	40.09	41.35	41	40.88	40.7	40.3	40.2	39.8
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



**Annex II**

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY (1997-2008)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	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
Speed until project completion (months)	31	24	33	34.16	36	34.7	35	35.36	35.4	36.6	37.3	37.1
<b>UNEP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%
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
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
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%
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
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
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%
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
Speed until project completion (months)	28	32	26	30	29.24	28.85	30	30.39	31	31.5	31.1	30.7



**Annex III**

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

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	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	1	1	3	2	6	14	7	34
			Satisfactory		1	2	1	8	4	4	20
			Less Satisfactory							1	1
IMPACT	General	In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	2	5	10	4	26
			Satisfactory		2	1	1	9	8	7	28
			Less Satisfactory							1	1
IMPACT	Overall	IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	2	3	3	4	15
			Satisfactory		2	1		4	6	4	17
			Less Satisfactory								
Implementing agency's response	General	Implementing agency's response	Highly Satisfactory								
			Satisfactory								
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
Implementing agency's response	General	Implementing agency's response	Highly Satisfactory								
			Satisfactory								
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
Narrative Rating	General	Narrative Rating	Highly Satisfactory Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		1	3	3	7	16	7	37
					1	2		7	2	4	16
						1				1	2
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory	1	2	4	2	4	11	3	27
						2	1	9	7	7	26
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory	1		4		5	9	3	22
					2	1	1	7	7	8	26
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory	1	1	4	3	7	13	6	35
					1			5	5	4	15
						1		1		1	3
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			4	2	8	12	5	31



Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
			Satisfactory		2	1		5	6	4	18
			Less Satisfactory			1		1		2	4
			Unsatisfactory								
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			1		5	3	2	11
			Satisfactory		1	1	1	7	6	3	19
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Development)?	Highly Satisfactory	1		5	3	8	15	7	39
			Satisfactory		2	1		5	2	5	15
			Less Satisfactory					1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Identification)?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	3	8	14	6	36
			Satisfactory		2	1		5	3	6	17
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory					1	1		2
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Implementation)?	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	3	7	15	7	36
			Satisfactory		2	2		6	3	5	18
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly Satisfactory	1		5	1	6	8	2	23
			Satisfactory		1		2	5	10	6	24
			Less Satisfactory		1	1		3		3	8
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	Overall	ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	2	5	4	1	15

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	1		2	4	3	12
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	1	4	5	4	18
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	2	2	7 2	9 1	6	28 3
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	2	7	12	3	29
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	1		7	5	7	22
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)?	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	2	5	11	4	26
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		1 1	2	1	8 1	6	6 2	24 4
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	1	4	8	2	20
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	1		8	4	4 2	19 2
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	3	4	9	3	23
			Satisfactory		2	2		7	7	4	22

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
			Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory					1		1	2
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	1	7	5	3	19
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	1		5	9	8	25
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	1	1	4	2	7	9	4	28
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		1	1	1	6	6	5 1	20 1
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	1		1		3	4	3	12
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	3		10	6	5 2	26 2
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	1		1		3	4	1	10
			Satisfactory Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		2	1		7 2	4 1	6 2	20 5
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects	Investment projects	Highly Satisfactory Satisfactory								

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
			Less Satisfactory Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	1	3	4	1	11
			Satisfactory		2	3		8	3	7	23
			Less Satisfactory					1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	1	4	10	1	19
			Satisfactory		2	3	2	5	3	7	22
			Less Satisfactory					3	2	3	8
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	1	3	4	3	14
			Satisfactory		2	2		8	5	6	23
			Less Satisfactory					1	2	1	4
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	2	6	8	3	24
			Satisfactory		2	1		5	5	5	18
			Less Satisfactory					1	1	1	3
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	National phase-out plans:	Highly Satisfactory								
			Satisfactory								
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		2	2	5	9	3	22
			Satisfactory		2	1	1	4	5	6	19
			Less Satisfactory					2	1	2	5
			Unsatisfactory								

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects:	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Adapted to local circumstances)?	Highly Satisfactory			1		1	3	2	7
			Satisfactory		2	2	7	11	6	28	
			Less Satisfactory				1		1	2	
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects:	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Applicable)?	Highly Satisfactory			1		2	4	3	10
			Satisfactory		1	2	6	8	6	23	
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects:	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Enforceable)?	Highly Satisfactory					2	3	2	7
			Satisfactory		1	3	5	7	6	22	
			Less Satisfactory				1	1		2	
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects:	Training projects:	Highly Satisfactory								
			Satisfactory								
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects:	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	1	4	6	4	19
			Satisfactory		2	2	1	8	8	6	27
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects:	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly Satisfactory	1		4	1	4	8	4	22
			Satisfactory		1	1	1	8	8	5	24
			Less Satisfactory		1			1		1	3
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Overall	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1		3	2	3	3	2	14

Category	Sub-category	Question	Data	Canada	France	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Grand Total
			Satisfactory		2	1		4	7	3	17
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								

-----