



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/70/16
5 June 2013

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventieth Meeting
Bangkok, 1-5 July 2013

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2012 BUSINESS PLANS

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 issuance of the document.

Introduction

1. This document presents the evaluation of the 2012 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 2012 business plans by the Executive Committee through decisions 66/7 to 66/10, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 70th 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 2012 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

2012 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	16	15	15	No	26	28	28	Yes	34	35	35	Yes	5	4	4	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	15	14	14	No	79	52	52	No	10	11	11	Yes	4	4	4	Yes
Milestone activities completed	12	11	11	No	5	6.1	6.1	Yes	14	At least 23	23	Yes	2/2	2/2	2/2	Yes
ODS phased out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	18.9	19.4	19.4	Yes	0.0	0.0	0.0	Yes	0.0	0.0	0.0	Yes	8.5	1.7	1.7	No
Project completion	41	11	11	No	41	37	37	No	3	5	5	Yes	6	7	7	Yes
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	N/A	2 (100%)	2	N/A	100% of countries	100% of countries	100% of countries	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On Time (66)	66	66	Yes	On Time (140)	On Time (104)	103	No	12 months after operational completion	8 months	8 months	Yes	11 months	26.8 months	26.8 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On Time (9)	12	13	Yes	On Time (57)	On Time (57)	16	No	On time (3)	3	3	Yes	100%	10%	10%	No
Timely submission of progress reports	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On Time	On Time	On Time	Yes	On time	On Time	On Time	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Number of targets achieved				4/8				5/9				8/8				5/9

4. Overall, agencies have met the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of eight targets, UNDP has fully met four (50 per cent) and partially achieved four;
 - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully met five (55.5 per cent) and partially achieved four;
 - (c) Out of a total of eight targets, UNIDO has fully met eight (100 per cent); and
 - (d) Out of a total of nine targets, the World Bank has fully met five (55.5 per cent) and partially achieved four.

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. UNDP has suggested that future assessments should not include whether 100 per cent of the target is achieved. The Secretariat will not present this assessment in future evaluations unless otherwise requested by the Executive Committee.

6. Some aspects of the implementing agencies' assessments of their achievements differed from those of the Secretariat. The Secretariat counted one project more than the number stated by UNDP for the for "project completion report". The results of the Secretariat's calculations for "speed of financial completion" were lower than UNEP's calculations by one project. Regarding the performance indicator for the "timely submission of project completion reports", the Secretariat calculated 41 project completions reports less than the number stated by UNEP.

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 2012

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	94%	14	15	108%	15	15	103%	15	15	80%	12
Individual projects/activities approved	10	93%	9	10	66%	7	10	110%	10	10	100%	10
Milestone activities completed	26	92%	24	20	122%	20	26	164%	26	20	100%	20
ODS phased-out for individual projects	17	103%	17	15	100%	15	17	100%	17	15	20%	3
Project completion	12	27%	3	10	90%	9	12	167%	12	10	117%	10
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	100%	10	10	74%	7	10	133%	10	10	0%	0

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
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	144%	5	5	28%	1	5	100%	5	5	10%	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5
2012 Assessment	100		87	100		89	100		100	100		71
<i>2011 Assessment</i>			89			71			89			66

8. For UNDP and 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 five targets, UNDP exceeded two, UNEP exceeded two and the World Bank exceeded one. The assessment for 2012 is as follows: UNDP: 87; UNEP: 89; UNIDO: 100; and the World Bank: 71. Compared to 2011, the quantitative assessments for 2012 were lower for UNDP (a decrease of 2 points) and higher for UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank (an increase in points of 18, 11 and 5, respectively).

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

10. Decision 41/93 also requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring 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.

13. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO in 2012 and the World Bank met 15 per cent of its planned disbursements for that year. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 10 per cent of its target.

14. The cost of project preparation varied from 2.8 per cent of the cost of the project for UNDP to 3.89 per cent for UNIDO and 5.56 per cent for the World Bank. In general, it was below the cost in previous year for UNDP and above the cost in previous year for UNIDO and the World Bank. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” increased for UNDP and decreased for UNIDO and the World Bank.

15. The cost-effectiveness of projects decreased for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank in 2012. The speed of delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from 9 to 14 months for the first disbursement and 35 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 2012 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), 60 per cent (in 2010), 63 per cent (in 2011) and 55 per cent (in 2012).

18. With respect to the "speed" of making the first disbursement UNEP, as in previous years, was the fastest (9.8 months). This was followed by UNIDO (10.3 months), UNDP (11.9 months), and the World Bank (15.1 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 30 to 37 months.

UNEP's CAP Performance in 2012

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). As per its decision 66/16, the Executive Committee, in the interest of further streamlining the reporting process, requested UNEP to present its detailed annual progress report on Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) activities to the third meeting of each year. The assessment for those indicators will therefore be presented at the 71st meeting.

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

20. On 6 May 2013, 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 13 May 2013. By 14 May 2013, 25 countries had provided 45 responses, which were sent to implementing agencies for their comments.

21. Subsequent to the dispatch of those responses to the agencies, an additional eight countries provided 14 assessments, which were received by 29 May 2013. Two countries (Nepal and Senegal) submitted a revised evaluation after consultations with the agencies for which they had provided low ratings. The additional responses are included in the analysis below.

22. A total of 59 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 (1), UNDP (15), UNEP (26), UNIDO (15) and the World Bank (2). Annex III presents the detailed results for each question, by agency. Table 4 presents a summary of the overall ratings. It should be noted however that several countries 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.

Table 4

OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Overall Ratings	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Impact	27	12		
Organization and cooperation	22	6		
Technical assistance/training	17	14		

23. UNDP received “less satisfactory” ratings from Belize, Colombia and the Republic of Moldova. The Secretariat sought explanations from UNDP about the ratings from Colombia and the Republic of Moldova but not Belize, as its assessment was received after the dispatch of the NOUs’ responses to UNDP.

24. UNDP has been in contact with the NOU in Colombia to get a further clarification about the rating for the acquisition of services and equipment. UNDP indicated that the ratings were related to two specific procurement processes undertaken by UNDP’s office in Colombia where there were some misunderstandings leading to delays/other problems. Both cases have been resolved and there is now a clear understanding in UNDP’s office in Colombia on how to avoid a similar situation in future. In both cases the equipment was procured according to UNDP’s rules and regulations and all activities are in the process of being implemented successfully.

25. Consultations with the NOU in the Republic of Moldova revealed that the assessment concerning the acquisition of services and equipment is more associated with one operational issue faced in the first quarter of 2013 (not the 2012 period) which relates to the HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP)’s sub-component on technicians’ training - a two-months delay in sub-contracting a local training institution has been experienced. This is now being resolved in a joint manner with the NOU and UNDP office.

26. Consultations with the NOU in the Republic of Moldova also indicated a misunderstanding of the question as to whether it had received sufficient funding instead of whether sufficient support had been provided to build capacities within the funding limitations.

27. UNEP received “less satisfactory” ratings from Colombia, Malawi and Senegal and one “unsatisfactory” rating from Belize.

28. Regarding Colombia, the issue of the procurement of ODS identifiers was a lengthy process that resulted from the poor service provided by the vendor, who did not pay close attention to the instructions provided regarding the customs documentation. Additionally, the customs broker did not explain clearly the proper procedure to conduct the nationalization of the equipment. Furthermore, there were communication difficulties between the National Ozone Officer (NOO) and the Customs Authority according to UNEP. UNEP indicated that it planned to have an additional open and constructive dialogue with the NOO, but felt that the rating should not apply to UNEP since it is not providing the procurement service per the small scale funding agreement (SSFA).

29. With respect to the low rating from Malawi, UNEP indicated that the rating was an error and a revised questionnaire would be sent by Malawi.

30. The Secretariat did not seek explanations from UNEP about the ratings from Belize and Senegal, as their assessments were received after the dispatch of the NOUs’ responses to UNEP.

31. UNIDO received “less satisfactory” ratings from Mexico for which the Secretariat did not seek any explanations from the agency as Mexico’s assessment was received after dispatch to UNIDO of the NOUs’ responses.

32. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNDP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Belize; UNEP with the NOUs in Belize, Colombia, and Senegal; and UNIDO with the NOU in Mexico, about the areas where their services were perceived to be “less than satisfactory” and/or “unsatisfactory”, and to report to the 71st meeting on the results of their consultations with the countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments.

SECRETARIAT’S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OBSERVATIONS

33. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNDP met 87 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators), UNEP met 89 per cent, UNIDO met 100 per cent, and the World Bank 71 per cent. Overall, in 2012 the agencies’ performance was slightly higher than it had been in 2011 except for UNDP.

34. Implementing agencies have been able to resolve issues in cases where they have had dialogues with countries that provided less than satisfactory ratings on some indicators. Dialogue is suggested for those agencies with those countries that submitted less or un-satisfactory ratings after 14 May 2013. This would apply to UNDP for the ratings from Belize, UNEP for the ratings from Belize and Senegal, and UNIDO for the ratings from Mexico. Responses to ratings are still pending from UNEP for Colombia and Malawi.

RECOMMENDATIONS

35. The Executive Committee may wish to:

(a) Note:

- (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies’ performance against their 2012 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/70/16;
- (ii) The quantitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies for 2012 on a scale of 100 as follows: UNDP (87), UNEP (89), UNIDO (100), and the World Bank (71); and

(b) Request UNDP to have an open and constructive discussion with the National Ozone Unit (NOU) in Belize; UNEP with the NOUs in Belize, Colombia, and Senegal; and UNIDO with the NOU in Mexico, about the areas where their services were perceived to be “less than satisfactory” and/or “unsatisfactory”, and to report to the 71st meeting on the results of their consultations with the countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments.

Annex I

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2012)**

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%
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	3.0	2.8
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	146.85	92.53
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	13.7	13.7
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	34.6	34.9
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
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%
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	2.71	3.89
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	187.59	35.34
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	8.7	8.7	8.4	8.6
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	35.0	35.9
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
World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%

Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%
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	1.51	5.56
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	545.23	69.01
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	24.6	24.7
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	40.2	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	801	901

Annex II

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2012)**

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%
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	11.8	11.9
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	37.1	37.4
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%
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	9.6	9.8
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	34.3	34.4
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%
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	10.3	10.3
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	31.4	32.8
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	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	14.4	14.9	14.6	15.1
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	30.1	30.3

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Ratings	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	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	2	7	20	11	41	
			Satisfactory			8	6	4	18	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	7	11	7	27	
			Satisfactory			4	6	2	12	
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	10	19	12	44	
			Satisfactory			5	7	3	15	
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	10	21	12	45	
			Satisfactory			1	5	2	13	
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5	19	9	36	
			Less satisfactory				1		1	
			Satisfactory			9	5	4	18	
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	7	18	12	40	
			Less satisfactory				1	1	2	
			Satisfactory			6	4	1	11	
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	10	20	13	45	
			Satisfactory			1	5	6	2	14
		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	1	2	13	20	12	48	
			Satisfactory			2	6	2	10	
		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	4	9	3	17
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Satisfactory				5	6	3	14
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	10	5	22	
			Satisfactory			2	3	1	6	
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	10	19	11	43	
			Satisfactory			5	7	3	15	
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	11	19	12	45	
			Satisfactory			4	7	3	14	
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	10	20	12	45	
			Satisfactory			4	6	2	12	
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	1		4	20	7	32	
			Less satisfactory				1		1	
			Satisfactory			2	10	6	7	25
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	6	12	10	31	
			Satisfactory			8	11	3	22	
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	16	10	34	
			Satisfactory			1	7	8	4	20
		Do you feel that you have received	Highly satisfactory			5	13	9	27	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Ratings	Germany	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total
		sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Less satisfactory			1			1
			Satisfactory	1	2	7	13	5	28
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	9	14	10	36
			Less satisfactory			1	1	1	3
			Satisfactory			2	5	2	9
			Unsatisfactory				1		1
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	1		7	17	9	34
			Less satisfactory				2		2
			Satisfactory		2	6	7	3	18
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	3	8	4	17
			Satisfactory			5	6	3	14
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	9	16	9	37
			Satisfactory			2	5	5	12
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5	11	9	28
			Less satisfactory			1			1
	Satisfactory				7	12	4	23	
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	4	10	8	25
			Satisfactory			8	7	5	20
		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	8	7	20
			Satisfactory		1	9	8	4	22
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5	12	8	28
			Less satisfactory					1	1
			Satisfactory			4	7	3	14
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5	14	8	30
			Satisfactory			8	10	6	24
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	7	16	11	37
			Satisfactory			6	6	3	15
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory		2	5	18	9	34
			Satisfactory	1		7	7	4	19
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory		2	5	16	10	33
	Satisfactory		1		8	7	4	20	
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	6	12	5	26
			Satisfactory			3	10	4	17
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	6	14	5	28
			Satisfactory			3	8	4	15
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory		1	5	12	4	22
			Satisfactory	1		4	8	4	17
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	2	2	16	9	30
			Satisfactory			10	6	2	18
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	14	10	30
Satisfactory				1	8	8	2	19	
