



联合国 环境规划署



Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/9
17 February 2021

CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第八十六次会议
2020年11月2日至6日，蒙特利尔
推迟至2021年3月8日至12日¹

对执行机构 2019 年业务计划的业绩评价²

导言

1. 本文件介绍：

- (a) 关于各执行机构 2019 年业务计划中所订业绩目标的业绩定量评价以及提交第八十六次会议的进度报告和财务报告；^{3,4}
- (b) 对八个业绩指标中的每一个进行的趋势分析；
- (c) 根据从国家臭氧机构干事那里收到的意见对双边机构和执行机构的业绩进行的定性评估；
- (d) 秘书处的评论和建议。

¹ 由于冠状病毒病（COVID-19）。

² 也包括双边机构的定性评估。

³ 根据经第 47/51 和第 71/28 号决定修订的第 41/93 号决定通过的业绩指标，以及第八十二次会议报告（UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/72）附件十一至十四中为 2019 年业务计划通过的各项目标。

⁴ 截至 2019 年 12 月 31 日的进度报告和财务报告是在为第八十六次会议制定的闭会期间核准程序下审议的。

2. 本文件还包括以下三个附件：

附件一： 机构投资项目业绩

附件二： 机构非投资项目业绩

附件三： 2019 年国家臭氧机构对执行机构的定性评估

定量业绩指标分析

3. 表 1 列出了各项核准目标、实现每个目标的进展措施和实现的目标数目。

表 1: 2019 年业绩指标的目标和实现

项目	开发署				环境规划署				工发组织				世界银行			
	目标	机构实现情况	秘书处评估	实现目标	目标	机构实现情况	秘书处评估	实现目标	目标	机构实现情况	秘书处评估	实现目标	目标	机构实现情况	秘书处评估	实现目标
核准的付款申请*	16	12	12	否	38	27	27	否	16	14	14	否	2	2	2	是
核准的项目/活动	20	26	27	是	94	72	85	否	26	21	20	否	1	1	1	是
已发放资金(百万美元)	15.62	23.14	23.14	是	20.99	21.15	17.61	否	23.57	18.53	18.56	否	11.73	9.32	9.37	否
淘汰消耗臭氧层物质*	230.2	223.0	223.7	否	153.8	9.6	142.3	否	235.1	193.4	193.4	否	67.9	1,191	67.9	是
项目活动完成	63	55	55	否	75	97	91	是	48	30	30	否	10	11	12	是
财务完成速度	70% (76)	79	79	是	18个月	16个月	16个月	是	运营完成后12个月	12个月	11.2个月	是	90%	100%	100%	是
及时提交项目完成报告	按时(16)	按时(16)	按时(16)	是	按时(26)	按时(30)	按时(27)	是	按时(11)	按时	按时(11)	是	按时(22)	按时	未按时(10)	否
及时提交进度报告	按时	按时	按时	是	按时	按时	按时	是	按时	按时	按时	是	按时	按时	按时	是
实现目标数量				5/8				4/8				3/8				6/8

* “如果某机构由于另一个合作机构或牵头机构的原因而无法提交付款申请”或“如果提交执行委员会审议的氟氯烃淘汰管理计划因国家臭氧机构无法控制的因素而未获核准”，则该机构的目标可降低。

业绩加权评估

4. 表 2 显示根据秘书处的方法按业绩指标进行的 2019 年加权评估的结果。

表 2: 2019 各执行机构业绩加权评估

项目	加权	开发署		环境规划署		工发组织		世界银行	
		已实现目标的百分比	分数	已实现目标百分比	分数	已实现目标的百分比	分数	已实现目标百分比	分数
核准的付款申请	10	75	8	71	7	88	9	100	10
核准的项目/活动	10	135	10	90	9	77	8	100	10
已发放资金	15	148	15	84	13	79	12	80	12
淘汰消耗臭氧层物质	25	97	24	93	23	82	21	100	25
项目活动完成	20	87	17	121	20	63	13	120	20
财务完成速度	10	104	10	111	10	107	10	100	10
及时提交项目完成报告	5	100	5	104	5	100	5	45	2
及时提交进度报告	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2018 年评估	100		94		92		83		94

其他定量业绩指标的分析

5. 根据第 41/93 号决定，⁵ 附件一和附件二分别列出了投资项目⁶和非投资项目的历史性分析。

6. 附件一显示，开发署和世界银行在 2019 年实现了逐步淘汰消耗臭氧层物质的目标，而工发组织当年没有实现这一目标。只有开发署的发放资金数额已经达标，世界银行完成了 80%，工发组织是 69%。开发署和工发组织实现了项目完成报告的目标，世界银行完成了其目标的 45%。2019 年的交付速度和首次付款与往年相似，反映了所有执行机构的历史业绩。开发署和工发组织在实现核准的项目价值目标方面有所提升，世界银行则有所下降。2019 年只有世界银行实现了逐步淘汰消耗臭氧层物质的目标。由于氟氯化碳和氟氯烃的耗氧潜能值不同，而且核准的是多年期协定项目而非单个项目，与任何趋势有关的“成本效益”和“项目筹建成本”指标都尚无定论。

7. 附件二显示，仅开发署的发放资金数额已经达标；所有执行机构 2019 年的交付速度和首次放款情况与往年相似。

定性业绩指标分析

8. 从 78 个第 5 条国家的国家臭氧机构共收到对双边机构和执行机构进行定性业绩评

⁵ 请秘书处在今后对执行机构的业绩评价中，继续根据趋势分析监测投资和非投资业绩指标。

⁶ 投资项目包括按项目编码指定的多年期协定。

估的问卷 136 份，⁷ 问卷已得到处理。

9. 表 3 概述了国家臭氧机构对三个主要类别的总体评分。应当指出，尽管一些国家臭氧机构回答了本文件附件三包含的单个问题，却未对一个或多个类别提供总体评分。总体评分中大多数为满意或更高一级评分。

表 3：按类别划分的双边机构和执行机构定性业绩的总体评分

类别	高度满意	满意	不甚满意	不满意
影响	66	19	0	1
组织与合作	44	22	0	1
技术援助/培训	41	42	0	1

10. 除了三个主要类别，国家臭氧机构分多个亚类别和按亚类别所提问题提供了评分（附件三）。亚类别中有 93 项不甚满意的评分。

秘书处的评论和建议

评论

11. 各执行机构已收到对其 2019 年业绩的定量评估结果，显示所有执行机构的目标都实现了 83%或更多。

12. 秘书处赞赏地注意到，有 78 个国家臭氧机构(2019 年为 71 个)提交了定量评估。秘书处将从国家臭氧机构收到的评估发送给各自的双边机构和执行机构征求意见，重点是 93 个亚类别的不甚满意评分和 3 个主要类别的不满意评分。

13. 所有在定性评估中发现问题(即评分为“不甚满意”或“不满意”)的国家的国家臭氧机构与双边机构和执行机构之间的对话已经完成，只有工发组织与伊拉克就不甚满意评分进行的对话尚未完成。所有机构都报告说，在与各自的国家臭氧机构对话期间商定了前进的方向，在大多数情况下，它们能够解决在不甚满意的评分方面发现的问题。

14. 谨建议执行委员会赞赏地注意到，双边机构和执行机构努力与各自的国家臭氧机构就其提供的服务被认为不甚满意的领域进行公开和建设性讨论，以及它们与有关国家臭氧机构之间协商的令人满意的结果。

15. 还谨建议执行委员会请工发组织与伊拉克国家臭氧机构进行公开和建设性讨论，解决对其业绩评价中提出的任何问题，并向第八十七次会议报告讨论结果。

建议

16. 谨建议执行委员会：

(a) 注意到：

⁷ 德国 (8 份)、日本(1 份)、开发署 (29 份)、环境规划署(63 份)、工发组织 (32 份)、世界银行 (3 份)。

- (一) 对各执行机构 2019 年业务计划的业绩评价，如 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/9 号文件所载；
 - (二) 所有执行机构在其 100 分制的 2019 年定量业绩评估中至少获 83 分；
 - (三) 趋势分析表明，执行机构 2019 年业绩的一些指标相比 2018 年没有改进；
 - (四) 赞赏地注意到双边和执行机构努力与各自的国家臭氧机构就其服务被认为不甚满意的领域进行公开和建设性讨论，以及它们与有关国家臭氧机构协商的令人满意的结果；
- (b) 请工发组织与伊拉克国家臭氧机构进行公开和建设性讨论，解决对其业绩评价中提出的任何问题，并向第八十七次会议报告讨论结果；
- (c) 鼓励国家臭氧机构每年及时提交对协助其政府的双边机构和执行机构的定性业绩评估，赞赏地注意到 144 个国家中有 78 个国家提交了此类评估，而 2019 年为 71 个。

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2019)

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%	81%	68%	85%	90%	60%	88%	80%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%	85%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%	97%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4%	3%	2.7%	2.7%	1.1%	2.5%	1.6%	3.6%	1.4%	0.5%	3.6%	1.5%	14.7%	14.4%	3.0%	2.8%	1.8%	0.2%	4.3%	2.3%	2.71%	0.99%	0.43%
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	56.92	249.68	70.89	108.35	184.95	38.00	45.41
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	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.6	13.5	13.6	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	34.6	34.9	34.9	35.2	35.1	34.4	35.6	35.7	35.8
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	92	113	101	520	538	248	238	-881	416.3	499.6	426.1
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%	72%	67%	100%	76%	54%	64%	75%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%	73%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%	61%	71%	82%

Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2%	4.2%	2.7%	3.8%	2.7%	3.3%	3.6%	2%	0.9%	1.8%	2.1%	1.3%	11.9%	5.7%	2.7%	3.9%	1.1%	1.3%	1.8%	3.6%	2.6%	0.4%	2.4%
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	186.02	79.01	56.02	65.50	53.61	22.83	119.38
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	8.5	8.6	9.0	8.9	9.0	9.2	9.2
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	36.8	38.3	39.5	40.2	40.9	41.1	41.7
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				4,667	5,899	5,727	5,960	3,503	13,035	1,481	3,864	4,470	3,431	6,970	8,918	14,583	17,144	8,805	9,939	13,389	6,906	8,054.8	7,971.7	3,372.1
World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%	45%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%	100%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%	46%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%	74%	69%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.9%	2.7%	2.9%	5.5%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.02%	0.6%	2.2%	74.8%	1.5%	5.6%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	4.0%	8.64%	1.04%	0.0%
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	118.26	214.04	19.84	48.54	52.66	618.83	177.65
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	24.6	24.6	24.6	24.6	24.5	24.4	24.5
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	40.3	40.8	40.8	40.8	41.0	40.1	41.2
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	901	1,002	275	455	249.9	788.4	812.98

Annex II

**NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2019)**

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funds disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	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	11.8	11.9	11.9	11.8	12.0	11.9	11.8	11.7	11.8
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	37.2	36.7	36.3	36.0	36.8	36.2	36.1
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funds disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%
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	9.8	9.9	10.1	10.5	10.5	10.9	10.9
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	34.7	35.3	35.3	36.1	36.7	36.7	36.8
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funds disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%
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	10.2	10.1	10.0	10.1	10.4	10.3	10.0
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	32.8	33.7	32.7	33.4	33.5	32.7	33.0
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Funds disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%
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	14.7	14.0	14.1	14.8	16.8	16.8	16.6
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	30.2	30.0	29.8	29.8	29.2	29.3	29.3

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2019**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
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	5	1	17	52	21	2
			Satisfactory	3		12	10	8	1
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	6	1	12	32	14	1
			Satisfactory	1		6	5	6	1
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	18	49	17	2
			Satisfactory	4		10	14	11	1
			Less satisfactory					3	
			Unsatisfactory						
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	20	54	21	2
			Satisfactory	3		7	9	10	1
			Less satisfactory			2		1	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	15	50	16	2
			Satisfactory	4		11	13	14	1
			Less satisfactory			2	1	1	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	17	44	17	2
			Satisfactory	4		10	13	11	1
			Less satisfactory			1		2	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	17	52	17	3
			Satisfactory	4		10	11	11	
			Less satisfactory			2		2	
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has the use of funds been directed effectively to reach the targets and was	Highly satisfactory	2	1	20	49	18	2
			Satisfactory	6		7	13	11	1

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank		
		it agreed between the national ozone unit and the implementing agency?	Less satisfactory			1		2			
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		If there was a lead agency for a multi-agency project, did it coordinate the activities of the other implementing agencies satisfactorily?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	13	23	8			
			Satisfactory			7	22	12	1		
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Less satisfactory					1			
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	3	1	9	22	8	1		
			Satisfactory	3		5	6	7	1		
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory						1		
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	19	50	17	3		
			Satisfactory	4		8	10	11			
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Less satisfactory					2			
			Unsatisfactory								
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	20	52	18	3		
			Satisfactory	4		7	9	10			
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Less satisfactory					2			
			Unsatisfactory								
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	18	50	17	3		
			Satisfactory	4		7	11	13			
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Less satisfactory			2		2			
			Unsatisfactory								
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	10	43	13	2		
			Satisfactory	4		16	21	16	1		
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Less satisfactory			2	1	2			
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	16	34	16	2
					Satisfactory	2		11	21	12	1
Less satisfactory								1			
Unsatisfactory								1			
Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory			5	1	16	48	17	2		
	Satisfactory			3		9	14	12	1		
	Less satisfactory					1		1			
	Unsatisfactory							1			
Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the	Highly satisfactory			4	1	14	37	15	2		
	Satisfactory			4		12	25	14	1		
	Less satisfactory							1	2		
	Unsatisfactory										

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	
		project (within the funding limitations)?	Unsatisfactory					1		
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	14	33	18	1	
			Satisfactory	3		10	19	11		
			Less satisfactory			2	1	2		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	13	37	14	2	
			Satisfactory	3		13	20	13	1	
			Less satisfactory			2		2		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/ TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	3	1	9	17	9	2	
			Satisfactory	4		8	18	11	1	
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory					1		
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	17	35	16	1	
			Satisfactory	3		9	21	13		
			Less satisfactory					1		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	5	1	19	44	15	2	
			Satisfactory	2		8	14	12	1	
			Less satisfactory					2		
			Unsatisfactory					1		
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	16	31	15	1	
				Satisfactory	3		11	13	10	2
				Less satisfactory					2	
				Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties that may have been encountered subsequent to the provision of non-ODS technology?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	11	22	12	3	
				Satisfactory	4		12	16	12	
				Less satisfactory				1	2	
				Unsatisfactory					1	
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	13	28	13	1	
				Satisfactory	4		11	22	14	
				Less satisfactory					3	
				Unsatisfactory						
			Highly satisfactory	2	1	14	37	10	2	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Satisfactory	3		8	22	15	1	
			Less satisfactory	1				4		
			Unsatisfactory							
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	15	32	14	1	
			Satisfactory	4		11	18	14		
			Less satisfactory					2		
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	14	43	13	2	
			Satisfactory	4		12	18	15	1	
			Less satisfactory					2		
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	15	40	13	2	
			Satisfactory	3		10	20	14	1	
			Less satisfactory					2		
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	11	30	11	2	
			Satisfactory	3		7	21	11		
			Less satisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	11	36	11	2	
			Satisfactory	3		6	20	12		
			Less satisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	11	29	7	2	
			Satisfactory	3		6	24	14		
			Less satisfactory					1		
		Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	15	45	16	1
				Satisfactory	4		9	14	8	1
				Less satisfactory						
	Unsatisfactory									
	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?		Highly satisfactory	4	1	15	43	15	2	
			Satisfactory	4		8	16	9		
			Less satisfactory							
Unsatisfactory										