



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

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

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Eighty-sixth Meeting  
Montreal, 2-6 November 2020  
Postponed to 8-12 March 2021<sup>1</sup>

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES  
AGAINST THEIR 2019 BUSINESS PLANS<sup>2</sup>**

**Introduction**

1. This document presents:
  - (a) The quantitative evaluations of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2019 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 86<sup>th</sup> meeting;<sup>3,4</sup>
  - (b) A trend analysis for each of the eight performance indicators;
  - (c) The qualitative assessment of the performance of bilateral and implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers; and
  - (d) Secretariat's comments and recommendation.
2. This document also includes the following three annexes:  

Annex I: Investment project performance by agency

Annex II: Non-investment project performance by agency

<sup>1</sup> Due to coronavirus disease (COVID-19)

<sup>2</sup> Also includes qualitative assessment of bilateral agencies.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, as modified by decisions 47/51 and 71/28, and the targets that were adopted for the 2019 business plans in Annexes XI – XIV to the report of the 82<sup>nd</sup> meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/72).

<sup>4</sup> The progress and financial reports as at 31 December 2019 were considered under the intersessional approval process established for the 86<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Annex III: Qualitative assessment of the implementing agencies by the national ozone units for 2019

**Analysis of quantitative performance indicators**

3. Table 1 presents the approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the number of targets achieved.

**Table 1: 2019 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 |
| Tranches approved*                              | 16           | 12                 | 12                     | No         | 38           | 27                 | 27                     | No         | 16                                     | 14                 | 14                     | No         | 2            | 2                  | 2                      | Yes        |
| Projects/activities approved                    | 20           | 26                 | 27                     | Yes        | 94           | 72                 | 85                     | No         | 26                                     | 21                 | 20                     | No         | 1            | 1                  | 1                      | Yes        |
| Funds disbursed (million US \$)                 | 15.62        | 23.14              | 23.14                  | Yes        | 20.99        | 21.15              | 17.61                  | No         | 23.57                                  | 18.53              | 18.56                  | No         | 11.73        | 9.32               | 9.37                   | No         |
| ODS phase-out*                                  | 230.2        | 223.0              | 223.7                  | No         | 153.8        | 9.6                | 142.3                  | No         | 235.1                                  | 193.4              | 193.4                  | No         | 67.9         | 1,191              | 67.9                   | Yes        |
| Project completion for activities               | 63           | 55                 | 55                     | No         | 75           | 97                 | 91                     | Yes        | 48                                     | 30                 | 30                     | No         | 10           | 11                 | 12                     | Yes        |
| Speed of financial completion                   | 70% (76)     | 79                 | 79                     | Yes        | 18 months    | 16 months          | 16 months              | Yes        | 12 months after operational completion | 12 months          | 11.2 months            | Yes        | 90%          | 100%               | 100%                   | Yes        |
| Timely submission of project completion reports | On time (16) | On time (16)       | On time (16)           | Yes        | On time (26) | On time (30)       | On time (27)           | Yes        | On time (11)                           | On time            | On time (11)           | Yes        | On time (22) | On time            | Not on time (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        | On time      | On time            | On time                | Yes        |
| Number of targets achieved                      |              |                    |                        | 5/8        |              |                    |                        | 4/8        |  |                    |                        | 3/8        |              |                    |                        | 6/8        |

\* The targets of an agency would be reduced “if it could not submit a tranche owing to another cooperating agency or lead agency” or “if HPMP submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee was not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency”.

### Weighted assessment of performance

4. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2019 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

**Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2019**

| Item  | Weight<br>-ing | UNDP                    |           | UNEP                    |           | UNIDO                   |           | World Bank              |           |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
|   |                | % of target<br>achieved | Points    | % of target<br>achieved | Points    | % of target<br>achieved | Points    | % of target<br>achieved | Points    |
| Tranches approved                                     | 10             | 75                      | 8         | 71                      | 7         | 88                      | 9         | 100                     | 10        |
| Projects/activities<br>approved                       | 10             | 135                     | 10        | 90                      | 9         | 77                      | 8         | 100                     | 10        |
| Funds disbursed                                       | 15             | 148                     | 15        | 84                      | 13        | 79                      | 12        | 80                      | 12        |
| ODS phase-out   | 25             | 97                      | 24        | 93                      | 23        | 82                      | 21        | 100                     | 25        |
| Project completion<br>for activities                  | 20             | 87                      | 17        | 121                     | 20        | 63                      | 13        | 120                     | 20        |
| Speed of financial<br>completion                      | 10             | 104                     | 10        | 111                     | 10        | 107                     | 10        | 100                     | 10        |
| Timely submission of<br>project completion<br>reports | 5              | 100                     | 5         | 104                     | 5         | 100                     | 5         | 45                      | 2         |
| Timely submission of<br>progress reports              | 5              | 100                     | 5         | 100                     | 5         | 100                     | 5         | 100                     | 5         |
| <b>2018 Assessment</b>                                | <b>100</b>     |                         | <b>94</b> |                         | <b>92</b> |                         | <b>83</b> |                         | <b>94</b> |

### **Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators**

5. In line with decision 41/93,<sup>5</sup> Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment<sup>6</sup> and non-investment<sup>7</sup> projects, respectively.

6. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNDP and the World Bank in 2019 while UNIDO did not achieve this target for that year. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was only achieved by UNDP while the World Bank met 80 per cent and UNIDO met 69 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 45 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2019 were similar to previous years reflecting the historical performance for all implementing agencies. The achievement of the target for value of projects approved increased for UNDP and UNIDO and decreased for the World Bank. The target for ODS to be phased out was achieved only by the World Bank in 2019. The indicators "cost-effectiveness" and "cost of project preparation" are inconclusive with respect to any trend due to the differences in ODP of CFCs and HCFCs and the approval of MYAs instead of individual projects.

7. Annex II shows that the target for the amount of funds disbursed was only achieved by UNDP; and the speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2019 were similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

### **Analysis of qualitative performance indicators**

8. A total of 136<sup>8</sup> questionnaires received from the NOUs of 78 Article 5 countries to assess the

<sup>5</sup> The Secretariat was requested to continue monitoring the investment and non-investment performance indicators on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies.

<sup>6</sup> Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

<sup>7</sup> Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

<sup>8</sup> Germany (8), Japan (1), UNDP (29), UNEP (63), UNIDO (32) and the World Bank (3).

qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed.

9. Table 3 presents a summary of the overall ratings provided by the NOUs for the three main categories. It should be noted that several NOUs 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 to the present document. Most of the overall ratings were satisfactory or above.

**Table 3: Overall ratings for qualitative performance of bilateral and implementing agencies by category**

| Category                      | Highly satisfactory | Satisfactory | Less satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Impact                        | 66                  | 19           | 0                 | 1              |
| Organization and cooperation  | 44                  | 22           | 0                 | 1              |
| Technical assistance/training | 41                  | 42           | 0                 | 1              |

10. In addition to the three main categories, the NOUs provide ratings divided into several sub-categories, and questions by sub-category (Annex III). There were 93 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories.

## SECRETARIAT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATION

### COMMENTS

11. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2019, showing that all of them achieved 83 per cent or more of their targets.

12. The Secretariat noted, with appreciation, that 78 NOUs (as compared to 71 in 2019) submitted qualitative assessments. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from NOUs to the respective bilateral and implementing agencies for their comments, with an emphasis on the 93 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories and three unsatisfactory ratings from the main categories.

13. Dialogues between NOUs and bilateral and implementing agencies have been completed for all countries that identified issues in their qualitative assessments (i.e., ratings of "less satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory"), except for the dialogue between UNIDO and Iraq regarding the less than satisfactory ratings. All agencies reported that a way forward was agreed during their dialogues with the respective NOUs, and in a majority of cases, they have been able to resolve the issues identified in regard to the less than satisfactory ratings.

14. The Executive Committee may wish to note, with appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective NOUs about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned.

15. The Executive Committee may also wish to request UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Iraq, to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 87<sup>th</sup> meeting on the outcome of the discussion.

### RECOMMENDATION

16. The Executive Committee may wish:

(a) To note:

(i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2019 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/86/9;

- (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2019 of at least 83 on a scale of 100;
  - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2019 in relation to 2018;
  - (iv) With appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective national ozone units (NOUs) about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned;
- (b) To request UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Iraq, to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 87<sup>th</sup> meeting on the outcome of the discussion; and
- (c) To encourage NOUs to submit, on a yearly basis and in a timely manner, their assessments of the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies in assisting their governments, noting, with appreciation, that 78 out of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments, as compared to 71 in 2019.

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

| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 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       |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
| 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     |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
| 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)**

| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 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        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
| 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        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
| 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        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2009</b> | <b>2010</b> | <b>2011</b> | <b>2012</b> | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> | <b>2016</b> | <b>2017</b> | <b>2018</b> | <b>2019</b> |
| 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 Development?  | 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/<br>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   |         |       |      |      |       |            |
|                   |   |   | Unsatisfactory      |         |       |      |      | 1     |            |
|                   |   | 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   |         |       |      |      |       |            |
|                   |   |   | Unsatisfactory      |         |       |      |      | 1     |            |
|                   |   | 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     |            |
|                   |   |   | Unsatisfactory      |         |       |      |      | 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  |                     |         |       |      |      |       |            |