



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/19
9 June 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-first Meeting
Montreal, 5-9 July 2010

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2009 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 2009 business plans of the implementing agencies, based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the revised weighting in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2009 business plans by the Committee through decisions 57/8 to 57/11, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 61st 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 2009 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

2009 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	40	34	34	No	56	43	43	No	28	21	21	No	14	10	10	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	12	15	15	Yes	88	64	64	No	20	16	16	No	7	5	5	No
Milestone activities completed	36	51	51	Yes	51	56	56	Yes	26	34	34	Yes	14	14	14	Yes
ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	633.0	1,151.7	1,072.8	Yes	0.0	1,374.5	525.1	Yes	155.2	191.0	202.0	Yes	229.0	172.4	52.0	No
Project completion	98	55	55	No	86	90	91	Yes	13	12	12	No	6	5	5	No
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On Time (118)	57	57	No	On Time (229)	90	91	No	12 months after operational completion	7.5 months	7.6 months	Yes	11 months	16 months	16 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On Time (33)	35	36	Yes	On Time (67)	31	31	No	On Time (19)	19	16	No	100%	25%	25%	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				6/9				5/9				4/8				3/9

4. Overall, agencies have met the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of nine targets, UNDP has fully met six (66.7 per cent) and partially achieved three;
 - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully met five (55.6 per cent) and partially achieved four;
 - (c) Out of a total of eight targets, UNIDO has fully met four (50 per cent) and partially achieved four (of which “project completion” has been almost fully achieved); and
 - (d) Out of a total of nine targets, the World Bank has fully met three (33.3 per cent) and partially achieved six (of which “individual projects approved” and “project completion” have been almost fully achieved).

5. The overall assessment is based on fully meeting the target of 100 per cent. Therefore, if there are eight targets and an agency meets 99 per cent of the 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.

6. Some aspects of the implementing agencies’ assessments of their achievements differed from those of the Secretariat. The Secretariat counted one project higher than the number stated by UNEP for the performance indicators “project completion” and “speed of financial completion”. The results of the Secretariat’s calculations for “ODS phase-out for individual projects” were lower than UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank calculations; however, the Secretariat’s calculations were higher than UNIDO’s calculation. The result of the Secretariat’s calculation for the “speed of financial completion” was worse than the result of UNIDO’s calculation for that indicator, although in both cases UNIDO met its target. Regarding the performance indicator on “timely submission of project completion reports”, the Secretariat counted one project higher than the number stated by UNDP and three projects lower than the number stated by UNIDO.

Weighted assessment of performance

7. As noted above, data provided by the implementing agencies on their achievements for certain performance indicators differed from the Secretariat’s assessment in only a few cases. For the sake of consistency, the achievement of performance indicators presented in Table 3 is based on the Secretariat’s methodology.

Table 3

WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCY PERFORMANCE IN 2009

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	85%	13	15	77%	12	15	75%	11	15	71%	11
Individual projects/activities approved	10	125%	10	10	73%	7	10	80%	8	10	71%	7
Milestone activities completed	20	142%	20	20	110%	20	26	131%	26	20	100%	20
ODS phased-out for individual projects	15	169%	15	15	> 100%	15	17	130%	17	15	23%	3
Project completion	10	56%	6	10	106%	10	12	92%	11	10	83%	8
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10	100%	10	10	100%	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	48%	5	10	40%	4	10	137%	10	10	55%	6
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	109%	5	5	46%	2	5	84%	4	5	25%	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5
2009 Assessment	100		89	100		85	100		92	100		71
<i>2008 Assessment</i>			76			88			95			72

8. For UNIDO, the weightings have been pro-rated. Fifty-five points are allocated for each approval and implementation indicator, and 20 points for each administrative indicator. Points earned are rounded to the nearest whole number.

9. Table 3 indicates that UNDP exceeded four targets, UNIDO exceeded three and UNEP exceeded three. The assessment for 2009 is as follows: UNDP: 89; UNEP: 85; UNIDO: 92; and the World Bank: 71. Compared to 2008, the quantitative assessments for 2009 were higher for UNDP (an increase of 13 points) and slightly lower for UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank (a decrease in points of 3, 3, and 1, respectively).

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

10. Decision 41/93 also requested the Secretariat to continue to monitor the following performance indicators on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies: ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out, cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement, speed of completion, and net 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.

13. Annex I shows, *inter alia*, that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. In 2009, the levels of ODS phased out by UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank were higher than they had been in 2008.

14. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO in 2009 and the World Bank met 73 per cent of its planned disbursements for that year. UNDP also reached its target for project completion reports. UNIDO and the World Bank met only 84 per cent and 25 per cent of their targets, respectively.

15. The cost of project preparation varied from 2.18 per cent of the cost of the project for the World Bank to 11.91 per cent for UNIDO and 14.7 per cent for UNDP. In general, it was above the cost in previous years. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” increased for the World Bank, decreased for UNIDO and remained the same for UNDP in 2009.

16. The cost-effectiveness of projects increased for UNDP in 2009. However, it decreased from US \$9.34/kg to US \$3.26/kg for UNIDO and from US \$9.36/kg to US \$1.43/kg for the World Bank in 2009 due to the portfolio submitted in 2009. The speed of delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from 9 to 13 months for the first disbursement and 34 months for completion. The World Bank’s speed of delivery for the first disbursement is 25 months and 40 months for project completion.

17. The indicator “net emissions due to delays” is a cumulative figure. Up until 2009 the total amount had been decreasing for all implementing agencies, except UNIDO. The data shown in Annex I for this indicator takes into account partial phase-out that was not accounted for in previous years.

18. Annex II includes a limited number of indicators that can be tracked. These cover the targets for “disbursement for non-investment projects” and “speed of delivery”. Prior to 2004, UNEP had achieved a disbursement rate of 93 to 100 per cent for six consecutive years. Since 2004, UNEP has achieved a disbursement rate of 54 per cent (in both 2004 and 2005), 51 per cent (in 2006), 49 per cent (in 2007), 64 per cent (in 2008) and 69 per cent (in 2009).

19. With respect to the “speed” of making the first disbursement UNEP, as in previous years, was the fastest (9 months). This was followed by UNIDO (10.4 months), UNDP (11.8 months), and the World Bank (14.4 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 31 to 37 months.

UNEP’S CAP Performance in 2009

20. 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). Table 4 presents the targets, and the achievements in 2009 measured against those targets.

Table 4

UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR 2009

Indicator	Target	UNEP Assessment
Efficient follow-up to regional network/thematic meetings	90% implementation rate	Target met. UNEP implemented 90% of the Network recommendations that indicated a UNEP follow-up action.
Effective support to NOUs in their work, particularly guidance to new NOUs	7 such ways/means/products/services; All new NOUs receive capacity building support	Target achieved. At least 15 cases of tailored support provided to NOUs via South-South cooperation and other means; all new NOUs that requested capacity building assistance (Bahamas (the), Lao People's Democratic Republic (the), Nauru, Serbia, and Turkey) received such support from UNEP.
Assistance to countries in actual or potential non-compliance (as per MOP decisions and/or as per reported Article 7 data and trend analysis)	All such countries	26 countries in actual or potential non compliance were provided assistance.
Innovations in production and delivery of global and regional information products and services	7 such products and services	Targets exceeded. More than 7 such products and services were produced and developed.
Close cooperation between CAP regional teams and IAs and BAs working in the regions	5 in each region	At least 21 joint missions/undertakings were done: Africa (7), Asia Pacific (5), Latin America and Caribbean (6), West Asia (4), Europe and Central Asia (3).

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

21. On 27 April 2010, 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 10 May 2010. By 19 May 2010, 24 countries had provided responses, which were sent to implementing agencies for their comment.

22. Subsequent to the dispatch of those responses to the agencies from 24 countries, an additional four countries provided assessments, which were received by 3 June 2010. Although there was no time to seek a response from agencies to these questionnaires, the additional responses are included in the analysis below.

23. A total of 48 questionnaires were processed because multiple responses were provided by countries in which more than one agency had implemented projects. The number of questionnaires by agency was: Canada (1), France (1), Germany (1), UNDP (12), UNEP (19), UNIDO (12) and the World Bank (2). Annex III presents the detailed results for each question, by agency. Table 5 presents a summary of the overall ratings. It should be noted however that several countries did not provide overall ratings for one or more categories although they did provide responses to individual questions which have been included in Annex III.

Table 5

OVERALL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

Overall Ratings	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	No Assessment
Organization and cooperation	16	8	0	0	24
Impact	21	13	0	0	14
Technical assistance/training	8	13	0	0	27

24. No agency was given an overall rating below satisfactory.

25. For all of the questions, the 2009 overall performance was either highly satisfactory or satisfactory for 96 per cent of the responses. This was similar to overall levels in 2008 and 2007 when more than 93 and 95 per cent of the questionnaires completed indicated either highly satisfactory or satisfactory performances of the implementing agencies.

26. Of the 1,311 responses, six countries (Benin, Colombia, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, and Togo) gave “less satisfactory” ratings to some questions and in 12 cases, “unsatisfactory” assessments from Benin, Chad, Kenya, and Togo. The relevant implementing agencies were requested to provide explanations. The questionnaires from Chad and Colombia arrived too late to request agencies to comment.

27. UNEP was given a “less satisfactory” rating from Paraguay with respect to the delivery of consultant services, effectiveness of the use of funds, timely delivery of services, and adequacy of policy support. UNEP was given an “unsatisfactory” rating from Chad with respect to coordination activities with other implementing agencies, adaptation of legislation to local circumstances, whether regulations proposed by UNEP were applicable and enforceable.

28. UNEP did not comply with the request to provide explanations despite reminders. The Executive Committee may therefore wish to request UNEP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOUs in Chad and Paraguay about the areas where UNEP services were perceived to be “less satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations with these countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments by the respective countries.

29. UNDP was given a “less satisfactory” rating from Paraguay with respect to general services related to organization and cooperation, specifically addressing whether the required services of the implementing agency had been delivered on time, the delivery of consultants, and the effective use of funds to reach agreed targets. UNDP also received a “less satisfactory” ranking with respect to specific technical assistance/training with respect to national phase-out plans (NPPs), and in particular, services related to supporting the identification of policy issues related to implementation. Further, UNDP received a rating of “unsatisfactory” from Togo with respect to the timely delivery of the required services of the agency, as well as several aspects related to technical assistance and training. Togo rated the performance of UNDP as “unsatisfactory” with respect to its role in achieving a sustainable result, and whether there has been value-added in managing compliance.

30. In response to the rating from Paraguay, UNDP indicated that it will have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU about the areas where UNDP services were perceived to be “less

satisfactory” in order to understand the reasons or clarify the scope of UNDP’s role, when other agencies are involved, or taking the lead, in key aspects of the project. UNDP responded to the rating by Togo and agreed that procurement of equipment had taken a long time, but noted that a new invitation to bid had been completed and the equipment was expected to be delivered in the second quarter of 2010 for the terminal phase-out management plan (TPMP) project in Togo (TOG/PHA/54/INV/16).

31. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNDP to report to the 62nd Meeting on its discussion with the NOU in Paraguay about the areas where UNDP services were perceived to be “less satisfactory”. It may also request UNDP to provide an additional status report to the 62nd Meeting on the status of the procurement of equipment for the TPMP project in Togo (TOG/PHA/54/INV/16).

32. UNDP was given a “less satisfactory” rating from Colombia with respect to meeting the expectations of stakeholders and the adequacy of equipment specifications.

33. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNDP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Colombia about the areas where UNDP’s services were perceived to be “less satisfactory” and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments.

34. UNIDO received low ratings from Benin, Kyrgyzstan and Kenya. The NOU in Benin rated the agency as “less satisfactory” with respect to the explanation of the work plan and the division of tasks, encouraging the participation of stakeholders, impact of the project to achieve sustainable results, and direction of funds. Benin rated support for the distribution of equipment as “unsatisfactory”. In its response, UNIDO noted that the project had been implemented based on an approved project document and that there had been several attempts to communicate with the NOU with respect to the purchase and distribution of equipment.

35. From Kenya, the rating was “less satisfactory” for several areas including some related to the categories: organization and cooperation; training; and impact. UNIDO noted that there may be some confusion with respect to agencies and the role of GTZ, as the project had been transferred to UNIDO in 2007. UNIDO had not been aware of misunderstandings with the NOU with respect to several organization and cooperation issues and indicated that the NOU had been fully informed and involved in the project. Kenya ranked the role of UNIDO as “unsatisfactory” with respect to the clear explanation of its work plan and division of tasks. UNIDO noted that the work plan and the division of tasks had been established by the previous agency.

36. Kyrgyzstan indicated a “less satisfactory” response for UNIDO concerning some areas related to organization and cooperation, some delays in delivering services, support in building capacity for national implementation and in the acquisition of services and equipment. UNIDO responded that the NOU had been provided support and that technical specifications had been given to national staff to procure equipment locally. There had been delays by the NOU in following procedures for procurement of services and transferring funds. UNIDO noted that it had received a positive assessment from the operator of the halon banking facility with respect to the agency’s support in providing technical assistance, training and commissioning.

37. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOUs about the areas where UNIDO’s services were perceived to be “less satisfactory” and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations with Benin, Kenya and Kyrgyzstan on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments.

SECRETARIAT'S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OBSERVATIONS

38. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNIDO met 92 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators) followed by UNDP (89 per cent), UNEP (85 per cent) and the World Bank (71 per cent). Overall, in 2009 the agencies' performance was slightly lower than it had been in 2008 due largely to not meeting the targets for multi-year tranches approved, individual projects approved, project completion, speed of final completion, and timely submission of project completion reports.

39. The qualitative assessment of the implementing agencies by the NOUs continued to indicate satisfactory or highly satisfactory performance in the overall assessments for the third consecutive year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

40. The Executive Committee may wish to:

(a) Note:

- (i) The evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2009 business plans as contained in UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/19;
- (ii) The quantitative assessment of the performance of the implementing agencies for 2009 on a scale of 100 as follows: UNDP (89), UNEP (85), UNIDO (92), and the World Bank (71);
- (iii) That the implementing agencies (Canada, France, Germany, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank) received satisfactory or highly satisfactory performance for the qualitative performance assessments by the National Ozone Units (NOUs) in the overall assessments of performance in 2009;

(b) Request:

- (i) UNEP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOUs in Chad and Paraguay about the areas where UNEP services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and "unsatisfactory" and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations with these countries on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments by the respective countries;
- (ii) UNDP to report to the 62nd Meeting on its discussion with the NOU in Paraguay about the areas where UNDP services were perceived to be "less satisfactory";
- (iii) UNDP to provide an additional status report to the 62nd Meeting on the status of the procurement of equipment for the terminal phase-out management plan (TPMP) project in Togo (TOG/PHA/54/INV/16);
- (iv) UNDP to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Colombia about the areas where UNDP's services were perceived to be "less satisfactory" and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations on the

implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments; and

- (v) UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOUs about the areas where UNIDO services were perceived to be “less satisfactory” and to report to the 62nd Meeting on the results of its consultations with Benin, Kenya and Kyrgyzstan on the implementation matters raised in the qualitative performance assessments.

Annex I
PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2009)

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4	3	2.7	2.7	1.1	2.54	1.6	3.61	1.44	0.54	3.58	1.5	14.7
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
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
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
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
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2	4.2	2.7	3.8	2.73	3.28	3.64	2.01	0.86	1.83	2.09	1.32	11.91
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
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
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
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
World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%

Annex I

Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%
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
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
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
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
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

Annex II

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2009)**

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	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
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
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%
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
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
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	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
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
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%
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
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

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total	
IMPACT	General	Has cooperation with the implementing agency substantially contributed and added value to your work or organization in managing compliance in your country?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	7	13	7	2	32	
			Satisfactory				4	6	5		15	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory				1					1
IMPACT	General	In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	6	13	6	2	30	
			Satisfactory				5	4	3		12	
			Less Satisfactory						2			2
			Unsatisfactory				1					1
IMPACT	General	IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	4	8	5	1	21	
			Satisfactory				4	5	4		13	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	9	16	6	2	36	
			Satisfactory				3	3	6		12	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	6	14	8	2	33	
			Satisfactory				6	5	2		13	
			Less Satisfactory						1			1
			Unsatisfactory						1			1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	4	9	6	1	23	
			Satisfactory				6	5	3		14	
			Less Satisfactory				1	1	1			3
			Unsatisfactory									

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	7	16	7	2	35
			Satisfactory				4	3	3		10
			Less Satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Has the use of funds been directed effectively to reach the targets and was it agreed between the national ozone unit and the implementing agency?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	9	14	6	2	34
			Satisfactory				2	3	5		10
			Less Satisfactory				1	1	1		3
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	If there was a lead agency for a multi-agency project, did it coordinate the activities of the other implementing agencies satisfactorily?	Highly Satisfactory				2	5	4		11
			Satisfactory				3	5	1		9
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory					1			1
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Development)?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	10	14	7	2	36
			Satisfactory				2	4	4		10
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Identification)?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	9	14	6	2	34
			Satisfactory				3	4	5		12
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project (Implementation)?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	10	15	8	2	38
			Satisfactory				2	4	2		8
			Less Satisfactory						1		1
			Unsatisfactory								
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	5	10	4	1	23
			Satisfactory				5	8	6	1	20
			Less Satisfactory				1	1	2		4
			Unsatisfactory				1				1

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total	
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	4	5	4	1	16	
			Satisfactory				2	4	2		8	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	2	7	7	1	19	
			Satisfactory				7	6	3	1	17	
			Less Satisfactory				1		1		2	
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	4	9	7		23	
			Satisfactory				4	5	4	2	15	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1		3	9	5		19	
			Satisfactory			1	6	9	5	2	23	
			Less Satisfactory				1		1		2	
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	8	10	4	1	26	
			Satisfactory				4	5	5		14	
			Less Satisfactory						2		2	
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	5	11	5	2	26	
			Satisfactory				5	5	2		12	
			Less Satisfactory						2		2	
			Unsatisfactory				1				1	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	3	7	6	1	19	
			Satisfactory				6	6	5	1	18	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	2	8	5	2	20
			Satisfactory				9	5	4		18
			Less Satisfactory						2		2
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects:	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	4	8	6		20
			Satisfactory				5	4	3	1	13
			Less Satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Investment projects:	Has the agency been responsive in addressing any technical difficulties that may have been encountered subsequent to the provision of non-ODS technology?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	4	7	6		19
			Satisfactory				4	3	4		11
			Less Satisfactory						1		1
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	4	8	5	1	20
			Satisfactory				5	5	5		15
			Less Satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory						1		1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	6	10	5	1	24
			Satisfactory				2	3	4	1	10
			Less Satisfactory				1	1	1		3
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	2	8	4	1	17
			Satisfactory				6	6	7	1	20
			Less Satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory								
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	3	9	5	1	20
			Satisfactory				6	5	5	1	17
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	National phase-out plans:	Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	6	10	4	2	24	
			Satisfactory				5	4	6		15	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Adapted to local circumstances)?	Highly Satisfactory		1		2	6	3		12	
			Satisfactory				7	6	6		19	
			Less Satisfactory				1	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					1			1	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Applicable)?	Highly Satisfactory				1	6	5	1	13	
			Satisfactory				7	7	5		19	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory				1	1			2	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency (Enforceable)?	Highly Satisfactory				1	5	4		10	
			Satisfactory				7	7	5		19	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory				1	1			2	
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly Satisfactory			1	4	8	6		19	
			Satisfactory				4	6	5	1	16	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly Satisfactory	1							1	
			Satisfactory									
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	Training projects	Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly Satisfactory	1	1	1	4	8	6	1	22	
			Satisfactory				4	5	5		14	
			Less Satisfactory									
			Unsatisfactory									

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/19
Annex III

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Data	Canada	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Grand Total
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly Satisfactory	1		1	1	2	3		8
			Satisfactory				5	6	2	1	13
			Less Satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory								
