



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/9
7 November 2025

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-seventh Meeting
Montreal, 1-5 December 2025
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda¹

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2024 BUSINESS PLANS**

Introduction

1. The present document consists of the following sections:
 - I. Analysis of quantitative performance indicators. This section presents the quantitative evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2024 business plans² and progress and financial reports submitted to the 97th meeting; and a trend analysis for each of the eight performance indicators.
 - II. Analysis of qualitative performance indicators. This section presents a qualitative assessment of the performance of bilateral and implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers.
 - III. Secretariat's comments
 - IV. Recommendation

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/1

² 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 2024 business plans in annexes X – XIII to the report of the 93rd meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/93/105).

I. Analysis of quantitative performance indicators

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

Table 1. 2024 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*	38	30	30	No	86	63	76	No	43	37	36	No	4	2	2	No
Projects/activities approved	33	29	29	No	119	153	122	Yes	56	18	40	No	4	4	4	Yes
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	26.75	18.74	18.74	No	24.72	24.01	23.78	No	19.68	19.79	19.79	Yes	18.16	26.41	26.41	Yes
ODS phase-out*	271.84	260.0	260.0	No	198.99	177.7	173.8	No	468.43	456.7	456.7	No	5,446.1	7,876.9	5,443.7	No
Project completion for activities	45	41	41	No	81	82	82	Yes	64	34	33	No	1	6	6	Yes
Speed of financial completion	70% (48)	48	48	Yes	12 months	5.8 months	5.9 months	Yes	12 months after operational completion	12 months	11.6 months	Yes	90% (7)	57% (4)	57% (4)	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	On time (1)	On time (6)	On time (2)	Yes	On time (5)	On time (11)	On time (11)	Yes	On time (4)	On time	On time (6)	Yes	0	0	0	N/A
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				3/8				5/8				4/8				4/7

* 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

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2024 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2. Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2024

Item	Weighting	UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank	
		% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved*	Points
Tranches approved	10	79	8	88	9	84	8	50	5
Projects/activities approved	10	88	9	103	10	71	7	100	10
Funds disbursed	15	70	11	96	14	101	15	145	15
ODS phase-out	25	96	24	87	22	97	24	100	25
Project completion for activities	20	91	18	101	20	52	10	600	20
Speed of financial completion	10	100	10	151	10	103	10	57	7
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	200	5	220	5	150	5	N/A	N/A
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	7
2024 Assessment	100		90		95		84		89

*For the World Bank, the weightings (5) for "Timely submission of project completion reports" has been prorated for other administrative indicators: "Speed of financial completion (3)" and "Timely submission of progress reports (2)". Points earned are rounded to the nearest number.

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

4. In line with decision 41/93,³ annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment⁴ and non-investment⁵ projects, respectively.

5. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by all agencies in 2024. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and the World Bank, while UNIDO met 98 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, while the World Bank did not have project completion reports due in 2024. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2024 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 compared to 2023. The target for ODS to be phased out was achieved by the World Bank and was partially achieved by UNDP and UNIDO. 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.

6. Annex II shows that the target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO; and the speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2024 were similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

³ 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.

⁴ Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

⁵ Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

II. Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

7. A total of 160⁶ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 93 Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed.

8. The questionnaire contains three main categories of questions, and an overall assessment of the agencies' performance in each category must be provided.

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 the individual questions that have been included in annex III to the present document. Table 3 shows that most of the overall ratings were satisfactory or above; only 13 ratings were below satisfactory.

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

Category	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Impact	91	37	4	1
Organization and cooperation	73	31	3	1
Technical assistance/training	78	41	2	2

10. In addition to the required overall ratings for the three main categories mentioned above, the questionnaire includes 31 individual questions. The NOUs provided 118 ratings below satisfactory for these questions, as detailed in annex III.

III. Secretariat's comments

11. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2024, showing that all of them achieved 84 per cent or more of their targets.

12. The Executive Committee may wish to note that the quantitative assessment of performance for 2024 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNDP and UNEP) compared to 2023.

13. The Secretariat noted that 93 NOUs (as compared to 88 in 2023) submitted qualitative assessments. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from the NOUs to the respective bilateral and implementing agencies for their comments, with an emphasis on the 131 ratings below satisfactory (including 13 low ratings for the three main categories and 118 low ratings for the individual questions).

14. Dialogues between the respective 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"); all agencies reported that a way forward was agreed during their dialogues with the respective NOUs, and in most cases, they have been able to resolve the issues identified in regard to the less than satisfactory ratings. In this regard, 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 that the outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned had also been satisfactory.

⁶ Australia (1), France (1), Germany (8), UNDP (30), UNEP (73), UNIDO (44) and the World Bank (3).

IV. Recommendation

15. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2024 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/97/9;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2024 of at least 84 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That trend analysis indicated that the performance of implementing agencies had not improved for some indicators in 2024 compared with 2023;
 - (iv) That quantitative performance in 2024 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNDP and UNEP) compared with 2023;
 - (v) 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 that the outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned had also been satisfactory; and
- (b) 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 assisting their governments, noting that 93 out of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments for 2024, compared with 88 in 2023.

Annex I

INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY (2001-2024)

UNDP	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
ODS phased out	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	37%	100%
Funds disbursed	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	64%	100%
Project completion reports	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%	81%	68%	85%	90%	60%	88%	80%	69%	76%	67%	77%	82%
Value of projects approved	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%	85%	81%	80%	78%	57%	84%
ODS to be phased out	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%	97%	93%	95%	98%	82%	96%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	0.74%	1.46%	6.42%	5.76%	5.18%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	51.97	51.22	59.08	14.18	16.46
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	13.6	13.6	13.6	13.7	13.7
Speed of completion (months)	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	35.7	35.8	35.9	35.8	35.9
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	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	395.9	268.4	335.3	480.9	651.7
UNIDO	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
ODS phased out	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	55%	87%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%	86%	87%	100%	100%	98%
Project completion reports	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%	72%	67%	100%	76%	54%	64%	75%	74%	52%	62%	66%	75%
Value of projects approved	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%	73%	85%	52%	90%	77%	100%
ODS to be phased out	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%	61%	71%	82%	86%	84%	70%	96%	97%

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	2.8%	3.2%	8.71%	8.82%	4.50%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	20.96	27.80	17.48	11.09	11.19
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	9.2	9.1	9.3	9.3	9.2
Speed of completion (months)	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	42.4	42.7	42.4	42.1	42.5
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	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	8,137.3	9,458.7	8,112.8	7,797.6	870.5
World Bank	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
ODS phased out	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	66%	100%
Funds disbursed	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%	70%	63%	99%	43%	100%
Project completion reports	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%	45%	26%	77%	90%	100%	N/A
Distribution among countries	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%	100%	33%	60%	75%	100%	40%
Value of projects approved	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%	46%	26%	77%	80%	100%	90%
ODS to be phased out	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%	74%	69%	100%	84%	95%	99%	100%	100%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	18.64%	1.04%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.61%	2.92%	0.81%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)	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	2.56	4.55	3.85	18.29	31.96
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	24.4	24.4	24.4	24.3	24.2
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.2	41.2	41.3	41.2	41.2
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	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	5.5	74.8	149.5	146.9	65.5

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(2001-2024)

UNDP	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Funds disbursed	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.6	11.5
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.0	36.0	35.7	35.7	35.6
UNEP	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Funds disbursed	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%	75%	85%	85%	82%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.1	11.6	11.9	12.2	12.5
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.8	36.7	36.6	36.9	37.4
UNIDO	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Funds disbursed	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	9.8	9.8	9.7	9.6	9.5
Speed until project completion (months)	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	34.1	34.1	33.9	34.3	34.4
World Bank	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Funds disbursed	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%	33%	34%	35%	100%	53%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	16.9	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	29.3	29.6	29.6	29.6	28.9

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2024

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Australia	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	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	7	16	55	28	1	109
			Satisfactory			1	10	17	12	2	42
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory								
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	13	46	23	1	91
			Satisfactory			2	11	13	9	2	37
			Less satisfactory				1		3		4
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	8	15	55	29	1	110
			Satisfactory				12	16	11	2	41
			Less satisfactory						2		2
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
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	7	20	65	32	2	128
			Satisfactory			1	9	8	7	1	26
			Less satisfactory				2		5		7
			Unsatisfactory								
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	14	58	24	2	105
			Satisfactory			3	13	15	18	1	50
			Less satisfactory				3		2		5
			Unsatisfactory								
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	16	50	29	1	102
			Satisfactory			4	11	20	14	2	51
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	17	63	29	2	119
			Satisfactory			2	9	10	9	1	31
			Less satisfactory				4		6		10
			Unsatisfactory								
		Has the use of funds been directed effectively to reach the targets and was it agreed between the national	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	18	63	30	2	121
			Satisfactory			2	8	9	10	1	30
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Australia	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		ozone unit and the implementing agency?	Unsatisfactory				1				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			11	31	16		59
			Satisfactory		1	2	5	15	11	1	35
			Less satisfactory				2	1	1		4
			Unsatisfactory								
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	14	36	15	1	73
			Satisfactory			2	11	8	9	1	31
			Less satisfactory						3		3
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	8	18	54	33	2	117
			Satisfactory				10	16	11	1	38
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	8	19	56	31	2	118
			Satisfactory				9	14	13	1	37
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	8	17	56	32	2	117
			Satisfactory				9	13	11	1	34
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	3	9	56	23	1	94
			Satisfactory			5	17	16	16	2	56
			Less satisfactory				3	1	5		9
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	13	35	21	2	79
			Satisfactory			1	11	26	17	1	56
			Less satisfactory				1	1	3		5
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	7	14	51	30	1	105
			Satisfactory			1	11	17	11	2	42
			Less satisfactory				1	1	3		5
			Unsatisfactory								
			Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	14	47	24	1	94

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Australia	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Satisfactory			2	12	22	14	2	52
			Less satisfactory						3		3
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	7	11	29	21	1	71
			Satisfactory			1	13	26	16	2	58
			Less satisfactory				1				1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	7	13	46	28	1	97
			Satisfactory			1	12	19	7	2	41
			Less satisfactory				1		2		3
			Unsatisfactory				1		2		3
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	13	37	19	1	78
			Satisfactory			1	11	15	12	2	41
			Less satisfactory						2		2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	15	45	25	2	94
			Satisfactory			2	9	20	18	1	50
			Less satisfactory			1					1
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	16	50	24	2	100
			Satisfactory			2	9	18	16	1	46
			Less satisfactory						2		2
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	1		3	11	35	24	1	75
			Satisfactory		1	4	11	15	9		40
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		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	10	25	19	1	61
			Satisfactory			3	12	17	10		42
			Less satisfactory						1		1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	6	12	33	20	1	74
			Satisfactory			2	10	13	14	1	40

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Australia	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
	National phase-out plans		Less satisfactory					1			1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	9	45	24	1	85
			Satisfactory			2	9	22	12	2	47
			Less satisfactory				1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	7	10	31	25		75
			Satisfactory			1	11	17	12	2	43
			Less satisfactory				1	1			2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory	1		5	12	50	26	1	95
			Satisfactory		1	3	9	14	11	2	40
			Less satisfactory				1	1	2		4
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1		5	15	51	25	2	99
			Satisfactory		1	3	8	13	12	1	38
			Less satisfactory						2		2
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1		2	10	40	20		73
			Satisfactory		1	2	4	22	11	2	42
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	3	10	47	15		77
			Satisfactory			1	4	15	16	2	38
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	3	9	38	17		69
			Satisfactory			1	5	23	14	2	45
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory				1				1
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	14	48	27	2	98
			Satisfactory			2	3	14	8		27
			Less satisfactory						1		1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2
			Highly satisfactory	1	1	5	14	42	25	1	89
			Satisfactory			2	3	20	10	1	36

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Australia	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Less satisfactory						1		1
			Unsatisfactory				1		1		2