UNITED NATIONS

EP

United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/99/9
13 November 2026

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Ninety-ninth Meeting
Montreal, 7–11 December 2026
Item 6(a) of the provisional agenda[1]

EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES AGAINST THEIR 2025 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 2025 business plans[2] and progress and financial reports submitted to the 99th meeting; and a trend analysis for each of the 11 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/99/1

[2] Based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, as modified by decisions 47/51, 71/28 and 93/8(d), and the targets that were adopted for the 2025 business plans in annexes XIII – XVI to the report of the 95th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/95/94).

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.

I. Analysis of quantitative performance indicators

2. At its 93rd meeting, the Executive Committee modified the performance indicators established in decision 71/28, noting that the new performance indicators would apply as of the 2025–2027 business plans (decision 93/8(d)). Table 1 presents the new approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the number of targets achieved.

Table 1. 2025 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*	29	21	21	No	70	40	42	No	46	42	41	No	6	2	2	No
Individual projects/ activities approved	20	19	19	No	96	62	42	No	46	17	47	Yes	5	7	7	Yes
Funds disbursed (million US $)	19.66	20.04	20.34	Yes	23.7	23.19	23.19	No	19.68	33.58	33.58	Yes	17.99	23.03	22.05	Yes
ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects (ODP tonnes)	942.9	560.3	560.3	No	107.9	0	19.8	No	259.0	1,529.0	1,529.1	Yes	5,996.9	7,184.9	7,184.9	Yes
HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects (CO_2-eq tonnes)	462,857	180,564	180,564	No	0	0	48,165	Yes	291,086	261,324	261,324	No	0	0	0	N/A
Project operational completion**	36	36	29	No	58	51	51	No	53	27	27	No	8	11	11	Yes
Gender mainstreaming	100%	100%	100%	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes
Speed of financial completion	12 months	76 projects	16.8 months	No	12 months	12 months	4.2 months	Yes	12 months	12 months	12.74 months	No	12 months	9.1 months	9.1 months	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	0	0	0	N/A	3	2	3	Yes	4	On time	3	No	0	0	0	N/A
Timely submission of progress reports and business plans	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On Time	On time	On time	Yes	On time	Extended by 1 week	Extended by 1 week	No
Number of targets achieved***				3/9				5/10				5/10				6/8

* The targets of an agency will be reduced if it cannot submit a tranche owing to another cooperating agency or lead agency or if the HCFC phase-out management plan or Kigali HFC implementation plan submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee is not approved as a result of factors beyond the control of the NOU and agency.

** The targets of an agency will be reduced if an extension of the completion date has been approved by the Executive Committee.

*** The target was reduced by one indicator for UNDP ("Timely submission of project completion reports") and by two indicators for the World Bank ("HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects (CO_2-eq tonnes)" and "Timely submission of project completion reports"), as these indicators are not applicable in 2025.

Weighted assessment of performance

3. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2025 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2. Weighted assessment of implementing agencies' performance in 2025

Item	Weight-ing	UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank	
		% of target achieved*	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved**	Points
Tranches approved	10	72	7	60	6	89	9	33	3
Individual projects/ activities approved	10	95	10	44	4	102	10	140	10
Funds disbursed	15	103	15	98	15	171	15	123	18
ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects	10	59	6	18	2	590	10	120	12
HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects	10	39	4	Over	10	90	9	N/A	N/A
Project operational completion	15	81	12	88	13	51	5	138	18
Gender mainstreaming	10	100	10	100	10	100	10	100	12
Speed of financial completion	10	60	8	100	10	94	9	100	13
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	N/A	N/A	100	5	75	8	N/A	N/A
Timely submission of progress reports and business plans	5	100	7	100	5	100	5	50	4
2025 Assessment	**100**		**79**		**80**		**90**		**90**

*For UNDP, the weighting (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 and business plans (2)". Points earned are rounded to the nearest number.

**For the World Bank, the weighting (10) for "HFC phase-down for HFC-related projects" has been prorated for other implementation indicators: "Funds disbursed (3)", "ODS phase-out for HCFC-related projects (2)", "Project operational completion (3)" and "Gender mainstreaming (2)"; and the weighting (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 and business plans (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 investment[4] and non-investment[5] projects, respectively.

5. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNIDO and the World Bank while UNDP met 75 per cent of the target. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO, while the World Bank met 95 per cent of the target. UNIDO met 75 per cent of the target for project completion reports, while UNDP and the World Bank did not have project completion reports due in 2025. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2025 were similar to previous years reflecting the historical performance for all implementing agencies. The achievement of the target for value of projects approved was the same for UNIDO and decreased for UNDP and the World Bank compared to 2024. The target for ODS to be phased out was achieved by UNIDO and was partially achieved by UNDP and the World Bank. The indicators "cost-effectiveness" and "cost of project preparation" are inconclusive

[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.

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 UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank; the speed of first disbursement for 2025 was similar to previous years for all implementing agencies; and the speed of delivery in 2025 was higher than 2024 for all implementing agencies.

II. Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

7. The Secretariat processed 163[6] questionnaires submitted by the NOUs of 97 Article 5 countries, assessing the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies.

8. The questionnaire comprises three main categories of questions, and NOUs are requested to provide an overall performance rating for each category. Table 3 presents a summary of the overall ratings provided by the NOUs for these categories. As shown in table 3, the majority of overall ratings were satisfactory or higher; only two ratings were below satisfactory.

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

Category	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Organization and cooperation	109	40	1	0
Technical assistance/training	99	43	1	0
Impact	116	43	0	0

9. In addition to the overall ratings for the three main categories, the questionnaire includes 31 individual questions, for which NOUs provided 67 ratings below satisfactory. It should be noted that several NOUs did not provide overall ratings for one or more of the three main categories, although they did respond to the related individual questions. Detailed ratings are presented in annex III to the present document.

III. Secretariat's comments

10. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2025, showing that all of them achieved 79 per cent or more of their targets.

11. The Executive Committee may wish to note that the quantitative assessment of performance for 2025 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNIDO and the World Bank) compared to 2024.

12. The Secretariat noted that 97 NOUs (as compared to 93 in 2024) 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 69 ratings below satisfactory (including two low ratings for the three main categories and 67 low ratings for the individual questions).

13. 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

[6] France (1), Germany (8), UNDP (32), UNEP (74), UNIDO (45) and the World Bank (3).

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.

Trend analysis

14. At its 41st meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to continue monitoring the performance indicators set out in annexes I and II to the present document on the basis of trend analysis in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies (decision 41/93(c)). As part of the migration of project data to the Knowledge Management System (KMS), the Secretariat carried out a full review and harmonization of the Multilateral Fund's historical project data, covering operations since 1991. Over that period, project data were collected through different methodologies, formats and technologies, in line with the reporting requirements and tools in use at the time. During the recent migration exercise, project records were validated, cleaned and harmonized so that they are consistent across the entire project portfolio. Where necessary, projects were reclassified according to the current categorization, and some data points were corrected or adjusted for consistency and comparability. These adjustments are a normal part of aligning historical data with a new, integrated information system. Future analyses will be based on this harmonized data set. Results should therefore be compared within the new series, not with figures produced under the previous data structure.

15. In light of these changes, the Secretariat would like to seek guidance from the Executive Committee on whether the trend analysis conducted in line with decision 41/93(c) should be discontinued and replaced with a new trend analysis based on the performance indicators established under decision 93/8(d) in future evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies.

IV. Recommendation

16. The Executive Committee may wish:

(a) To note:

(i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2025 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/99/9;

(ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2025 of at least 79 on a scale of 100;

(iii) That trend analysis indicated that the performance of implementing agencies had not improved for some indicators in 2025 compared with 2024;

(iv) That quantitative performance in 2025 had improved for two implementing agencies (UNIDO and the World Bank) compared with 2024;

(v) With appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective national ozone units about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory and that the outcome of their consultations with the national ozone units concerned had also been satisfactory;

(b) To encourage national ozone units 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 97 of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments for 2025, compared with 93 for 2024; and

(c) To consider whether to discontinue the trend analysis of investment and non-investment performance indicators in line with decision 41/93 and to replace with a new trend analysis based on the performance indicators established under decision 93/8(d) in future evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies.

Annex I

INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY (2002–2025)

UNDP	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
ODS phased out	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	37%	100%	75%
Funds disbursed	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	64%	100%	100%
Project completion reports	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Distribution among countries	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%	81%	68%	85%	90%	60%	88%	80%	69%	76%	67%	77%	82%	61%
Value of projects approved	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%	85%	81%	80%	78%	57%	84%	62%
ODS to be phased out	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%	97%	93%	95%	98%	82%	96%	38%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	11.09%
Cost-effectiveness ($/kg)	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	20.89
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	13.9
Speed of completion (months)	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	36.5
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	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	1,476.9
UNIDO	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
ODS phased out	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	55%	87%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%	86%	87%	100%	100%	98%	100%
Project completion reports	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%
Distribution among countries	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%	72%	67%	100%	76%	54%	64%	75%	74%	52%	62%	66%	75%	65%
Value of projects approved	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%	73%	85%	52%	90%	77%	100%	100%
ODS to be phased out	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%	61%	71%	82%	86%	84%	70%	96%	97%	100%

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	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%	2.81%
Cost-effectiveness ($/kg)	7.28	9.79	3.58	3.10	7.13	6.51	9.34	3.26	22.58	187.59	35.34	186.02	79.01	56.02	65.50	53.61	22.83	119.38	20.96	27.80	17.48	11.09	11.19	23.82
Speed of first disbursement (months)	9.16	9.2	9.06	8.97	9.0	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.6	9.0	8.9	9.0	9.2	9.2	9.2	9.1	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.1
Speed of completion (months)	30.89	31.7	32.35	32.98	33.2	33.5	33.4	33.7	34.1	35.0	35.9	36.8	38.3	39.5	40.2	40.9	41.1	41.7	42.4	42.7	42.4	42.1	42.5	41.9
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	5,960	3,503	13,035	1,481	3,864	4,470	3,431	6,970	8,918	14,583	17,144	8,805	9,939	13,389	6,906	8,054.8	7,971.7	3,372.1	8,137.3	9,458.7	8,112.8	7,797.6	870.5	2,374.6
World Bank	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
ODS phased out	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	66%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%	70%	63%	99%	43%	100%	95%
Project completion reports	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%	45%	26%	77%	90%	100%	N/A	N/A
Distribution among countries	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%	100%	33%	60%	75%	100%	40%	50%
Value of projects approved	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%	46%	26%	77%	80%	100%	90%	44%
ODS to be phased out	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%	74%	69%	100%	84%	95%	99%	100%	100%	58%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.02%	0.6%	2.2%	74.8%	1.5%	5.6%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	4.0%	18.64%	1.04%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.61%	2.92%	0.81%	5.88%
Cost-effectiveness ($/kg)	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	8.59
Speed of first disbursement (months)	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	24.2
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.2
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)	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	176.5

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY (2002–2025)

UNDP	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
Funds disbursed	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	71%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.3
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.6
UNEP	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
Funds disbursed	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%	75%	85%	85%	82%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	13.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	38.6
UNIDO	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
Funds disbursed	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	9.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	37.0
World Bank	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**2021**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
Funds disbursed	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%	33%	34%	35%	100%	53%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	17.0
Speed until project completion (months)	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	29.7

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2025

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	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	5	21	59	36	1	123
			Satisfactory		3	11	15	8	1	38
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	5	21	53	35	1	116
			Satisfactory		3	11	19	9	1	43
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	1	7	20	60	40	1	129
			Satisfactory		1	12	14	5	2	34
			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	7	22	65	37	2	134
			Satisfactory		1	7	7	7	1	23
			Less satisfactory			2		1		3
			Unsatisfactory							
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory		6	20	46	31	1	104
			Satisfactory	1	2	10	27	13	2	55
			Less satisfactory			2	1			3
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory		6	19	47	33	1	106
			Satisfactory	1	2	10	24	10	1	48
			Less satisfactory			1	1			2
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	1	7	21	55	38	2	124
			Satisfactory		1	11	18	6	1	37
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		Has the use of funds been directed effectively to reach the targets and was it agreed between the national	Highly satisfactory	1	4	23	59	31	1	119
			Satisfactory		4	7	15	13	1	40
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory			1				1

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		ozone unit and the implementing agency?								
		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	13	32	21		67
			Satisfactory	1	1	8	23	13		46
			Less satisfactory				1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		4	19	53	32	1	109
			Satisfactory	1	3	12	14	8	2	40
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory		6	24	55	39	2	126
			Satisfactory	1	2	7	18	5	1	34
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory		6	26	57	37	2	128
			Satisfactory	1	2	5	16	7	1	32
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	26	60	39	1	133
			Satisfactory		2	6	12	5	1	26
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	13	49	29	1	97
			Satisfactory		3	15	24	14	1	57
			Less satisfactory		1	4	1	2	1	9
			Unsatisfactory							
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	19	35	30	1	91
			Satisfactory		3	11	28	12	2	56
			Less satisfactory				1			1
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	18	54	31	1	111
			Satisfactory		2	8	18	11	1	40
			Less satisfactory					2		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		Do you feel that you have received sufficient support in building	Highly satisfactory		5	17	47	29	1	99
			Satisfactory	1	3	14	21	13	1	53

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		capacities for the national implementation of the project (within the funding limitations)?	Less satisfactory				3	1		4
			Unsatisfactory							
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	16	32	28	1	83
			Satisfactory		2	13	21	10	1	47
			Less satisfactory		1	2	1	3		7
			Unsatisfactory							
		In case of need, was troubleshooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	1	7	15	49	28	1	101
			Satisfactory		1	14	18	12	1	46
			Less satisfactory			1				1
			Unsatisfactory					1		1
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory		6	18	46	28	1	99
			Satisfactory	1	1	12	18	10	1	43
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory		4	18	46	33	1	102
			Satisfactory	1	4	10	23	10	1	49
			Less satisfactory			1	1	1		3
			Unsatisfactory			1		1		2
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	21	43	28	1	99
			Satisfactory		3	9	27	16	2	57
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	16	34	28	1	84
			Satisfactory		3	12	17	10	1	43
			Less satisfactory					2		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		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	5	13	30	23	1	73
			Satisfactory		2	14	18	16	1	51
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	16	28	26	1	78
			Satisfactory		1	7	12	14	1	35
			Less satisfactory			1	1	1		3
			Unsatisfactory							

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	France	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		5	15	50	27	1	98
			Satisfactory	1	1	11	18	12	1	44
			Less satisfactory			1		1		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory		6	15	33	33	1	88
			Satisfactory	1	2	12	11	10	1	37
			Less satisfactory					2		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory		7	16	49	32	1	105
			Satisfactory	1	1	12	16	11	1	42
			Less satisfactory					2		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory		6	20	42	30	1	99
			Satisfactory	1	2	9	26	13	2	53
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory		4	14	35	19		72
			Satisfactory	1	2	6	27	13	1	50
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory		3	14	42	19		78
			Satisfactory	1	3	6	19	15	1	45
			Less satisfactory					1		1
			Unsatisfactory							
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory		3	13	36	20		72
			Satisfactory	1	2	7	24	14	1	49
			Less satisfactory				1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory							
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	17	47	34	1	106
			Satisfactory		2	5	15	6	1	29
			Less satisfactory				1	1		2
			Unsatisfactory							
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	1	6	17	49	30	1	104
			Satisfactory		2	5	14	11	1	33
			Less satisfactory							
			Unsatisfactory							