UNITED
NATIONS

EP

United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/25/8
20 June 1998

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Twenty-fifth Meeting
Montreal, 29-31 July 1998

EVALUATION OF 1997 BUSINESS PLANS

1. At its Fourth Meeting, the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance considered a Status Report on the Implementation of 1997 Business Plans and observed that the full evaluation would be available at the 25th Meeting of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, having taken note of the Sub-Committee's observations, decided that the business planning process should be considered at its 25th Meeting (decision 24/2).

2. This document presents the evaluation of the 1997 business plans of the implementing agencies. The evaluation is based on the performance indicators adopted by the Executive Committee at its 22nd Meeting (decision 22/18), the revised 1997 business plans of the implementing agencies and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to this meeting as well as their last progress reports submitted to the 22nd Meeting and the relevant sections in the agencies' approved 1998 business plans.

3. At its Second Meeting, the Sub-Committee on Monitoring Evaluation, and Finance requested that the evaluation of the agency business plans should include additional information derived from the business plan tables on the number of projects completed, comparative figures showing the cost-effectiveness of the implementing agencies over the previous years on a sectoral basis, and a table on the evaluation of investment projects. These requests of the Sub-Committee are also addressed in this document.

4. The Sub-Committee also requested the implementing agencies to provide "summaries for the reasons why the targets of the implementing agencies had not been met, especially in cases where there appeared to be a clear trend towards poor performance vis-à-vis targets". The Secretariat shared a preliminary analysis of the agencies' performance against their 1997 business plan targets and requested them to provide reasons why targets were not met. Agency explanations are included in this document where explanations were provided.

5. This document addresses the agencies' performance for investment and non-investment projects, speed of delivery indicators, the assessment of performance, the business planning process, and concludes with recommendations for Executive Committee consideration.

INVESTMENT PROJECTS

6. The following table summarizes the implementing agencies' performance on investment projects. The speed of delivery performance indicators of both investment and non-investment projects are addressed in a separate section at the end of this document.

TABLE 1

1997 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR INVESTMENT PROJECTS *

ITEMS	UNDP	UNIDO	WORLD BANK
Number of Projects to be approved in 1997			
Target	156	76	110
Actual	167	82	84
Value of Projects Approved (US$)**			
Target	$48,588,696	$40,505,748	$74,867,826
Actual	$49,084,261	$40,201,113	$65,289,691
ODP From Projects Approved in 1997			
Target	7,614	7,695	14,818
Actual	8,045	6,576	18,147
Funds Disbursed in 1997 (US$)			
Target	$30,410,000	$28,157,190	$57,785,000
Actual	$31,868,397	$24,594,667	$44,256,661
ODP Phased out in 1997 (tonnes)			
Target	4,274	4,318	19,191
Actual	3,965	3,447	18,005
Cost of Project Preparation			
Target	3.7%	2.0%	2% to 3%
Actual	4.4%	2.2%	2.9%
Cost-effectiveness from Approvals (US$/ODP in kg)			
Target	$6.38	$5.26	$5.05
Actual	$6.10	$6.11	$3.60
* Includes technical assistance projects for recovery and recycling			
** Minus 15% overprogramming			

Number of Projects

7. Both UNDP and UNIDO submitted more projects than their targets in 1997. The World Bank did not meet its target because, according to the Bank, projects that raised policy issues, including the MAC projects in China, the Thai commercial refrigeration umbrella project and chiller replacement projects, were deferred.

Value of Projects Approved in 1997

8. UNDP met its target; however, UNIDO and the World Bank did not meet their targets. The value of projects approved in 1997 for UNIDO was US $304,000 less than its target, and the World Bank achieved US $9.6 million less than its target. This occurred in spite of decision 23/36 which allowed the implementing agencies to submit, to the 24th Meeting of the Executive Committee (March 1998), projects up to a value sufficient to make up their unused allocations of funds for 1997.

ODP from Projects Approved in 1997

9. Both UNDP and the World Bank accomplished their targeted levels of ODP from projects approved in 1997, while UNIDO did not meet its target. The Bank exceeded its target by over 3,700 ODP tonnes due largely to the approval of the first annual programme for the China Halon Phase-out Plan. UNIDO indicated that the shortfall of its ODP target was due to the lower phase-out than expected from approved projects.

Funds Disbursed in 1997

10. UNDP met its target. UNIDO did not provide an explanation for not meeting its target. The World Bank disbursed US $13.5 million less than it targeted. The Bank indicated in its progress report that US $5.6 million less than targeted was disbursed in Southeast Asian countries due to the consequences of economic difficulties related to the devaluation of local currencies, changes in contract values and problems in obtaining letters of credit. The Bank also indicated that some of the low rate of disbursement is related to delays in the completion of administrative activities (sub-grant agreements and grant extensions).

ODP Phased Out in 1997

11. None of the implementing agencies phased out as much as they targeted in their business plans although both UNDP and the World Bank achieved more than 90 per cent of their target. UNIDO achieved almost 80 per cent of its target. Agencies were asked to explain why the targets have not been met. UNIDO indicated that 10 per cent of its phase-out target was for a project that UNIDO canceled. The other agencies did not provide explanations. Per decision 24/4 the shortfall in phase-out from the 1997 business plans will be in addition to the implementing agencies' phase-out targets for 1998.

Cost of Project Preparation

12. The World Bank met its target (2.9 per cent of the value of projects approved). UNIDO achieved a cost of project preparation (2.2 per cent) close to its target (2.0 per cent). UNDP's cost of project preparation in 1997 (4.4 per cent) was higher than its target (3.7 per cent).

Cost-effectiveness of Projects Approved in 1997

13. This target is related to the two other project approval targets (value of projects approved and ODP phase-out from these approvals). Consequently, UNIDO did not meet its target for cost-effectiveness for projects approved in 1997 as UNIDO's projects were US $0.85/kg more expensive than forecast. UNDP and the World Bank both met their targets as the projects approved for these agencies were more cost effective than anticipated in their targets.

14. Table 2, "Cost-Effectiveness", is presented in response to Paragraph 28 (a) of the Report of the Second Meeting of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance Sub-Committee (ExCom/23/4) which requests "comparative figures showing the cost-effectiveness of the implementing agencies over the previous years on a sectoral basis". The table indicates that overall the cost-effectiveness of projects supported by the Fund has improved from 1993 through 1997. Although 1997 had the most cost-effective projects, this was greatly influenced by the cost-effectiveness of the China Halon Sector Plan. The Plan will continue to influence the overall cost-effectiveness as annual funding and phase-out will continue through the year 2010. Agencies individually also reflect the trend of better cost-effective projects based on historic data.

TABLE 2

COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Sector/Agency	ALL IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES					Thresholds
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	
Aerosol	$2.33	$0.50	$2.30	$2.87	$2.68	$4.40
Foam	$6.90	$4.43	$4.44	$5.41	$5.48	$6.23-$16.86
Halon	n/a	$0.73	$0.54	n/a	$1.25	$1.48
Fumigants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Multiple Sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a	$10.64	n/a	n/a
Other	$13.49	n/a	n/a	n/a	$13.49	n/a
Production	$2.28	$0.48	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Refrigeration	$20.59	$14.80	$8.90	$9.82	$8.25	$13.26-$15.21
Several	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Solvents	$34.02	$24.78	$10.21	$17.74	$8.14	$19.73-$38.50
Overall	$11.03	$6.04	$6.06	$7.65	$4.83	n/a
	UNDP					
Aerosol	n/a	$2.49	$3.08	$5.95	$3.12	$4.40
Foam	$6.72	$5.26	$5.33	$5.94	$6.35	$6.23-$16.86
Halon	n/a	n/a	$0.54	n/a	n/a	$1.48
Fumigants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Multiple Sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Production	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Refrigeration	$12.50	$12.90	$7.74	$7.50	$7.81	$13.26-$15.21
Several	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Solvents	$59.00	$56.33	$6.92	$15.12	$13.33	$19.73-$38.50
Overall	$7.81	$7.42	$5.39	$7.08	$6.72	n/a
	UNIDO					
Aerosol	n/a	n/a	$1.85	$2.19	$2.55	$4.40
Foam	$4.61	$2.92	$1.67	$5.38	$3.93	$6.23-$16.86
Halon	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	$1.48
Fumigants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Multiple Sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Production	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Refrigeration	$11.80	$21.76	$9.98	$11.08	$7.71	$13.26-$15.21
Several	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Solvents	n/a	$17.95	$16.65	$24.32	$6.64	$19.73-$38.50
Overall	$10.39	$10.89	$5.06	$7.10	$5.92	n/a
	WORLD BANK					
Aerosol	$2.33	$0.49	$4.40	$2.08	$2.67	$4.40
Foam	$7.58	$2.92	$5.87	$4.76	$5.30	$6.23-$16.86
Halon	n/a	$1.08	$0.54	n/a	$1.25	$1.48
Fumigants	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Multiple Sectors	n/a	n/a	n/a	$10.64	n/a	n/a
Other	$13.49	n/a	n/a	n/a	$13.49	n/a
Production	$2.28	$0.48	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Refrigeration	$31.59	$12.63	$9.00	$10.91	$9.07	$13.26-$15.21
Several	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Solvents	$31.54	$16.48	$8.26	$21.26	$21.55	$19.73-$38.50
Overall	$12.17	$3.99	$7.35	$8.59	$3.65	n/a

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS

15. Decision 22/18 established four performance indicators for non-investment projects. Two of those targets are addressed in the Speed of Delivery section of the report and the other two, number of projects completed and funds disbursed, are presented below in Table 3.

TABLE 3
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS

Type/Agency	Target - Number of Completed Projects	Actual - Number of Completed Projects	Target - Funds Disbursed (US$)	Actual - Funds Disbursed (US$)
UNDP				
Country Programme Preparation	0	0	210,000	9,425
Demonstration Projects *	2	1	126,417	-17,315
Institutional Strengthening Projects	10	3	1,822,040	1,448,425
Technical Assistance Projects	21	11	2,037,798	2,486,911
Training Projects	2	1	23,884	307,672
Grand Total	35	16	4,220,138	4,235,118
UNEP				
Country Programme Preparation	13	7	423,000	127,600
Demonstration Projects	0	0	0	0
Institutional Strengthening Projects	5	4	1,498,650	662,439
Technical Assistance Projects	8	31	2,955,000	1,490,789
Training Projects	3	7	425,00	338,800
Grand Total	29	49	5,301,650	2,619,628
UNIDO **				
Country Programme Preparation	0	0	180,000	n/a
Demonstration Projects	0	0	252,000	n/a
Institutional Strengthening Projects	1	0	359,000	n/a
Technical Assistance Projects	0	1	38,200	n/a
Training Projects	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	1	1	829,200	660,000
WORLD BANK				
Country Programme Preparation ***	1	1	82,081	-21,193
Demonstration Projects	0	0	0	78,212
Institutional Strengthening Projects	2	2	432,000	514,081
Technical Assistance Projects	1	3	90,000	6,922,935
Training Projects	0	2	0	97,508
Grand Total	4	8	604,081	7,591,542

* Negative disbursements for demonstration project resulting from a refund of previously recorded expenditures.

** UNIDO included unliquidated obligations in its last progress report thus disbursements by project type is not available. UNIDO indicated the amount of funds disbursed as US $660,000.

*** Bank indicates that US $200,000 was disbursed for country programme preparation in 1997 although the data in its progress report indicates a negative amount.

16. Most non-investment projects are implemented by UNEP. The other implementing agencies have relatively few non-investment projects in their portfolios. The targeted number of non-investment projects to be completed in 1997 comes from an analysis of Table 3 of the agencies' business plans. This table lists all approved and planned non-investment projects by project title, type of project, funds approved/to be requested, funds disbursed during the year of the business plan, and projected date of completion. The sum of the later two entries for each project becomes the agencies' targets for the year as is the case with the tables for investment projects.

17. All agencies met their targets for completion except UNDP which completed only 16 of its targeted 35 project completions. UNDP did not explain the discrepancy. Both UNEP and the World Bank completed more projects than they included in their 1997 business plan, but they did not list all of their projects in their 1997 business plans.

18. UNDP and the World Bank met their disbursement targets while UNIDO and UNEP achieved only half of their disbursement targets. The large disbursement for the World Bank is related to the fact that the Bank did not include all of its projects and its planned disbursements in its business plan due to a misunderstanding of what was to be included for non-investment projects. UNEP indicated that its disbursement target shortfall was due to late financial reporting of the actual disbursement of unliquidated obligations.

19. UNEP also set other performance indicators that cannot be compared to other agencies based on the data in the progress report databases. UNEP assessed its performance in its progress report against these targets. Some of UNEP's targets included, for example: a significant improvement in data reporting and enacted legislation and phase-out policies; extent to which experience from UNEP activities is used in the adoption of phase-out strategies; and, the extent to which networks are used by agencies and secretariats in developing work or explaining policies. To all of these indicators, UNEP states that the performance indicator was achieved.

SPEED OF DELIVERY

20. Annex I, "Speed of Delivery", is based on the implementing agencies' targeted speed of delivery performance indicators. Agencies did not provide a consistent approach to setting these indicators. In some cases, agencies set a target by year of approval. Only UNDP provided a target for each year of approval; other agencies indicated targets for some of the years of approval but not all. Therefore, data in Annex I are difficult to compare as agencies did not provide one target for each indicator. The Executive Committee's decision on performance indicators requests the average number of months from approval to completion or first disbursement for both investment and non-investment projects. The Executive Committee may wish to require such indicators for 1998 and future business plans.

21. Overall, investment projects are expected to be completed 30 months after approval and the first disbursement on investment projects occurs 16 months after approval[1]. The long time until first disbursement is reflective of the time it takes to reach an agreement on the implementation of projects either with the government or the beneficiary enterprise or both. Once the agreements are reached, investment projects are completed on average in 14 months after first disbursement.

22. In 1997, the first disbursement occurred 5 to 7 months after approval. Projects approved in 1997 are expected to be completed in from 19 to 24 months after approval. UNIDO's 1997 projects are expected to be completed 3 months faster than those of the World Bank and 5 months faster than those of UNDP.

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE

23. Whilst the Executive Committee has adopted performance indicators, it has not adopted a methodology for assessing performance or addressed the relative importance of the indicators in assessing performance.

24. As mentioned above, a comparison of the speed of delivery indicators cannot be performed because the targets set by the agencies are not comparable. Of the seven remaining performance indicators for investment projects, the agencies met the following number of targets: UNDP (5), UNIDO (1), and the World Bank (2). Of the two remaining performance indicators for non-investment projects, the World Bank achieved both targets and the other agencies achieved 1 of their 2 targets.

BUSINESS PLANNING PROCESS

25. At its 24th Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that the business planning process should be considered at the 25th Meeting. The business planning process was adopted at the 22nd Meeting in decisions 22/14-15 and reconfirmed at the 23rd Meeting in decision 23/56.

26. The business planning process currently begins at the second meeting of the year with the receipt of annual progress reports and the final evaluation of the previous year's business plan. At the third meeting of the year, the draft business plans for the next year (in this case, 1999) are considered as well as non-contentious work programme activities. At the first meeting of the following year, the revised business plan and work programmes of the implementing agencies are approved. Also, implementing agencies that did not meet their funding shares for the previous year are allowed to present additional projects to meet their previous year's funding shares at the first meeting of the year.

---

[1] This is an estimate which includes both actual and estimated completion. Projects completed to date have taken an average of 27 months from approval to completion and an average of 18 months until first disbursement.

27. The key to the business planning process is the evaluation. The evaluation is dependent upon the submission of progress reports. Progress reports are submitted to the second meeting of the year because the data in the progress reports are actual data that must correspond to the annual audited financial reports of the agencies. Actual data on expenditures are not available until April for most agencies, although this year UNEP could not provide actual expenditures through the end of 1997 until the end of May 1998.

28. Prior to last year, implementing agencies submitted at least two progress reports per year. Only one of the two reports contained actual financial data. Progress reports without actual financial data do not reflect financial progress toward implementation and may be misleading. Moreover, progress reports consume a significant effort on the part of agency staff that would otherwise be used for project-related activities.

29. The business plans of the agencies are presented twice to the Executive Committee for its consideration. The first presentation of the draft business plans was intended to allow the maximum input from Committee members. The second presentation was intended to allow the plans as revised per Committee comments, to be adopted. This year the Committee had more substantive discussion about the Final business plans than the Draft business plans.

30. The current business planning process also allows for the submission of work programmes to more than one meeting. The work programme is distinguished from the business plan in that the work programme is a funding document and the business plan is a planning document. Once a draft business plan is reviewed and comments received, a work programme could then be proposed to effect the targets of the business plan.

31. The main reason non-contentious work programme activities are approved at the last meeting of the year when draft business plans are submitted is the funding of UNEP's core programme (clearinghouse and networking activities). This is necessary to enable UNEP to issue contracts for most of its employees for the next year.

32. Finally, the current business planning process allows agencies that do not meet their funding shares to submit projects in the year after the year of the business plan to be counted as part of the previous year's business plan. For example, projects in the 1997 business plan exclude some projects approved in 1997 that were part of the agencies' 1996 business plans (decision 20/11) and include some projects approved in 1998 (decision 23/36). Also, the project preparation advances approved at the 23rd Meeting for UNDP, UNIDO, and the World Bank (decisions 23/32-33) and UNEP's work programme (decision 23/34) approved at the 23rd Meeting are considered part of the agencies' 1998 business plan.

RECOMMENDATION

1. At its Twentieth Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that agency shares would be discussed during the consideration of business plans with regard to the agencies' 1997 business plans (decision 20/11). The Secretariat recommends that the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance should consider this decision during its review of this document and recommend a methodology for assessing the performance of the agencies taking into consideration the Executive Committee's decisions concerning performance indicators.

2. The Executive Committee may wish to consider the background to the current business planning process before determining if any changes should be made to the process at this time. The Secretariat recommends that the practice of allowing agencies to complete their business plans during the following year should be discontinued and the implementing agencies should be requested to set one average overall target only for each speed-of-delivery indicator instead of targets based on the year the projects were approved.

	All Agencies	UNDP											
INVESTMENT PROJECTS	Average	1991-1993		1994		1995		1996		1997		AVERAGE	
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Approval to First Disbursement*	16	14-18	13	14	14	15	15	9	10	12	6	n/a	13
Approval to Completion**	30	26-29	27	32	37	24	30	22	23	27	24	n/a	29
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS													
Approval to First Disbursement													
Country Programme Preparation	5	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	n/a	8
Technical Assistance	8	n/a	19	n/a	7	n/a	5	n/a	9	n/a	6	n/a	10
Training	11	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23
Institutional Strengthening	12	n/a	11	n/a	13	n/a	5	n/a	3	n/a	1	n/a	10
Overall	9	11-16	14	6	8	4	5	6	7	6	5	n/a	12
Approval to Completion													
Country Programme Preparation	21	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22	n/a	20
Technical Assistance	25	n/a	46	n/a	33	n/a	26	n/a	22	n/a	26	n/a	32
Training	25	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34
Overall	24	24-33	39	24	33	15	26	24	22	24	26	n/a	31

* Includes ongoing projects

** Includes planned completions of ongoing projects

	All Agencies	UNEP											
INVESTMENT PROJECTS	Average	1991-1993		1994		1995		1996		1997		AVERAGE	
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Approval to First Disbursement*	16	UNEP DOES NOT IMPLEMENT INVESTMENT PROJECTS											
Approval to Completion**	30												
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS													
Approval to First Disbursement													
Country Programme Preparation	5	n/a	2	n/a	7	n/a	7	n/a	7	n/a	3	n/a	6
Technical Assistance	8	n/a	3	n/a	4	n/a	3	n/a	1	n/a	2	n/a	3
Training	11	n/a	4	n/a	7	n/a	4	n/a	2	n/a	2	n/a	4
Institutional Strengthening	12	n/a	18	n/a	14	n/a	7	n/a	10	n/a	4	3	12
Overall	9	n/a	6	n/a	8	n/a	5	n/a	4	n/a	2	n/a	5
Approval to Completion													
Country Programme Preparation	21	n/a	20	n/a	24	n/a	29	n/a	23	n/a	24	15	24
Technical Assistance	25	n/a	25	n/a	20	n/a	21	n/a	17	n/a	12	n/a	17
Training	25	n/a	22	n/a	22	n/a	15	n/a	23	n/a	24	n/a	20
Overall	24	n/a	22	n/a	22	n/a	22	n/a	19	n/a	16	n/a	20

* Includes ongoing projects

** Includes planned completions of ongoing projects

	All Agencies	UNIDO											
INVESTMENT PROJECTS	Average	1991-1993		1994		1995		1996		1997		AVERAGE	
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Approval to First Disbursement*	16	n/a	20	n/a	15	n/a	11	11	9	n/a	5	n/a	10
Approval to Completion**	30	34	42	28	34	24	31	17	23	n/a	19	n/a	24
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS													
Approval to First Disbursement													
Country Programme Preparation	5	n/a	12	n/a	8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5	n/a	7
Technical Assistance	8	n/a	8	n/a	13	n/a	9	n/a	n/a	n/a	4	n/a	8
Training	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Institutional Strengthening	12	n/a	7	n/a	n/a	n/a	29	n/a	6	n/a	(9)	n/a	8
Overall	9	11	8	n/a	12	7	13	n/a	6	n/a	3	n/a	7
Approval to Completion													
Country Programme Preparation	21	31	20	n/a	24	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	15	n/a	18
Technical Assistance	25	n/a	31	n/a	32	n/a	18	n/a	n/a	n/a	23	n/a	27
Training	25	31	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5
Overall	24	n/a	30	n/a	30	n/a	14	n/a	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	24

* Includes ongoing projects

** Includes planned completions of ongoing projects

	All Agencies	WORLD BANK											
INVESTMENT PROJECTS	Average	1991-1993		1994		1995		1996		1997		AVERAGE	
	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Approval to First Disbursement*	16	n/a	32	n/a	24	n/a	17	n/a	14	10	7	n/a	26
Approval to Completion**	30	n/a	40	n/a	41	n/a	32	n/a	27	24-30	22	n/a	34
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS													
Approval to First Disbursement													
Country Programme Preparation	5	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Technical Assistance	8	n/a	18	n/a	1	n/a	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23
Training	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	36
Institutional Strengthening	12	n/a	28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	27
Overall	9	n/a	16	n/a	5	n/a	10	n/a	6	n/a	n/a	n/a	16
Approval to Completion													
Country Programme Preparation	21	n/a	9	n/a	11	n/a	27	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14
Technical Assistance	25	n/a	42	n/a	17	n/a	22	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	38
Training	25	n/a	n/a	n/a	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	55
Overall	24	n/a	34	n/a	17	n/a	23	n/a	n/a	n/a	14	n/a	28

* Includes ongoing projects

** Includes planned completions of ongoing projects