



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/79/6
7 June 2017

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventy-ninth Meeting
Bangkok, 3-7 July 2017

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2016 BUSINESS PLANS**

Introduction

1. This document presents:
 - (a) The quantitative evaluations of the performance of the implementing agencies with respect to the performance targets set in the 2016 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 79th meeting¹;
 - (b) A trend analysis for each of the eight performance indicators;
 - (c) The qualitative assessment of the performance of implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers; and
 - (d) Secretariat's comments and recommendations.
2. This document also includes the following three annexes:

Annex I:	Investment project performance by agency
Annex II:	Non-investment project performance by agency
Annex III:	Qualitative assessment of the implementing agencies by the national ozone units for 2016

¹ 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 2016 business plans in Annexes V – VIII to the report of the 77th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/77/76).

Analysis of quantitative performance indicators

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

Table 1: 2016 performance indicator targets and achievement

Item	UNDP				United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment)				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	35	27	No	74	46	46	No	39	39	39	Yes	8	7	7	No
Projects/activities approved	18	19	19	Yes	59	51	51	No	17	13	13	No	5	11	11	Yes
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	26.91	25.1	28.29	Yes	14.89	13.72	13.86	No	22.35	22.65	22.67	Yes	30.8	42	42.2	Yes
ODS phase-out	394.98	360.7	360.7	No	69.86	0	174.3	Yes	667.5	572.6	555.9	No	509.5	255	255.5	No
Project completion for activities	61	24	16	No	119	116	60	No	37	33	33	No	7	2	2	No
Speed of financial completion	70% of those due (57)	55	55	No	14 months	14 months	16 months	No	12 months after operational completion	12 months	12 months	Yes	90%	100%	100%	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	70% of those due (9)	100%	100% (9)	Yes	On time (77)	On time	Not on time (4)	No	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On Time (24)	Not on time	Not on time (2)	No
Timely submission of progress reports	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On Time	On time	On time	Yes
Number of targets achieved				4/8				2/8				5/8				4/8

Weighted assessment of performance

4. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2016 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2016

Item	Weighting	UNDP		UN Environment		UNIDO		World Bank	
		% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points	% of target achieved	Points
Tranches approved	10	93	9	62	6	100	10	88	9
Projects/activities approved	10	106	10	86	9	76	8	220	10
Funds disbursed	15	105	15	93	14	101	15	137	15
ODS phase-out	25	91	23	249	25	83	21	50	13
Project completion for activities	20	26	5	50	10	89	18	29	6
Speed of financial completion	10	96	10	86	9	100	10	100	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100	5	5	0	100	5	8	0
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2016 Assessment	100		82		78		92		68

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

5. In line with decision 41/93² Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment³ and non-investment⁴ projects, respectively.

6. These annexes show that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. For investment projects, the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNIDO and the World Bank in 2016 while UNDP did not achieve this target for that year. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was only achieved by UNIDO while UNDP met 97 per cent and the World Bank met 78 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 8 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2016 are similar to previous years reflecting the historical performance for all implementing agencies. The achievement of the target of "value of projects approved" increased for UNDP and decreased for UNIDO and the World Bank. The target for "ODS to be phased out" has not been achieved for all implementing agencies in 2016. The indicators "cost-effectiveness" and "cost of project preparation" are inconclusive with respect to any trend due to the differences in ODP of CFCs and HCFCs and the approval of MYAs instead of individual projects.

7. For non-investment projects, the target for the amount of funds disbursed was not achieved by all implementing agencies. The speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2016 are similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

² 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.

³ Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

⁴ Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

8. A total of 76⁵ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 43 Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed. Annex III to the present document presents the detailed results for each question, by agency.

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 countries did not provide overall ratings for one or more of the categories, although they did send responses to individual questions that have been included in Annex III. Most of the overall ratings were satisfactory or above.

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

Category	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Impact	31	19	0	1
Organization and cooperation	17	14	1	1
Technical assistance/training	23	22	0	0

10. In addition to the three main categories, the NOUs provide ratings divided into several sub-categories, and questions by sub-category (Annex III). There were 75 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from NOUs to the respective implementing agencies for their comments, with an emphasis on the less than satisfactory ratings. Implementing agencies provided comments and, where applicable, reported on the results of their dialogues with the respective NOUs regarding the low ratings. However, dialogues between NOUs and implementing agencies have not been completed for a number of countries that identified issues in their qualitative assessments (i.e., ratings of “less satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”).

SECRETARIAT’S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENTS

11. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2016 as indicated in Table 2 above, and subsequently agreed with the Secretariat.

12. The quantitative performance indicators show that all agencies achieved 68 per cent of their targets or more.

13. Implementing agencies have been able to resolve issues in all cases where they have had dialogues with countries that provided less than satisfactory ratings on any qualitative performance indicator. However, at the time of finalizing the present document, UNIDO was unable to initiate dialogues with the following countries: Brazil, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, and Senegal. The Executive Committee may wish to request UNIDO to have open and constructive discussions with the relevant NOUs to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 80th meeting on the outcome of these discussions.

⁵ Germany (8), UNDP (11), UN Environment (34), UNIDO (21) and the World Bank (2).

RECOMMENDATIONS

14. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To note:
 - (i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2016 business plans as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/79/6;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2016 at least at 68 per cent on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2016 in relation to 2015;
- (b) To request UNIDO to have open and constructive discussions with the national ozone units (NOUs) of Brazil, Georgia, Iraq, Kenya, and Senegal about the areas in which its services were perceived to be less than satisfactory and to report back to the 80th meeting on the results of its consultations; and
- (c) To encourage NOUs to submit on a yearly basis and in a timely manner, their assessments of the qualitative performance of the implementing agencies assisting their Government, noting that only 43 out of 144 countries submitted questionnaires for 2016.

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2016)

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%	44%	75%	64%	66%	83%	51%	79%	94%	81%	68%	85%	90%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4%	3%	2.7%	2.7%	1.1%	2.5%	1.6%	3.6%	1.4%	0.5%	3.6%	1.5%	14.7%	14.4%	3.0%	2.8%	1.8%	0.2%	4.3%	2.3%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.1	6.3	9.14	6.74	8.3	10.35	7.1	6.27	8.24	4.99	5.76	5.61	6.09	59.84	146.85	92.53	56.92	249.68	70.89	108.35
Speed of first disbursement (months)		13	13	12	13	12.84	12.8	12.8	12.91	12.9	13.0	13.1	13.2	13.4	13.6	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.6
Speed of completion (months)	24	29	29.5	32	33	33.6	32.7	32.4	32.41	32.9	33.6	33.9	33.8	33.9	34.2	34.6	34.9	34.9	35.2	35.1	34.4
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				8,995	11,350	11,727	9,023	6,466	3,607	4,538	6,619	2,674	1,312	92	113	101	520	538	248	238	-881
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%	79%	69%	75%	82%	61%	81%	83%	100%	72%	67%	100%	76%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2%	4.2%	2.7%	3.8%	2.7%	3.3%	3.6%	2%	0.9%	1.8%	2.1%	1.3%	11.9%	5.7%	2.7%	3.9%	1.1%	1.3%	1.8%	3.6%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.11	6.27	7.78	6.71	5.67	7.28	9.79	3.58	3.10	7.13	6.51	9.34	3.26	22.58	187.59	35.34	186.02	79.01	56.02	65.50
Speed of first disbursement (months)		10	9	8	9	9.29	9.16	9.2	9.06	8.97	9.0	8.9	8.7	8.7	8.7	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.6	9.0	8.9
Speed of completion (months)	20	24	28	26	29	29.85	30.89	31.7	32.35	32.98	33.2	33.5	33.4	33.7	34.1	35.0	35.9	36.8	38.3	39.5	40.2
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				4,667	5,899	5,727	5,960	3,503	13,035	1,481	3,864	4,470	3,431	6,970	8,918	14,583	17,144	8,805	9,939	13,389	6,906

World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.9%	2.7%	2.9%	5.5%	1.3%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.02%	0.6%	2.2%	74.8%	1.5%	5.6%	0.2%	0.6%	0.4%	4.0%
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		3.6	1.9	2.83	2.96	3.85	4.57	6.12	3.74	1.04	3.33	3.29	9.36	1.43	1.12	545.23	69.01	118.26	214.04	19.84	48.54
Speed of first disbursement (months)		26	26	25	25	25.33	26.28	26	26.02	25.7	25.3	25.0	24.8	24.8	24.6	24.6	24.7	24.6	24.6	24.6	24.6
Speed of completion (months)	37	34	40	37	39	40.09	41.35	41	40.88	40.7	40.3	40.2	39.8	39.8	40.2	40.2	40.2	40.3	40.8	40.8	40.8
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				7,352	16,608	21,539	22,324	18,021	8,338	4,843	5,674	2,316	1,303	182	1,680	801	901	901	1,002	275	455

Annex II

**NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2016)**

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	12	6	11	11.29	12	11.4	11	11.44	11.5	11.8	11.7	11.7	11.8	12.2	11.8	11.9	11.9	11.8	12.0	11.9
Speed until project completion (months)	31	24	33	34.16	36	34.7	35	35.36	35.4	36.6	37.3	37.1	37.3	37.7	37.1	37.4	37.2	36.7	36.3	36.0
UN Environment	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	5	3	5	6.33	6.87	7.3	7.6	8.49	8.4	8.4	8.7	9.0	9.0	9.5	9.6	9.8	9.8	9.9	10.1	10.5
Speed until project completion (months)	20	15	25	27.9	29.66	30.4	31	31.8	32.4	32.9	33.2	33.6	32.9	33.9	34.3	34.4	34.7	35.3	35.3	36.1
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	7	6.5	6	8	9.15	9.85	9.4	9.34	8.9	9.8	10.2	10.6	10.4	10.4	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.1	10.0	10.1
Speed until project completion (months)	24	11	29	31	33.66	33.84	33.7	33.89	31.9	33.1	33.0	32.9	32.0	31.9	31.4	32.8	32.8	33.7	32.7	33.4
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	16	17	5	12	11.95	12.05	13.7	14.58	13.6	14.6	14.3	14.4	14.4	14.9	14.6	15.1	14.7	14.0	14.1	14.8
Speed until project completion (months)	28	32	26	30	29.24	28.85	30	30.39	31	31.5	31.1	30.7	30.7	30.3	30.1	30.3	30.2	30.0	29.8	29.8

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2016**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UN Environment	UNIDO	World Bank
IMPACT	General	Has cooperation with the implementing agency substantially contributed and added value to your work or organization in managing compliance in your country?	Highly satisfactory	6	6	23	11	2
			Satisfactory	2	4	10	7	
			Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory			1	1	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	5	5	14	7	
			Satisfactory	3	2	9	4	1
			Less satisfactory					
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	6	6	20	12	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	12	7	1
			Less satisfactory			1	2	
			Unsatisfactory					
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	3	5	24	14	1
			Satisfactory	5	5	8	6	1
			Less satisfactory			1		
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	2	4	19	12	1
			Satisfactory	5	5	13	7	1
			Less satisfactory	1			1	
			Unsatisfactory			1	1	
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	2	4	18	13	1
			Satisfactory	6	5	11	6	1
			Less satisfactory			1	1	
			Unsatisfactory					

	Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	3	6	23	14	1
		Satisfactory	5	3	9	5	1
		Less satisfactory		1	2	1	
		Unsatisfactory				1	
	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	5	22	12	1
		Satisfactory	6	5	10	7	1
		Less satisfactory	1			1	
		Unsatisfactory					
	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	4	9	5	
		Satisfactory	2	3	7	5	
		Less satisfactory				1	
		Unsatisfactory			1		
	ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	2	2	8	5	
		Satisfactory	3	3	5	3	
		Less satisfactory			1		
		Unsatisfactory				1	
	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	3	7	22	12	1
		Satisfactory	5	3	9	8	1
		Less satisfactory			1		
		Unsatisfactory					
	Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	3	7	23	12	1
		Satisfactory	5	3	10	7	1
		Less satisfactory				1	
		Unsatisfactory					
Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	3	7	22	12	1	
	Satisfactory	5	3	9	6	1	
	Less satisfactory				2		
	Unsatisfactory			1			
Were the required services of the	Highly satisfactory	3	3	13	10	2	

		implementing agency delivered in time?	Satisfactory	5	7	17	7	
			Less satisfactory			3	4	
			Unsatisfactory			1		
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	5	4	14	7	1
			Satisfactory	3	3	12	10	1
			Less satisfactory			1	1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	5	3	18	9	1
			Satisfactory	3	4	12	8	1
			Less satisfactory		1		1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		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	4	4	15	9	2
			Satisfactory	4	5	16	7	
			Less satisfactory		1		2	
			Unsatisfactory			1		
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	3	5	12	11	
			Satisfactory	5	3	12	5	
			Less satisfactory				2	
			Unsatisfactory			1		
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	16	9	2
			Satisfactory	4	2	11	3	
			Less satisfactory	1	1		2	
			Unsatisfactory			1		
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	4	3	11	5			
	Satisfactory	2	4	9	6	1		
	Less satisfactory							
	Unsatisfactory							
Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency	Highly satisfactory	2	5	14	10			
	Satisfactory	6	4	15	7	1		

		satisfactory?	Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory					
	Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	5	5	16	10	1	
		Satisfactory	3	4	13	7	1	
		Less satisfactory				1		
		Unsatisfactory			1			
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	4	4	12	9	2
			Satisfactory	3	4	9	5	
			Less satisfactory	1			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	3	3	12	9	2
			Satisfactory	4	3	8	4	
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	4	3	12	11	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	5	4	
			Less satisfactory	1		1	2	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	4	3	19	11	2
			Satisfactory	2	4	10	3	
Less satisfactory					1	2		
Unsatisfactory								
Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?		Highly satisfactory	3	5	12	11	2	
		Satisfactory	4	2	7	5		
		Less satisfactory				1		
		Unsatisfactory			1			
Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?		Highly satisfactory	4	4	20	11	2	
		Satisfactory	3	5	9	4		
		Less satisfactory				1		

			Unsatisfactory					
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	4	4	18	10	1
			Satisfactory	3	5	12	3	1
			Less satisfactory				2	
			Unsatisfactory			1		
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	3	3	16	7	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	11	6	1
			Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	3	3	20	8	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	9	5	1
			Less satisfactory					
			Unsatisfactory					
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	3	2	17	7	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	11	5	1
			Less satisfactory					
			Unsatisfactory					
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	4	3	20	11	
			Satisfactory	4	4	9	5	
			Less satisfactory					
Unsatisfactory								
Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?		Highly satisfactory	5	3	21	11	1	
		Satisfactory	3	4	6	5		
		Less satisfactory						
		Unsatisfactory						