



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/10
13 November 2018

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Eighty-second Meeting
Montreal, 3-7 December 2018

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2017 BUSINESS PLANS¹**

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 2017 business plans and progress and financial reports submitted to the 82nd meeting²;
 - (b) A trend analysis for each of the eight performance indicators;
 - (c) The qualitative assessment of the performance of bilateral and implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers; and
 - (d) Secretariat's comments and recommendation.
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 2017

¹ Also includes qualitative assessment of bilateral agencies.

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 2017 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: 2017 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*	23	16	16	No	34	18	18	No	26	14	14	No	6	3	3	No
Projects/activities approved	15	11	11	No	64	88	39	No	11	9	9	No	1	4	1	Yes
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	27.84	30.45	30.71	Yes	13.12	16.76	17.84	Yes	22.35	31.08	30.9	Yes	31	31	31	Yes
ODS phase-out*	186.04	155.4	155.4	No	37.10	24.5	24.5	No	472.2	285	319.2	No	523.2	117	279.6	No
Project completion for activities	62	63	63	Yes	82	49	191	Yes	60	64	64	Yes	13	12	12	No
Speed of financial completion	70% (36)	36	36	Yes	14 months	31 months	21 months	No	12 months after operational completion	12 months	12 months	Yes	90%	94%	94%	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	On time (8)	On time (8)	On time (8)	Yes	On time (47)	Not on time	Not on time (26)	No	On time	On time	On time	Yes	On time (21)	Not on time	Not on time (7)	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				5/8				3/8				5/8				4/8

* 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

4. Table 2 presents the outcome of the 2017 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2017

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	70	7	53	5	54	5	50	5
Projects/activities approved	10	73	7	61	6	82	8	100	10
Funds disbursed	15	110	15	136	15	138	15	100	15
ODS phase-out	25	84	21	66	17	68	17	53	13
Project completion for activities	20	102	20	233	20	107	20	92	18
Speed of financial completion	10	100	10	50	5	100	10	104	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	100	5	55	3	100	5	33	2
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2017 Assessment	100		90		76		85		78

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

5. In line with decision 41/93³ Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment⁴ and non-investment⁵ 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 2017 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 96 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 33 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2017 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 UNIDO and decreased for UNDP and the World Bank. The target for "ODS to be phased out" has not been achieved for all implementing agencies in 2017. 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 achieved by all implementing agencies. The speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2017 are 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.

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

8. A total of 66⁶ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 40 Article 5 countries to assess the qualitative performance of the bilateral and implementing agencies were processed.

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	24	18	3	0
Organization and cooperation	8	17	2	0
Technical assistance/training	18	19	2	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 115 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories.

SECRETARIAT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENTS

11. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2017, showing that all of them achieved 76 per cent or more of their targets.

12. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from NOUs to the respective bilateral and 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. 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").

13. Implementing agencies have been able to resolve issues in most 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, the Government of Germany had an ongoing dialogue with the NOU in Zimbabwe, and the following agencies informed the Secretariat that they would finalize their discussions with the respective NOUs during the Thirtieth Meeting of the Parties in November 2018; UNEP (Barbados), and UNIDO (Botswana, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Somalia, Malawi and Rwanda). The outcomes of the discussions are expected to be reported prior to the 82nd meeting, in which case an update will be provided to the Executive Committee at the 82nd meeting. In the event that the outcomes of the discussions are not reported, the Executive Committee may wish to request the Government of Germany, UNEP and UNIDO to have open and constructive discussions with the relevant NOUs to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of their performance and to report to the 83rd meeting on the outcome of these discussions.

⁶ Germany (5), UNDP (11), UNEP (29), UNIDO (19) 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 2017 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/82/10;
 - (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2017 of at least 76 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2017 in relation to 2016; and
- (b) To request the following 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 to report back to the 83rd meeting on the results of their consultations: UNEP with Barbados; UNIDO with Botswana, Iraq, Mexico, Pakistan, Somalia, Malawi and Rwanda; and the Government of Germany with Zimbabwe.
- (c) 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 Government, noting that only 40 out of 144 countries submitted questionnaires for 2017.

Annex I

**INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1996-2017)**

UNDP	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
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%	34%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	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%	60%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	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%	2.71%
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	184.95
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	13.5
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	35.6
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	416.3
UNIDO	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	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%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	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%	54%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%
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%	61%
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%	2.6%
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	53.61
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	9.0
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	40.9
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	8,054.8

World Bank	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	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%	96%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%
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%	74%
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%	18.64%
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	52.66
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	24.5
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	41.0
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	249.9

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2017)

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funds disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	12	6	11	11.29	12	11.4	11	11.44	11.5	11.8	11.7	11.7	11.8	12.2	11.8	11.9	11.9	11.8	12.0	11.9	11.8
Speed until project completion (months)	31	24	33	34.16	36	34.7	35	35.36	35.4	36.6	37.3	37.1	37.3	37.7	37.1	37.4	37.2	36.7	36.3	36.0	36.8
UNEP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funds disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%
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	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	36.7
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funds disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	7	6.5	6	8	9.15	9.85	9.4	9.34	8.9	9.8	10.2	10.6	10.4	10.4	10.3	10.3	10.2	10.1	10.0	10.1	10.4
Speed until project completion (months)	24	11	29	31	33.66	33.84	33.7	33.89	31.9	33.1	33.0	32.9	32.0	31.9	31.4	32.8	32.8	33.7	32.7	33.4	33.5
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funds disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%
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	16.8
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	29.2

Annex III

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2017**

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	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	2	6	19	9	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	10	7	1
			Less satisfactory	1	1		2	
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	4	13	6	
			Satisfactory	1	5	6	6	
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	20	9	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	9	8	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	6	25	10	1
			Satisfactory	1	5	4	6	1
			Less satisfactory	1			3	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	16	6	1
			Satisfactory	2	5	11	9	1
			Less satisfactory			1	4	
			Unsatisfactory	1				
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	15	7	1
			Satisfactory	2	5	11	9	1
			Less satisfactory	1			1	
			Unsatisfactory				2	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Highly satisfactory	3	4	22	11	1
			Satisfactory	2	7	7	5	1
			Less satisfactory				2	
			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	2	6	19	9	2
			Satisfactory	2	3	10	7	
			Less satisfactory				2	
			Unsatisfactory	1	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	4	9	4	
			Satisfactory		2	7	4	1
			Less satisfactory				4	
			Unsatisfactory					
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	2	5		
			Satisfactory	1	5	7	4	
			Less satisfactory	1			1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	20	6	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	9	10	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	21	6	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	8	11	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	2	7	20	8	1
			Satisfactory	2	4	9	6	1
			Less satisfactory	1			3	
			Unsatisfactory				2	
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	2	2	15	4	1
			Satisfactory	2	9	14	10	1
			Less satisfactory	1			4	
			Unsatisfactory				1	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING	General	Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Highly satisfactory	2	7	17	4	1
			Satisfactory	2	1	9	13	1
			Less satisfactory	1	1		2	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	19	5	1
			Satisfactory	2	3	8	9	1
			Less satisfactory	1	1		4	
			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	2	3	18	7	1
			Satisfactory	2	6	10	8	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory		1		2	
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	2	7	12	7	
			Satisfactory	2	2	11	9	1
			Less satisfactory	1	1		1	
			Unsatisfactory				2	
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	15	6	1
			Satisfactory	2	2	10	6	1
			Less satisfactory	1	1		3	
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	1	4	8	4	1
			Satisfactory	1	4	10	4	
			Less satisfactory	1			1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	16	8	
			Satisfactory	2	4	9	9	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	14	8	1		
	Satisfactory	3	3	13	9	1		
	Less satisfactory		1		2			
	Unsatisfactory							

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
	Investment projects	Has the agency been effective and met the expectations of stakeholders in providing technical advice, training and commissioning?	Highly satisfactory	1	7	9	7	1
			Satisfactory	2	1	10	9	1
			Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory	1			1	
		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	8	5	1
			Satisfactory	2	1	10	10	1
			Less satisfactory					
			Unsatisfactory	1			1	
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	3	10	8	
			Satisfactory	1	5	10	7	1
			Less satisfactory	1				
			Unsatisfactory				2	
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	3	15	6	1
			Satisfactory	1	5	9	9	1
			Less satisfactory	1			3	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	11	8	1
			Satisfactory	1	2	11	7	1
			Less satisfactory	1			1	
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory	2	6	18	9	1
			Satisfactory	2	1	7	7	1
			Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory				1	
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	5	15	8	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	12	8	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
	Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	14	3	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	11	8	1
			Less satisfactory	1			3	
			Unsatisfactory					

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	5	16	5	1
			Satisfactory	2	2	9	6	1
			Less satisfactory				2	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	1	4	15	5	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	10	6	1
			Less satisfactory	1			2	
			Unsatisfactory					
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	3	4	16	9	1
			Satisfactory	1	3	9	5	1
			Less satisfactory				1	
			Unsatisfactory					
		Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	3	4	19	7	1
			Satisfactory		3	4	8	1
			Less satisfactory	1				
			Unsatisfactory					