



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/9
25 October 2021

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Eighty-eighth Meeting
Montreal, 15-19 November 2021¹

**EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES
AGAINST THEIR 2020 BUSINESS PLANS²**

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 2020 business plans³ and progress and financial reports submitted to the 88th meeting;⁴
 - (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 ozone units for 2020

¹ Online meetings and an intersessional approval process (IAP) will be held in November and December 2021 due to coronavirus disease (COVID-19).

² Also includes qualitative assessment of bilateral agencies.

³ 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 2020 business plans in Annexes X – XIII to the report of the 84th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/84/75).

⁴ The progress and financial reports as at 31 December 2020 are considered under the IAP established for the 88th meeting.

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: 2020 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*	40	34	34	No	133	90	87	No	41	33	33	No	4	1	1	No
Projects/activities approved	15	12	12	No	68	33	49	No	18	16	16	No	3	3	1	No
Funds disbursed (million US \$)	15.62	27.67	27.7	Yes	20.99	17.56	15.43	No	23.58	20.64	20.65	No	11.73	12.52	12.52	Yes
ODS phase-out*	572.81	530.4	530.5	No	73.83	19.8	36.8	No	793.15	681.23	681.23	No	387.56	2,553	324.86	No
Project completion for activities	70	34	34	No	130	86	86	No	64	35	35	No	4	2	2	No
Speed of financial completion	70% (55)	50	50	No	14 months	9 months	9 months	Yes	12 months after operational completion	12 months	11 months	Yes	90%	100%	100%	Yes
Timely submission of project completion reports	On time (3)	On time (8)	On time (5)	Yes	On time (13)	On time (13)	On time (13)	Yes	On time (5)	On time	On time (5)	Yes	On time (23)	6	6	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				3/8				3/8				3/8				3/8

* 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 2020 weighted assessment by performance indicator based on the Secretariat's methodology.

Table 2: Weighted assessment of implementing agencies performance in 2020

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	85	9	65	7	80	8	25	3
Projects/activities approved	10	80	8	72	7	89	9	33	3
Funds disbursed	15	177	15	74	11	88	13	107	15
ODS phase-out	25	93	23	50	12	86	21	84	21
Project completion for activities	20	49	10	66	13	55	11	50	10
Speed of financial completion	10	91	9	136	10	108	10	100	10
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	167	5	100	5	100	5	26	1
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100	5	100	5	100	5	100	5
2020 Assessment	100		84		70		82		68

Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators

5. In line with decision 41/93,⁵ Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment⁶ and non-investment⁷ projects, respectively.

6. Annex I shows that the target for ODS phased out was achieved by UNDP and the World Bank in 2020 while UNIDO did not achieve this target for that year. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP while UNIDO met 86 per cent and the World Bank met 70 per cent. UNDP and UNIDO reached their targets for project completion reports, and the World Bank met 26 per cent of its target. The speed of delivery and first disbursement in 2020 were similar to previous years reflecting the historical performance for all implementing agencies. The achievement of the target for value of projects approved increased for UNIDO and decreased for UNDP and the World Bank. The target for ODS to be phased out was not achieved by all agencies. 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. Annex II shows that the target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNDP and UNIDO; and the speed of delivery and first disbursement for 2020 were similar to previous years for all implementing agencies.

Analysis of qualitative performance indicators

8. A total of 69⁸ questionnaires received from the NOUs of 37 Article 5 countries to assess the

⁵ 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.

⁶ Investment projects include multi-year agreements (MYAs) that are so-designated by project code.

⁷ Only the "funds disbursed", "speed of first disbursement" and "speed of project completion" indicators are applicable to non-investment projects.

⁸ Germany (5), Japan (1), UNDP (9), UNEP (31), UNIDO (18) and the World Bank (5).

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 NOUs 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 to the present document. 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	34	20		1
Organization and cooperation	35	22	1	
Technical assistance/training	30	25		1

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 33 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories.

SECRETARIAT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATION

COMMENTS

11. The implementing agencies have been informed of the results of the quantitative assessment of their performance for 2020, showing that all of them achieved 68 per cent or more of their targets.

12. The Secretariat noted that only 37 NOUs (as compared to 78 in 2019) submitted qualitative assessments. The Secretariat sent the assessments received from NOUs to the respective bilateral and implementing agencies for their comments, with an emphasis on the 33 less than satisfactory ratings from the sub-categories and three unsatisfactory ratings from the main categories.

13. Dialogues between 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"), except for the dialogue between UNIDO and Iraq regarding the less than satisfactory ratings. All agencies reported that a way forward was agreed during their dialogues with the respective NOUs, and in a majority of cases, they have been able to resolve the issues identified in regard to the less than satisfactory ratings.

14. The Executive Committee may wish to note, with appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective NOUs about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned.

15. The Executive Committee may also wish to request UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Iraq, to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 90th meeting on the outcome of the discussion.

RECOMMENDATION

16. The Executive Committee may wish:

(a) To note:

(i) The evaluation of the performance of implementing agencies against their 2020 business plans, as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/9;

- (ii) That all implementing agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2020 of at least 68 on a scale of 100;
 - (iii) That the trend analysis indicated that performance of implementing agencies had not improved in some indicators in 2020 in relation to 2019;
 - (iv) With appreciation, the efforts undertaken by bilateral and implementing agencies to have open and constructive discussions with the respective national ozone units (NOUs) about the areas in which their services were perceived to be less than satisfactory, and the satisfactory outcome of their consultations with the NOUs concerned;
- (b) To request UNIDO to have an open and constructive discussion with the NOU in Iraq, to resolve any issues raised in the evaluation of its performance and to report to the 90th meeting on the outcome of the discussion; and
- (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 in assisting their governments, noting that 37 out of the 144 countries had submitted such assessments for 2020, as compared to 78 in 2019.

Annex I
INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1997-2020)

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
ODS phased out	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%	91%	85%	100%	86%	100%	N/A	0%	94%	100%	100%	100%	0%	34%	100%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%	96%	66%	76%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	97%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports			38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%	79%	30%	82%	74%	100%	54%	100%	100%	100%	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%	88%	80%	69%
Value of projects approved	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%	82%	83%	77%	100%	100%	38%	87%	100%	87%	89%	91%	100%	80%	79%	85%	81%
ODS to be phased out	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	61%	100%	29%	83%	84%	84%	96%	97%	93%
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%	0.99%	0.43%	0.74%
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	38.00	45.41	51.97
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	13.6	13.6	13.6
Speed of completion (months)	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	35.7	35.8	35.7
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	499.6	426.1	395.9
UNIDO	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
ODS phased out	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	100%	99%	100%	100%	84%	86%	100%	100%	0%	27%	42%	100%	100%	100%	50%	45%	55%
Funds disbursed	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	69%	86%
Project completion reports			83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	100%	100%	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%	64%	75%	74%
Value of projects approved	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%	100%	100%	92%	100%	59%	78%	100%	79%	88%	64%	93%	71%	73%	57%	73%	85%
ODS to be phased out	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%	100%	47%	91%	100%	100%	100%	36%	81%	21%	36%	100%	82%	61%	71%	82%	86%

UNDP	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
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%	0.4%	2.4%	2.8%
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	22.83	119.38	20.96
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	9.2	9.2	9.2
Speed of completion (months)	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	41.1	41.7	42.4
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	7,971.7	3,372.1	8,137.3
World Bank	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
ODS phased out	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%	69%	31%	84%	47%	100%	100%	100%	20%	98%	100%	100%	100%	100%	51%	100%	100%
Funds disbursed	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%	100%	100%	100%	100%	73%	64%	43%	15%	100%	100%	100%	78%	96%	62%	80%	70%
Project completion reports			61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%	100%	84%	74%	69%	25%	20%	85%	10%	100%	24%	24%	8%	33%	11%	45%	26%
Distribution among countries			75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%	93%	79%	92%	77%	67%	50%	57%	100%	67%	50%	33%	100%	50%	60%	100%	33%
Value of projects approved	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%	83%	87%	83%	93%	98%	3%	93%	29%	93%	72%	100%	39%	29%	95%	46%	26%
ODS to be phased out	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%	100%	66%	93%	35%	100%	89%	11%	7%	25%	11%	100%	50%	74%	69%	100%	84%
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%	8.64%	1.04%	0.0%	0.0%
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	52.66	618.83	177.65	2.56
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	24.4	24.5	24.4
Speed of completion (months)	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	40.1	41.2	41.2
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	788.4	812.98	5.5

Annex II

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY
(1998-2020)

UNDP	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Funds disbursed	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	88%	100%	47%	82%	100%	100%	100%	109%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	11.7	11.8	11.7
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.2	36.1	36.0
UNEP	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Funds disbursed	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%	54%	51%	49%	64%	69%	60%	63%	55%	47%	61%	44%	91%	100%	81%	85%	75%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	10.9	10.9	11.1
Speed until project completion (months)	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	36.7	36.8	36.8
UNIDO	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Funds disbursed	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%	90%	80%	89%	69%	100%	84%	95%	100%	62%	82%	82%	75%	100%	100%	95%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	10.3	10.0	9.8
Speed until project completion (months)	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	32.7	33.0	34.1
World Bank	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Funds disbursed	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%	100%	57%	59%	59%	19%	47%	75%	59%	49%	42%	100%	88%	100%	100%	78%	33%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	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	16.8	16.6	16.9
Speed until project completion (months)	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	29.3	29.3	29.3

Annex III

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES BY THE NATIONAL OZONE UNITS FOR 2020

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	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	3	1	5	22	10	3
			Satisfactory	2		4	8	7	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		In the design and implementation of the project, has the implementing agency been striving to achieve sustainable results?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	23	9	3
			Satisfactory	2		4	8	8	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		IMPACT (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	15	8	2
			Satisfactory	2		4	7	5	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION	General	Did cooperation with the staff of the implementing agency take place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	6	26	13	3
			Satisfactory	1		3	5	4	2
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Did the implementing agency clearly explain its work plan and division of tasks?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	3	20	10	4
			Satisfactory	3		5	10	7	1
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Did the implementing agency sufficiently control and monitor the delivery of consultant services?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	4	21	9	3
			Satisfactory	2		5	6	8	2
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Did the responsible staff of the implementing agency communicate	Highly satisfactory	4	1	6	25	11	5
			Satisfactory	1		3	6	6	
			Less satisfactory					1	

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
		sufficiently and help to avoid misunderstanding?	Unsatisfactory						
		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	1	5	25	10	4
			Satisfactory	3		4	6	7	1
			Less satisfactory					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	1	4	12	6	
			Satisfactory			3	10	7	2
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Development?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	21	12	4
			Satisfactory	2		4	10	5	1
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Identification?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	23	12	4
			Satisfactory	2		4	8	5	1
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Was active involvement of the national ozone unit ensured in project Implementation?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	23	10	4
			Satisfactory	2		4	8	7	1
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		Were the required services of the implementing agency delivered in time?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	3	20	10	3
			Satisfactory	2		6	11	7	2
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		ORGANIZATION AND COOPERATION (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	2	1	4	16	11	1
			Satisfactory	3		5	9	3	2
			Less satisfactory					1	
			Unsatisfactory						
	General		Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	14	8	4
				Satisfactory	1		3	12	7

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE /TRAINING		Did project partners receive sufficient technical advice and/or assistance in their decision-making on technology?	Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Did the agency give sufficient consideration to training aspects within funding limits?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	4	17	9	3
			Satisfactory	1		5	11	7	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		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	3	1	5	19	9	2
			Satisfactory	2		4	12	7	3
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has the acquisition of services and equipment been successfully administered, contracted and its delivery monitored?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	5	15	9	1
			Satisfactory	1		2	6	8	2
			Less satisfactory			1		1	
			Unsatisfactory						
		In case of need, was trouble-shooting by the agency quick and in direct response to your needs?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	20	10	3
			Satisfactory	1		4	7	6	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Was the selection and competence of consultants provided by the agency satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	6	17	8	3
			Satisfactory	1		3	10	8	1
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Were project partners and stakeholders encouraged by the implementing agency to participate positively in decision-making and design of activities?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	18	8	3
			Satisfactory	1		3	9	8	2
Less satisfactory									
Unsatisfactory						1			
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/TRAINING (Overall Rating)	Highly satisfactory	2	1	4	13	7	3		
	Satisfactory	2		5	10	6	2		
	Less satisfactory								
	Unsatisfactory					1			

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	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	2	1	5	16	8	2
			Satisfactory	2		3	5	6	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					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	2	1	4	14	8	3
			Satisfactory	1		3	5	6	1
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
	National phase-out plans	Has support for the distribution of equipment been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	2	1	4	13	7	1
			Satisfactory	1		2	7	8	1
			Less satisfactory	1					
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has support to identify policy issues related to implementation been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	18	8	3
			Satisfactory	1		1	9	6	1
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has technical advice on equipment specifications been adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	12	8	3
			Satisfactory	2		3	9	8	
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Has the technical advice or training that was provided been effective?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	4	19	9	3
			Satisfactory	1		5	6	6	1
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
		Were proposed implementation strategies adequate?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	5	20	8	2
			Satisfactory	1		4	8	8	2
			Less satisfactory						
			Unsatisfactory					1	
Regulatory assistance projects	Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Adapted to local circumstances?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	17	8	1	
		Satisfactory	1			8	6	2	
		Less satisfactory							

Category	Sub-category	Questions	Values	Germany	Japan	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank		
			Unsatisfactory					1			
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Applicable?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	17	7	3		
			Satisfactory	1			7	5			
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory						1		
		Were the regulations that were proposed by the agency Enforceable?	Highly satisfactory	1	1	4	13	5	3		
			Satisfactory	1			11	7			
			Less satisfactory								
			Unsatisfactory						1		
	Training projects	Was the quality of the training provided satisfactory?	Highly satisfactory	4	1	4	19	10	2		
				Satisfactory			1	10	5	1	
				Less satisfactory							
				Unsatisfactory						1	
			Was the training designed so that those trained would be likely to use the skills taught?	Highly satisfactory	3	1	4	19	10	3	
				Satisfactory	1		1	10	4		
				Less satisfactory							
				Unsatisfactory						1	