



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/46/16  
31 May 2005



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Forty-sixth Meeting<sup>4</sup>  
Montreal, 4-8 July 2005

**EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2004 BUSINESS PLANS AND  
FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 45/59 (c)**

## Introduction

1. At its 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee approved quantitative performance indicators for the evaluation of the performance of the implementing agencies, starting with the year 2004, with weightings for each indicator. It also requested the Secretariat to continue to monitor nine of the previous indicators and at the same time adopted performance indicators for UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) (decision 41/48).

2. At its 45<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee decided to consider at its 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting whether a further review of the weighting of the quantitative performance indicators was warranted based on their application in the evaluation of the implementing agencies' 2004 business plans to be submitted to the 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting. Nevertheless, in the context of its Assessment Report on the Recommendations in the 2004 Evaluation and Review of the Financial Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol, the Executive Committee noted that it would report back to the meeting of the Parties on the outcome of its deliberations on the weighting of quantitative performance indicators (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/55, Annex XVII, Recommendation 11).

3. This document therefore presents the evaluation of the 2004 business plans of the implementing agencies based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, the targets that were adopted by the Committee in decisions 42/8 to 42/11, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee. It also presents trend analyses of 9 quantitative performance indicators used in prior year evaluations, and concludes with the Secretariat's observations and recommendations.

## **Evaluation based on quantitative performance indicators in decision 41/48**

4. Table 1 presents the performance indicators that were adopted in decision 41/93 and are applied to all agencies along with the short titles for the indicators used in this document.

Table 1

**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ADOPTED IN DECISION 41/93 AND THEIR SHORT TITLES**

<b>Approved Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Short Title</b>
Number of annual programmes of multi-year agreements approved vs. those planned	Multi-year tranches approved
Number of individual projects/activities (investment projects, RMPs, halon banks, TAS) approved vs. those planned	Individual projects/activities approved
Milestone activities completed (e.g. policy measures, regulatory assistance)/ODS levels achieved for approved multi-year annual tranches vs. those planned	Milestone activities completed
ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports	ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes
Project completion (pursuant to decision 28/2 for investment projects) and as defined for non-investment projects vs. those planned in progress reports	Project completion
Percentage of policy/regulatory assistance completed vs. that planned	Policy/regulatory assistance completed
Speed of financial completion vs. that required per progress report completion dates	Speed of financial completion
Timely submission of project completion reports vs. those agreed	Timely submission of project completion reports
Timely submission of progress reports and responses unless otherwise agreed	Timely submission of progress reports

5. The performance of the implementing agencies during 2004 is assessed against the targets that were set in their business plans or by targets determined by the relevant decisions of the Executive Committee. Table 2 presents the approved targets and their achievement.

Table 2

## 2004 QUANTITATIVE 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
Multi-year tranches approved	20	20	19	No	2	3	3	Yes	30	20	18	No	13	18	18	Yes
Individual projects/ activities approved	32	25	25	No	28	19	19	No	7	9	11	Yes	10	5	5	No
Milestone activities completed	12	12	12	Yes	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	16	24	14	No	15	15	15	Yes
ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes	4,919	2,579	2,579	No	21.2	0	0	No	5,666	4,953	4,790.6	No	8,076	4,961	4,961	No
Project completion	113	97	97	No	38	8	8	No	70	84	84	Yes	72	40	40	No
Policy/ regulatory assistance completed	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a	11	2	2	No	4	15	15	Yes	All targets in annual phase-out	All targets in annual phase-out	All targets in annual phase-out	Yes
Speed of financial completion	On time	88 of 104 (85%)	88 of 104 (85%)	No	On Time	10 of 36 (28%)	19 of 34 (56%)	No	12 months	9.1 months	9.3 months	Yes	3 months	12 months	12 months	No
Timely submission of project completion reports	100%	97%	97%	No	100%	100%	100%	Yes	100%	100%	100%	Yes	100%	84%	84%	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				2/8				3/8				6/9				4/9

6. The overall achievement of targets by agencies are as follows:
- (a) UNDP fully achieved two out of its 8 targets (25 per cent), the remaining six being partially achieved with several of them almost fully achieved. UNDP's own assessment indicated it had achieved three out of its 8 targets;
  - (b) UNEP fully achieved three out of its 8 targets (38 per cent), the remaining five being partially achieved except the ODS reduction target that was not achieved since the phase-out was for only one institutional strengthening renewal that had not been submitted;
  - (c) UNIDO fully achieved six out of its 9 targets (67 per cent), the remaining three being partially achieved. UNIDO's own assessment indicated it had achieved seven out of its 9 targets; and
  - (d) The World Bank fully achieved four out of its 9 targets (44 per cent), the remaining five being partially achieved.

7. The implementing agencies disagreed with some assessments of their achievements. In a number of cases, the Secretariat's analyses showed a greater achievement than the agency, but not in other cases. Some of the difficulty had to do with the definition of the multi-year agreements and speed of financial completion indicators. UNDP's target for the number of annual multi-year projects approved was also changed to 20 from 21 pursuant to decision 44/15(b); however, the Secretariat did not agree with UNDP's calculation of the number of agreements achieved because UNDP included a bilateral project in its achievement. The target for UNEP was changed from not applicable to 2 because 2 of the 3 multi-year agreements had been included in their business plans tables. UNIDO included 2 individual projects in its achievement on the number of multi-year tranches approved that were not included in the Secretariat's assessment.

8. UNDP's target for financial completion was based on data in its 2002 progress report instead of its 2003 progress report. The target was changed to reflect data in its 2003 progress report. UNEP specified a lower achievement than the Secretariat had calculated for UNEP's financial completion indicator. The difference in the Secretariat's assessment of achievement for UNIDO's financial completion indicator was that UNIDO used 30.5 days per month, instead of the 30 days per month as had been applied to all previous evaluations.

9. UNIDO used a different methodology for assessing the target for milestones achieved than that allocated. The target was set on the assumption that if all milestones were achieved for all of the existing 16 multi-year agreements, then UNIDO would receive 16 out of 16. Since UNIDO acknowledged that not all of the milestones had been achieved for two of its agreements, the Secretariat's assessment was that UNIDO achieved 14 out of 16. UNIDO however used a methodology whereby 2 points were assigned for each agreement with all milestones except ODS phase-out representing one point and ODS phase-out representing another point. This would have resulted in an achievement of 24 according to UNIDO's methodology and UNIDO meeting its target.

10. There were also small disagreements with regard to ODS phase-out for UNIDO.

11. The target for policy and regulatory measures for the World Bank was changed from not applicable to meeting all compliance targets and annual plan targets.

### Weighted Assessment of Performance

12. As noted above, implementing agencies' data on their achievements for some performance indicators differs from the Secretariat's assessment. However, as the Secretariat's assessment is based on a standard methodology that was applied equally to all implementing agencies' data provided in the progress reports, the weighted assessments of performance presented in Table 3 are based on the Secretariat's methodology for the sake of consistency.

Table 3

### **WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCY PERFORMANCE IN 2004**

Item	UNDP			UNEP			UNIDO			World Bank		
	Weight-ing	% of Target Achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of Target Achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of Target Achieved	Points	Weight-ing	% of Target Achieved	Points
Multi-year tranches approved	20	95%	19	20	150%	20	20	60%	12	20	138%	20
Individual projects/activities approved	20	78%	16	20	68%	14	20	157%	20	20	50%	10
Milestone activities completed	27	100%	27	N/a	N/a		20	88%	18	20	100%	20
ODS phased-out for individual projects	7	52%	3	10	0%	0	5	85%	4	5	61%	3
Project completion	7	86%	6	10	21%	2	5	120%	5	5	56%	3
Policy/regulatory assistance completed	N/a	N/a	N/a	20	18%	4	10	375%	10	10	100%	10
Speed of financial completion	10	85%	8	10	56%	6	10	100%	10	10	25%	3
Timely submission of project completion reports	5	97%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	84%	4
Timely submission of progress reports	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	5
Assessment	100		89	100		56	100		89	100		78

13. UNIDO and the World Bank targeted all 9 indicators. Therefore, the weightings adopted in decision 41/93 apply to these agencies. For UNDP and UNEP, the weightings were pro-rated to maintain points amounting to 40 points each for approval and implementation indicators and 20 points for administrative indicators. The resulting points are rounded to the nearest number.

14. UNEP and the World Bank both exceeded one of their targets for multi-year tranches to be approved, while UNIDO exceeded three of its targets. The overall assessment is as follows: UNDP (89), UNEP (56), UNIDO (89), and the World Bank (78).

UNEP'S CAP Performance in 2004

15. Decision 41/93 also established revised performance indicators that are related to UNEP's CAP. Table 4 presents the targets, and achievements against those targets in 2004.

Table 4

**UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR THE YEAR 2004**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2004 Target</b>	<b>UNEP Achievement Drafts</b>
Usefulness of the region network/thematic meetings	Overall average of 3 on a 5-point scale.	Average rating was 4.3
Assistance to countries for data reporting for the purpose of establishing baselines	All 9 countries with missing baselines (as of January 2004) that accept CAP assistance.	100% (Cape Verde, Djibouti, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, India, Liberia, Mali, São Tomé and Príncipe, and Somalia.)
Assistance with Article 7 data reporting	1) 100% of all Article 5 countries that accept CAP assistance will have achieved compliance with Article 7 reporting requirements. 2) UNEP believes that a realistic achievement is 114 countries (i.e. 80%)	138 countries (96%) reported Article 7 data by December 2004
Countries in actual or potential non-compliance as per MOP decisions	1) 39 countries in non-compliance as per MOP XV that accept CAP assistance will be in compliance. 2) UNEP believes that a realistic achievement is 29 countries (i.e. 75%)	33 countries out of 41 came back to compliance (81%) (The following 41 countries were declared to be in actual or potential non-compliance by MOP-15: <b>Albania, Barbados, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Congo DR, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Federated States of Micronesia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Morocco, Nauru, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Thailand, Uganda, Uruguay and Viet Nam.</b> ) The 33 countries highlighted in bold came back to compliance as per MOP-16.
Countries at risk of becoming in non-compliance as per Article 7 data trends	1) CAP assistance to all countries at risk of non-compliance (outside of network meetings). 2) UNEP believes that a realistic achievement is 80%.	CAP assistance was provided to 63 out of 72 countries identified to be at risk of non-compliance (88%) (The following 72 countries were identified to be at risk of non-compliance as per their reported Article 7 data: <b>Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Congo DR, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Korea, Korea DPR, Kuwait, Lao, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Palau, Paraguay, Philippines, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen and Zimbabwe.</b> UNEP assisted the 63 countries highlighted in bold to sustain compliance. Details of the assistance provided by UNEP can be found in Annex III to the Progress Report 2004.)

Indicator	2004 Target	UNEP Achievement Drafts
Information clearing-house	The following will be based on reported figures in 2003 Progress Report: (a) 5% increase in subscriptions compared to 2003; (b) 10% increase in visitors compared to 2003; (c) 10% increase in downloads compared to 2003; (d) 5% increase documents disseminated compared to 2003; (e) 10% increase in queries compared to 2003; 10 working days of receipt of query.	a) 2% increase in the number of newsletter subscriptions. b) 2.9% increase in the number of discrete visitors (IP addresses) to the web site. c) 20% increase in the number of PDF documents downloaded from website. d) 1% decrease in the number of hardcopy publications disseminated.

16. UNEP achieved its targets for “ratings for regional meetings” and “assistance to countries for data reporting for the purpose of establishing baselines” but did not achieve its “information clearinghouse” target. Additionally, UNEP set targets to achieve “100% Article 7 data reporting”, “assistance to all countries that were in non-compliance to return into compliance”, and to “provide assistance to all countries at risk of becoming in non-compliance”. Although UNEP indicated that it would be likely to achieve 75 to 80 per cent of these targets, it reported data indicating greater achievement than it thought, although not 100 per cent. Whilst the reporting of Article 7 data is the responsibility of the country and not UNEP, 96 per cent of Article 7 data was reported by December 2004, 33 out of 41 countries came back into compliance, and 63 out of 72 countries identified at risk were provided CAP assistance.

#### Analysis of other performance indicators

17. Decision 41/93 also requested the Secretariat to continue to monitor the following performance indicators on the basis of trend analyses in future evaluations of the performance of implementing agencies: value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out, cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, distribution among countries, funds disbursed, speed of first disbursement, speed of completion, and net emission due to delays.

18. Some of the targets, ODS phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved and ODS to be phased out can be determined based on projections in business plans and progress reports. For other indicators, such as cost of project preparation, cost-effectiveness, speed of first disbursement and speed of completion implementing agencies do not set targets or projections in either their progress reports or business plans. For these indicators, the actual achievement for each year is presented.

19. It should also be noted that previous performance indicators were divided between investment and non-investment projects. All of the 9 indicators are applicable to investment projects, but only “funds disbursed”, “speed until first disbursement” and “speed until project completion indicators” are applicable to non-investment projects. Annexes I and II present the historical analyses for investment and non-investment projects, respectively.

20. Annex I shows *inter alia* that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. The amount of ODS phased out was not as high as normally achieved for UNDP and UNIDO in 2004. The amount of funds disbursed was 100 per cent achieved by UNDP and UNIDO in 2004 and the World Bank achieved 74 per cent of its planned disbursements. Performance on project completion reports has improved in general. However, in the last three



years, the “value of projects approved” and the “ODS to be phased out” from those approvals have not performed as well as historically.

21. Regarding the trend analyses of the other indicators, the “cost of project preparation” is going down with the exception of UNDP that increased to 3.6 per cent of total approvals in 2004. The cost-effectiveness of the agencies’ projects decreased since 2003. The speed of delivery remains similar between UNIDO and UNDP being from 9 to 13 months for the first disbursement and 32 months for completion. The World Bank’s speed of delivery for the first disbursement is 26 months and project completion 41 months. Net emissions due to delays is a cumulative figure but the total amount has been decreasing in general except for an increase in this indicator for UNDP of about 3,000 ODP tonnes and an increase for UNIDO of 10,700 tonnes from 2003 to 2004. The World Bank had a 3,700 ODP tonnes decrease from 2003 to 2004, but has the largest amount of net emission due to delays of 18,155 ODP tonnes, compared to 15,874 ODP tonnes for UNIDO and 12,440 ODP tonnes for UNDP.

22. Annex II has limited indicators that can be tracked including the target for disbursement for non-investment projects and speed of delivery indicators. The disbursement rate for UNEP in particular was near its target over recent years but was only 54 per cent of its target in 2004. UNEP’s first disbursement in 2004 was quickest (8 months) followed by UNIDO (9), UNDP (11) and the World Bank (15). Speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies ranging from 30 to 35 months.

### Review of Weighting of the Quantitative Indicators

23. Decision 41/93 established the weighting for quantitative performance indicators that are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

#### WEIGHTINGS FOR QUANTITATIVE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Type of Indicator	Item	Weighting	Sub-total
Approval	Multi-year tranches approved	20	
Approval	Individual projects/activities approved	20	
			40
Implementation	Milestone activities completed	20	
Implementation	ODS phased-out for individual projects	5	
Implementation	Project completion	5	
Implementation	Policy/regulatory assistance completed	10	
			40
Administrative	Speed of financial completion	10	
Administrative	Timely submission of project completion reports	5	
Administrative	Timely submission of progress reports	5	
			20

24. The rationale for the weighting was that approval and implementation indicators should account for the largest share of weighting, but there should be sufficient weighting for administrative indicators to encourage timely reporting and financial completion. Therefore, the implementation indicators have a weighting of 40 points as do the approval indicators, while the administrative indicators have a total weighting of 20 points. For UNEP, since it did not target all of the indicators, the Secretariat pro-rated the remaining indicators to maintain the 40/40/20 distribution.

25. The weighting within the categories also had rationale. It was assumed that more agencies would be involved in multi-year projects, but that all agencies would continue to have significant numbers of individual projects. Therefore, the weightings were shared. As shown in Table 6, the total number of ongoing multi-year agreements is 102 (including multiple tranches for some projects) and the total number of investment/training/technical assistance/demonstration projects is 385 of which 198 are projects that will result in phase-out.

Table 6

**NUMBER OF ONGOING MULTI-YEAR AND INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS**

		UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	World Bank	Total
Multi-Year Projects		38	7	38	19	102
Individual Projects (investment/training/ technical assistance/ demonstration projects)	With Phase-Out	89	3	61	45	198
	Without Phase-Out	35	137	8	7	187
	Total	124	140	69	52	385
<b>Total</b>		<b>162</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>487</b>

26. The points were shared equally between multi-year agreements (20) and individual projects (5+5+10) for the implementation indicators. More points were given to “policy and regulatory measures” (10) due to the importance of these projects during the compliance period than to “project completion” (5) and “ODS phase-out” for individual projects (5).

27. More points were given to “speed of financial completion” (10) than to the other administrative indicators (5 each) because agencies’ financial completion has been delayed and there was a strong desire to address this issue through a performance indicator. The other administrative indicators are now normally achieved but remain important for the efficient operation of the Multilateral Fund.

**SECRETARIAT’S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Observations**

28. The quantitative performance indicators show that while no agency achieved more than 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of its targets, based on the weighting of the indicators, UNDP and UNIDO achieved

assessments of 89% and the World Bank 78%. While UNEP achieved an assessment of 56%, it fully achieved all but one of its targets for its Compliance Assistance Programme in 2004.

29. The trend analyses provided on the other performance indicators indicated that the “value of projects approved” and the “ODS to be phased out” from those approvals that the agencies have not performed as well as historically. There was however improvement in the cost-effectiveness indicator, while the cost of project preparation ranged from 0.16% for the World Bank, 2.01% for UNIDO, and 3.61% for UNDP.

30. The first year of operation of the quantitative performance indicators suggests that there was a need for more consistency among the targets of the agencies in particular for the indicators “multi-year tranches approved” and “speed of financial completion”.

31. The current weightings provide for equal weighting between multi-year projects and individual projects, between approval and implementation indicators, as well as the 20 per cent for administrative indicators.

## **Recommendations**

The Executive Committee may wish:

1. To note the evaluation of the implementing agencies’ performance against their 2004 business plans as contained in UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/46/16; and
2. To consider the need for modifications to the weightings for performance indicators, and report to the Meeting of the Parties on the outcome of its deliberations in the light of Recommendation 11 of the Report on the Review and Evaluation of the Financial Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol.



## Annex I

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR  
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1996-2004)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
ODS phased out	24%	93%	100%	76%	41%	99%	92%	100%	79%
Funds disbursed	59%	100%	95%	90%	100%	95%	77%	64%	100%
Project completion reports				38%	93%	86%	87%	100%	97%
Distribution among countries				65%	61%	63%	58%	38%	72%
Value of projects approved	100%	100%		100%	80%	100%	99%	65%	73%
ODS to be phased out	74%	100%		100%	92%	96%	77%	44%	89%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		4.4	3	2.7	2.7	1.1	2.54	1.6	3.61
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.1	6.3	9.14	6.74	8.3	10.35	7.1	6.27
Speed of first disbursement (months)		13	13	12	13	12.84	12.8	12.8	12.91
Speed of completion (months)	24	29	29.5	32	33	33.6	32.7	32.4	32.41
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				18,291	14,136	14,381	13,375	9,322	12,440
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
ODS phased out	73%	80%	100%	57%	70%	100%	100%	88%	41%
Funds disbursed	81%	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Project completion reports				83%	66%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Distribution among countries				83%	74%	89%	73%	78%	67%
Value of projects approved	99%	99%		100%	93%	99%	97%	68%	82%
ODS to be phased out	42%	85%		100%	72%	100%	100%	37%	89%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.2	4.2	2.7	3.8	2.73	3.28	3.64	2.01
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		6.11	6.27	7.78	6.71	5.67	7.28	9.79	3.58
Speed of first disbursement (months)		10	9	8	9	9.29	9.16	9.2	9.06
Speed of completion (months)	20	24	28	26	29	29.85	30.89	31.7	32.35
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				4,722	6,563	5,940	6,579.5	5,114	15,874
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
ODS phased out	32%	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	84%	100%
Funds disbursed	64%	77%	88%	97%	100%	74%	100%	100%	73%
Project completion reports				61%	98%	74%	100%	84%	84%
Distribution among countries				75%	79%	67%	79%	65%	71%
Value of projects approved	94%	87%		100%	75%	92%	100%	82%	94%
ODS to be phased out	34%	100%		100%	83%	72%	91%	65%	59%
Cost of project preparation (% of approvals)		2.9	2.7	2.9	5.5	1.26	0.43	0.64	0.16
Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)		3.6	1.9	2.83	2.96	3.85	4.57	6.12	3.74
Speed of first disbursement (months)		26	26	25	25	25.33	26.28	26	26.02
Speed of completion (months)	37	34	40	37	39	40.09	41.35	41	40.88
Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)				2,765	17,422	25,257	24,889	21,807	18,155



**Annex II**

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED AND SPEED OF  
FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR  
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1997-2004)**

<b>UNDP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	98%	100%	100%	93%	61%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	12	6	11	11.29	12	11.4	11	11.44
Speed until project completion (months)	31	24	33	34.16	36	34.7	35	35.36
<b>UNEP</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
Funds Disbursed	49%	100%	100%	100%	93%	93%	99%	54%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	5	3	5	6.33	6.87	7.3	7.6	8.49
Speed until project completion (months)	20	15	25	27.9	29.66	30.4	31	31.8
<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
Funds Disbursed	80%	100%	49%	100%	48%	89%	100%	100%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	7	6.5	6	8	9.15	9.85	9.4	9.34
Speed until project completion (months)	24	11	29	31	33.66	33.84	33.7	33.89
<b>World Bank</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>
Funds Disbursed	100%	49%	35%	27%	12%	38%	100%	79%
Speed until first disbursement (months)	16	17	5	12	11.95	12.05	13.7	14.58
Speed until project completion (months)	28	32	26	30	29.24	28.85	30	30.39

-----