



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/52/16  
20 June 2007

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Fifty-second Meeting  
Montreal, 23-27 July 2007

**EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2006 BUSINESS PLANS**

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issue of the document.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to the meeting and not to request additional copies.

## **Introduction**

1. The Executive Committee has evaluated the performance of the implementing agencies based on quantitative performance indicators since 1996. At its 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee approved quantitative performance indicators (including weightings) to evaluate the work of implementing agencies beginning from 2004, while continuing to monitor nine of the pre-existing indicators (decision 41/93). Subsequently, at its 47<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Committee revised the weightings for quantitative performance indicators, to apply as of the 2005 evaluation of the performance of multilateral implementing agencies (decision 47/51).

2. The performance indicators for UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) were replaced as a result of a decision at the 48<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee (decision 48/7).

3. With respect to the qualitative performance indicators, at its 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee considered a document on qualitative performance indicators and sought input from regional networks (decision 44/6). After consideration at its 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee modified the qualitative performance indicators (decision 46/14).

4. This document presents the evaluation of the 2006 business plans of the implementing agencies, based on the performance indicators adopted in decision 41/93, and the revised weighting in decision 47/51, the targets that were adopted for the 2006 business plans by the Committee through decisions 48/6 to 48/9, and the implementing agencies' progress and financial reports submitted to the 52<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee. It also presents a trend analysis for each of the nine performance indicators used in previous year evaluations and presents results of the qualitative assessment of the performance of implementing agencies based on input received from national ozone unit (NOU) officers. It concludes with the Secretariat's observations and recommendations.

### **Analysis of quantitative performance indicators in decision 41/93 with revised weightings adopted in decision 47/51**

5. Table 1 presents the quantitative performance indicators and the weightings that were adopted in decisions 41/93 and 47/51, respectively, and are applied to all agencies. It also presents the short titles that are used in this document to describe the indicators.

Table 1

**PERFORMANCE INDICATORS ADOPTED IN DECISION 41/93, THE NEW WEIGHTINGS ADOPTED IN DECISION 47/51 AND THEIR SHORT TITLES**

| <b>Type of Indicator</b> | <b>Approved Performance Indicator</b>   | <b>Short Title</b>                                   | <b>New Weighting</b> |
|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| Approval                 | Number of annual programmes of multi-year agreements approved vs. those planned   | Multi-year tranches approved                         | 15                   |
| Approval                 | Number of individual projects/activities (investment projects, RMPs, halon banks, TAS) approved vs. those planned   | Individual projects/activities approved              | 10                   |
|                          |   | <b>Subtotal</b>                                      | <b>25</b>            |
| Implementation           | Milestone activities completed (e.g., policy measures, regulatory assistance)/ODS levels achieved for approved multi-year annual tranches vs. those planned | Milestone activities completed                       | 20                   |
| Implementation           | ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes vs. those planned per progress reports   | ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes | 15                   |
| Implementation           | 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                                   | 10                   |
| Implementation           | Percentage of policy/regulatory assistance completed vs. that planned   | Policy/regulatory assistance completed               | 10                   |
|                          |   | <b>Subtotal</b>                                      | <b>55</b>            |
| Administrative           | Speed of financial completion vs. that required per progress report completion dates  | Speed of financial completion                        | 10                   |
| Administrative           | Timely submission of project completion reports vs. those agreed  | Timely submission of project completion reports      | 5                    |
| Administrative           | Timely submission of progress reports and responses unless otherwise agreed   | Timely submission of progress reports                | 5                    |
|                          |   | <b>Subtotal</b>                                      | <b>20</b>            |
|                          |   | <b>Total</b>   | <b>100</b>           |

6. The performance of the implementing agencies during 2006 is assessed against the targets that were established in their business plans or against targets determined by decisions of the Executive Committee. Table 2 presents the approved targets, measures of progress towards achieving each target, and the numbers of targets achieved.

Table 2

## 2006 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                         | 27            | 22                 | 22                     | No         | 20  | 10   | 10                     | No         | 29                                     | 24                 | 23                     | No         | 23         | 19  | 19                     | No         |
| Individual projects/activities approved              | 7             | 5                  | 4                      | No         | 16  | 6  | 6                      | No         | 11                                     | 11                 | 11                     | Yes        | 1          | 2   | 2                      | Yes        |
| Milestone activities completed                       | 15            | 18                 | 18                     | Yes        | 4   | 4  | 4                      | Yes        | 22                                     | 19                 | 19                     | No         | 20         | 19  | 19                     | No         |
| ODS phased-out for individual projects in ODP tonnes | 2,622         | 1,543              | 1,543                  | No         | 0   | 51.3*  | 51.3                   | Yes        | 1,119.4                                | 1,119.4            | 1,127.1                | Yes        | 2,288      | 478.52  | 478.52                 | No         |
| Project completion                                   | 55            | 48                 | 48                     | No         | 86  | 89   | 89                     | Yes        | 36                                     | 35                 | 35                     | No         | 20         | 22  | 22                     | Yes        |
| Policy/regulatory assistance completed               | N/A           | N/A                | N/A                    | N/A        | 77 countries (100%) either received assistance or were offered assistance | At least 77 countries have been given assistance. In addition, several countries have been provided with policy advice such as Montenegro (new Party) and Armenia and Turkmenistan (former Article 2 countries). | 77                     | Yes        | N/A                                    | 9                  | N/A                    | N/A        | N/A        | All countries with WB multiyear projects in compliance and targets met per APs submitted and approved | N/A                    | N/A        |
| Speed of financial completion                        | On time (123) | 45                 | 45                     | No         | On time   | 14 of 32 (44%)   | 15 of 32 (47%)         | No         | 12 months after operational completion | 10.4 months        | 10.4 months            | Yes        | 11 months  | 5 months  | 5 months               | Yes        |
| Timely submission of project completion reports      | On time (44)  | 13                 | 13                     | No         | On time   | 8 of 14  | 8 of 14                | No         | On time                                | On time            | On time                | Yes        | 100%       | 84%   | 84%                    | No         |
| Timely submission of progress reports                | On time       | On time            | On time                | Yes        | On time   | Progress report was submitted with 1 day delay   | 1 day delay            | No         | On time                                | On time            | On time                | Yes        | 100%       | 100%  | 100%                   | Yes        |
| Number of targets achieved                           |               |                    |                        | 2/8        |   |  |                        | 4/9        |  |                    |                        | 5/8        |            |   |                        | 4/8        |

\* Phase-out due to the institutional strengthening projects to which phase-out is attributed and one technical assistance project, none of which had planned completion in 2006.

7. Overall, agencies have achieved the following targets:
- (a) Out of a total of eight targets, UNDP has fully achieved two (25 per cent) and partially achieved six (of which “multi-year tranches approved” and “project completion” are almost fully achieved);
  - (b) Out of a total of nine targets, UNEP has fully achieved four (44 per cent) and partially achieved five (of which “timely submission of progress report” has been almost fully achieved);
  - (c) Out of a total of eight targets, UNIDO has fully achieved five (63 per cent) and partially achieved three (of which “milestone activities completed” and “project completion” have been almost fully achieved); and
  - (d) Out of a total of eight targets, the World Bank fully achieved four (50 per cent) and partially achieved four (of which two “milestone activities completed” and “multi-year tranches approved” have been almost fully achieved).

8. The overall assessment is based on fully achieving the target i.e. 100 per cent, therefore if there are 8 targets and one achieves 99 per cent of the target, the overall assessment would still be a 0. For this reason a more accurate assessment might take into account partially or almost fully achieved indicators.

9. Some aspects of the implementing agencies’ assessments of their achievements differed from that of the Secretariat. The Secretariat counted one multi-year tranche approved less than had been indicated by UNIDO, one individual project less than had been indicated by UNDP and one project more for speed of financial completion than had been indicated by UNEP. The Secretariat’s calculation of a phase-out amount was slightly above that of UNIDO. Overall, however, differences in 2006 were minor and there was more agreement among the assessments than there had been in 2005.

#### Weighted Assessment of Performance

10. As noted above, data provided by the implementing agencies’ on their achievements for certain performance indicators differ from the Secretariat’s assessment in a few cases only. For the sake of consistency, the achievement of performance presented in Table 3 is based on the Secretariat’s methodology.

Table 3

**WEIGHTED ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTING AGENCY PERFORMANCE IN 2006**

| 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                    | 15         | 81%                  | 12        | 15         | 50%                  | 8         | 15         | 79%                  | 12        | 15         | 83%                  | 12        |
| Individual projects/activities approved         | 10         | 57%                  | 6         | 10         | 38%                  | 4         | 10         | 100%                 | 10        | 10         | 200%                 | 10        |
| Milestone activities completed                  | 26         | 120%                 | 26        | 20         | 100%                 | 20        | 26         | 86%                  | 22        | 26         | 95%                  | 25        |
| ODS phased-out for individual projects          | 17         | 59%                  | 10        | 15         | Over                 | 15        | 17         | 101%                 | 17        | 17         | 21%                  | 4         |
| Project completion                              | 12         | 87%                  | 10        | 10         | 103%                 | 10        | 12         | 97%                  | 12        | 12         | 110%                 | 12        |
| Policy/regulatory assistance completed          | N/A        | N/A                  | N/A       | 10         | 100%                 | 10        | N/A        | N/A                  | N/A       | N/A        | N/A                  | N/a       |
| Speed of financial completion                   | 10         | 37%                  | 4         | 10         | 47%                  | 5         | 10         | 100%                 | 10        | 10         | 100%                 | 10        |
| Timely submission of project completion reports | 5          | 30%                  | 2         | 5          | 57%                  | 3         | 5          | 100%                 | 5         | 5          | 84%                  | 4         |
| Timely submission of progress reports           | 5          | 100%                 | 5         | 5          | 50%                  | 3         | 5          | 100%                 | 5         | 5          | 100%                 | 5         |
| <b>2005 Assessment</b>                          | <b>100</b> |                      | <b>75</b> | <b>100</b> |                      | <b>78</b> | <b>100</b> |                      | <b>93</b> | <b>100</b> |                      | <b>82</b> |
| <i>2005 Assessment</i>                          |            |                      | 83        |            |                      | 84        |            |                      | 94        |            |                      | 82        |

11. Because UNEP targeted all nine indicators the weightings adopted in decision 47/51 are applied to its assessment. For UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank the weightings have been pro-rated. Fifty-five points are allocated for each approval and implementation indicator, and 20 points for each administrative indicator. Points earned are rounded to the nearest whole number.

12. UNDP and UNIDO each exceeded one target and UNEP and the World Bank each exceeded two targets. The assessment for 2006 is as follows: UNDP (75), UNEP (78), UNIDO (93), and the World Bank (82). UNEP's quantitative assessment for 2006 was slightly below its 2005 assessment, dropping six points. UNDP's assessment in 2006 was slightly below its 2005 assessment, dropping by eight points. The World Bank's assessment was the same as in 2005 and UNIDO's assessment dropped by one point. Only UNDP and UNEP met or exceeded their targets for completing the milestones of multi-year agreements (MYAs)—one of the most critical indicators of progress in the compliance period.

#### **Analysis of other quantitative performance indicators**

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

14. The targets covering ODP phased out, funds disbursed, project completion reports, distribution among countries, value of projects approved, ODS to be phased out and net emissions due to delays can be determined based on projections in business plans, progress reports, and schedules agreed with the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer. For the other indicators, namely 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.

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

16. Annex I shows, *inter alia*, that agencies have had various levels of success in different years. In 2006, the level of ODS phased-out for the World Bank was not as high it had been in previous years. This is due primarily to the fact that two halon banking projects (ARG/HAL/26/TAS/80 and IDS/HAL/27/TAS/107) with large ODP phase-out impact 1,172 ODP tonnes were not completed as planned. Moreover, the phase-out achieved was not offset by the phase-out of 181.3 ODP tonnes of a refrigeration project in Pakistan (PAK/REF/42/INV/59) that was completed one year earlier than planned or additional phase-out achieved from other projects completed in 2006.

17. The target for the amount of funds disbursed was achieved by UNIDO and the World Bank in 2006, and UNDP met 66 per cent of its planned disbursements. The main reason that UNDP did not meet its target is due to the fact that there was limited disbursement in several MYAs (Brazil, China solvent, and Nigeria). UNIDO reached its target for project completion reports. UNDP and the World Bank met only 30 per cent and 84 per cent of their targets, respectively.

18. The cost of project preparation varied from 0.4 per cent of the cost of the project for the World Bank to 0.54 per cent for UNDP and 1.83 per cent for UNIDO. In general however, it was either comparable to, or below, the cost in previous years, except for UNIDO, where the cost of project preparation increased from 0.86 per cent in 2005 to 1.83 per cent in 2006. The achievement of the target of “value of projects approved” improved for all agencies in 2006.

19. The cost-effectiveness of projects increased for UNIDO and the World Bank in 2006. It decreased to US \$4.99/kg in 2006 for UNDP. The speed of delivery is similar for UNIDO and UNDP, ranging from nine to 13 months for the first disbursement and 33 months for completion. The World Bank’s speed of delivery for the first disbursement is 25 months and 40 months for project completion.

20. The indicator “net emissions due to delays” is a cumulative figure. Up until 2006 the total amount had been decreasing for the implementing agencies. In 2006 that number increased. The Secretariat reviewed the calculations to ascertain the reason for the increase. The main reason appears to be the fact that planned completion dates of annual tranches of MYAs have been

extended to reflect the end of the agreement. Therefore, this figure could continue to increase. The data shown in Annex I for this indicator takes into account partial phase-out that was not taken into account in previous years.

21. Annex II includes a limited number of indicators that can be tracked. These cover the targets for “disbursement for non-investment projects” and “speed of delivery”. Prior to 2004, UNEP had achieved a disbursement rate of 93 to 100 per cent for six consecutive years. Since 2004, UNEP has achieved a disbursement rate of 54 per cent (in both 2004 and 2005) and 51 per cent (in 2006).

22. With respect to “timing of the first disbursement”, UNEP was the fastest (8.4 months), as in previous years. This was followed by UNIDO (9.8 months), UNDP (11.8 months), and the World Bank (14.6 months). The speed of non-investment project completion is similar for all agencies and ranges from 31 to 37 months.

### UNEP’S CAP Performance in 2006

23. Decision 41/93 also established revised performance indicators that are related to UNEP’s CAP. At its 48<sup>th</sup> Meeting the Executive Committee decided to change these indicators beginning with the 2006 business plans (decision 48/7). Table 4 presents the targets, and the achievements in 2006 measured against those targets.

Table 4

### UNEP CAP PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR 2006

| Indicator  | Target   | UNEP achievement in 2006  | UNEP assessment |
|--|--|---|-----------------|
| Efficient follow-up to regional/thematic meetings.   | - 100% implementation.<br>- High score of relevance and presentation.  | - Implementation of recommendations was positively reported on in subsequent meetings.<br>- Meetings for which evaluation was conducted show high satisfaction, | - Achieved      |
| Effective support to NOUs in their work, particularly guidance to new NOUs, including support to the development and introduction of import/export licensing systems covering all controlled substances, including management and enforcement. | - 10 such ways/means/products/ services.<br>- Qualitative description of the progress made in the development and enforcement of import/export licensing systems covering all controlled substances, including management and enforcement. | - Demonstrated in Part III Section B and Annex IV of UNEP’s progress report.  | - Achieved      |
| Assistance to countries in actual or potential non-compliance (according to decisions of the Meeting of the Parties and/or as per reported Article 7 data and trends analysis).  | All such countries received assistance leading to evident results.   | 22 countries provided with compliance assistance through CAP (Annex III of UNEP’s progress report).   | - Achieved      |
| Innovation in production and delivery of global and regional information products and services.  | 10 such products and services.   | 15 global and regional products and services delivered (Part III Section A Information Clearinghouse & Public Awareness activities of UNEP’s progress report).  | - Achieved      |
| Close cooperation between CAP regional teams and bilateral and multilateral implementing agencies working in the region.   | 5 joint missions /undertakings with substantive outcomes in each region.   | Over five joint mission/undertakings completed for all regions (ECA, ROA, ROAP, ROLAC, ROWA)  | - Achieved      |



Special CAP compliance assistance activities in 2006

24. At its 48<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee was informed that the business plans submitted by the implementing agencies (which include special CAP initiatives and terminal phase-out management plans) could address the phase-out needs identified in the three-year phase-out plan to enable compliance by 2010 (except for some countries, which have reported their latest consumption as zero). There are several references in the section of the Consolidated Business Plan (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/48/6) entitled ‘Country Analysis Adherence to the 2006-2008 Compliance Oriented Model/Three-year ODS Phase-out Plan’, which indicate how special CAP assistance would be provided to countries for which additional actions might be needed and where no activities had been funded in the business plan. Completion of these CAP assistance activities was a vital aspect of the CAP’s programmatic activities for compliance assistance.

25. There were 269 special CAP assistance activities in UNEP’s 2006 business plan, with an additional 83 activities listed in this category but relating to projects funded outside the CAP programmatic budget. Of those that were considered special assistance activities, UNEP completed 116 (43 per cent). It did not complete 54 activities (20 per cent). For the remaining 99 activities, there was insufficient information to determine whether or not they had been completed.

**Analysis of qualitative performance indicators**

[An addendum will be issued prior to the 52<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee to address this section and any resulting recommendations.]

**SECRETARIAT’S OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS****OBSERVATIONS**

26. The quantitative performance indicators show that UNIDO achieved 93 per cent of its targets (based on the weighting of the indicators) followed by the World Bank (82 per cent), UNEP (78 per cent) and UNDP (75 per cent). Overall, in 2006 the agencies’ performance was slightly lower than it had been in 2005.

27. UNEP indicated that it achieved all of the new CAP performance indicators but continued to have a low rate of disbursement. While 116 special CAP assistance activities were completed in 2006, 54 were not completed. The Executive Committee may wish to encourage UNEP to continue to report on the achievement of the special compliance assistance activities and to strive to complete them as planned.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

28. The Executive Committee may wish to:
- (a) Note the evaluation of the implementing agencies' performance against their 2006 business plans as contained in UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/52/16; and
  - (b) Urge UNEP to continue to report on the achievement of the planned special compliance assistance activities and to strive to complete these activities as planned.

## Annex I

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR  
WEIGHTED INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1996-2006)**

| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ODS phased out                               | 24%         | 93%         | 100%        | 76%         | 41%         | 99%         | 92%         | 100%        | 79%         | 91%         | 85%         |
| Funds disbursed                              | 59%         | 100%        | 95%         | 90%         | 100%        | 95%         | 77%         | 64%         | 100%        | 96%         | 66%         |
| Project completion reports                   |             |             |             | 38%         | 93%         | 86%         | 87%         | 100%        | 97%         | 79%         | 30%         |
| Distribution among countries                 |             |             |             | 65%         | 61%         | 63%         | 58%         | 38%         | 72%         | 44%         | 75%         |
| Value of projects approved                   | 100%        | 100%        |             | 100%        | 80%         | 100%        | 99%         | 65%         | 73%         | 82%         | 83%         |
| ODS to be phased out                         | 74%         | 100%        |             | 100%        | 92%         | 96%         | 77%         | 44%         | 89%         | 70%         | 100%        |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) |             | 4.4         | 3           | 2.7         | 2.7         | 1.1         | 2.54        | 1.6         | 3.61        | 1.44        | 0.54        |
| Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)                   |             | 6.1         | 6.3         | 9.14        | 6.74        | 8.3         | 10.35       | 7.1         | 6.27        | 8.24        | 4.99        |
| Speed of first disbursement (months)         |             | 13          | 13          | 12          | 13          | 12.84       | 12.8        | 12.8        | 12.91       | 12.9        | 13.0        |
| Speed of completion (months)                 | 24          | 29          | 29.5        | 32          | 33          | 33.6        | 32.7        | 32.4        | 32.41       | 32.9        | 33.6        |
| Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)     |             |             |             | 8,995       | 11,350      | 11,727      | 9,023       | 6,466       | 3,607       | 4,538       | 6,619       |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
| ODS phased out                               | 73%         | 80%         | 100%        | 57%         | 70%         | 100%        | 100%        | 88%         | 100%        | 99%         | 100%        |
| Funds disbursed                              | 81%         | 88%         | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        |
| Project completion reports                   |             |             |             | 83%         | 66%         | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        |
| Distribution among countries                 |             |             |             | 83%         | 74%         | 89%         | 73%         | 78%         | 67%         | 79%         | 69%         |
| Value of projects approved                   | 99%         | 99%         |             | 100%        | 93%         | 99%         | 97%         | 68%         | 82%         | 100%        | 100%        |
| ODS to be phased out                         | 42%         | 85%         |             | 100%        | 72%         | 100%        | 100%        | 37%         | 89%         | 100%        | 47%         |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) |             | 2.2         | 4.2         | 2.7         | 3.8         | 2.73        | 3.28        | 3.64        | 2.01        | 0.86        | 1.83        |
| Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)                   |             | 6.11        | 6.27        | 7.78        | 6.71        | 5.67        | 7.28        | 9.79        | 3.58        | 3.10        | 7.13        |
| Speed of first disbursement (months)         |             | 10          | 9           | 8           | 9           | 9.29        | 9.16        | 9.2         | 9.06        | 8.97        | 9.0         |
| Speed of completion (months)                 | 20          | 24          | 28          | 26          | 29          | 29.85       | 30.89       | 31.7        | 32.35       | 32.98       | 33.2        |
| Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)     |             |             |             | 4,667       | 5,899       | 5,727       | 5,960       | 3,503       | 13,035      | 1,481       | 3,864       |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
| ODS phased out                               | 32%         | 94%         | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 84%         | 100%        | 69%         | 31%         |
| Funds disbursed                              | 64%         | 77%         | 88%         | 97%         | 100%        | 74%         | 100%        | 100%        | 73%         | 100%        | 100%        |
| Project completion reports                   |             |             |             | 61%         | 98%         | 74%         | 100%        | 84%         | 84%         | 100%        | 84%         |
| Distribution among countries                 |             |             |             | 75%         | 79%         | 67%         | 79%         | 65%         | 71%         | 93%         | 79%         |
| Value of projects approved                   | 94%         | 87%         |             | 100%        | 75%         | 92%         | 100%        | 82%         | 94%         | 83%         | 87%         |
| ODS to be phased out                         | 34%         | 100%        |             | 100%        | 83%         | 72%         | 91%         | 65%         | 59%         | 100%        | 66%         |
|  |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| Cost of project preparation (% of approvals) |             | 2.9         | 2.7         | 2.9         | 5.5         | 1.26        | 0.43        | 0.64        | 0.16        | 0.39        | 0.4         |
| Cost-effectiveness (\$/kg)                   |             | 3.6         | 1.9         | 2.83        | 2.96        | 3.85        | 4.57        | 6.12        | 3.74        | 1.04        | 3.33        |
| Speed of first disbursement (months)         |             | 26          | 26          | 25          | 25          | 25.33       | 26.28       | 26          | 26.02       | 25.7        | 25.3        |
| Speed of completion (months)                 | 37          | 34          | 40          | 37          | 39          | 40.09       | 41.35       | 41          | 40.88       | 40.7        | 40.3        |
| Net emissions due to delays (ODP tonnes)     |             |             |             | 7,352       | 16,608      | 21,539      | 22,324      | 18,021      | 8,338       | 4,843       | 5,674       |



**Annex II**

**PERCENTAGE OF TARGET ACHIEVED FOR FUNDS DISBURSED, SPEED OF  
FIRST DISBURSEMENT AND PROJECT COMPLETION FOR  
NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE BY AGENCY  
(1997-2006)**

| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Funds Disbursed                         | 100%        | 98%         | 100%        | 100%        | 93%         | 61%         | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 92%         |
| Speed until first disbursement (months) | 12          | 6           | 11          | 11.29       | 12          | 11.4        | 11          | 11.44       | 11.5        | 11.8        |
| Speed until project completion (months) | 31          | 24          | 33          | 34.16       | 36          | 34.7        | 35          | 35.36       | 35.4        | 36.6        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
| Funds Disbursed                         | 49%         | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 93%         | 93%         | 99%         | 54%         | 54%         | 51%         |
| Speed until first disbursement (months) | 5           | 3           | 5           | 6.33        | 6.87        | 7.3         | 7.6         | 8.49        | 8.4         | 8.4         |
| Speed until project completion (months) | 20          | 15          | 25          | 27.9        | 29.66       | 30.4        | 31          | 31.8        | 32.4        | 32.9        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
| Funds Disbursed                         | 80%         | 100%        | 49%         | 100%        | 48%         | 89%         | 100%        | 100%        | 90%         | 80%         |
| Speed until first disbursement (months) | 7           | 6.5         | 6           | 8           | 9.15        | 9.85        | 9.4         | 9.34        | 8.9         | 9.8         |
| Speed until project completion (months) | 24          | 11          | 29          | 31          | 33.66       | 33.84       | 33.7        | 33.89       | 31.9        | 33.1        |
|   |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
| <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> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2006</b> |
| Funds Disbursed                         | 100%        | 49%         | 35%         | 27%         | 12%         | 38%         | 100%        | 79%         | 100%        | 57%         |
| Speed until first disbursement (months) | 16          | 17          | 5           | 12          | 11.95       | 12.05       | 13.7        | 14.58       | 13.6        | 14.6        |
| Speed until project completion (months) | 28          | 32          | 26          | 30          | 29.24       | 28.85       | 30          | 30.39       | 31          | 31.5        |

-----