

UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/10

Distr.: General

21 July 2016

Original: English



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

**Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the  
Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete  
the Ozone Layer**

Kigali, 10–14 October 2016

Item 4 of the provisional agenda of the high-level segment<sup>1</sup>

**Presentation by the Chair of the Executive  
Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the  
Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on the  
work of the Executive Committee, the Multilateral  
Fund Secretariat and the Fund's implementing  
agencies**

**REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR  
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL TO THE  
TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

**Introduction**

1. The present report covers the activities undertaken by the Executive Committee since the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties<sup>2</sup> and consists of three parts dealing with: policy matters; projects, their implementation and monitoring; and business planning, administrative and financial matters. During the reporting period, the 75<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> meetings of the Executive Committee were held in Montreal from 16 to 20 November 2015 and 9 to 13 May 2016, respectively. The reports<sup>3</sup> of those meetings are available on the Multilateral Fund's web site ([www.multilateralfund.org](http://www.multilateralfund.org)).

**Attendance**

2. The 75<sup>th</sup> meeting was attended<sup>4</sup> by Australia, Belgium, Italy, Japan, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the United States of America, representing parties not operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol (non-Article 5 parties), and by Bahrain, Brazil, the Comoros,

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro.28/1

<sup>2</sup> The terms of reference of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol (UNEP/OzL.Pro.9/12, Annex V) require the Executive Committee to report annually to the Meeting of the Parties.

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/85 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/66

<sup>4</sup> In accordance with decision XXVI/19 of the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties

Egypt, Grenada, India and the United Republic of Tanzania, representing parties operating under paragraph 1 of Article 5 (Article 5 parties). The meeting was chaired by Mr. John Thompson (United States of America), with Mr. Leslie Smith (Grenada) as Vice-Chair.

3. The 76<sup>th</sup> meeting was attended<sup>5</sup> by Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Japan, the Russian Federation and the United States of America, representing non-Article 5 parties, and by Argentina, Cameroon, China, Egypt, India, Jordan and Mexico, representing Article 5 parties. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Agustín Sánchez (Mexico), with Mr. Paul Krajnik (Austria) as Vice-Chair.

4. The 75<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> meetings were also attended by representatives of the implementing agencies, namely, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), both as implementing agency and Treasurer of the Multilateral Fund, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the World Bank, and by representatives of the Ozone Secretariat and other observers.

## I. POLICY MATTERS

5. The preparation and implementation of HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) and an HCFC production phase-out management plan (HPPMP) continued to be the focus of work at the 75<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> meetings. The HPMPs and HPPMP approved so far are listed in Annex I to the present report. Stage I of only three HPMPs<sup>6</sup> for Article 5 countries remains to be adopted.

### (i) Requests for multiple delayed or future tranches of stage I of HPMPs

6. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, in relation to business planning, the Executive Committee had noted that Article 5 countries for which multiple tranche requests had been submitted to the same meeting as a result of major delays in implementation would submit revised plans of action to take into account the reallocation of the outstanding tranches (decision 75/3). At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, submissions for tranches of stage I of the HPMPs for four countries included requests for the consideration of multiple tranches at the same time owing either to the merging of outstanding tranches because of implementation delays and the need to complete stage I, or to advanced tranche requests for low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries to enable the purchase of equipment for the efficient implementation of activities.

7. The Executive Committee urged bilateral and implementing agencies and Article 5 countries to implement approved tranches of HPMPs on time to avoid delays in the submission of future funding tranches. Bilateral and implementing agencies and Article 5 countries were requested to ensure proper planning and distribution of the tranches for stage II of HPMPs to ensure efficient equipment procurement, taking into account relevant decisions of the Executive Committee, in particular the requirement to achieve disbursement of 20 per cent of the previous tranche and to allocate to the last tranche of the stage of the HPMP in question at least 10 per cent of the total funding approved in principle for the refrigeration servicing sector.

8. The Executive Committee also decided to consider, on a case-by-case basis, any request for approval at the same meeting, of two or more tranches of a stage of an HPMP, noting the requirement for revised work and disbursement plans and agreements, and taking into account the availability of resources within the approved resource allocations for the years concerned (decision 76/16).

### (ii) Preparation of HCFC phase-out investment activities in stage II of HPMPs

9. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, after consideration of a request for project preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities for a country, the Executive Committee reiterated that future funding requests to prepare stages of HPMPs for all countries should be submitted for the purpose of

---

<sup>5</sup> In accordance with decision XXVII/13 of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Parties

<sup>6</sup> Mauritania, South Sudan and Syrian Arab Republic

developing the entire stage and include all of the activities and bilateral and implementing agencies involved, in line with decision 71/42 (decision 76/21(b)).

**(iii) Uncertainty on incremental operating cost in the foam sector**

10. During review of a few of the stage II of the HPMPs prior to the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, it had not been possible for the Secretariat to determine the incremental operating cost for reduced HFO formulations in the foam sector as small changes in the assumptions used in the calculation of such costs could have a major effect on the overall costs. Further to discussions in plenary and at an informal group, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare, for consideration at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, a document on the calculation of the incremental capital and operating costs for foam sector alternatives, providing transparency and consistency in comparing the quality of foam produced for different applications and transparency on the sources of information, and taking into account prices in different regions and the size of enterprises (decision 75/28).

11. The report presented at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>7</sup> highlighted the equipment needed, typical formulations, co-blowing agents (principally water) and the need for testing, trials and training. While some members were satisfied with the report, others felt that additional quantitative information was required. The importance of practical experience was stressed and expert consultation suggested. It was, however, pointed out that it would be difficult for an expert consultant to quantify maintenance costs as they depended on the local cost of chemicals, labour and other factors. Furthermore, a more in-depth, quantitative study would be hampered by the fact that the application-specific formulations used with alternative blowing agents were often proprietary and not disclosed, and the related costs were therefore impossible to determine. The Executive Committee took note of the report (decision 76/50).

**(iv) Incremental costs of conversion of the heat exchanger lines**

12. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, following the report of the informal group established to consider, among other issues, assessment of incremental costs of the conversion of heat-exchanger manufacturing lines that related to stage II of the HPMP for one country, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to undertake additional work on the level of incremental costs for the conversion of heat-exchanger manufacturing lines in enterprises converting to R-290 technology, and to report to the Executive Committee at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 75/43(f)).

13. After consideration of the report at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>8</sup>, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to revise the document, in time for the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting, to examine further the technical and cost implications of reducing the tube diameter of the condenser from 7 mm to 5 mm while maintaining the same evaporator and to provide further information on the estimated number of units required for each tool/equipment type when reducing the tube diameter, on the basis of a typical level of production by an enterprise in an Article 5 country (decision 76/51).

**(v) Projects to demonstrate technologies with low global-warming potential (GWP) and feasibility studies on district cooling**

14. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered 11 demonstration projects and two feasibility studies for district cooling. While the funding being requested was below the total funding of US \$10 million provided for in decision 72/40, eight additional projects were due to be considered at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting. As a result, the total amount of funding already approved, being requested at the meeting or to be requested in future (including project preparation funding and agency support costs) surpassed the amount set aside for demonstration projects. Further to discussions in plenary and at a contact group, the Executive Committee agreed to provide funding for the two feasibility studies and

<sup>7</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/58

<sup>8</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/59

two projects to demonstrate low-GWP technologies (see Part II “Non-investment activities” and “Demonstration projects” below). The Committee also allowed resubmission, to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, of five demonstration project proposals for the foam sector and three demonstration project proposals for the refrigeration and air-conditioning (RAC) manufacturing sector that had been submitted to the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting.

15. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, following discussions in a contact group, the Executive Committee approved 15 projects to demonstrate low-GWP technologies (see Part II “Demonstration projects” below) consisting of seven projects in the RAC and assembly sub-sector, five in the foam sector and three in the refrigeration servicing sector (decisions 76/22 to 76/36). Those 15 projects, plus the project preparation and the two projects approved at the 74<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> meetings, respectively, represented total funding of US \$9,883,076, which was within the envelopment of US \$10 million.

**(vi) Template for draft agreements for stage II of HPMPs**

16. Following discussion at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting on the template for draft agreements for stage II of HPMPs<sup>9</sup>, in particular clauses relating to financial completion of stage I; a penalty clause; consideration of alternatives already used in several stage I agreement; and consideration of non-in-kind technologies, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to resubmit the template for draft agreement for stage II of HPMPs for consideration at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, after taking into account both the discussion at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting and additional comments received from Executive Committee members by 31 December 2015 (decision 75/66).

17. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee approved the template for draft agreements for stage II of HPMPs<sup>10</sup> and decided to allow the flexibility to modify the agreement between a government and the Executive Committee in cases where a country was proposing total HCFC phase-out (decision 76/52).

**(vii) Finalization of the Multilateral Fund Climate Impact Indicator (MCII)**

18. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted a report on the finalization of the MCII<sup>11</sup> based on feedback received from the Executive Committee at the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting, the response from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the feedback from the World Bank in the context of its work with other multilateral development banks to harmonize greenhouse gas accounting across their investment portfolios and its work on energy subsidy reform. The Secretariat would continue to calculate the impact on the climate of investment projects in the RAC manufacturing sector using the MCII model and would apply the methodologies described in paragraph 14 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/54 for investment projects in all other manufacturing sectors (decision 75/68).

**(viii) Format for preparation of the surveys of ODS alternatives and presentation of the resulting data**

19. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered the format for the surveys of ODS alternatives<sup>12</sup>. Concerns were expressed relating to the difficulties that might be encountered when collating some of the data specified in the tabulation, timeline and sustainability of the exercise. After hearing the report of the informal group set up to discuss the matter, the Executive Committee noted the document on the format for the surveys of ODS alternatives on the understanding that information contained in part I (preparation of the surveys) and annex I (use of ODS alternatives by sector) of the document was provided for guidance purposes only. Surveys would be conducted on a voluntary basis, information would be collected where available, and the results would solely be for information

---

<sup>9</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/76

<sup>10</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/60

<sup>11</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/78

<sup>12</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/77/Rev.1

purposes. National surveys on ODS alternatives would be undertaken by Article 5 countries that had received funding from the Multilateral Fund to cover the years 2012–2015, with the assistance of the relevant bilateral or implementing agency and using the methodology and approach agreed between the country and the agency. The results of any survey would, however, be presented in accordance with part II (presentation of the results of the surveys) and annex II (data analysis tables by sector) of the document (decision 75/67).

**(ix) Sub-group on the Production Sector**

20. The Sub-group on the Production Sector met in the margins of the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting and continued deliberating on a number of matters. Based on the report of the Sub-group<sup>13</sup>, the Executive Committee noted the verification report on the HCFC production sector for China and subsequently considered and approved a tranche of the HPPMP for China with a number of conditions (decisions 75/73 and 75/74). The Sub-group also considered, but was unable to reach agreement on the technical audit of the HCFC production sector in Mexico.

21. The Sub-group was reconstituted at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting and considered the draft HCFC production sector guidelines. It made some progress and agreed to pursue consideration of the guidelines at the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**(x) Review of the operation of the Executive Committee**

22. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee took note of the analysis of the main procedures of the operation of the Executive Committee<sup>14</sup> including the roles of the Secretariat and the implementing agencies regarding their provision of advice to the Executive Committee and, where applicable, to beneficiary countries. Several concerns were raised, including the accountability of implementing agencies; countries being able to speak in order to clarify issues regarding their own projects; and the review of the present scenario of two meetings per year. Those issues would be taken into account in a document being prepared for the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting pursuant to decision 73/70(h).

23. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting when considering the findings and conclusions of that document<sup>15</sup>, several members expressed the view that the regime of two meetings per year had enabled the Committee to perform its duties, but it was important to be able to schedule a third meeting if necessary. The idea of holding virtual or e-meetings had been rejected by members following discussions at previous meetings, and the trial of a four-day meeting some years earlier had not proved satisfactory. Noting that the outcome of discussions at the meetings of the Open-ended Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties might have an impact on its workload, the Executive Committee decided to defer to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting a decision on the number, timing and agenda of meetings (decision 76/55).

## II. PROJECTS, THEIR IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

**(i) Fund achievement since inception**

24. Since 1991, 7,677 projects and activities (excluding cancelled and transferred projects) had been approved. Of the 461,248 tonnes of ODS to be eliminated once all these projects had been implemented, a total of 481,654 tonnes of ODS had already been phased out (including consumption and production). The geographical and sectoral distribution of phase-out in all approved projects and activities and funds approved since inception is shown in the table below:

	Number of projects*	Consumption ODP tonnes approved*	Consumption ODP tonnes phased-out*	Production ODP tonnes approved*	Production ODP tonnes phased out*	Funds approved* (US \$)

<sup>13</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/84

<sup>14</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/83

<sup>15</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/63

	Number of projects*	Consumption ODP tonnes approved*	Consumption ODP tonnes phased-out*	Production ODP tonnes approved*	Production ODP tonnes phased out*	Funds approved* (US \$)
<b>Region</b>						
Africa	1,832	22,331	21,683	0	0	299,575,534
Asia and Pacific	3,136	204,661	212,793	165,799	180,269	2,135,497,707
Europe	480	8,910	8,901	175	175	109,894,883
Latin America and Caribbean	1,915	39,596	38,059	19,775	19,775	561,129,679
Global	314	0	0	0	0	236,638,635
<b>Sector</b>						
Aerosol	203	27,808	27,172	0	0	93,906,778
Destruction	37	45	45	0	0	12,386,160
Fire fighting	1	0	0	0	0	53,500
Foam	1,297	68,890	69,733	0	0	444,801,024
Fumigant	378	8,370	8,125	0	0	136,858,246
Halon	148	37,943	46,559	30,381	41,958	91,005,937
Multi-sector	8	670	455	0	0	2,772,673
Other	11	1,530	1,574	0	0	17,381,709
Process agent	39	19,573	19,573	52,162	52,162	130,286,738
Phase-out plan	1,620	49,775	48,632	11,266	10,988	842,077,516
Production	76	0	0	91,940	95,111	452,154,186
Refrigeration	1,637	52,776	51,473	0	0	603,173,053
Several	2,000	753	714	0	0	405,995,211
Solvent	218	7,313	7,320	0	0	108,679,239
Sterilant	4	55	60	0	0	1,204,469
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,677</b>	<b>275,499</b>	<b>281,435</b>	<b>185,749</b>	<b>200,219</b>	<b>3,342,736,438</b>

\* Excluding cancelled and transferred projects and including agency support costs, where applicable.

25. The total funds approved by the Executive Committee since 1991 in order to achieve the phase-out of ODS amounted to US \$3,342,736,438, including US \$338,250,119 for agency support costs (excluding cancelled and transferred projects). Of the total project funds approved, the amounts allocated to, and disbursed by, each of the bilateral and implementing agencies, are indicated in the table below:

Agency	Funds approved* (US \$)	Agency support cost* (US \$)	Funds disbursed** (US \$)
Bilateral	144,630,007	13,518,110	137,296,349
UNDP	718,701,682	96,819,247	694,548,642
UNEP	265,966,782	22,773,388	226,805,985
UNIDO	749,378,799	94,996,478	693,486,203
World Bank	1,125,809,049	110,142,896	1,096,927,473
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,004,486,319</b>	<b>338,250,119</b>	<b>2,849,064,652</b>

\* As at 13 June 2016 (excluding cancelled and transferred projects)

\*\* As at 31 December 2014 (excluding cancelled and transferred projects)

## (ii) Projects and activities approved at the 75<sup>th</sup> and 76<sup>th</sup> meetings

26. During the reporting period, the Executive Committee approved a total of 295 additional projects and activities, with a planned phase-out of 1,518 ODP tonnes in the production and

consumption of controlled substances amounting to US \$156,281,223, including US \$15,777,720 for agency support costs as per the table below:

Agency	Funds approved(US \$)	Agency support cost (US \$)	Total (US \$)
Bilateral	4,951,214	596,371	5,547,585
UNDP	35,846,237	4,602,643	40,448,880
UNEP	19,487,588	1,492,234	20,979,822
UNIDO	40,321,525	4,896,691	45,218,216
World Bank	39,896,939	4,189,781	44,086,720
<b>Total</b>	<b>140,503,503</b>	<b>15,777,720</b>	<b>156,281,223</b>

### Investment projects

27. Of the total funds approved in the period under review, the Executive Committee allocated US \$106,402,468, including US \$6,881,085 for agency support costs, for the implementation of investment projects to eliminate an estimated quantity of 1,428 ODP tonnes in consumption and production of ODS.

### *HPMPs and HPPMPs*

28. During the reporting period, the Executive Committee approved tranches of stage I of HPMPs for 56 countries and the fourth tranche of stage I of the HPPMP for one country (see Part I “Sub-group on the Production Sector” above). It also approved first tranches of stage II of HPMPs for 12 countries.

29. Commitments in principle associated with stages I and II of HPMPs approved during the reporting period totalled US \$94,011,858 including support costs.

### *Demonstration projects*

30. During the reporting period, the Executive Committee approved funding in the amount of US \$9,284,946, including US \$675,951 in agency support costs for 19 projects to demonstrate low-GWP technologies in the foam, RAC manufacturing, and servicing sectors and the RAC assembly sub-sector.

### Non-investment activities

31. During the reporting period, amendments to the 2015 work programmes of UNDP<sup>16</sup>, UNEP<sup>17</sup>, UNIDO<sup>18</sup> and the World Bank<sup>19</sup> were approved (decisions 75/29 and 75/32 to 75/37). These covered: renewal of institutional strengthening projects; preparation for stage II of HPMPs and related investment activities, and stage II of an HPPMP; feasibility studies for district cooling; and surveys of alternatives to ODS.

32. The 2016 work programmes of UNDP<sup>20</sup>, UNEP<sup>21</sup>, UNIDO<sup>22</sup> and the World Bank<sup>23</sup> were also approved (decisions 76/18, 76/20 and 76/21). These covered requests for renewal of institutional

<sup>16</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/29

<sup>17</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/30

<sup>18</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/31

<sup>19</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/32

<sup>20</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/14

<sup>21</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/15

<sup>22</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/16

<sup>23</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/17

strengthening, preparation of a national survey of ODS alternatives and project preparation for investment activities in stage II of an HPMP.

**(iii) Monitoring and evaluation**

33. During the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted the 2015 consolidated project completion report<sup>24</sup>, urged bilateral and implementing agencies to submit outstanding project completion reports (PCRs) to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting and invited all those involved in the preparation and implementation of multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects to take into consideration the lessons learned from PCRs when preparing and implementing future projects (decision 75/5). By the same decision, the format of the PCR for HPMPs was approved and the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer was requested to further develop the pilot application for searching for, and extracting, information on lessons learned in PCRs so that the application covered all the PCRs, and to report back to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting.

34. Following that report at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>25</sup>, the Executive Committee urged bilateral and implementing agencies to submit to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting the backlog of PCRs for MYAs and individual projects, and, if the PCRs due were not submitted, to provide the reasons for not doing so and the schedule for submission, and urged cooperating implementing agencies to complete their portions of PCRs to allow the lead implementing agency to submit them according to the schedule. Bilateral and implementing agencies were urged to enter clear, well written and thorough lessons learned in their PCRs. The Executive Committee reiterated its invitation to all those involved in the preparation and implementation of MYAs and individual projects to take into consideration the lessons learnt from PCRs when preparing and implementing future projects (decision 76/5).

35. Having considered at its 75<sup>th</sup> meeting the MYA database report prepared pursuant to decision 74/6<sup>26</sup> and which suggested modifications to allow for the collection of the most needed data, the Executive Committee requested the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the Secretariat to work closely with bilateral and implementing agencies on implementation of decision 74/6 and to report back to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 75/6). After considering that report at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>27</sup>, the Executive Committee requested the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer to continue to implement the decision and to report again at the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 76/6).

36. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted two desk studies, one on the evaluation of HCFC phase-out projects in the RAC manufacturing sector<sup>28</sup> (decision 75/7) and the other on the evaluation of the pilot demonstration projects on ODS disposal and destruction<sup>29</sup> (decision 75/8). The Committee invited the bilateral and implementing agencies to take into account, when appropriate, the findings and recommendations of those desk studies. The Secretariat was requested to post on the Fund Secretariat's website the outcome of demonstration projects implemented to date and the key lessons learned from relevant completed projects.

37. Also at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2016<sup>30</sup>. After hearing the report of the informal group set up to discuss the matter of the final evaluation of HCFC phase-out projects in the RAC manufacturing sector and the budget, the Executive Committee approved the 2016 monitoring and evaluation work programme and a corresponding budget of US \$177,226, and approved terms of reference for phase two of the evaluation of HCFC phase-out projects in the RAC manufacturing sector (decision 75/9).

---

<sup>24</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/7

<sup>25</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/7 and Corr.1

<sup>26</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/8

<sup>27</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/8

<sup>28</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/9

<sup>29</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/10

<sup>30</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/11/Rev.2

**(iv) Progress reports as at 31 December 2014**

38. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted the consolidated progress report of the Multilateral Fund as at 31 December 2014<sup>31</sup>. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a paper for the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting to inform the Executive Committee of issues relating the recording of disbursements for activities associated with tranches of MYAs and planned completion dates of tranches (decision 75/10).

39. After considering that report<sup>32</sup>, the Executive Committee requested bilateral and implementing agencies to establish a system, where one was lacking, to ensure that they were able to confirm whether the 20 per cent disbursement threshold of a tranche had been achieved for all stage II and subsequent stages of HPMPs. The Committee also asked the bilateral and implementing agencies to report the same funding disbursement data in the tranche requests and the annual progress reports, and to indicate, when submitting the tranche requests of HPMPs, the “planned completion dates” that reflected when the activities in the tranche were expected to be completed. That was on the understanding that any change would have to be approved by the Executive Committee, and that updates to latest planned completion dates of tranches would continue to be reported in annual progress reports (decision 76/14). The Committee further noted the deletion of the MYA spreadsheets contained in the annual progress and financial report format because the information on activities and disbursements therein was also provided when reporting on the disbursement of funding tranches of the HPMPs.

40. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee also noted the progress reports of the bilateral and implementing agencies<sup>33</sup>, changed the completion dates for nine projects (decisions 75/11 to 75/15), and requested bilateral and implementing agencies to submit specific reports on several approved projects to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting (see “Status reports and reports on projects with specific requirements” below).

**(v) Evaluation of the implementation of the 2014 business plans**

41. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Committee noted the evaluation of the implementing agencies’ performance against their 2014 business plans and the fact that all the agencies had a quantitative assessment of their performance for 2014 of at least 70 on a scale of 100<sup>34</sup> (decision 75/16).

**(vi) Tranche submission delays**

42. Having considering the report on tranche submission delay<sup>35</sup> submitted to the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted that 56 of 79 tranches of MYAs due for submission had been submitted to the meeting on time and that five of those tranches had then been withdrawn following discussion with the Secretariat. There was, however, no indication that any of the countries with delayed tranches would be in non-compliance and all countries concerned were in compliance with the 2013 freeze on HCFC consumption (decision 75/4).

43. Similarly, the Executive Committee examined the report at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>36</sup>, which indicated that 52 out of 104 activities related to tranches HPMPs due for submission to that meeting had not been submitted on time and that six activities from four tranches had been withdrawn following discussions with the Secretariat. Relevant bilateral and implementing agencies, however, had indicated that the late submission of those tranches of HPMPs would have no impact, or was unlikely to have an impact, on compliance with the Montreal Protocol, apart from the case of one

---

<sup>31</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/12

<sup>32</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/11

<sup>33</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/13 to UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/17

<sup>34</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/18

<sup>35</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/6

<sup>36</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/6

country, and that there had been no indication that any of the countries concerned had been in non-compliance in 2014 with the 2013 freeze on HCFC consumption (decision 76/4).

44. At both meetings, the Secretariat was requested to send letters to the governments concerned inviting them to address outstanding issues so that tranches could be submitted by a specific deadline.

**(vii) Country programme data and prospect of compliance**

45. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered the document on country programme data and prospect of compliance<sup>37</sup>. The Executive Committee noted that 100 of the 125 country programme reports for the year 2014 had been submitted using the web-based system. A number of concerns were raised regarding the proposed revised format for the country programme reports and an informal group was established to discuss the matter. After hearing the report, the Executive Committee decided to continue using the existing country programme data format for 2015 country programme reports, but asked the Secretariat to prepare a revised format for consideration at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, taking into account the related issues raised at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Executive Committee also requested bilateral and implementing agencies to assist Article 5 countries in addressing discrepancies between country programme and Article 7 reports, while one implementing agency was requested to continue assisting three countries with steps relating to licensing and quota systems. (decision 75/17).

46. Following consideration of the document on country programme data and prospect of compliance at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting<sup>38</sup>, the Executive Committee, in decision 76/7, noted that 108 of the 138 countries that had submitted 2014 country programme data had done so using the web-based system and that 18 countries had submitted 2015 data eight weeks prior to the first meeting of the year in line with decision 74/9(b)(iv). It also noted the explanations provided by UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO on possible data discrepancies pursuant to decision 75/17(b)(ii) and the report from the agency requested to continue assisting three countries with steps relating to licensing and quota systems. That agency was requested to continue its support to two of those countries and to report to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Secretariat was requested to send letters to the governments of countries with outstanding 2014 country programme data reports urging them to submit the reports as soon as possible, noting that, without them, the relevant analyses of ODS consumption and production levels could not be undertaken. In the meantime, the Secretariat was requested to clarify the uses of HCFCs as process agents reported in Tables 9 to 11 of the document and to provide an update to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting.

47. In relation to the potential revision of the country programme data format, the Committee decided to continue using the existing country programme data report format, noting that: Section B on regulatory, administrative and supportive actions was no longer needed, although such data might be required if there were further adjustments or chemicals added; Section C on HCFC quotas issued and prices of ODS and alternatives (where available) was still relevant, although information on training and recovery, recycling and reuse was no longer needed; Section D on the status of implementation of the licence and quota system (qualitative assessment of operation of the HPMP) should continue to be provided, but other qualitative information in that section was no longer necessary. The Committee would consider revising the country programme data report format at a future meeting, on the basis of the outcome of the surveys of ODS alternatives and the discussions on the HFC amendment.

**(viii) Projects with implementation delays and for which special status reports were requested**

48. At its 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered projects with implementation delays and for which special status reports had been requested<sup>39</sup>. The Executive Committee decided that the

---

<sup>37</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/19

<sup>38</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/9

<sup>39</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/10

Secretariat and the bilateral and implementing agencies would take established actions according to the Secretariat's assessments on status reports and report on implementation delays, and notify governments and implementing agencies as required. The Committee requested submission, to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting, of implementation delay reports and additional status for certain projects and asked the Secretariat to send letters of possible cancellation for three projects if the project documents were not signed by the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting and for one project if confirmation of the establishment of a project management working group was not received by the same time. The Executive Committee also extended the completion date for three projects (decision 76/8).

#### (ix) Reports on projects with specific reporting requirements

49. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered reports on projects with specific reporting requirements<sup>40</sup>. In relation to those reports, the Committee approved the two action plans for the accelerated CFC production phase-out project and phase-out in consumption and production of CTC in India, and requested a number of actions from countries, bilateral and implementing agencies (decisions 75/18 to 75/21). This included *inter alia* requesting the Governments of China and India to undertake a study on their countries' use of CTC for feedstock applications – and in China on its production for feedstock applications – and to make the results of the studies available by the end-2018 for China and 2016 for India.

50. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee again considered projects with specific reporting requirements<sup>41</sup>. It *inter alia* approved the extension of stage I of the HPMP for the Dominican Republic, and invited bilateral and implementing agencies to share the final report of the demonstration project “Promoting low GWP refrigerants for air-conditioning sectors in high-ambient temperature countries (PRAHA)” when assisting Article 5 countries in preparing such projects in countries with high ambient temperatures (decisions 76/9 to 76/13). The Executive Committee also decided to take into account the results of the report when considering approval of the demonstration project PRAHA II, “Promoting refrigerant alternatives for countries with high ambient temperatures in West Asia”.

### III. BUSINESS PLANNING, FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

#### (i) Status of contributions and disbursements

51. As at 6 May 2016, the total income to the Multilateral Fund, including cash payments, promissory notes held, bilateral contributions, interest earned and miscellaneous income, amounted to US \$3,501,913,917, and total allocations, including provisions, amounted to US \$3,461,060,466. The balance available at 6 May 2016 therefore amounted to US \$40,853,451.

52. The yearly distribution of contributions against pledges is shown in the table below:

Year	Pledged contributions US \$	Total payments US \$	Arrears/outstanding pledges US \$
1991-1993	234,929,241	210,877,289	24,051,952
1994-1996	424,841,347	393,465,069	31,376,278
1997-1999	472,567,009	440,047,383	32,519,626
2000-2002	440,263,109	429,656,726	10,606,383
2003-2005	474,167,042	465,835,305	8,331,737
2006-2008	368,153,731	359,144,684	9,009,047
2009-2011	399,781,507	389,251,446	10,530,062
2012-2014	397,073,537	384,749,811	12,323,726
2015-2016	291,214,603	194,681,648	96,532,954
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,502,991,126</b>	<b>3,267,709,362</b>	<b>235,281,764</b>

Note: Not including any disputed contributions.

<sup>40</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/20 and Add.1

<sup>41</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/10

*Interest collected during the 2015–2017 triennium*

53. As at 6 May 2016, the total level of interest recorded in the Treasurer's accounts amounted to US 1,424,199 for the 2015–2017 triennium.

*Fixed-exchange-rate mechanism (FERM)*

54. The Treasurer informed the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting of the total amounts lost from exchange differences since the inception of the FERM, which stood at US \$4,944,772 as at 6 May 2016.

*Outstanding contributions and return of balances*

55. At its 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat, as follow-up to decision 74/3(b) on outstanding contributions, to report to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting on the feedback received from countries with outstanding contributions from one triennium or more (decision 75/1). A response was received by one country, and the Committee requested the Secretariat to continue to follow-up with the countries that had outstanding contributions and to report back to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 76/1). At both meetings it urged all parties to pay their contributions to the Multilateral Fund in full and as early as possible.

56. At both meetings, the Executive Committee also noted the return of funds and requested bilateral and implementing agencies to return, to the following meeting, balances from projects approved over two years previously and to disburse or cancel commitments not needed for completed projects and projects completed "by decision of the Executive Committee" so that those balances could also be returned to the following meeting (decisions 75/2 and 76/2).

57. After an update on the Fund balance at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, financial resources available were insufficient in relation to the funding approvals made at that meeting. To address the shortfall, the Government of China and the World Bank agreed to a delay in the disbursement of part of the funding tranche of the 2016 annual implementation programme of stage I of the HPPMP for China until sufficient resources were available. Similarly, the Treasurer delayed the transfer of funds for the Secretariat's 2018 budget. These resources were transferred by the Treasurer well in advance of the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee.

**(ii) Bilateral cooperation**

58. During the reporting period, requests by the Governments of France, Germany, Italy, Japan and the Russian Federation were approved to offset funds amounting to US \$5,547,585 for bilateral projects (decisions 75/31 and 76/19), bringing the total for bilateral cooperation since the inception of the Multilateral Fund to US \$158,148,117 (including agency fees and excluding cancelled and transferred projects), representing approximately 4.7 per cent of the funds approved.

**(iii) 2015–2017 business plan**

59. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted the update on implementation of the 2015–2017 business plan<sup>42</sup> and that several of the activities in the 2015 business plan that had not been submitted to the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting had been included in the business plans of the bilateral and implementing agencies for the year 2016 (see Section III "2016–2018 business plan", below). With respect to decision XXVI/10 by the Twenty-Sixth Meeting of the Parties requesting the Executive Committee to take action to ensure, as far as possible, that the whole of the triennial budget was committed by the end of the triennium, the Committee encouraged bilateral and implementing agencies to plan carefully the timing and value of tranches in stage II of HPMPs to reduce possible carryovers to a subsequent triennium due to the late submission of tranche requests (decision 75/3).

---

<sup>42</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/5 and Add.1

**(iv) 2016–2018 business plan**

60. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee endorsed the 2016–2018 consolidated business plan of the Multilateral Fund<sup>43</sup>, as adjusted by the Secretariat and the Executive Committee during the meeting, and by adding to the 2016 business plan the HPMPs from the 2015 business plan that had been deferred at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 75/22). Performance indicators were approved for the implementing agencies (decisions 75/23 to 75/27) and their individual business plans<sup>44</sup> were noted.

61. With regard to the business plan for Germany, the Government of Germany was requested to indicate how it would rationalize its new business plan activities in 2016 and 2017, taking into account approvals and forward commitments at the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, to ensure that the level of funding did not exceed 20 per cent of Germany's contribution for the 2015–2017 replenishment period and to report back to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 75/23).

62. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted the revised 2016–2018 business plan provided by Germany, along with an update on the status of implementation of the 2016–2018 consolidated business plan<sup>45</sup> and the reports on dialogue with national ozone units by UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO with respect to the ratings in the qualitative performance assessments, as requested in decision 75/16(b) (decision 76/3).

**(v) UNEP's Compliance assistance programme (CAP) budget for 2016**

63. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee approved the 2016 CAP budget<sup>46</sup>, in the amount of US \$9,540,000, plus agency support costs of 8 per cent, and noted both the 2016–2018 rolling strategy proposed by UNEP for its CAP and the approaches contained therein. UNEP was requested to continue to submit an annual work programme and budget for the CAP, providing detailed information on the progress of the four new activities identified in the 2016 work programme where the global funds would be used, extending the prioritization of funding between CAP budget lines so as to accommodate changing priorities and providing details on the reallocations made in its budget pursuant to decisions 47/24 and 50/26, and reporting on the current staff post levels and inform the Executive Committee of any changes thereto, particularly in respect to any increased budget allocations (decision 75/38).

**(vi) Core unit costs for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank**

64. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee approved core unit funding for 2016<sup>47</sup> for UNDP of US \$2,040,715, for UNIDO of US \$2,040,715, and for the World Bank of US \$1,725,000, noting that the World Bank's core unit operation was again below its budgeted level and that the World Bank would be returning unused balances (decision 75/39).

**(vii) Terms of reference for the review of the administrative cost regime and its core unit funding budget**

65. The Executive Committee approved the revised terms of reference for the review of the administrative cost regime, and its core unit funding budget<sup>48</sup>, for the assessment of administrative costs for the 2018–2020 triennium, as well as a one-off budget for the Secretariat to conduct the administrative cost study (decision 75/69). The report on the review of the administrative cost regime and its core unit funding budget would be considered at the first meeting in 2017, in line with decision 73/62(c).

<sup>43</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/21

<sup>44</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/22 to UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/26

<sup>45</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/5, Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1

<sup>46</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/33/Rev.1

<sup>47</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/34

<sup>48</sup> Annex XXXII of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/85

**(viii) Accounts of the Multilateral Fund**

66. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted: the final financial statements of the Multilateral Fund as at 31 December 2014<sup>49</sup>, which had been produced in accordance with International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS); feedback from the Treasurer on the bank account of the Multilateral Fund in New York, United States of America; and information on IPSAS-compatible ways of recording financial information. The Executive Committee requested the Treasurer to record in the 2015 accounts of the Multilateral Fund the differences between the implementing agencies' provisional 2014 financial statements and final 2014 statements and authorized the Treasurer to restate the 2014 expenditure balance in the 2015 accounts so that the UNIDO 2014 accounts met the IPSAS reporting requirements (decision 75/70).

67. The Executive Committee noted the reconciliation of the 2014 accounts<sup>50</sup>, the 2014 outstanding reconciling items, as well as a number of standing reconciling items, and requested the Treasurer and UNIDO to carry out a number of adjustments and related actions. UNEP was requested to submit a revised 2014 progress report to the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting with a view to completing the 2014 reconciliation of accounts exercise (decision 75/71). Following consideration of that revised progress report by UNEP<sup>51</sup>, at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting the Executive Committee requested UNEP to reconcile a number of items in the 2015 accounts (decision 76/53).

**(ix) Budgets of the Fund Secretariat**

68. At the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee noted the approved 2015, 2016, and 2017 and proposed 2018 budgets of the Fund Secretariat<sup>52</sup> and approved the staff and operational costs of the 2018 budget, based on a scenario of two meetings per year, while giving the Secretariat the option of providing an updated version at the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Secretariat was authorized to reallocate funding among budget lines in the 2015 approved budget to absorb the additional costs incurred owing to the introduction of the UMOJA system in June 2015 and the need for a higher number of meeting documents than originally estimated. The Secretariat would report back to the Executive Committee at its 77<sup>th</sup> meeting if any funding transfers exceeded the 20 per cent limit within the Chief Officer's authority (decision 75/72).

69. At the 76<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to revise the 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 budgets of the Fund Secretariat and to propose a 2019 budget, taking into consideration the outcome of the review by a United Nations classification officer of the job descriptions currently classified at the P-3 level, and to submit it to the 77<sup>th</sup> meeting (decision 76/54).

**(x) Fund Secretariat activities**

70. During the period under review, the Fund Secretariat took actions<sup>53</sup> pursuant to the decisions taken by the Executive Committee at its previous meetings, and prepared documentation and provided conference services. In addition to the documents customarily prepared for Executive Committee meetings, the Secretariat also prepared documents, *inter alia*, on the policy matters referred to above.

71. The Secretariat analysed and reviewed 351 funding requests and provided comments and recommendations for the Executive Committee's consideration. The requested level of funding for approval of US \$273,195,852, following project review, amounted to US \$230,761,571.

72. The meetings received updates on staff matters and on linkages and synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements and relevant organizations.

---

<sup>49</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/80

<sup>50</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/81

<sup>51</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/61

<sup>52</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/82

<sup>53</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/75/2 and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/76/2

## Annex I

## HPMPs AND HPPMPs APPROVED

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
<b>HCFC phase-out management plans (stage I)</b>					
Afghanistan	UNEP	8.33	398,825	51,847	450,672
	Germany		280,276	36,436	316,712
Albania	UNIDO	2.10	230,000	20,700	250,700
	UNEP		85,000	11,050	96,050
Algeria	UNIDO	14.48	1,993,331	152,731	2,146,062
Angola	UNDP	1.59	176,000	15,840	191,840
Antigua and Barbuda	UNEP	0.03	51,700	6,721	58,421
Argentina	UNIDO	83.53	9,560,542	714,843	10,275,385
	IBRD		914,612	68,596	983,208
	Italy		300,000	39,000	339,000
Armenia	UNDP	2.23	562,838	42,213	605,051
	UNEP		39,000	5,070	44,070
Bahamas	UNEP	1.68	156,900	20,397	177,297
	UNIDO		151,420	13,628	165,048
Bahrain	UNEP	23.21	470,000	61,100	531,100
	UNIDO		2,338,985	163,729	2,502,714
Bangladesh	UNDP	24.53	1,201,074	90,081	1,291,155
	UNEP		355,000	46,150	401,150
Barbados	UNEP	1.29	192,000	24,960	216,960
	UNDP		88,000	7,920	95,920
Belize	UNEP	1.03	213,500	27,755	241,255
	UNDP		66,500	5,985	72,485
Benin	UNEP	8.33	370,000	48,100	418,100
	UNIDO		260,000	19,500	279,500
Bhutan	UNEP	0.30	282,000	36,660	318,660
	UNDP		188,000	16,920	204,920
Bosnia and Herzegovina	UNIDO	6.58	953,284	69,886	1,023,170
Bolivia	Germany	2.13	94,500	12,285	106,785
	UNIDO		220,500	19,845	240,345
Botswana	UNEP	3.85	280,000	36,400	316,400
	UNIDO		280,000	19,600	299,600
Brazil	UNDP	220.30	15,326,957	1,149,522	16,476,479
	Germany		4,090,909	460,000	4,550,909
Brunei Darussalam	UNEP	2.14	183,000	23,790	206,790
	UNDP		132,000	11,880	143,880
Burkina Faso	UNEP	10.11	546,168	71,002	617,170
	UNIDO		249,900	22,491	272,391
Burundi	UNEP	2.50	172,000	22,360	194,360
	UNIDO		160,000	14,400	174,400
Cambodia	UNEP	15.00	950,000	123,500	1,073,500
	UNDP		650,000	48,750	698,750
Cameroon	UNIDO	20.50	1,182,725	88,704	1,271,429
Cape Verde	UNEP	0.09	160,000	20,800	180,800
Central African Republic	UNEP	4.20	310,000	40,300	350,300
	UNIDO		250,000	18,750	268,750
Chad	UNEP	5.63	325,000	42,250	367,250
	UNIDO		235,000	17,625	252,625

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
Chile	UNDP	22.00	1,497,966	112,347	1,610,313
	UNEP		288,489	37,504	325,993
China - Industrial, Commercial and Air Conditioning (ICR)	UNDP	3,385.83	61,000,000	4,396,900	65,396,900
China - XPS Foam	Germany		1,350,000	158,500	1,508,500
China - XPS Foam	UNIDO		48,650,000	3,512,360	52,162,360
China - PU Foam	IBRD		73,000,000	5,303,870	78,303,870
China - Room Air Conditioning (RAC)	UNIDO		75,000,000	5,432,150	80,432,150
China - Servicing Sector, including enabling	UNEP		5,240,000	586,400	5,826,400
China - Servicing Sector, including enabling	Japan		400,000	52,000	452,000
China - National Co-ordination	UNDP		360,000	27,000	387,000
China - Solvent	UNDP		5,000,000	362,500	5,362,500
Colombia	UNDP	78.91	6,721,483	504,111	7,225,594
	UNEP		100,000	13,000	113,000
Comoros	UNEP	0.05	160,000	20,800	180,800
Congo	UNEP	3.55	175,000	22,750	197,750
	UNIDO		175,000	15,750	190,750
Congo, DR	UNEP	5.80	235,000	30,550	265,550
	UNDP		240,000	21,600	261,600
Cook Islands	UNEP	0.02	99,000	12,871	111,871
Costa Rica	UNDP	18.93	1,153,523	86,514	1,240,037
Cote D'Ivoire	UNEP	22.33	905,740	109,631	1,015,371
	UNIDO		920,000	66,700	986,700
Croatia	UNIDO	8.10	871,150	65,336	936,486
	Italy		210,000	27,300	237,300
Cuba	UNDP	19.26	1,747,527	131,065	1,878,592
Djibouti	UNEP	0.24	164,500	21,385	185,885
Dominica	UNEP	0.08	164,500	21,385	185,885
Dominican Republic	UNDP	27.14	1,646,225	123,467	1,769,692
	UNEP		50,000	6,500	56,500
Ecuador	UNIDO	23.18	1,846,440	138,483	1,984,923
	UNEP		115,000	14,950	129,950
Egypt	UNIDO	174.00	2,325,415	174,406	2,499,821
	UNDP		6,195,400	469,193	6,664,593
El Salvador	UNDP	9.03	699,277	52,446	751,723
	UNEP		375,000	11,700	386,700
Equatorial Guinea	UNEP	2.20	165,000	21,450	186,450
	UNIDO		150,000	13,500	163,500
Eritrea	UNEP	0.03	84,500	10,985	95,485
	UNIDO		80,000	7,200	87,200
Ethiopia	UNEP	1.92	175,000	22,750	197,750
	UNIDO		140,000	12,600	152,600
Fiji	UNDP	2.02	189,500	17,055	206,555
	UNEP		125,500	16,316	141,816
Gabon	UNEP	10.57	290,100	37,713	327,813
	UNIDO		249,900	22,491	272,391
Gambia	UNEP	0.52	110,000	14,300	124,300
	UNIDO		100,000	9,000	109,000
Georgia	UNDP	2.33	500,900	37,568	538,468
Ghana	UNDP	26.27	1,031,311	77,348	1,108,659
	Italy		325,000	42,250	367,250
Grenada	UNEP	0.30	210,000	27,300	237,300

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
Guatemala	UNIDO	4.30	345,637	25,923	371,560
	UNEP		96,500	12,546	109,046
Guinea	UNEP	7.91	327,000	42,510	369,510
	UNIDO		320,000	24,000	344,000
Guinea-Bissau	UNEP	0.99	165,000	21,450	186,450
	UNIDO		115,000	10,350	125,350
Guyana	UNEP	0.18	18,000	2,340	20,340
	UNDP		48,000	4,320	52,320
Haiti	UNEP	1.26	182,881	23,775	206,656
	UNDP		97,119	8,741	105,860
Honduras	UNIDO	6.97	380,000	28,500	408,500
	UNEP		250,000	32,500	282,500
India	UNDP	341.77	18,438,490	1,340,694	19,779,184
	UNEP		861,600	104,776	966,376
	Germany		1,994,400	229,384	2,223,784
Indonesia	UNDP	135.00	8,901,102	667,583	9,568,685
	Australia		300,000	39,000	339,000
	IBRD		2,714,187	203,564	2,917,751
	UNIDO		777,395	58,305	835,700
Iran	UNDP	164.40	4,340,246	325,518	4,665,764
	UNEP		262,000	34,060	296,060
	UNIDO		2,506,277	187,971	2,694,248
	Germany		2,885,815	327,440	3,213,255
Iraq	UNEP	14.98	660,000	82,600	742,600
	UNIDO		520,000	39,000	559,000
Jamaica	UNDP	8.10	578,450	43,384	621,834
	UNEP		77,000	10,010	87,010
Jordan	UNIDO	25.51	2,259,217	170,824	2,430,041
	IBRD		1,070,100	79,823	1,149,923
Kenya	France	11.00	900,000	109,000	1,009,000
Kiribati	UNEP	0.02	109,000	14,171	123,171
Korea, DPR	UNIDO	20.03	890,380	62,327	952,707
Kuwait	UNEP	239.15	1,043,000	124,730	1,167,730
	UNIDO		8,861,677	638,005	9,499,682
Kyrgyzstan	UNDP	1.02	52,800	4,752	57,552
	UNEP		35,200	4,576	39,776
Lao, DPR	UNEP	0.80	235,000	30,550	265,550
	France		45,000	5,850	50,850
Lebanon	UNDP	24.51	2,495,109	187,133	2,682,242
Lesotho	Germany	1.23	280,000	36,400	316,400
Liberia	Germany	1.85	315,000	40,950	355,950
Libya	UNIDO	26.51	1,908,843	133,619	2,042,462
Macedonia, FYR	UNIDO	2.18	1,166,955	87,522	1,254,477
Madagascar	UNEP	6.00	300,000	39,000	339,000
	UNIDO		260,000	19,500	279,500
Malawi	UNEP	3.78	230,000	29,900	259,900
	UNIDO		120,000	10,800	130,800
Malaysia	UNDP	111.85	9,587,470	719,060	10,306,530
Maldives	UNEP	3.70	680,000	88,400	768,400
	UNDP		420,000	31,500	451,500
Mali	UNEP	5.20	280,000	36,400	316,400
	UNDP		280,000	21,000	301,000
Marshall Islands	UNEP	0.08	113,000	14,690	127,690
Mauritius	Germany	8.00	950,000	114,500	1,064,500

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
Mexico	UNIDO	417.30	4,412,195	330,915	4,743,110
	UNDP		13,654,016	1,024,051	14,678,067
Micronesia	UNEP	0.05	112,000	14,560	126,560
Moldova	UNDP	0.10	88,000	7,920	95,920
Mongolia	UNEP	1.00	236,000	30,680	266,680
	Japan		130,000	16,900	146,900
Montenegro	UNIDO	0.28	404,500	30,338	434,838
Morocco	UNIDO	16.77	1,286,740	96,506	1,383,246
Mozambique	UNEP	2.27	165,000	21,450	186,450
	UNIDO		150,000	13,500	163,500
Myanmar	UNEP	1.50	220,000	28,600	248,600
	UNIDO		60,000	5,400	65,400
Namibia	Germany	8.40	900,000	109,000	1,009,000
Nauru	UNEP	0.003	74,000	9,620	83,620
Nepal	UNEP	0.64	126,000	16,380	142,380
	UNDP		84,000	7,560	91,560
Nicaragua	UNEP	2.69	108,000	14,040	122,040
	UNIDO		222,000	19,980	241,980
Niger	UNIDO	5.60	285,000	21,375	306,375
	UNEP		275,000	35,750	310,750
Nigeria	UNDP	90.10	2,999,750	224,981	3,224,731
	UNIDO		1,939,080	145,431	2,084,511
Niue	UNEP	0.003	73,000	9,490	82,490
Oman	UNIDO	6.79	349,120	26,184	375,304
	UNEP		85,000	11,050	96,050
Pakistan	UNIDO	79.10	5,008,849	375,664	5,384,513
	UNEP		440,000	57,200	497,200
Palau	UNEP	0.06	120,000	15,600	135,600
Panama	UNDP	4.78	265,545	19,916	285,461
	UNEP		70,000	9,100	79,100
Papua New Guinea	Germany	3.40	1,250,000	147,500	1,397,500
Paraguay	UNEP	6.28	330,000	42,900	372,900
	UNDP		300,000	22,500	322,500
Peru	UNDP	3.74	232,671	20,940	253,611
	UNEP		50,000	6,500	56,500
Philippines	UNEP	45.00	230,000	29,900	259,900
	UNIDO		1,770,650	132,799	1,903,449
	Japan		317,350	41,256	358,606
Qatar	UNIDO	57.86	1,726,600	129,495	1,856,095
	UNEP		310,000	40,300	350,300
Region: ASP	UNEP		285,000	37,050	322,050
Rwanda	UNEP	1.44	170,000	22,100	192,100
	UNIDO		110,000	9,900	119,900
Saint Kitts and Nevis	UNEP	0.18	124,500	16,185	140,685
	UNDP		40,000	3,600	43,600
Saint Lucia	UNEP	0.38	82,650	10,745	93,395
	UNIDO		127,350	11,462	138,812
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	UNEP	0.28	345,800	44,954	390,754
	UNIDO		124,115	11,170	135,285
Samoa	UNEP	0.09	148,500	19,306	167,806
Sao Tome and Principe	UNEP	0.05	160,000	20,800	180,800
Saudi Arabia	UNIDO	703.29	12,480,171	882,206	13,362,377
	UNEP		720,800	89,289	810,089
	Japan		220,000	28,600	248,600

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
Senegal	UNIDO	12.65	505,216	37,891	543,107
	UNEP		530,000	68,300	598,300
Serbia	UNIDO	2.94	897,760	67,333	965,093
	UNEP		75,500	9,815	85,315
Seychelles	Germany	1.40	600,000	76,000	676,000
Sierra Leone	UNEP	0.58	110,000	14,300	124,300
	UNIDO		100,000	9,000	109,000
Solomon Islands	UNEP	0.67	195,000	25,351	220,351
Somalia	UNIDO	1.85	315,000	22,050	337,050
South Africa	UNIDO	176.72	6,533,556	457,349	6,990,905
Sri Lanka	UNDP	4.76	398,866	29,915	428,781
	UNEP		249,000	32,370	281,370
Sudan	UNIDO	16.15	1,456,341	108,476	1,564,817
Suriname	UNEP	0.69	104,000	13,520	117,520
	UNIDO		106,000	9,540	115,540
Swaziland	UNEP	6.19	210,000	27,300	237,300
	UNDP		667,948	50,096	718,044
Tanzania	UNEP	0.59	110,000	14,300	124,300
	UNIDO		100,000	9,000	109,000
Thailand	IBRD	234.73	22,749,072	1,592,436	24,341,508
	Japan		302,965	39,385	342,350
Timor-Leste	UNEP	0.05	164,900	21,437	186,337
	UNDP		106,800	9,612	116,412
Togo	UNEP	7.00	280,000	36,400	316,400
	UNIDO		350,000	26,250	376,250
Tonga	UNEP	0.05	127,000	16,511	143,511
Trinidad and Tobago	UNDP	17.90	1,462,733	109,705	1,572,438
Tunisia	UNIDO	10.60	1,100,195	77,014	1,177,209
	UNEP		100,000	13,000	113,000
	France		600,000	76,000	676,000
Turkey	UNIDO	507.87	14,120,090	1,026,975	15,147,065
	UNEP		103,450	13,449	116,899
Turkmenistan	UNIDO	2.38	652,050	48,904	700,954
Tuvalu	UNEP	0.03	92,000	11,960	103,960
Uganda	UNEP	0.07	84,500	10,985	95,485
	UNIDO		80,000	7,200	87,200
Uruguay	UNDP	4.18	380,004	28,500	408,504
Vanuatu	UNEP	0.10	148,500	19,306	167,806
Venezuela	UNIDO	23.16	1,772,068	132,905	1,904,973
	UNEP		122,432	15,916	138,348
Vietnam	IBRD	143.20	9,125,020	684,377	9,809,397
Yemen	UNEP	63.28	380,000	49,400	429,400
	UNIDO		410,000	28,700	438,700
Zambia	UNEP	1.70	175,000	22,750	197,750
	UNIDO		140,000	12,600	152,600
Zimbabwe	Germany	12.34	1,038,818	124,270	1,163,088
<b>HCFC phase-out management plans (stage II)</b>					
Brazil	UNDP	464.06	16,770,000	1,173,900	17,943,900
	UNIDO		11,216,697	785,169	12,001,866
	Germany		7,727,273	860,000	8,587,273
	Italy		250,000	32,500	282,500
Chile	UNDP	49.52	2,145,047	150,153	2,295,200
	UNEP		218,270	28,375	246,645
	UNIDO		1,030,700	72,149	1,102,849

Country	To be implemented by	Total phase-out ODP tonnes	Funding approved in principle (US \$)		
			Project funds	Support costs	Total
Colombia	UNDP	122.30	4,503,481	315,243	4,818,724
	UNEP		175,000	22,750	197,750
	Germany		543,000	69,730	612,730
Guyana	UNEP	1.62	242,500	31,525	274,025
	UNDP		441,500	30,906	472,406
Indonesia	UNDP	84.33	4,047,000	283,290	4,330,290
	IBRD		4,255,163	297,861	4,553,024
Kyrgyzstan	UNDP	3.08	400,000	28,000	428,000
	UNEP		312,000	40,560	352,560
Lebanon	UNDP	36.70	4,203,826	294,267	4,498,093
Mexico	UNIDO	533.60	9,899,581	692,971	10,592,552
	Germany		650,000	81,500	731,500
	Italy		458,191	59,565	517,756
	UNEP		80,000	10,400	90,400
Oman	UNIDO	5.32	285,000	19,950	304,950
	UNEP		200,000	26,000	226,000
Pakistan	UNIDO	72.98	4,776,772	334,374	5,111,146
	UNEP		503,000	65,330	568,330
Panama	UNDP	9.11	723,654	50,656	774,310
Sudan	UNIDO	31.34	2,750,729	192,551	2,943,280
Venezuela	UNIDO	64.41	1,967,144	137,700	2,104,844
	UNDP		1,326,420	92,849	1,419,269
Vietnam	IBRD	130.57	14,411,204	1,008,786	15,419,990
	Japan		233,630	30,372	264,002
<b>HCFC production phase-out management plan (stage I)</b>					
China	IBRD	3,970.00	95,000,000	5,320,000	100,320,000

-----