



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/70/55
7 June 2013

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventieth Meeting
Bangkok, 1-5 July 2013

OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (DECISION 69/25)

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 issuance of the document.

Introduction

1. At its 69th meeting, the Executive Committee considered a policy document on the operation of the Executive Committee¹ which analysed the option of holding only two Executive Committee meetings per year, taking into account the current status of policies and guidelines, the status of approvals of the HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) and the foreseen future workload of the Committee. The document outlined proposals for rescheduling the submission of tranche requests for approved stage I of HPMPs² and requests for the renewal of institutional strengthening (IS) projects, and for setting up an intersessional process to enable Executive Committee members to approve project proposals with no outstanding policy, cost or technical issues between the first and second meetings, under the current provisions for blanket approval. The document further considered the agendas of those two meetings a year in terms of the annual progress and financial reports of bilateral and implementing agencies and other potential agenda items, and revised dates for meetings under the two-meeting per year scenario.
2. During the discussion, Executive Committee members expressed their support for holding two meetings a year in 2014 on a trial basis. However, there was some concern expressed by one member about the proposed intersessional approval procedure. Potential solutions included the suggestion that, if necessary, a short meeting could be held mid-year, back-to-back with that of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) to approve projects.
3. After further discussion of the proposal to move to a two-meeting scenario without any intersessional approval procedure, Committee members felt that they did not have sufficient information on the implications of such a process for the Secretariat, the implementing agencies and the Executive Committee, and on the degree to which this approach will affect the implementation of activities to be able to conclude on the matter. Therefore the Secretariat was requested to prepare an analysis of the implications of holding only two meetings a year without any intersessional approval procedure for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 70th meeting (decision 69/25).
4. The Secretariat prepared the present document as a follow-up to decision 69/25.

Analysis of a two-meeting scenario without an intersessional approval procedure

5. In order to ensure that a two-meeting per year scenario without an intersessional approval procedure will nonetheless enable the Executive Committee to fulfil its tasks and responsibilities effectively and efficiently, and to avoid interrupting the operation of the Multilateral Fund, the dates and venues of Executive Committee meetings must be selected carefully, and the activities currently on the agenda of the second meeting must be re-scheduled appropriately.

Dates and venues of meetings

6. To the extent possible, and in accordance with the Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Executive Committee³, meetings shall take place at the seat of the Secretariat, thus facilitating the logistical arrangements for organizing and conducting the meetings cost-effectively, and also avoiding additional costs to the Fund for holding meetings outside of Montreal⁴. Due consideration should be given

¹ UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/69/36.

² As at the close of the 69th meeting, 138 countries have approved HPMPs.

³ Meetings of the Executive Committee shall take place at the seat of the Secretariat, unless other appropriate arrangements are made by the Secretariat in consultation with the Executive Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/3/11 Annex VI of Decision III/22 (Rule 3); and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/3/18/Rev.1 Annex II).

⁴ The cost of a meeting held outside Montreal depends mostly on the venue and whether there is a host Government agreement with the Secretariat covering the cost differential of having the meeting outside of Montreal. As a reference, the cost of having the 67th meeting in Bangkok (16 to 20 July 2012) as opposed to having it in Montreal amounted to an additional US \$179,576 (paragraphs 4 and 5 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/68/50).

to the timing of consecutive meetings, to allow proper planning of work by the staff of bilateral and implementing agencies, the staff of the Secretariat and all Executive Committee members. Furthermore, the timing between Executive Committee meetings and those of the OEWG and the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP) should be properly assessed, allowing sufficient preparation time for all participants attending them.

7. A particular situation occurs in the years when the Parties to the Montreal Protocol adopt the replenishment level of the Multilateral Fund. In those years, the Last meeting should take place prior to the MOP in order that the Executive Committee would be able to commit, as far as possible, the entire budget of the relevant triennium⁵. This would be the case in 2014, as it would be the last meeting of the 2012-2014 triennium.

8. Additionally, the expected level of financial resources in the Multilateral Fund⁶, and the availability of project and financial data required when bilateral and implementing agencies submit meeting documents should be taken into account when re-distributing the workload between the two meetings and determining their dates.

Tranches of stage I HPMPs and renewal of IS projects

9. Based on the above considerations, the Secretariat discussed with relevant bilateral and implementing agencies the re-scheduling of tranche requests for stage I of HPMPs for 56 Article 5 countries, and requests for IS renewals currently scheduled for submission at the second meeting of the Executive Committee.

10. The proposed redistribution of tranches agreed with the agencies, shown in Table 2 of Annex II of the present document, took into consideration the availability of resources in the Fund, and the time required for the preparation of verification reports (a component of tranche requests for non-low-volume consuming (LVC) countries⁷). As a result, the number of tranches and their associated funding levels are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of number of tranches of stage I HPMPs and their funding levels*

Description	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	>2020
First meeting								
Funding (US\$)	6,248,128	8,219,461	9,957,671	2,932,000	2,990,141	531,009	2,546,322	725,950
No. of tranches	17	29	45	14	31	6	51	6
Last meeting								
Funding (US\$)	40,314,995	57,840,422	13,749,775	3,604,697	6,179,709	279,199	1,694,419	383,850
No. of tranches	19	24	21	11	15	2	22	4

(*) Including agency supports costs.

⁵ For example, through their decision XXIII/15, the Parties inter alia requested that the Executive Committee take action to ensure, as far as possible, that the entire budget for 2012–2014 be committed by the end of 2014.

⁶ As reported in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/69/36, an analysis of the level of contributions received at the time of each Executive Committee meeting held between 2010 and 2012 shows that 5 to 8 per cent of the total pledged contributions were paid at the time of the first meeting; 30 to 50 per cent were paid at the second meeting; and 40 to 80 per cent were paid at the third meeting.

⁷ In decision 61/46(c), the Secretariat was requested to provide to the Executive Committee at the first meeting of each year, starting in 2013, a list of all countries with a HCFC consumption baseline of 360 metric tonnes and below that had an approved HPMP, and an indication of a sample of 20 per cent of countries from that list to enable the Executive Committee to approve such a sample for the purposes of verification of that country's compliance with the HPMP agreement for that year.

11. The Executive Committee may wish to note that:

- (a) The differences in the funding levels between the First and the Last meetings for the years 2014, 2015 and 2016 are associated with the tranches for stage I HPMP for China (i.e., US \$32,186,059 in 2014; US \$41,816,960 in 2015 and US \$7,764,491 in 2016);
- (b) The large number of tranches in 2016 represents the scheduled submission of last tranches (of a few LVC and several non-LVC countries) with a funding level of approximately 10 per cent of the total funding approved for stage I HPMPs; and
- (c) The large number of tranches in 2020 represents the scheduled submission of last tranches of several LVC countries with a funding level of approximately 10 per cent of the total funding approved for stage I HPMPs.

12. To further streamline the operation of the Executive Committee, the Committee may wish to consider allowing the Secretariat to submit tranche requests of HPMPs with a funding level of up to US \$5 million (including agency support costs) in the list of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval⁸, provided that they contain no policy issues and all technical and cost issues have been agreed between the Secretariat and relevant bilateral and/or implementing agencies⁹ (Table 2). The Executive Committee always has the option of removing any tranche recommended for blanket approval for its individual consideration¹⁰.

Table 2. Tranches of stage I HPMPs with funding levels of over US \$1 million

Country	Meeting	Total funding (US\$)*		
		2014	2015	2016
Brazil	Last	3,225,000	2,227,841	
China	Last	32,186,059	41,816,960	7,764,491
India	Last		1,865,393	
Islamic Republic of Iran	First		1,128,390	
Kuwait	First	3,977,887		1,505,661
Mexico	Last		1,449,982	
Saudi Arabia	Last	1,284,000	2,171,680	
South Africa	Last		1,393,499	
Thailand	Last	1,070,000	3,277,990	1,070,000
Turkey	First		2,675,000	1,710,770
Viet Nam	First		1,124,860	

(*). Including agency support costs.

13. The submission of IS renewal requests was also discussed with the implementing agencies. To ensure that there is no interruption of funding for institutional strengthening to the country, Article 5 countries are allowed to submit requests for renewal of their IS projects six months before the end of the period approved for the IS project (decision 19/29). In the event that the time between two meetings is

⁸ As per decision 66/19, tranches for stage I of HPMPs can be submitted for blanket approval provided that they are in accordance with relevant policies and decisions of the Fund; they contain no policy issues; all technical and cost issues have been agreed; and that the total requested funding for the tranche is less than US \$1 million.

⁹ At the 68th meeting, tranches of the HPMPs for Brazil, Egypt, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Mexico were submitted for individual consideration as they were all over US \$1 million, although all policy, technical and cost issues were satisfactorily addressed. Further to a presentation by the Secretariat, the four HPMPs were approved without comments from any member of the Executive Committee.

¹⁰ For example, at its 67th meeting the Executive Committee agreed to remove the second tranche request for stage I of the HPMP for Ghana from the list of blanket approval, and to present it for individual consideration, in view of the changes in the calculation of the starting point for aggregate reduction in consumption (paragraph 68 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/67/39).

more than six months, the Executive Committee may wish to allow the submission of IS renewal requests at the date of the meeting closest to the six-month requirement, on the understanding that submissions would be in line with relevant decisions.

Annual progress reports

14. The submission of bilateral and implementing agencies' annual progress reports presents a particular challenge given that complete financial data required for their preparation is only available by the end of the first quarter of the year.

15. Therefore, the consolidated progress report document could only be considered by the Executive Committee if the First meeting of the year were to take place no earlier than the last week of June, because implementing agencies receive their final financial reports only by the end of March-early April and could submit progress reports with final financial data to the Secretariat no earlier than 15 April (currently this is 1 May). This would imply that the Secretariat would have only about eight weeks to process and submit the progress reports to the Executive Committee. However, it would not be able to submit them on time (i.e., four weeks before the Executive Committee meeting). Historically the Secretariat requires at least 10 weeks prior to the Executive Committee meeting, to prepare and submit the progress report documents.

16. However, if the First meeting were to take place earlier than June, the progress reports would either have to be divided and considered at two different meetings (i.e., the operational component with estimated data submitted to the First meeting and a final progress report to include reconcilable financial data and updated status to the Last meeting).

17. In analysing the options for submission of the progress reports the Secretariat noted that:

- (a) Holding the First meeting no earlier than the second week in June sets the date of the Last meeting to no earlier than the last week of December, which would cause a timing problem in a replenishment year. Furthermore, the time available to Executive Committee members to prepare themselves for attending Executive Committee meetings and those of the OEWG and the MOP will be reduced;
- (b) Dividing the annual progress reports into two components would require the resources to input and analyse data for an additional six documents. This would imply additional workload that the Secretariat may not be able to accommodate within existing capacities and resources. If six documents are required, there would also be additional preparation for Executive Committee members, incurring additional costs for translation of those documents into all relevant UN languages. It could also imply additional submissions by the implementing agencies. Furthermore, the financial component of the annual progress report would be out of date by ten months (or more depending on the time set for the Last meeting); and
- (c) Considering the consolidated progress report at the Last meeting could overload the agenda of the meeting (in as much as both the progress report and the business plans would be considered at the same meeting); and, as previously mentioned, the financial component of the progress report would be outdated. This fact further exacerbates the issue on capacities and resources raised in sub-paragraph (b) above because there is limited time to perform the statistical analyses required to address the six documents for the progress reports plus an additional six documents for the business plans.

18. Based on the above observations and in the overall context of the Executive Committee meetings, the Secretariat concluded that dividing the annual progress reports into two components would be the best

option, on the understanding that the annual progress and financial reports would be submitted to the First meeting with estimated financial data, and to the Last meeting with final reconcilable financial data and updated status reports.

Rearrangement of other agenda items

19. Under a two-meeting-per-year scenario other agenda items would need to be rearranged as follows:

- (a) The document on status reports and compliance¹¹ would have to be submitted at the First and the Last meetings, as well as to the two meetings of the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure for the Montreal Protocol¹² as an information document but some of the status reports could be included in a two-progress report process if approved;
- (b) The business plan of the Multilateral Fund covering a three-year period (commencing with the year following the submission of the business plan) would have to be considered at the Last meeting of the year to enable bilateral and implementing agencies to start implementing their business plans from 1 January of the following year. However, since the meetings of the Parties at which the replenishment level of the Multilateral Fund is adopted needs to occur after the Last meeting of the year, the business plans would have to be revised at the First meeting of the year following the adoption of the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund by the Parties (e.g., in 2014)¹³;
- (c) The documents on the review of the implementation of business plans and the tranche submission delays would have to be submitted at the First and Last meetings¹⁴;
- (d) The consolidated project completion reports (PCR) of multi-year agreements (MYA) and the MYA database report would have to be considered at the First meeting, while the consolidated PCR report would have to be considered at the Last meeting. Desk studies and final evaluation reports that request field visits would be submitted as appropriate;
- (e) New activities in the work programmes of the implementing agencies that are not required for compliance and have not previously been considered by the Executive Committee would be submitted only at the First meeting of the following year in line with decision 60/9(b); and
- (f) The document on the provisional accounts of the Multilateral Fund (currently submitted to the second meeting) would not be prepared, and only the final accounts of the Fund would be submitted to the Last meeting.

¹¹ The document, *inter alia*, presents the status of compliance of Article 5 countries used as a guide for business planning; contains information on Article 5 countries that are subject to decisions of the Parties and recommendations of the Implementation Committee on compliance; presents data on the implementation of country programmes; presents information on projects with implementation delays and for which special status reports were requested, as well as projects with specific reporting requirements.

¹² These meetings are held back-to-back with the Open-Ended Working Group held in June-July, and the meeting of the Parties, usually held between mid-October and end-November

¹³ This will require the preparation of an additional document by each bilateral and implementing agency on their respective business plans, as well as the preparation of six additional documents by the Secretariat related to business plans for consideration by the Executive Committee.

¹⁴ Pursuant to decision 53/3(c), implementation of the business plan and tranche submission delays document is currently submitted to both the second and third meetings after the business plan is endorsed by the Executive Committee; and the document on tranche submission delays is presented separately to the current first meeting.

20. Illustrative agendas have been developed for the two-meeting scenario and are contained in Annex II to the present document.

Potential dates of the meetings

21. Based on all above considerations, the Secretariat considers that the most convenient dates for holding Executive Committee meetings are in late March/early April for the First meeting, and the late September/early October for the Last meeting. As previously mentioned, the Last meeting of the year in 2014 might be changed depending on the date of the 26th Meeting of the Parties.

Recommendations

22. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Taking note of the document on the operation of the Executive Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/70/55) prepared pursuant to decision 69/24;
- (b) Agreeing to convene two meetings of the Executive Committee in 2014 on a trial basis, on the following conditions:
 - (i) Agreement reached on the revised submission schedule of tranche requests for stage I of HPMPs of Article 5 countries between the First and the Last meetings as contained in Table 2 of Annex I of the present document;
 - (ii) Allowing:
 - a. The submission of the terminal report and the plan of future action associated with the renewals of institutional strengthening projects to the meeting immediately preceding the set date six months before the end of the previously approved period, to avoid any delay in the approval of such projects and on the understanding that they are in compliance with all relevant decisions;
 - b. The Secretariat to include tranche requests of HPMPs with a funding level of up to US \$5 million (including agency support costs) in the list of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval, provided that they contain no policy issues and all technical and cost issues have been agreed between the Secretariat and relevant bilateral and/or implementing agencies;
 - (iii) Requesting:
 - a. The submission of the business plans and tranche submission delay documents to both the First and Last meetings of the year, thus amending decision 53/3(c);
 - b. The potential submission of a revised business plan to the First meeting of the year following the year of the adoption of the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund by the Parties;

- c. Bilateral and implementing agencies to submit annual progress and financial reports ten weeks in advance to the First and Last meetings, with estimated financial data submitted to the First meeting and final financial data submitted to the Last meeting; and
- (c) Reviewing the two-meeting per year scenario at the last meeting of 2014.

Annex I

Table 1. Current schedule for submission of tranches of approved HPMPs

No.	First	Second	Third
1	Algeria	Afghanistan	Angola
2	Antigua and Barbuda	Albania	Armenia
3	Barbados	Argentina	Bahamas
4	Chile	Belize	Bahrain
5	Colombia	Benin	Bangladesh
6	Cote D'Ivoire	Bhutan	Burundi
7	Croatia	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Cameroon
8	Cuba	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Cape Verde
9	Djibouti	Brazil	China
10	Dominican Republic	Brunei Darussalam	Egypt
11	Eritrea	Burkina Faso	El Salvador
12	Ethiopia	Cambodia	Equatorial Guinea
13	Georgia	Central African Republic	Fiji
14	Guinea	Chad	Gambia
15	Haiti	Comoros	Guatemala
16	Indonesia	Congo	Iraq
17	Islamic Republic of Iran	Congo (Democratic Republic of)	Jordan
18	Kenya	Costa Rica	Malaysia
19	Kuwait	Dominica	Mauritius
20	Maldives	Ecuador	Mongolia
21	Moldova (Republic of)	Gabon	Morocco
22	Montenegro	Ghana	Nepal
23	Mozambique	Grenada	Nicaragua
24	Namibia	Guinea-Bissau	Nigeria
25	Niger	Guyana	Peru
26	Panama	Honduras	Qatar
27	Saint Kitts and Nevis	India	Saudi Arabia
28	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Jamaica	Senegal
29	Seychelles	Kyrgyzstan	Serbia
30	Tanzania (United Republic of)	Lao (Democratic People's Republic)	Sudan
31	Timor-Leste	Lebanon	Suriname
32	Turkey	Lesotho	Thailand
33	Uganda	Liberia	Uruguay
34	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic of)	Yemen
35	Viet Nam	Madagascar	Zimbabwe
36	Pacific Island Countries (12)	Malawi	
37		Mali	
38		Mexico	
39		Myanmar	
40		Oman	
41		Pakistan	
42		Papua New Guinea	
43		Paraguay	
44		Philippines	
45		Rwanda	
46		Saint Lucia	
47		Sao Tome and Principe	
48		Sierra Leone	
49		Somalia	
50		South Africa	
51		Sri Lanka	
52		Swaziland	
53		Togo	
54		Trinidad and Tobago	
55		Turkmenistan	
56		Zambia	

Table 2. Re-schedule for submission of tranches of approved HPMPs

No.	First meeting	Last meeting
1	Afghanistan	Angola
2	Albania	Argentina
3	Algeria	Armenia
4	Antigua and Barbuda	Bahamas
5	Barbados	Bahrain
6	Belize	Bangladesh
7	Benin	Brazil
8	Bhutan	Burundi
9	Bolivia	Cameroon
10	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Cape Verde
11	Brunei Darussalam	China
12	Burkina Faso	Ecuador
13	Cambodia	Egypt
14	Central African Republic	El Salvador
15	Chad	Equatorial Guinea
16	Chile	Fiji
17	Colombia	Gambia
18	Comoros	Guatemala
19	Congo	India
20	Congo (Democratic Republic of)	Indonesia
21	Costa Rica	Iraq
22	Cote D'Ivoire	Jordan
23	Croatia	Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic of)
24	Cuba	Malaysia
25	Djibouti	Mauritius
26	Dominica	Mexico
27	Dominican Republic	Mongolia
28	Eritrea	Morocco
29	Ethiopia	Nepal
30	Gabon	Nicaragua
31	Georgia	Nigeria
32	Ghana	Pakistan
33	Grenada	Papua New Guinea
34	Guinea	Peru
35	Guinea-Bissau	Philippines
36	Guyana	Qatar
37	Haiti	Saudi Arabia
38	Honduras	Senegal
39	Islamic Republic of Iran	Serbia
40	Jamaica	South Africa
41	Kenya	Sudan
42	Kuwait	Suriname
43	Kyrgyzstan	Thailand
44	Lao Democratic People's Republic	Trinidad and Tobago
45	Lebanon	Uruguay
46	Lesotho	Yemen
47	Liberia	Zimbabwe
48	Madagascar	
49	Malawi	
50	Maldives	
51	Mali	
52	Moldova	
53	Montenegro	

No.	First meeting	Last meeting
54	Mozambique	
55	Myanmar	
56	Namibia	
57	Niger	
58	Oman	
59	Panama	
60	Paraguay	
61	Rwanda	
62	Saint Kitts and Nevis	
63	Saint Lucia	
64	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	
65	Sao Tome and Principe	
66	Seychelles	
67	Sierra Leone	
68	Somalia	
69	Sri Lanka	
70	Swaziland	
71	Tanzania	
72	Timor-Leste	
73	Togo	
74	Turkey	
75	Turkmenistan	
76	Uganda	
77	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	
78	Viet Nam	
79	Zambia	
80	Pacific Island Countries (12)	

Annex II
ILLUSTRATIVE AGENDAS

Illustrative agenda of the First meeting

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Secretariat activities.
4. Status of contributions and disbursements.
5. Status of resources and planning:
 - (a) Report on balances and availability of resources;
 - (b) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan and tranche submission delays;
 - (c) Status reports and compliance.
6. Programme implementation: Monitoring and evaluation:
 - (a) Evaluation reports from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (e.g., consolidated project completion reports (PCR) of multi-year agreements (MYA), MYA database report, desk studies and final evaluation reports that request field visits);
 - (b) Progress reports as at 31 December of the previous year (operational part with estimated financial data):
 - (i) Consolidated progress report;
 - (ii) Bilateral agencies;
 - (iii) UNDP;
 - (iv) UNEP;
 - (v) UNIDO;
 - (vi) World Bank.
 - (c) Progress reports as at 31 December of the previous year (operational part with estimated financial data):
 - (i) Consolidated progress report;
 - (ii) Bilateral agencies;
 - (iii) UNDP;
 - (iv) UNEP;
 - (v) UNIDO;
 - (vi) World Bank.
7. Project proposals:
 - (a) Overview of issues identified during project review;
 - (b) Bilateral cooperation;
 - (c) Work programmes (e.g., institutional strengthening; preparation for stage II HPMPs):
 - (i) UNDP;
 - (ii) UNEP;
 - (iii) UNIDO;
 - (iv) World Bank;
 - (d) Investment projects (e.g., tranches of stage I HPMPs; a few stage II HPMPs).
8. Policy issues (documents).

9. Draft Report of the Executive Committee to the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.¹⁵
10. Report of the Production Sector Sub-group.
11. Other matters.
12. Adoption of the report.
13. Closure of the meeting.

¹⁵ This agenda item would be included if that year's Meeting of the Parties is scheduled to take place before the Last Executive Committee meeting of the year.

Illustrative agenda of the Last meeting

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (b) Organization of work.
3. Secretariat activities.
4. Status of contributions and disbursements.
5. Status of resources and planning:
 - (a) Report on balances and availability of resources;
 - (b) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan and tranche submission delays;
 - (c) Status reports and compliance.
6. 201#-201# business plans:
 - (a) Consolidated business plan of the Multilateral Fund;
 - (b) Business plans of the implementing agencies:
 - (i) Bilateral agencies;
 - (ii) UNDP;
 - (iii) UNEP;
 - (iv) UNIDO;
 - (v) World Bank.
7. Programme implementation: Monitoring and evaluation.
 - (a) Evaluation reports from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (e.g., consolidated project completion reports (PCR), desk studies and final evaluation reports that request field visits);
 - (b) Progress reports as at 31 December of the previous year (operational part with reconcilable financial data):
 - (i) Consolidated progress report;
 - (ii) Bilateral agencies;
 - (iii) UNDP;
 - (iv) UNEP;
 - (v) UNIDO;
 - (vi) World Bank.

 - (b) Draft Monitoring and Evaluation work programme for the year 201#.
8. Project proposals:
 - (a) Overview of issues identified during project review;
 - (b) Bilateral cooperation;
 - (c) Amendments to work programmes (e.g., IS; project preparation; UNEP CAP; core unit costs):
 - (i) UNDP;
 - (ii) UNEP;
 - (iii) UNIDO;
 - (iv) World Bank;
 - (d) Investment projects (e.g., tranches of stage I HPMPs; a few stage II HPMPs).
9. Policy issues (documents).
10. Accounts of the Multilateral Fund:
 - (a) Final 201# accounts;

- (b) Reconciliation of the accounts.
- 11. Revised 201#, 201# and 201# budgets of the Fund Secretariat.
- 12. Draft Report of the Executive Committee to the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.¹⁶
- 13. Report of the Production Sector Sub-group.
- 14. Other matters.
- 15. Adoption of the report.
- 16. Closure of the meeting.

¹⁶ This agenda item will be included if that year's Meeting of the Parties is scheduled to take place following the last Executive Committee meeting of the year.