



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12*
15 April 2014



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventy-second Meeting
Montreal, 12-16 May 2014

OVERVIEW OF ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING PROJECT REVIEW

Introduction

1. This document consists of the following sections:
 - (a) An analysis of the number of projects and activities submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies to the 72nd meeting;
 - (b) Issues identified during the project review process;
 - (i) Submission of verification reports under a two-meeting regime;
 - (ii) Clarification on the application of a new support cost regime for HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) approved at the 66th meeting;
 - (iii) ODS disposal demonstration projects withdrawn;
 - (iv) Verifications for low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries in 2014;
 - (v) Submission of stage II of an HPMP with stage I currently ongoing; and
 - (vi) Fund disbursement threshold for tranches of HPMPs.
 - (c) Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval; and
 - (d) Investment projects for individual consideration.

Projects and activities submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies

2. Bilateral and implementing agencies submitted 141 funding requests for tranches of approved multi-year agreements, projects and activities, amounting to US \$68,570,209, including agency support costs where applicable. The funding requests covered:

* Reissued for technical reasons on 22 April 2014

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.

- (a) Two stage I of HPMPs for non-LVC countries and one stage II of the HPMP for a non-LVC;
- (b) Second/third/fifth tranches of approved HPMPs for 16 countries;
- (c) Second tranche of an approved HCFC production phase-out management plan (HPPMP);
- (d) Two tranches of approved methyl bromide (MB) phase-out projects; and one tranche of approved MB production phase-out project;
- (e) Requests for renewals of institutional strengthening (IS) projects in 23 countries;
- (f) Pilot demonstration projects on ODS waste management and disposal in three countries and one region;
- (g) Project preparation for stage II of the HPMP/HCFC phase-out investment activities for 19 countries, and project preparation for MB in one country; and,
- (h) Activities for HCFC demonstration (two countries, two regional and one global); and technical assistance for MB in one region.

3. Following the project review process, 103 projects and activities totalling US \$9,566,730 including support costs are recommended for blanket approval and 21 projects and activities associated with two ODS disposal demonstration projects, one new stage I HPMP, one new stage II HPMP, tranches of HPMPs for three countries, one tranche of HPPMP and one tranche of MB production totalling US \$36,530,241 are being forwarded for individual consideration by the Executive Committee. Together, the projects for blanket approval and those for individual consideration, represent a total amount of US \$46,096,971 in funding being requested at this meeting.

Projects and activities withdrawn

4. A number of projects at a total cost of US \$9,531,480 as originally submitted were withdrawn by relevant agencies for different reasons. Two of these projects included the HPMP for Brazil (third tranche) and the HPMP for Libya.

HPMP for Brazil (third tranche)

5. The third tranche of stage I of the HPMP for Brazil at a total cost of US \$3,000,000 (excluding agency support costs), was withdrawn by UNDP since the level of disbursement of the previous tranche was below 20 per cent. In responding to additional concerns from the Secretariat on the low level of implementation, UNDP informed that the low level of disbursement was partially related to initial administrative issues that have since been resolved; and contracts have been signed with most large enterprises, who are undertaking significant efforts to evaluate performance of several technologies. Once decisions on technology have been taken, associated plant adaptations and equipment procurement would start in an expedited way.

HPMP for Libya

6. Stage I of the HPMP for Libya, at a total cost of US \$3,706,361 (excluding agency support costs) as originally submitted, was withdrawn by UNIDO as the country has not established an operational licensing and quota system for HCFCs. During the project review process issues related to the consumption data were identified and are still under discussion. In withdrawing the submission, UNIDO indicated that it has done all the efforts to assist and encourage the country to establish the licensing system since the approval of the preparatory funding for the HPMP in July 2008. A factor that affected

the process was the civil war in 2011, which caused political changes. Despite this, UNIDO finalized the HPMP and considered that the licensing and quota system was in place. As this issue was further analyzed, UNIDO agreed to continue assisting the country to establish the licensing and quota system and submit the HPMP to the 73rd meeting.

Review of requests for PRP funding for stage II of HPMPs submitted to the 72nd meeting

7. The Secretariat received requests for funding for the preparation of stage II of the HPMPs for 19 countries. These consisted of requests for the preparation of the overarching strategy, and for project preparation for investment projects in various sectors.

8. The Secretariat reviewed these requests in line with decision 71/42, guidelines for funding the preparation of stage II of the HPMPs. In considering the submissions, the Secretariat scrutinized the details provided in each proposal taking into account the information requirements contained in the guidelines. It noted especially the following: that stage I of the HPMP for the country requesting funding had demonstrated substantial progress in implementation; that each proposal contained the activities planned for stage II with the corresponding costs; that explanations were provided for additional project preparation funding requested in sectors which had been considered in stage I; that official transmittal letters were received from Governments of the respective countries that specified agency roles, where multiple agencies were assisting; and whether the request was eligible based on the timing of submission. Detailed comments on each submission were sent to the lead agencies responsible for the HPMPs.

9. In order to undertake a thorough analysis of the proposals and to evaluate the responses provided by the bilateral and implementing agencies, the Secretariat examined the stage I of the HPMP documents as approved by the Executive Committee, as well as the subsequent tranches submitted and approved. Overall, the review process for the stage II preparation funding required the Secretariat to peruse over fifty documents in order to come to a comprehensive recommendation for each request. In addition, during the review process, several discussions were held with the agencies in order to further clarify outstanding issues raised in the review.

10. The Secretariat further noted that the format of the submitted proposals varied depending on the responsible bilateral or implementing agency despite the availability of a guide on how to prepare requests for project preparation developed by the Secretariat and distributed to the implementing agencies at the Inter-agency coordination meeting held in Montreal on 11 to 13 February 2014. Implementing agencies are encouraged to ensure that future submissions are in line with the guide.

Retrofitting refrigeration equipment with hydrocarbons

11. The Secretariat received additional information about activities pertaining to retrofits of existing refrigeration equipment to hydrocarbon (HC) technology (retrofit to HC). This information is provided to the Executive Committee to advise about related recent developments. These activities seem to be concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean, mostly performed outside the activities of the HPMP. However, in some cases implementation reports include HPMP activities related to the retrofit to HC. In the majority of cases, these activities were linked to the training component where training for service technicians included technical information on how to retrofit HCFC-based equipment to alternative technologies, many of which are flammable. In others, proposals to retrofit HCFC-based equipment to HCs were submitted.

12. For example, the third tranche of the stage I of the HPMP for Ghana submitted to the 72nd meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/27), indicated that the retrofit of air conditioners to HC technology has been institutionalized in the country. A limited number of workshops licensed for this type of conversion undertake the retrofits on their premises, with their operations supervised by a national authority. The conversions are carried out according to existing European refrigeration standards to

ensure subsequent safe operation of the equipment, and are followed by strict quality control procedures. The equipment owner is made aware of the restrictions in operating the equipment, that the refrigerant used during conversion will be a flammable substance and thus requires stricter safety considerations in its operation, and that servicing is to be provided solely by one of the licensed workshops. By signing a document, the owner accepts the information and conditions provided. This approach appears to respond to an existing demand in the market for retrofitting equipment to HC, and fully takes into account worker safety, quality control, necessary tools and equipment, as well as safety and owner information. A national authority is responsible for certification and enforcement of the application of relevant standards in these workshops. Liability issues are clarified through full disclosure of information to the different stakeholders as well as a strict adherence to procedures that have been put in place to safeguard such operations.

Issues identified during project review

Submission of verification reports under a two-meetings regime

13. One of the pre-conditions for approval of funding future tranches of HPMPs under the Agreements between Article 5 countries and the Executive Committee is the submission of an independent verification report stating that the consumption targets have been met. This pre-condition is applicable to all non-LVC countries and to a selection of 20 per cent of approved HPMPs in LVC countries each year in line with decision 61/46(c).

14. In a three meetings regime, for tranches submitted to the first meeting of the year taking place before 1 May, the due date for the submission of country programme implementation reports, verifications would have to cover the year before the precedent year; while for tranches submitted to the second or third meetings of the year, the verification would have to cover the immediate precedent year.

15. Implementing agencies informed the Secretariat during the Inter-agency coordination meeting that as tranche submissions for the 72nd meeting were due in March, official data from countries on their HCFC consumption would not yet be available therefore making it very difficult to include the verification of the 2013 consumption in the submission. The Secretariat acknowledged that some difficulties may be encountered with this requirement due to timing issues, but also considered that almost all countries have operational licensing and quota systems in place, in some cases even on-line. Therefore, it should be possible to undertake the verification exercise in February. Taking note of the concerns expressed by the implementing agencies it was agreed that if final verification reports cannot be completed at the due date for submission of tranches for the 72nd meeting, interim data would be accepted on an exceptional basis, and that the Secretariat will exercise flexibility and allow extended deadlines for submission of the final verification reports only.

16. A total of seven requests of tranches of HPMPs requiring verification reports have been submitted to the 72nd meeting: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Ghana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya and Saudi Arabia. Out of these, three submitted final verification reports (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ghana and Kenya), one submitted an interim verification (Islamic Republic of Iran), and three informed that these will be submitted prior to the 72nd meeting (Colombia and Saudi Arabia) or after the meeting (Afghanistan). These three countries however provided preliminary data showing that the consumption in 2013 was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the maximum allowable consumption established in the Agreement.

17. For the latter three cases, the Secretariat recommended in their respective project evaluation documents that the Executive Committee may consider approving the funding for the tranches, on the understanding that the approved funds will not be transferred to the implementing agency(ies) until the Secretariat has received a verification report confirming that in 2013 the country was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between the Government and the Executive Committee.

18. For future cases, the Executive Committee may wish to encourage lead implementing agencies submitting HPMP tranche requests to the first meeting of the year, to include a verification report for the year immediately preceding that year at the time the tranche is being submitted.

Clarification on application of new administrative cost regime for HPMPs approved at the 66th meeting

19. A number of HPMPs were approved at the 66th meeting, among them the HPMPs for Bosnia and Herzegovina and Guinea. At the same meeting before considering these HPMPs, the Executive Committee discussed options for an administrative cost regime for the 2012-2014 triennium. In decision 66/17, the Executive Committee decided to reconsider the administrative cost at its 67th meeting, and, in sub-paragraph (c) of the decision, to apply the existing administrative cost regime to the first tranche of agreements approved at the 66th meeting and to reconsider the agency fee for subsequent tranches at the 67th meeting. The Agreements, between the Governments of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Guinea and the Executive Committee, calculated the agency support costs according to the administrative cost regime in place at the 66th meeting, as reflected in Appendix 2-A. At the 67th meeting, new agency support costs were approved by decision 67/15, reducing, *inter alia*, the agency support costs from 7.5 per cent to 7 per cent.

20. In the case of Guinea, the HPMP tranche was submitted for consideration at the 72nd meeting. Noting that no funding is being requested by UNIDO at this meeting and its next tranche is not scheduled until 2016, and as the administrative cost regime will be further reviewed at the 74th meeting (decision 67/15(c)), the Secretariat agreed not to adjust the support cost for UNIDO in the Agreement at this meeting. The Agreement will thus be adjusted when the second tranche for UNIDO is submitted in 2016.

21. The Secretariat is of the opinion that the new agency support costs regime would be applicable for future tranches of the HPMPs approved at the 66th meeting based on decision 66/17(c). Moreover, the HPMP tranches approved at the 66th meeting included a revision to the Agreement to apply the support cost regime in line with decision 67/15. UNIDO was of the opinion that HPMPs approved at the 67th meeting maintain the same support costs in place at the time of approval, including all future tranches as the Executive Committee had not taken a specific decision at the 67th meeting requiring this change. The Secretariat and UNIDO agreed to advise the Executive Committee accordingly of the different interpretations and seek guidance.

22. The Executive Committee may consider whether to:

- (a) Apply the new support cost in line with decision 67/15 for the second and subsequent tranches of HPMPs approved at the 66th meeting;

OR

- (b) Apply the support cost in place at the time of the approval of these HPMPs at the 66th meeting as indicated in Appendix 2-A of the respective Agreements.

ODS disposal demonstration projects withdrawn from submission to the 72nd meeting

23. One ODS waste disposal demonstration project proposal for Lebanon and one regional ODS destruction for some countries in Asia and the Pacific have been submitted by UNIDO and Japan respectively. During the project review process, the Secretariat addressed a number of technical and cost-related issues with the relevant agencies. However, the following issues could not be resolved: the proposals have not met some of the criteria for an ODS disposal demonstration project set in decision 58/19 (i.e., interim guidelines for pilot ODS disposal projects), such as demonstrating that credible collection programmes are at an advanced stage of set up and to which activities under these projects

would relate; sources of ODS from end-of-life equipment and collection activities related to these sources; lack of a sustainable business model to ensure sustainability of the projects; potential for exporting ODS waste for destruction; and lack of a comprehensive strategy that would support the regional approach for the project in Asia and the Pacific. Accordingly, the agencies were requested to withdraw the project proposals as these could not be recommended for approval due to the issues identified.

24. Given these circumstances, the Secretariat recognized that in light of decision 69/5(i), where the Executive Committee decided to allow the submission of ODS destruction projects where project preparation had already been approved in accordance with the approved guidelines no later than the 72nd meeting, this would be the last opportunity for both agencies to submit these projects for the consideration of the Executive Committee. The Secretariat also acknowledged that given additional time, these issues may be satisfactorily addressed by the agencies, noting that US \$115,000 had been approved for their preparation.

25. In light of decision 69/5(i), the Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To consider whether or not to allow, on an exceptional basis, the pilot demonstration project for ODS disposal in Lebanon for implementation by UNIDO, and the regional ODS waste management project for Asia and the Pacific for implementation by the Government of Japan to be resubmitted to the 73rd meeting on the following conditions:
 - (i) That the resubmitted proposals met all of the criteria in the ODS destruction guidelines as established in decision 58/19 to the fullest extent;
 - (ii) That exporting ODS for destruction be included as an option within the proposal; and
- (b) To request the Secretariat to refrain from submitting these project proposals to the 73rd meeting if the conditions in sub-paragraph (a) above are not fully met.

Verification reports for LVCs

26. In its decision 61/46(c), the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to provide the Executive Committee at the first meeting of each year, starting in 2013, with a list of all countries with an HCFC consumption baseline of 360 metric tonnes (mt) and below that had an approved HPMP, and an indicative 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.

27. In line with decision 61/46(c), the list of the 86 Article 5 countries with a baseline consumption below 360 mt is contained in Annex I to the present document. From the list, the Secretariat selected a sample of 17 countries, as listed in Table 1 below, for the purpose of verifying compliance with the HPMP agreement, using the following criteria:

- (a) Geographical distribution of the countries (five in Africa, five in Asia and the Pacific, two in Europe and Central Asia and five in Latin America and the Caribbean);
- (b) Level of HCFC consumption among countries (i.e., seven countries with an HCFC consumption baseline below 100 mt; five countries with a consumption baseline between 101 and 200 mt, and five countries with a consumption baseline over 200 mt);
- (c) Countries with HCFC consumption only in the servicing sector (10) and also countries

with consumption in the manufacturing sector (7); and

- (d) Participation of most relevant bilateral and implementing agencies (three for Germany, nine for UNEP, three for UNDP and two for UNIDO).

Table 1. Sample of Article 5 countries for verification of compliance with their HPMP agreement

No.	Country	Baseline (mt)	Lead agency	Cooperating agency
1	Angola	290.00	UNDP	
2	Armenia	126.69	UNDP	UNEP
3	Bhutan	5.62	UNEP	UNDP
4	Burundi	129.20	UNEP	UNIDO
5	Cambodia	272.21	UNEP	UNDP
6	Chad	292.70	UNEP	UNIDO
7	Guatemala	143.79	UNIDO	UNEP
8	Haiti	66.00	UNEP	UNDP
9	Honduras	344.65	UNIDO	UNEP
10	Lesotho	62.68	Germany	
11	Maldives	76.47	UNEP	UNDP
12	Myanmar	77.80	UNEP	UNIDO
13	Namibia	149.76	Germany	
14	Nicaragua	118.36	UNEP	UNIDO
15	Papua New Guinea	58.71	Germany	
16	Paraguay	333.06	UNEP	UNDP
17	Republic of Moldova (the)	17.00	UNDP	

28. During the implementation of the terminal phase-out management plans (TPMP), funding of US \$30,000 plus agency support costs was approved for verification reports. On this basis, the Executive Committee might wish to request relevant bilateral and implementing agencies to include in their respective amendments to the work programmes for submission to the 73rd meeting, funding for verification reports for stage I of the HPMPs for the Article 5 countries listed in Table 1.

Submission of stage II of an HPMP with stage I currently ongoing

29. In the context of the discussion on the criteria for funding HCFC phase-out in the consumption sector for stage II of HPMPs, the Executive Committee decided to allow countries to submit stage II of HPMPs following existing guidelines in the absence of a decision on the criteria of funding (decision 70/21(e)).

30. UNIDO, on behalf of the Government of Mexico, submitted to the 72nd meeting stage II of the HPMP for Mexico. While the discussions on technical and cost issues were completed as reflected in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/72/33, the Secretariat was unable to produce a draft Agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Executive Committee as a number of questions arising from the transition among stages could not be resolved.

31. Stage II of the HPMP for Mexico, and future stage II for other countries will be approved at a time when stage I is still ongoing. In the case of Mexico, the first tranche of stage II could be approved before the last two tranches of stage I are approved. In addition, for the year 2018, the consumption target and the penalty clause agreed under stage II (reduction of 35 per cent of the baseline) is lower than that agreed in stage I (30 per cent).

32. This could also happen in other HPMPs with overlapping stages as additional activities in the new stage will generate additional reductions.

33. In preparing versions of joint and separated Agreements to compare, the Secretariat noted that before deciding on the Agreement format, there are several issues that would need to be resolved. For example:

- (a) The overall HPMP might take up to 25 years to implement (2040). In the view of the Secretariat and based on experience with the interface between different HPMP tranches as well as between national phase-out plan (NPP)/TPMP and HPMP, failing to clearly separate the different stages in terms of activities and funding could lead to a single project with no clear accountability for expenditures versus activities until after all activities of the overall HPMP are completed. It is also the Secretariat's view that this should be avoided to ensure appropriate oversight and fund management. Thus, it would be preferable to have differentiated monitoring and accountability for stages, as each one of them has specific funding directly associated with specific activities and HCFC reduction targets for a clearly defined implementation period;
- (b) In order to ensure this, it is necessary to define a common understanding when each stage can be determined as completed, how the different activities will be accounted for, and how the provisos in the agreement for completion may be fulfilled (i.e. project completion reports, return of balances from ongoing and new stages). In the case of stage I, clause 7(e) of the Agreement indicates that any remaining funds will be returned to the Multilateral Fund, without specifying the actual date when the funds will be returned. Furthermore, the actual date of completion of stage I is unclear. For instance, in the case of Mexico the last tranche takes place in 2015 but the last compliance target is in 2018, which could only be verified in 2019;
- (c) While for specific sector activities a possible date of completion could be established based on period of implementation (i.e., a number of years after approval of each tranche), for recurrent activities such as the project monitoring units and some technical assistance activities in the refrigeration servicing sector, this completion date is more difficult to establish, but should be established as the funding approved under the stage is associated to specific costing; and
- (d) Since a methodology exists to calculate the penalty clause based on the cost effectiveness, having two overlapping stages two different penalty levels would exist, and so would be two different levels of maximum allowable consumption, like in the case of Mexico for 2018. Therefore a consistent way to establish the penalty clause would also need to be determined.

34. In order to address these questions it is necessary to have a common understanding on whether stages of an HPMP should be seen from the financial perspective as separate entities or part of a long plan, as this understanding will determine the modality of monitoring required. Guidance on transition from stage I to stage II is timely as funding to prepare stage II of the HPMPs will be considered at the present meeting.

35. Possible options (not mutually exclusive) so far considered are listed below:

- (a) Maintaining the status quo for stage I using the current agreement, and developing a new agreement for stage II separated from stage I. The new agreement will need adjustments to reflect updated target for 2018, penalty clause, and time of completion of stage I;

- (b) Preparing a joint agreement for the HPMP for Mexico including specific clauses related to the transition from stage I to stage II and monitoring of ongoing activities under stage I and stage II, with a view to returning any remaining funding from stage I to the Multilateral Fund;
- (c) Requesting implementing agencies that will start preparing stages II of the HPMP to include in the submission of the HPMP document a plan for closure of ongoing tranches already approved under stage I including date of completion of activities associated with the tranches and any balance return, and to integrate outstanding tranches from stage I into stage II into a new agreement that will replace the stage I agreement; and
- (d) Establishing that stages of HPMPs should be monitored separately and including specific conditions for funding stage II subject to completion of stage I.

36. The Executive Committee may wish:

- (a) To provide guidance on the submission of an Agreement of stage II of the HPMP between an Article 5 country and the Executive Committee when stage I is currently ongoing considering the options proposed in the current document, or request the Secretariat to further develop other options; and
- (b) To provide guidance on finalization of the Agreement between the Government of Mexico and the Executive Committee for stage II of the HPMP for Mexico.

Fund disbursement threshold for tranches of HPMPs

Background

37. During the 71st meeting, the Executive Committee recalled that the main reason for tranche submission delays was the inability of Article 5 countries to meet the required 20 per cent disbursement threshold for the previous tranche of the HPMP. The Executive Committee decided to request the Secretariat to review the application of the 20 per cent disbursement threshold provision for the 72nd meeting with a view to clarifying and ensuring its consistent application, and to enable consideration of alternative options for defining pre-conditions for submission of multi-year agreement (MYA) tranches (decision 71/29).

Application of the threshold

38. All agreements specify that at the scheduled tranche submission date (eight or 14 weeks before an Executive Committee meeting), the rate of disbursement of funding available from the previously approved tranche has to be more than 20 per cent. In order to ensure consistent application on the 20 per cent disbursement threshold (as requested in decision 71/29), the Secretariat reviewed tranches submitted to the 72nd meeting as indicated in the Agreement between the country concerned and the Executive Committee.

Assessment of options

39. During the Inter-agency coordination meeting, the Secretariat discussed this issue with the implementing agencies, and they were invited to provide information about the implementation challenges related to meeting the 20 per cent disbursement threshold, the potential options for the modification of this disbursement threshold, and reasons for additional funding when only 20 per cent (or even less) of previous tranches have been disbursed.

40. In addressing these issues, the implementing agencies emphasized that any new approach to calculate a minimum disbursement threshold should take into account that activities could be funded from various tranches and would not need to be associated with a specific tranche. One modality proposed by an implementing agency was to use a threshold of 20 per cent for the aggregated disbursements of all previous tranches, while another agency suggested to consider, *inter alia*, the amount of time between tranche approvals, allowing differentiation between tranche implementation periods. Such an approach would lead to a set of increasing targets for minimum disbursement over the years of implementation. The resulting minimum disbursement figures for each previous tranche would then be aggregated to a combined minimum disbursement figure for all previous tranches, against which the submission would be assessed.

41. The Secretariat noted that the objective of any new modality would be to provide a continued incentive to accelerate the implementation of activities in the HPMPs, to limit the accumulation of large, unused balances with the agencies, and to minimize challenges to countries solely caused by the 20 per cent disbursement threshold.

42. The Secretariat analysed past HPMP tranche disbursements over the years of implementation, based on the progress report as at December 2012, and noted that the majority of them were related to first tranches, and very few second or later tranches. The Secretariat applied the current modality as well as those proposed by implementing agencies to this model, to understand how these proposed modalities would change the tranche approvals.

43. This analysis showed that principally, a minimum threshold of 20 per cent of disbursement would meet the above objectives in the majority of cases. However, there were challenges in cases where the implementation period between tranches is shorter than 12 months particularly if the modality for implementation of investment activities is based on the requirement that contracts be signed with a substantial number of enterprises. Depending on the specific implementation modality used, reaching the disbursement level of 20 per cent might require the signing of contracts for 80 per cent or more of the approved amount and disbursing initial payment within less than a year. For these specific cases, the threshold of 20 per cent disbursement may pose a barrier to submission of future tranches.

44. The proposal of an averaged threshold of 20 per cent of aggregated disbursement of all approved tranches versus aggregated tranche approvals would be more difficult to achieve than the current existing threshold. Furthermore, it does not seem to provide advantages over the current modality. Delays related to start-up of activities under an HPMP, such as signing of agreements, would lead to not meeting the threshold for either modality, therefore this does not offer a better option.

45. While the second modality proposed appears to provide a more tailored and equitable approach to tranche approval, the Secretariat encountered difficulties in identifying possible thresholds for the different years of implementation. Due to the delayed implementation of the first tranche almost across all HPMPs, disbursements for the initial years were extremely low that the Secretariat could not provide a set of meaningful thresholds. Disbursement data for second and subsequent tranches were insufficient to allow for a comparison. The 2013 progress reports would be available by the last meeting of 2014, by which time data availability will improve, and more modelling could be undertaken to eliminate the effects presumed to be particular to the first tranches. Only then it can be ascertained whether a modality as suggested would represent an improvement over the current modality

Conclusion

46. The Secretariat concluded that the current system requiring a 20 per cent disbursement threshold should be maintained as a requirement for the approval of future tranches of the HPMP. The Secretariat will also continue to assess this modality and will provide the Executive Committee with updated information as soon as it is available.

Recommendation

47. The Executive Committee may wish to:

- (a) Request the Secretariat to continue using the 20 per cent disbursement threshold as a requirement for the approval of future tranches of the HPMP; and
- (b) Request the Secretariat to continue assessing different modalities for fund disbursement threshold for HPMPs and inform the Executive Committee on the results of this analysis no later than the last meeting of 2015.

Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval

48. Annex I to this document lists 103 projects and activities totalling US \$9,566,730 including support costs that are recommended for blanket approval. The approval of these projects by the Executive Committee would include the relevant conditions or provisions in the corresponding project evaluation sheets as well as the approval of implementation programmes associated with the relevant tranches of multi-year projects.

Investment projects for individual consideration

49. Projects/activities submitted by eight countries, totalling US \$36,530,241 including support costs after the review by the Secretariat, are proposed for individual consideration.

50. To facilitate the Executive Committee's consideration of the projects submitted for individual consideration, the Secretariat has classified the projects by sector, and has grouped them according to the issues, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Projects submitted for individual consideration

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
ODS Disposal				
Algeria	Pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	UNIDO	72/19	All technical and cost issues resolved
Brazil	Pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	UNIDO	72/23	All technical and cost issues resolved
Methyl Bromide production sector				
China	Sector plan for the phase out of methyl bromide production (phase IV)	UNIDO	72/24	Balances from previous tranches, duplicative activities and not related to the production sector, and closure/return of balances
HPMPs tranches request				
Bosnia and Herzegovina	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNIDO	72/22	Non-compliance with HCFC consumption in 2013
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche)	UNDP/UNIDO	72/29	Changes in the foam component, HCFC verification
Saudi Arabia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNIDO/UNEP	72/34	NPP verification, HCFC verification
HPMPs stage I				
Tunisia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNIDO	72/36	All technical and cost issues have been resolved
HPMPs stage II				
Mexico	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II, first tranche)	UNIDO/Germany/Italy/UNEP	72/33	Overlap between stages I and II

Annex I

LIST OF LVC COUNTRIES WITH AN APPROVED STAGE I HPMP

No.	Country	Baseline (mt)	Lead	Cooperating
1	Albania	107.31	UNIDO	UNEP
2	Angola	290.00	UNDP	
3	Antigua and Barbuda	5.51	UNEP	
4	Armenia	126.69	UNDP	UNEP
5	Bahamas (the)	87.55	UNEP	UNIDO
6	Barbados	66.73	UNEP	UNDP
7	Belize	49.86	UNEP	UNDP
8	Bhutan	5.62	UNEP	UNDP
9	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	102.15	Germany	UNDP
10	Bosnia and Herzegovina	70.65	UNIDO	
11	Brunei Darussalam	110.62	UNEP	UNDP
12	Burundi	129.20	UNEP	UNIDO
13	Cambodia	272.21	UNEP	UNDP
14	Cape Verde	18.50	UNEP	
15	Central African Republic	217.94	UNEP	UNIDO
16	Chad	292.70	UNEP	UNIDO
17	Comoros (the)	2.48	UNEP	
18	Congo (the)	160.65	UNEP	UNIDO
19	Cook Islands (the)	0.86	UNEP	
20	Costa Rica	224.94	UNDP	
21	Croatia	72.73	UNIDO	Italy
22	Cuba	283.62	UNDP	
23	Djibouti	11.73	UNEP	
24	Dominica	7.24	UNEP	
25	El Salvador	186.51	UNDP	UNEP
26	Equatorial Guinea	114.36	UNEP	UNIDO
27	Eritrea	19.71	UNEP	UNIDO
28	Ethiopia	100.00	UNEP	UNIDO
29	Fiji	152.79	UNDP	UNEP
30	Gambia (the)	25.70	UNEP	UNIDO
31	Georgia	93.00	UNDP	
32	Grenada	15.10	UNEP	
33	Guatemala	143.79	UNIDO	UNEP
34	Guinea-Bissau	26.00	UNEP	UNIDO
35	Guyana	31.02	UNEP	UNDP
36	Haiti	66.00	UNEP	UNDP
37	Honduras	344.65	UNIDO	UNEP
38	Jamaica	263.68	UNDP	UNEP
39	Kiribati	0.97	UNEP	
40	Kyrgyzstan	66.61	UNEP	UNEP
41	Lao People's Democratic Republic (the)	41.93	UNEP	France
42	Lesotho	62.68	Germany	
43	Liberia	95.45	Germany	
44	Malawi	196.30	UNEP	UNIDO
45	Maldives	76.47	UNEP	UNDP
46	Mali	272.25	UNEP	UNDP
47	Marshall Islands (the)	3.99	UNEP	
48	Mauritius	144.98	Germany	

No.	Country	Baseline (mt)	Lead	Cooperating
49	Micronesia (Federated States of)	2.56	UNEP	
50	Mongolia	23.73	UNEP	Japan
51	Montenegro	13.88	UNIDO	
52	Mozambique	118.18	UNEP	UNIDO
53	Myanmar	77.80	UNEP	UNIDO
54	Namibia	149.76	Germany	
55	Nauru	0.18	UNEP	
56	Nepal	20.00	UNEP	UNDP
57	Nicaragua	118.36	UNEP	UNIDO
58	Niger	290.39	UNIDO	UNEP
59	Niue	0.15	UNEP	
60	Palau	2.97	UNEP	
61	Papua New Guinea	58.71	Germany	
62	Paraguay	333.06	UNEP	UNDP
63	Republic of Moldova	17.00	UNDP	
64	Rwanda	74.77	UNEP	UNIDO
65	Saint Kitts and Nevis	8.92	UNEP	UNDP
66	Saint Lucia	3.96	UNEP	UNIDO
67	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5.13	UNEP	UNIDO
68	Samoa	4.60	UNEP	
69	Sao Tome and Principe	38.95	UNEP	
70	Serbia	151.11	UNIDO	UNEP
71	Seychelles	24.89	Germany	
72	Sierra Leone	30.37	UNEP	UNIDO
73	Solomon Islands	35.05	UNEP	
74	Sri Lanka	235.20	UNDP	UNEP
75	Suriname	35.92	UNEP	UNIDO
76	Swaziland	81.74	UNEP	UNDP
77	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	32.78	UNIDO	
78	Timor-Leste	9.08	UNEP	UNDP
79	Tonga	2.55	UNEP	
80	Turkmenistan	124.14	UNIDO	
81	Tuvalu	1.64	UNEP	
82	Uganda	2.67	UNEP	UNIDO
83	United Republic of Tanzania	30.86	UNEP	UNIDO
84	Vanuatu	5.11	UNEP	
85	Zambia	89.95	UNEP	UNIDO
86	Zimbabwe	314.94	Germany	

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
AFGHANISTAN					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	Germany	1.0	\$84,000	\$10,920	\$94,920
<i>Approved on the understanding that the approved funds will not be transferred to the Government of Germany and UNEP until the Secretariat has received a verification report confirming that in 2013 the Government of Afghanistan was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between the Government and the Executive Committee. Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance, and that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 23.8 ODP tonnes, calculated using the average of 22.2 ODP tonnes of consumption for 2009 and 25.4 ODP tonnes of consumption (consisting of 24.9 ODP tonnes of virgin HCFC-22 and 0.5 ODP tonnes of recycled HCFC-22) for 2010, reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.</i>					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNEP	1.4	\$118,000	\$15,340	\$133,340
<i>Approved on the understanding that the approved funds will not be transferred to the Government of Germany and UNEP until the Secretariat has received a verification report confirming that in 2013 the Government of Afghanistan was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between the Government and the Executive Committee. Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance, and that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 23.8 ODP tonnes, calculated using the average of 22.2 ODP tonnes of consumption for 2009 and 25.4 ODP tonnes of consumption (consisting of 24.9 ODP tonnes of virgin HCFC-22 and 0.5 ODP tonnes of recycled HCFC-22) for 2010, reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.</i>					
Total for Afghanistan		2.3	\$202,000	\$26,260	\$228,260
ALBANIA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Renewal of institutional strengthening project (phase VI: 7/2014-6/2016)	UNEP		\$109,200	\$0	\$109,200
Total for Albania			\$109,200		\$109,200
ALGERIA					
FUMIGANT					
Preparation of project proposal					
Project preparation in the fumigants sector (high-moisture dates)	UNIDO		\$35,000	\$2,450	\$37,450
Total for Algeria			\$35,000	\$2,450	\$37,450

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)	
			Project	Support		Total
ANGOLA						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
HCFC phase out plan						
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNDP		\$39,111	\$3,520	\$42,631	
Total for Angola			\$39,111	\$3,520	\$42,631	
BAHAMAS						
SEVERAL						
Ozone unit support						
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase V: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000	
Total for Bahamas			\$60,000		\$60,000	
BELIZE						
SEVERAL						
Ozone unit support						
Renewal of institutional strengthening project (phase VII: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNEP		\$76,700	\$0	\$76,700	
Total for Belize			\$76,700		\$76,700	
BOLIVIA						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
HCFC phase out plan						
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	Germany	0.5	\$94,500	\$12,285	\$106,785	
<i>Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance, and that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 6.7 ODP tonnes, calculated using actual consumption of 4.4 ODP tonnes and 7.7 ODP tonnes reported for 2009 and 2010, respectively, under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, plus 0.6 ODP tonnes of HCFC-141b contained in imported pre blended polyols.</i>						
Total for Bolivia			0.5	\$94,500	\$12,285	\$106,785
BRAZIL						
FOAM						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500	
REFRIGERATION						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500	

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	Germany		\$30,000	\$3,900	\$33,900
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNIDO		\$10,000	\$700	\$10,700
	Total for Brazil		\$390,000	\$29,100	\$419,100
CHINA					
FUMIGANT					
Methyl bromide					
National phase-out of methyl bromide (phase II, ninth tranche)	UNIDO		\$302,742	\$22,706	\$325,448
<i>The Government of China, the Government of Italy and UNIDO were requested to submit the project completion report to the Executive Committee to the first meeting in 2016.</i>					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche) (refrigeration servicing sector including enabling programme)	Japan		\$80,000	\$10,400	\$90,400
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche) (refrigeration servicing sector including enabling programme)	UNEP		\$1,104,000	\$123,547	\$1,227,547
	Total for China		\$1,486,742	\$156,653	\$1,643,395
COLOMBIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (commercial and industrial air-conditioning manufacturing sector)	UNDP		\$25,000	\$1,750	\$26,750
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (commercial refrigeration manufacturing sector)	UNDP		\$25,000	\$1,750	\$26,750
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	Germany		\$15,000	\$1,950	\$16,950

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$75,000	\$5,250	\$80,250
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche)	UNDP	2.9	\$150,000	\$11,250	\$161,250
<i>Approved on the understanding that the approved funds will not be transferred to UNDP until the Secretariat has received a verification report confirming that in 2013 the Government of Colombia was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between the Government and the Executive Committee. The Government of Colombia, UNDP and UNEP were requested to submit the project completion report to the second meeting of the Executive Committee in 2016.</i>					
Total for Colombia		2.9	\$440,000	\$32,450	\$472,450
COOK ISLANDS					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase V: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Cook Islands			\$60,000		\$60,000
DOMINICA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VI: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Dominica			\$60,000		\$60,000
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
Total for Dominican Republic			\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
EGYPT					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase X: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNIDO		\$228,323	\$15,983	\$244,306
Total for Egypt			\$228,323	\$15,983	\$244,306
FIJI					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase IX: 12/2014-11/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Fiji			\$60,000		\$60,000

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
GAMBIA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VIII: 7/2014-6/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Gambia			\$60,000		\$60,000
GEORGIA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNDP	0.5	\$150,000	\$11,250	\$161,250
Total for Georgia			0.5	\$150,000	\$161,250
GHANA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche)	Italy	1.4	\$70,000	\$9,100	\$79,100
<i>Approved on the understanding that the regulatory environment for the safe use of hydrocarbon refrigerants would be established prior to the submission of the fourth tranche request to the Executive Committee.</i>					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, third tranche)	UNDP	4.4	\$190,000	\$14,250	\$204,250
<i>Approved on the understanding that the regulatory environment for the safe use of hydrocarbon refrigerants would be established prior to the submission of the fourth tranche request to the Executive Committee.</i>					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase XI: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNDP		\$139,100	\$9,737	\$148,837
Total for Ghana			5.7	\$33,087	\$432,187
GUINEA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$7,800	\$67,800
<i>Approved on the understanding that the approved funds will not be transferred to UNEP until the Secretariat has received a verification report confirming that in 2013 the Government of Guinea was in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between the Government and the Executive Committee.</i>					
Total for Guinea			\$60,000	\$7,800	\$67,800

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
INDIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (polyurethane foam sector)	UNDP		\$120,000	\$8,400	\$128,400
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (extruded polystyrene foam sector)	UNDP		\$40,000	\$2,800	\$42,800
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (air-conditioning sector)	UNDP		\$120,000	\$8,400	\$128,400
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration sector)	UNDP		\$120,000	\$8,400	\$128,400
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	Germany		\$20,000	\$2,600	\$22,600
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$20,000	\$2,600	\$22,600
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase X: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNDP		\$373,230	\$26,126	\$399,356
		Total for India	\$863,230	\$62,826	\$926,056
INDONESIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	IBRD		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$90,000	\$6,300	\$96,300
FIRE-FIGHTING					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (fire-fighting manufacturing sector)	UNDP		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
		Total for Indonesia	\$290,000	\$20,300	\$310,300

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
IRAN					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	Germany		\$75,000	\$9,750	\$84,750
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration sector)	UNDP		\$25,000	\$1,750	\$26,750
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (air-conditioning sector)	UNDP		\$25,000	\$1,750	\$26,750
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$25,000	\$3,250	\$28,250
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$45,000	\$3,150	\$48,150
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	Germany		\$20,000	\$2,600	\$22,600
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase X: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNDP		\$173,511	\$12,146	\$185,657
Total for Iran			\$388,511	\$34,396	\$422,907
KENYA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	France	5.2	\$200,000	\$24,222	\$224,222
<i>Approved on the understanding that approval of further funding will be subject to satisfactorily addressing the issues on the licensing and quota system identified in the verification report.</i>					
Total for Kenya			5.2	\$200,000	\$24,222

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
KYRGYZSTAN					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNEP	0.2	\$3,520	\$458	\$3,978
<i>Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance, and that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 4.1 ODP tonnes, calculated using actual consumption of 4.4 ODP tonnes and 3.7 tonnes, reported for 2009 and 2010, respectively under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol. The Government of Kyrgyzstan, UNDP and UNEP were requested to submit the project completion report to the Executive Committee no later than the last meeting of 2016.</i>					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$20,000	\$1,400	\$21,400
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$10,000	\$1,300	\$11,300
HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, second tranche)	UNDP		\$5,280	\$475	\$5,755
<i>Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance, and that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 4.1 ODP tonnes, calculated using actual consumption of 4.4 ODP tonnes and 3.7 tonnes, reported for 2009 and 2010, respectively under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol. The Government of Kyrgyzstan, UNDP and UNEP were requested to submit the project completion report to the Executive Committee no later than the last meeting of 2016.</i>					
Total for Kyrgyzstan		0.2	\$38,800	\$3,633	\$42,433
LAO, PDR					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Renewal of the institutional strengthening project (phase VII: 12/2014-11/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Lao, PDR			\$60,000		\$60,000
LEBANON					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$20,000	\$1,400	\$21,400
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration and air-conditioning sectors)	UNDP		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
 Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$70,000	\$4,900	\$74,900
Total for Lebanon			\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
MACEDONIA, FYR					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (phase I, fifth tranche)	UNIDO	0.2	\$82,000	\$6,150	\$88,150
Total for Macedonia, FYR			0.2	\$82,000	\$88,150
MALAWI					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase IX: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNEP		\$66,733	\$0	\$66,733
Total for Malawi			\$66,733		\$66,733
MALAYSIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration sector)	UNDP		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (air-conditioning sector)	UNDP		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$65,000	\$4,550	\$69,550
Total for Malaysia			\$315,000	\$22,050	\$337,050
MALDIVES					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VIII: 12/2014-11/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Maldives			\$60,000		\$60,000

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
MAURITIUS					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
HCFC phase-out management plan (second tranche)	Germany		\$131,400	\$15,851	\$147,251
<i>Noted that the Agreement was updated based on the established HCFC baseline for compliance and the revised funding level; that the revised starting point for sustained aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption was 8.0 ODP tonnes, calculated using actual consumption of 10.7 ODP tonnes and 5.3 tonnes reported for 2009 and 2010, respectively, under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, and that the revised funding level for the HPMP for Mauritius was US \$950,000, plus agency support costs, in accordance with decisions 60/44(f)(xii) and 62/10.</i>					
Total for Mauritius			\$131,400	\$15,851	\$147,251
MICRONESIA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Renewal of institutional strengthening project (phase V: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Micronesia			\$60,000		\$60,000
MOLDOVA, REP					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$20,000	\$1,400	\$21,400
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$10,000	\$1,300	\$11,300
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VIII: 7/2014-6/2016)	UNEP		\$69,334	\$0	\$69,334
Total for Moldova, Rep			\$99,334	\$2,700	\$102,034
NAURU					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase V: 8/2014-7/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Nauru			\$60,000		\$60,000

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
 Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
NEPAL					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VIII: 12/2014-11/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
	Total for Nepal		\$60,000		\$60,000
NIGERIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$80,000	\$5,600	\$85,600
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration and air-conditioning manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$90,000	\$6,300	\$96,300
	Total for Nigeria		\$320,000	\$22,400	\$342,400
PAKISTAN					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration and air-conditioning sector)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$48,000	\$6,240	\$54,240
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNIDO		\$42,000	\$2,940	\$44,940
	Total for Pakistan		\$200,000	\$16,880	\$216,880

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
 Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
PANAMA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$80,000	\$5,600	\$85,600
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
Total for Panama			\$140,000	\$9,800	\$149,800
PARAGUAY					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VII: 7/2014-6/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Paraguay			\$60,000		\$60,000
SRI LANKA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase X: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNDP		\$134,056	\$9,384	\$143,440
Total for Sri Lanka			\$134,056	\$9,384	\$143,440
SUDAN					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$40,000	\$2,800	\$42,800
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration and air-conditioning sector)	UNIDO		\$35,000	\$2,450	\$37,450
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNIDO		\$25,000	\$1,750	\$26,750
Total for Sudan			\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
TANZANIA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VI: 4/2014-3/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Tanzania			\$60,000		\$60,000
TIMOR LESTE					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNEP		\$20,000	\$2,600	\$22,600
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$10,000	\$700	\$10,700
Total for Timor Leste			\$30,000	\$3,300	\$33,300
TUVALU					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase V: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Tuvalu			\$60,000		\$60,000
URUGUAY					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$68,000	\$4,760	\$72,760
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNDP		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
Total for Uruguay			\$128,000	\$8,960	\$136,960
VANUATU					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase V: 1/2015-12/2016)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Total for Vanuatu			\$60,000		\$60,000

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/12
Annex II

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
VENEZUELA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	UNDP		\$150,000	\$10,500	\$160,500
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Update the preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$50,000	\$3,500	\$53,500
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	UNIDO		\$90,000	\$6,300	\$96,300
Total for Venezuela			\$290,000	\$20,300	\$310,300
VIETNAM					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (foam sector)	IBRD		\$80,000	\$5,600	\$85,600
FUMIGANT					
Methyl bromide					
National phase-out plan of methyl bromide (fifth tranche)	IBRD	50.0	\$40,000	\$3,000	\$43,000
<i>The Government of Viet Nam and the World Bank were requested to submit the project completion report to the last meeting of the Executive Committee in 2015.</i>					
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (air-conditioning sector)	IBRD		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (stage II) (refrigeration sector)	IBRD		\$60,000	\$4,200	\$64,200
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (stage II)	IBRD		\$90,000	\$6,300	\$96,300
Total for Vietnam		50.0	\$330,000	\$23,300	\$353,300
GRAND TOTAL		67.4	\$8,907,740	\$658,990	\$9,566,730