

**MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL**

Inter-agency Coordination Meeting
Montreal, 31 August – 2 September 2015

MLF/IACM.2015/2/24

13 October 2015

REPORT OF THE INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION MEETING

AGENDA ITEM 1: WELCOME BY THE CHIEF OFFICER

1. The Chief Officer welcomed representatives of the bilateral and implementing agencies and the Treasurer to Montreal. He took the opportunity to introduce and welcome Mr. Federico San Martini, Ico, a new team member of the Secretariat who although joined the Secretariat three weeks ago he was already fully engaged in reviewing project proposals for consideration at the 75th meeting. He also welcomed Mr. Girma Gina and Mr. Christopher Taylor representing UNEP as the Treasurer and recalled that the workshop on the reporting requirements under the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) would take place on 2 September 2015. The report on the IPSAS workshop is attached as Annex I.

2. The list of participants is attached as Annex II.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (MLF/IACM.2015/2/1/Rev.1)

3. The Chief Officer indicated a number of significant items on the agenda in particular agenda item 3 on business planning. The submission of agency progress reports would be added to the agenda. He invited representatives of bilateral and implementing agencies to share their challenges and experiences related to the preparation of their submissions to the 75th meeting and advised that there would be an opportunity for bilateral discussion with Secretariat staff in the margins of the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 3: BUSINESS PLANNING

(a) Update on the implementation of the 2015-2017 business plans (MLF/IACM.2015/2/2)

4. The Secretariat presented a brief update on the implementation of the 2015-2017 business plans following the 74th meeting, indicating that tranches of HPMPs worth some US \$21.6 million would not be submitted to the 75th meeting (see the Excel spreadsheet issued with document MLF/IACM.2015/2/2).

5. Following the discussion, it was agreed that all projects and activities in the 2015 business plan not submitted to the 75th meeting should be added to the 2016 business plan. Furthermore, the Secretariat would recommend to the Executive Committee that any projects submitted to, but not approved at the 75th meeting, or projects that were deferred, should also be added to the 2016 business plan.

6. Noting the large carryover from the last three triennia, proposals were discussed on how to ensure full use of the allocation for the 2015-2017 triennium including: allowing the submission of a tranche in advance of the schedule contained in the HPMP agreement if all conditions for approval were met; avoiding planning the last tranche of multi-year projects to the final meeting of the 2015-2017 triennium; and, considering the review of agreements, on a case-by-case basis, to allow for the submission of more

than one tranche to the same meeting, especially in the third year of the triennium. In addition UNIDO proposed that it would programme any projects with uncertainty one year later.

(b) 2016-2018 business plans (MLF/IACM.2015/2/3)

7. Sub-agenda items 3(b)(i) to 3(b)(xii) on the 2016-2018 business plans were discussed with reference to the Secretariat's observations and comments in document MLF/IACM.2015/2/3. Bilateral and implementing agencies were requested to take action on these sub-agenda items as appropriate while revising and resubmitting their 2016-2018 business plans. (**Action: Bilateral and implementing agencies**)

(b)(i) Resource allocation as submitted

8. The draft business plan tables, as submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies, represented a resource allocation of almost US \$659 million for the 2016-2018 period, of which just under US \$508 million would be for new activities. However, the proposed budget for the triennium was US \$497 million and thus over-programming amounted to US \$162 million with US \$80 million of over-programming in 2018. Agencies were requested to consider carefully the activities in their business plan scheduled for 2016 and to indicate those that might be submitted to the 75th meeting. Measures agreed to reduce the level of over-programming are indicated in the relevant sub-agenda items below.

(b)(ii) Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), core unit, and institutional strengthening

9. There were no issues regarding the CAP budget and agency core unit costs with respect to the business plans.

10. The Secretariat explained that institutional strengthening (IS) projects in the business plan had been scheduled as per the two-year renewal cycle. Some IS projects scheduled for 2015 would be moved to 2016 since their completion dates had been re-scheduled.

(b)(iii) ODS alternative surveys

11. It was noted that 24 countries¹ had not requested funding for the preparation of surveys on ODS alternative. UNDP advised that it would submit requests for surveys for Bangladesh, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Paraguay and Peru to the 75th meeting. UNEP also advised that a number of requests for surveys might be submitted to the 75th meeting. The World Bank stated that the preparation for the survey for the Philippines might be submitted to the 75th meeting instead of in 2016 as indicated in the draft business plan. The Secretariat requested agencies to provide further information on funding requests for surveys being submitted to the 75th meeting and those for any remaining countries should be included in the 2016 business plan.

(b)(iv) HCFC demonstration projects

12. Agencies were requested to include in the 2016-2018 business plan for the relevant agency, the estimated costs of the HCFC demonstration projects which would result from project preparation being requested at the 75th meeting.

13. The Secretariat advised that there was only one entry (UNEP) in the 2016 business plan for the two additional stages for the project for promoting low-global warming potential (low-GWP) refrigerants

¹ Brazil; Cameroon; China; Cuba; Dominica; Dominican Republic; Egypt; Grenada; Haiti; Indonesia; Jordan; Libya; Malaysia; Morocco; Paraguay; Peru; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Somalia; South Africa; South Sudan; Vietnam; and Yemen.

in high-ambient temperature countries in West Asia that had been approved at the 69th meeting. UNEP and UNIDO were requested to indicate their individual entry separately and to provide a concept note to the Secretariat for its review, if these new stages were being presented in line with decision 72/40. UNIDO indicated that it would not require funding for preparation of the project.

(b)(v) HCFC production sector

14. The Secretariat opined that the HCFC production phase-out management plan (HPPMP) and associated project preparation that was included for Mexico (UNIDO) should be removed from the business plan as it was not currently eligible. If the project was included, the non-eligibility issue would be raised as an issue in the context of the review of agency's business plan presented to the Executive Committee.

15. With regard to the HPPMP for China, the World Bank explained that the higher level of funding that was indicated in the 2016 business plan (i.e., US \$29.3 million compared to US \$21.9 million of annual average funding) was to take into account compensation for lost profits due to early closure of the production plants.

(b)(vi) Stage I of HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs)

16. The Secretariat advised bilateral and implementing agencies of a number of discrepancies with respect to stage I of HPMPs that required their attention. The values in the 2016 business plan for Botswana and Libya had been modified by the Secretariat to correspond to the values in the stage I project proposals originally submitted to the 75th meeting. The value for the HPMP for South Sudan was higher than the funding eligibility for the 35 per cent reduction in the country's baseline and would have to be modified accordingly. UNEP advised that stage I of the HPMP for South Sudan would be submitted to the 76th meeting.

17. The Secretariat requested a reduction of the cost-effectiveness threshold value for stage I of the HPMP for the Syrian Arab Republic in line with the stage I guidelines as it was twice the value in the project proposal that had been submitted to, and subsequently withdrawn from, the 68th meeting. UNIDO mentioned the possibility of reviewing stage I of the HPMP to achieve the 35 per cent reduction from the baseline.

18. The Secretariat had noted that eight countries² with HCFC consumption solely in the refrigeration servicing sector and with foam enterprises relying exclusively on imported HCFC-141b pre-blended polyol systems were eligible for an additional investment project for the conversion of those enterprises (decision 63/15). Agencies informed the Secretariat that the following investment projects for countries missing from the draft 2016-2018 business plan would be taken into account: UNDP would submit the project for Panama to the 75th meeting, the project for Paraguay to the 76th meeting, and the project for Peru would be included in stage II of the country's HPMP; UNIDO would add the missing project for Ecuador. The Secretariat advised that the additional project for phasing out HCFC-141b contained in imported pre-blended polyols in Bahrain was not eligible under decision 63/15 as it is a non-low-volume consuming (non-LVC) country with manufacturing sector consumption. The Secretariat noted that if pre-blended polyols containing HCFC-141b were imported into the Plurinational State of Bolivia, a project proposal for the phase out of HCFC-141b would be eligible under decision 63/15. The project in Uruguay should be adjusted to the cost-effectiveness threshold for the refrigeration assembly sector that was agreed in the stage I of the HPMP approved at the 65th meeting.

(b)(vii) Stage II of HPMPs for low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries

² Cuba; Bahrain; Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Ecuador; Panama; Paraguay; Peru; and Uruguay

19. Stage II of the HPMPs for LVC countries should be adjusted to phase out 67.5 per cent of the baseline consumption if the country already has a stage I of the HPMP that corresponds to the 35 per cent reduction step. The reduction step should be 35 per cent of the baseline for the remaining five countries without a stage I³ unless the HPMP would result in a 100 per cent phase-out, in which case compliance with the requirements of decision 60/15⁴ should be indicated in the remarks column. Agencies should provide a rationale for any front-loading of stage II tranches in the light of decision 74/18(b)⁵ and how such a funding distribution enables meeting the 20 per cent disbursement threshold.

(b)(viii) Stage II of HPMPs for non-LVC countries

20. The cost-effectiveness used by the agencies in most of the manufacturing sector for non-LVC countries were similar to the thresholds agreed by the Executive Committee. Following a discussion it was agreed that for business planning purposes the cost-effectiveness thresholds of foam and refrigeration and air conditioning (RAC) sector projects would be adjusted as per the table below.

Table 1: Cost-effectiveness threshold for the 2016 to 2018 business plan (US \$/kg)

Sector	Threshold	Threshold plus 25 per cent	Threshold for non-LVC countries
Foam general	6.92	8.65	7.00
Foam XPS	6.92	8.65	7.00
Foam rigid	7.83	9.79	7.00
RAC	9.00		8.40

21. In the light of the Secretariat's comments in document MLF/IACM.2014/2/3, agencies were requested to address the timing of submission of stage II of HPMPs for both LVC and non-LVC countries as several stage II of HPMPs are expected to be submitted at a different time from that previously anticipated. In addition, agencies were requested to review the distribution of tranches as it appears that these are front-loaded as opposed to equal distribution or back-loading. Moreover, stage II of HPMPs for non-LVC countries should not exceed compliance with the 35 per cent control measure with the exception of the non-eligible additional amounts of HCFCs used by transnational corporations for which an explanatory comment should be included in the remarks column.

22. The missing entries for the amounts of HCFCs to be phased out should be indicated by substance (HCFC-22, HCFC-141b and HCFC-142b) on separate lines so the respective cost-effectiveness thresholds can be taken into account. Furthermore, the amounts of HCFCs to be phased out in business plans cannot exceed the remaining eligible consumption for each chemical as per the relevant agreement between the Executive Committee and the country concerned.

(b)(ix) Stage II of HPMP project preparation

23. The Secretariat advised that project preparation for stage II of HPMPs cannot exceed the values agreed by the Executive Committee. When the stage II of the HPMP for a country is to be implemented by more than one agency, the relevant agencies should agree on the levels of project preparation for each agency.

³ Botswana, Libya, Mauritania, South Sudan, and Syrian Arab Republic.

⁴ Projects which accelerated the phase-out of consumption of HCFCs could be considered on a case-by-case basis for LVC countries that had a strong national level of commitment in place to support accelerated phase-out.

⁵ Bilateral and implementing agencies were requested when assisting Article 5 countries to prepare future stages of their HPMPs, to carefully design the schedule of submission of tranches and their completion according to the activities to be implemented in the following one to three years and their associated costs, and to commence all preparatory work, such as legal agreements or memorandums of understanding as required, in advance of the submission of funding tranches.

24. Project preparation for stage II of HPMPs should be scheduled in the business plan no more than two years before the completion of stage I unless it is allowed by a decision of the Executive Committee. In these cases a reference to the specific decision should be added to the remarks column.

(b)(x) Possible overlaps

25. The Secretariat identified possible overlapping activities of UNDP and UNIDO in the Islamic Republic of Iran that should be resolved.

(b)(xi) Modifications by Secretariat

26. The Secretariat presented the resulting modifications to the 2016-2018 business plan as described in MLF/IACM.2014/2/3. The values of funding and ODP phase-out in the agreements of approved MYAs in the business plan should be adjusted to match the Secretariat's database on MYAs.

(b)(xii) Additional possible modifications for consideration

27. The Secretariat had proposed further options to standardize submissions and to adjust the business plan in paragraph 24 of document MLF/IACM.2014/2/3. A number of options were discussed and would be applied to the business plan as indicated in the above sub-agenda items.

(c) List of countries with delayed submissions of a tranche of HPMP and outstanding stage I of HPMPs (MLF/IACM.2015/2/4)

28. The Secretariat referred to Table 1 of document MLF/IACM.2015/2/4 which lists delayed tranche of HPMPs for which the Executive Committee requires a specific response to a decision. Agencies were requested to fill in the last column of Table 1 and update the missing information as well as provide suggestions on actions to be taken to address outstanding issues, so that the delayed tranches could be submitted to the 75th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 4: MATTERS ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION

(a) Outstanding project completion reports (PCRs) (MLF/IACM.2015/2/5)

29. The Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO) requested the bilateral and implementing agencies to submit the PCRs due⁶, as soon as possible, and to provide reasons for any PCRs not submitted. All PCRs should be sent to the Fund Secretariat with a copy to the SMEO (**Action: Bilateral and implementing agencies**).

30. The Chief Officer reiterated the importance of submitting outstanding PCRs due to the valuable information they contained and the importance of disseminating the lessons learned given their relevance to the implementation of future projects. Furthermore, status reports on those projects would have to be submitted until the PCRs were submitted, which would increase the workload of the Executive Committee, the agencies and the Secretariat.

31. UNDP commented that it had no outstanding PCRs for the 75th meeting while UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank stated they would do their utmost to clear the backlog. The World Bank mentioned that the technical audit for China, and resource mobilization projects should not be included in the list of PCRs due. UNIDO noted that the completion date of some "by decision" projects had been extended and thus a PCR was not yet due. The SMEO would verify the matter and inform UNIDO accordingly (**Action: SMEO**).

⁶ The list of PCRs due can be found in Annexes I to III of document MLF/IACM.2015/2/5

(b) Issues relating to the multi-year agreement database (MLF/IACM.2015/2/6)

32. The SMEO presented document MLF/IACM.2015/2/6 and explained that following internal discussions on the MYA database, it was concluded that the database should be streamlined and focus mainly on the information at the enterprise level. The Chief Officer stressed the importance of reporting reliable data at the enterprise level as this information is required for monitoring and evaluation purposes as well as for undertaking analysis and reports requested by the Executive Committee and/or the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. He mentioned an analysis that the Secretariat was requested to undertake on the HCFC emission into the atmosphere associated with stage I of the HPMPs and its impact on the climate; for this analysis, the Secretariat had to extract relevant information at the enterprise level from the actual submission of the HPMPs as it was not available in the MYA database. He explained that the changes proposed to the MYA database, would simplify the work of the bilateral and implementing agencies.

33. UNDP proposed using a Word form with macros to input data to the MYA database system, which could also be used to generate both the tranche implementation progress report and the HPMP tranche requests. UNEP suggested adding PCRs and possibly the business plans to such a system and later suggested that the format for the HPMP project proposal from the country could be adapted to include macros to collect the necessary MYA information. Agencies requested the removal of the financial component of the annual implementation tranche section of the database since it was inconsistent with the actual tranche request and thus difficult to complete.

34. The Secretariat made a number of points including: the ease and efficiency of collecting quantitative inputs versus qualitative inputs; that data inconsistencies can occur in the most user-friendly databases; the importance of and mandatory requirement for enterprise level data as it demonstrates among other things the impact of the conversion; the difficulties posed by the need to revise data following approval of a project and the need to update entries; and the need to reduce data inconsistencies to a minimum.

35. In response to the suggestions for a system using Word forms with macros for data entry and to incorporate progress reports and PCRs into the MYA database, the Chief Officer recalled that there were major differences in information requirements and formats between stand-alone projects, business plans, MYAs, and PCRs which would make their combination into a single system or database unfeasible.

36. In response to a comment by UNDP that stage II of HPMPs could include several hundreds of enterprises and thus would involve substantive work to enter the data at the enterprise level, the Chief Officer clarified that, as in the past, data could be collectively reported for large number of enterprises consuming very small amounts of HCFCs that will convert to the same technology.

37. In response to a question by the World Bank on the information required on the actual costs of conversion of individual enterprises, the Chief Officer clarified that the baseline consumption of each HCFC used at the enterprise level, the alternative technology proposed, a brief description of the activities to be undertaken, the incremental capital cost and incremental operating costs, and the date of completion would be required (similar to the data currently reported under the Inventory of approved projects database).

38. The SMEO recalled decision 74/6(b)(ii) through which bilateral and implementing agencies were requested that information into the MYA database should not be included without the prior approval of the countries concerned, and that the Executive Committee had requested the SMEO to make an recommendation to the 75th meeting on options to enable the countries concerned to confirm the data being entered in the MYA database.

39. The Chief Officer advised that the Secretariat would further discuss the issue of the MYA database internally and consider the idea of a Word form with macros, the fields needed for enterprise

level information, the proposed maximum number of enterprises in a project where individual reporting would be required, and the issue raised on financial data (i.e., annual data versus tranche data). The SMEO will inform the Executive Committee accordingly (**Action: Secretariat and SMEO**).

(c) Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2016 (MLF/IACM.2015/2/7)

40. The SMEO invited agencies to provide comments on the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for 2016 which included: an evaluation of HCFC phase-out projects in the refrigeration and air-conditioning (RAC) manufacturing sector; evaluation of pilot demonstration projects on ODS disposal and destruction; improvement of the MYA database for HPMPs; and preparation of the consolidated project completion report. She also informed agencies of the need to undertake the field missions to countries in relation to the RAC manufacturing sector and ODS disposal and destruction evaluations.

41. With regard to field missions, UNDP advised that there should be an equitable distribution of countries by regions for evaluations and stressed the importance of choosing countries with more than one enterprise to avoid any confidentiality problems when an enterprise could easily be identified.

42. The Chief Officer requested implementing agencies for their continuing assistance and collaboration to prepare field missions, and that representatives from the agencies accompany the SMEO on the field visits.

(d) Overview of activities under monitoring and evaluation (MLF/IACM.2015/2/8)

43. The SMEO presented an overview of on-going monitoring and evaluation activities, namely the desk studies for the evaluation of HCFC phase-out projects in RAC manufacturing sector and for the evaluation of the pilot demonstration projects on ODS disposal and destruction. She also mentioned that the draft reports of the two desk studies will be shared with the agencies for their comments prior to their submission to the Executive Committee.

44. UNEP opined that relevant ongoing ODS disposal and destruction projects should not be evaluated yet since they are still ongoing and the required information might not be available.

AGENDA ITEM 5: MATTERS ON PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

(a) Overview of the document on country programme (CP) data and prospects for compliance (MLF/IACM.2015/2/9)

45. The Secretariat presented a review of compliance related issues for Libya and South Sudan, the status of submission of 2014 CP data reports where 28 countries had not yet submitted the reports due on 1 May 2015, and a proposed revision of the CP data report format for the year 2015 onwards.

46. UNIDO confirmed that, with respect to Libya's non-compliance with the HCFC control measures, the country would submit an action plan to the Implementation Committee under the Non-Compliance Procedure of the Montreal Protocol (ImpCom) by mid-September 2015. The country was likely to remain in non-compliance until 2018. UNEP stated that it would continue to discuss the issue of non-compliance with South-Sudan in order to provide an update to the 55th meeting of the Implementation Committee. The Secretariat noted that at the last two meetings of the Implementation Committee, countries have indicated that the implementation of their action plans were contingent upon receiving support from the Multilateral Fund. It was noted that any action taken by both the Implementation and Executive Committee were "without prejudice to" each Committee's competence. The Secretariat clarified that there is no requirement for the Multilateral Fund to finance a country's action plan to return to compliance.

47. UNEP reported it was in the process of re-establishing communications with the Government of Mauritania to assist in the preparation and submission of stage I of the HPMP, and was also working with the national ozone officer (NOO) of Dominica on the amendment of the licensing systems to include the accelerated HCFC control measures.

48. A number of suggestions were made to encourage the timely submission of CP data reports, including: sending the annual letter from the Chief Officer to Article 5 countries requesting CP data report to national ozone units (NOUs) in January or February; asking for a stricter Executive Committee decision on the requirement for CP data as a pre-condition for the approval of funds; adding specific comments on the timeliness of CP data reporting in the “Views of the Executive Committee” sent to the countries following approval of an IS project; UNEP to include in the agenda of network meetings with NOO CP data reports emphasising the need to submit CP reports as early as possible in the year preferably eight weeks prior to the first meeting of the Executive Committee; and to send letters to countries with outstanding CP reports pursuant to a decision by the Executive Committee on this matter. The list of countries with pending CP data reports as of 18 September 2015 is attached as Annex III to the present report (**Action: Secretariat**).

49. The Secretariat explained that several sections of the previous CP reporting format had been removed in the proposed revised format, and that new columns had been added to collect additional data on energy prices/tariffs, alternatives to HCFCs and their prices, where available (see table 3 of document MLF/IACM.2015/2/9 and its attachment).

50. UNEP considered that the data on ODS alternatives (Section A.2) should be optional. Concerns were expressed on the need for average estimated prices of energy (Section B.3) as it might involve an additional government clearance step prior to submission to the Secretariat. The Secretariat explained that energy costs had been included in the revised CP format in response to discussions at the 74th meeting (decision 74/9) and that only simple information was required such as a range of prices.

51. The Chief Officer concluded the discussion highlighting the importance of the CP database and the need for submission of CP data early in the year as the information contained therein was useful to identify discrepancies with data reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, to analyse aggregated consumption and production data on a substance basis; to early identify countries that might be in risk of non-compliance; and the Implementation Committee. The Secretariat would revise the report format and would share it with the agencies for their comments (**Action: Secretariat**).

(b) Reports on projects with specific reporting requirements (MLF/IACM.2015/2/10)

52. Bilateral and implementing agencies provided status updates on the implementation of projects with reporting requirements in China, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Egypt.

53. With respect to the temporary use of a high-GWP technology by enterprises that had been converted to a low-GWP technology in El Salvador and Dominican Republic, UNDP advised that in the case of El Salvador the low-GWP technology had been fully introduced. The situation in the Dominican Republic remained the same as at the 74th meeting. The Chief Officer asked that the progress reports on the status of the introduction of the low-GWP technologies in these two countries requested by the Executive Committee are as robust as possible. He also reminded agencies that whenever a new low-GWP technology were introduced, a document stating the commercial availability of the technology should be provided in line with decision 74/20(a)(iii).

54. UNDP advised it would submit the report on the low-cost options for the use of hydrocarbons in the manufacture of polyurethane foams in Egypt to the 75th meeting. The World Bank informed that it had reminded China about the financial audit report regarding the CFC production, halon, PU foam, process agent II, refrigeration servicing and solvent sector plans.

55. The Chief Officer reminded relevant agencies to submit comprehensive reports on projects with specific reporting requirements no later than 21 September 2015. **(Action: UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank)**

(c) Operation of the Executive Committee (MLF/IACM.2015/2/11)

56. Bilateral and implementing agencies were invited to provide written information on their responsibilities and roles regarding provision of advice to the Executive Committee and the beneficiary countries. The information would be attached to the document on the Main procedures of the operation of the Executive Committee to be submitted to the 75th meeting. The Secretariat advised that the information already received from UNDP, and attached to document MLF/IACM.2015/2/11, could be used as a guide for the type of information required.

57. On the subject of the rule that prohibited countries taking the floor to talk about their own projects, it was recalled that the purpose of the rule was to ensure equity between countries attending and not attending Executive Committee meetings. As such, all countries have an equal and ample opportunity to discuss their projects and the comments of the Secretariat with the relevant agencies prior to Executive Committee meetings. UNDP suggested the creation of an online forum where project submissions, the Secretariat's comments and agency responses could be shared with Executive Committee members prior to completion of the review.

58. UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank agreed to provide information on their operations regarding their project cycle, standard procedures for processing project proposals to the approval phase and project implementation. UNEP suggested that the document presented to the Executive Committee include information on the role of agencies in cases where two or more agencies were involved in the implementation of a project. Information on business planning should also be added to give the full spectrum of agencies' interactions with beneficiary countries and the Secretariat.

59. Bilateral and implementing agencies were also invited to indicate any difficulties experienced with the two meetings per year schedule. There continued to be a preference for the two meetings per year. UNDP reiterated that it would prefer a first meeting in July and a second in December, as it would provide more time to receive CP data reports in time for analysis at the first meeting of the year, allow consideration of the progress report at the first meeting, submission of verification reports associated with funding tranches of HPMPs, and avoid an unequal workload between the two meetings (i.e., a heavy workload at the second meeting).

60. The Chief Officer recalled that the first Executive Committee of 2015 (74th meeting) had a substantial agenda and resulted in 58 decisions with approved funding of almost US \$60 million. He invited implementing agencies to provide the relevant information required on their operation and interactions with the Secretariat and beneficiary countries. **(Action: Implementing agencies)** The Secretariat will circulate advice on the information required. **(Action: Secretariat)**

AGENDA ITEM 6: MATTER RELATED TO PROJECT PROPOSALS

(a) Template for draft agreements for stage II of HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) (MLF/IACM.2015/2/12)

61. The Secretariat explained that the new template for agreements for stage II of HPMPs was based on the Agreement for stage II of the HPMP for Mexico approved at the 73rd meeting. Some modifications had been introduced as set out in document MLF/IACM.2015/2/12.

62. Some concerns were expressed regarding the pre-condition in paragraph 5(e), requiring all tranches from the previous stage to be completed, remaining funds returned to the Multilateral Fund and

the corresponding project completion reports submitted. UNDP explained that the 10 per cent of the total funding approved for stage I of an HPMP allocated for the final tranche could take longer than one year to be implemented. The Secretariat advised that in those cases, agencies should anticipate and plan the date of completion and referred agencies to paragraph 14 of the Agreement. UNEP and the World Bank remarked that paragraph 14 did not specify whether the completion date was operational or financial.

63. While implementing agencies understood that stages need to have an effective completion date, which should be monitored, they expressed concern that making a future second stage tranche conditional on the financial completion of stage I could potentially put the implementation of stage II at risk. It was suggested there be some flexibility or that the condition should be linked to operational instead of financial completion.

64. UNIDO suggested that in the template for draft agreements the text that was removed from paragraph 5(a) should be reinstated as the deletion of text was predicated on a two-meeting per year scenario while the stage II agreement should also take into account a three-meeting per year scenario.

65. The Chief Officer advised that the Secretariat would take into account the comments made at the meeting and requested bilateral and implementing agencies to send any additional comments as soon as possible. **(Action: Bilateral and implementing agencies)** A revised draft based would be circulated to bilateral and implementing agencies before finalizing the template that would be used for agreements of stage II of HPMPs submitted to the 75th meeting. **(Action: Secretariat)**

(b) Draft format for preparation of the surveys of ODS alternatives and presentation of the resulting data (MLF/IACM.2015/2/13)

66. The Secretariat introduced the draft format for the preparation of national surveys of ODS alternatives developed in response to decision 74/53. The draft format took into account the extensive experience of bilateral and implementing agencies in undertaking and analysing ODS surveys for the preparation of national plans to phase-out CFCs and HCFCs, as well as information on approaches to HFC inventories funded outside the Multilateral Fund.

67. UNIDO expressed appreciation for the guide and said that surveys on ODS alternative in progress funded outside the Multilateral Fund were being conducted along similar lines. UNDP and UNIDO suggested replacing the column heading “energy consumption” in Table 5 of Appendix 1 (ODS alternatives in refrigeration and air conditioning servicing sector) with “energy efficiency ratio” but expressed concerns that the “energy efficiency ratio” could vary significantly due to various reasons. UNEP commented that the survey was complicated for LVC countries and suggested the energy information should be optional. The Secretariat agreed to change the column heading to “Energy efficiency ratio (if available)”; explanatory text could be added in the survey narrative. The Chief Officer stressed the importance of energy information as decision XIX/6 ODS alternatives should take into account energy efficiency.

68. UNDP stated that it would be challenging to provide a high level of detail given the time and funding parameters and both UNDP and UNEP indicated that the May 2016 deadline for submission of reports did not provide adequate time to complete the surveys. The Secretariat clarified the level of data required and stressed that the data provided must be reliable; any information on challenges in acquiring data would also be valuable. The Secretariat also indicated that it would greatly appreciate submissions as early as possible, but no later than November 2016, noting that the Executive Committee expected the Secretariat to provide an overall analysis of these surveys to the first meeting in 2017.

69. In response to a question about surveys for countries that were partially funded by the Multilateral Fund as per decision 74/53(d), the Secretariat explained that the same survey format should be used for those countries.

70. The Chief Officer requested bilateral and implementing agencies to make an effort to collect as much information as possible, including on energy efficiency. Bilateral and implementing agencies were invited to provide further feedback on the format. (**Action: Bilateral and implementing agencies**). Relevant comments would be incorporated into a revised draft which would be submitted to Executive Committee members for an inter-sessional review, and the final version would be submitted to the 75th meeting.

(c) Guide for the submission of institutional strengthening (IS) projects (MLF/IACM.2015/2/14)

71. The Secretariat recalled decision 74/51 which increased the level of IS funding for IS projects from the 75th meeting onwards. The decision also specified that countries should continue to use the format for IS renewals approved at the 61st meeting with a modification in section 10 to indicate that performance indicators were required. The Secretariat informed that it would prepare a guide for the submission of IS projects.

72. The Secretariat presented the amended reporting format that should be used for submissions to the 75th meeting and clarified the data/information required for each section (as contained in document MLF/IACM.2015/2/14). The Secretariat requested that the exact date of CP data reporting be stated in section 6 as efficient data reporting is one of the IS project performance indicators (section 12). Other recommendations included adding an organization chart in section 7 (role of the NOU); adding text on any staffing challenges in section 9; taking care when cutting text from section 10 of a previous IS report for pasting into the current IS report; including specific performance indicators in the “Planned activities in next phase” column; and that section 11 may eventually have to be revised in view of the adoption of IPSAS. The Secretariat stressed the importance of presented comprehensive executive summaries (section 15) on progress of activities implemented and plan of action since these would be used in the documents submitted to the Executive Committee. Implementing agencies were kindly requested to ensure that the IS submission includes a draft of “Views expressed” text which should take into account the achievements, challenges and failures, if any, faced by the country.

73. UNEP thanked the Secretariat for its efforts and close cooperation and added that the exercise to develop performance indicators was useful as the indicators would spell out the clear obligation of the NOU and would be used for monitoring IS activities. The Secretariat informed agencies that the work on developing and optimizing performance indicators would continue. UNEP also asked for clarification on the evaluation criteria in section 12 and what comments were expected. The Secretariat explained that in the case of CP data reporting “Very good” could be defined as CP data reported submitted no later than 8 weeks before the first meeting, “satisfactory” could be by 1 May, and “poor” could be later than 1 May. The Secretariat would review this section and provide guidance on the evaluation of the four performance indicators. (**Action: Secretariat**).

74. UNIDO requested clarification on whether the increase in funding would apply to IS approvals prior to the 75th meeting. The Secretariat confirmed that, as with previous decisions to change the level of IS funding, the decision applied to IS projects submitted from the 75th meeting onwards. The Secretariat also confirmed that the IS reporting format did not have to be used by the five countries which had integrated into their IS project into their respective HPMPs.

75. The Chief Officer stressed the importance of submitting high quality information for all components of the IS reports in order to continue assisting Article 5 countries effectively, and requested bilateral and implementing agencies to continue their excellent cooperation in submitting good executive summaries on the progress report and plan of action of IS projects and good text on the views expressed by the Executive Committee reflecting achievements, challenges and failures, if any, of the IS project.

(d) Status report on the Multilateral Fund climate impact indicator (MCII) (MLF/IACM.2015/2/15)

76. The Secretariat provided an update on the MCII, which has been revised and shared with the World Bank and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in line with decision 73/65. The World Bank informed the Secretariat that it had circulated the MCII tool internally to other departments working on greenhouse gases inventories and planned to present it at an upcoming Multilateral Development Bank (MDB) coordination meeting planned in Paris and would provide feedback to the Secretariat. (**Action: World Bank**) As of the time of the meeting, the Secretariat had not yet received any feedback from the IPCC.

(e) Issues identified from projects submitted to the 75th meeting:

- (e)(i) *Demonstration projects for low-global warming potential (GWP) alternatives to HCFCs, feasibility studies for district cooling, and preparation of demonstration projects for low-GWP alternatives to HCFCs in the air-conditioning manufacturing sector (paragraphs 6(e) and (f)) of planning fax)*
- (e)(ii) *Completeness of submissions (paragraphs 13 to 15 of planning fax)*
- (e)(iii) *Submission deadlines (paragraphs 16 and 17)*
- (e)(iv) *Outstanding verification reports on HCFC consumption (paragraph 19)*
- (e)(v) *Bilateral discussions between representatives of the bilateral and implementing agencies and the Secretariat*

77. The Secretariat referred to important information in the planning fax for the 75th meeting sent on 18 June 2015 and highlighted some issues identified from the preliminary review of projects submitted so far. The Secretariat reiterated the importance of verification reports and requested the agencies to kindly submit any outstanding ones.

78. Regarding the submissions received for stage II of the HPMP, the Secretariat noted that any discrepancies between stage I and stage II must be highlighted and explained. This may pertain to changes in consumption of HCFCs in a sector; accelerated phase-out of HCFCs; change in the overarching strategy; change in number of enterprises consuming HCFCs. It was also noted that funding being requested should correspond to HCFC reduction commitment by the country; stage II proposals to achieve more than a 35 per cent reduction in the baseline consumption would be considered based on the circumstances of the country and in line with relevant decisions of the Executive Committee. It was also emphasized that stage II should be planned carefully to ensure that sufficient funding remains available for phase-out of eligible consumption used by eligible enterprises in future stages of the HPMP. Also, in accordance with decision 71/42(h), proposals should include information on how the strategy for the servicing sector takes into account climate aspects. A new agreement must be submitted with the stage II submission and the relevant country programme report should be available.

79. UNEP asked about adjustments to HPMP funding for small LVC countries, specifically the Pacific Island Countries (PICs) which had recently reported very low or even zero HCFC consumption. Due to their advanced state of HCFC phase-out, the PICs have asked how the Executive Committee may further assist the phase-out since if the PICs Agreement is followed it could potentially disrupt the current phase-out momentum. The Secretariat suggested that the PICs consider the current status of the HCFC consumption in all the countries and whether the plan of action proposed in stage I should be revised given the phase-out of HCFC consumption that has so far been achieved. Based on the results of this review, the submission of the stage II of the HPMP for the PICs at an earlier date could be considered by the Executive Committee.

80. The Chief Officer reminded bilateral and implementing agencies that the remaining eligible consumption is established by individual substance and cannot be transferred. UNDP discussed concerns of fluctuation in HCFC consumption, and asked whether adjustments to the starting point consumption

could be made to reflect these fluctuations. The Secretariat stated that the agreement, in which starting point consumption is established per substance, reflects a legal commitment between the country and the Executive Committee. The Chief Officer added that eligible funding for a country is determined according to these starting points at the time of the agreement; he urged bilateral and implementing agencies to remind countries of this fact.

81. UNIDO gave the example of a situation where consumption of one HCFC decreased, while another increased and asked whether funding could be adjusted to reflect this within the parameters of the eligible consumption. The Secretariat noted that the HCFC consumption eligible for funding was based on the consumption of each HCFC (as reflected in appendices 1-A and 2-A of the agreements between the Governments and the Executive Committee), and thus, adjusting the level of consumption among HCFCs for funding purposes might not be possible. However, in the specific case described, a very clear rationale for the changes in consumption should be provided if it were to be submitted for consideration on an exceptional basis.

82. The Secretariat also asked for agencies' cooperation in sending project proposals as early as possible especially in view of the proximity of the 27th Meeting of the Parties and the 75th meeting of the Executive Committee.

83. A number of issues regarding project review were discussed in bilateral meetings following the inter-agency coordination meeting.

(f) Guides and templates for submissions

(f)(i) *Guide for preparation of stage I of HPMPs (MLF/IACM.2015/2/16)*

(f)(ii) *Guide for the presentation of tranches of HPMPs (MLF/IACM.2015/2/17)*

(f)(iii) *Guide for project preparation for stage II of HPMPs (MLF/IACM.2015/2/18)*

(f)(iv) *Guide for the presentation of stage II of HPMPs (MLF/IACM.2015/2/19)*

(f)(v) *Guide for the preparation and submission of additional projects to demonstrate climate-friendly and energy-efficient alternative technologies to HCFCs, and feasibility studies (MLF/IACM.2015/2/20)*

(f)(vi) *Guide for the presentation of tranches of HCFC production sector phase-out management plans (MLF/IACM.2015/2/21)*

84. The Secretariat introduced the above-mentioned guides noting that no major changes had been made except to update them in accordance with relevant decisions adopted at the 74th meeting. Bilateral and implementing agencies were invited to follow the guides when preparing relevant project submissions.

85. The guide for presentation of stage II of HPMPs was prepared taking into account the experience gained in the preparation and submission of stage I of HPMPs with emphasis on specific elements that were not part of stage I. Agencies were encouraged to use the guide and to circulate it among their staff as a reference tool.

86. Bilateral and implementing agencies expressed appreciation for all the guides prepared. The Secretariat requested them to send any comments on the guides as soon as possible. (**Action: Bilateral and implementing agencies**)

AGENDA ITEM 7: FINANCIAL MATTERS

(a) Return of balances (MLF/IACM.2015/2/22 and Add.1)

87. The addendum to documents MLF/IACM.2015/2/22 and Add.1 provided Excel files with the updated list of completed projects with balances as per the information provided in the 2014 progress and financial reports submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies. Agencies were requested to review the information and advise the Secretariat if they have any issues especially regarding overdue return of funds, and to return the outstanding balances of completed projects and ongoing projects. The Secretariat would meet agencies bilaterally to discuss specific issues.

88. The issue of unobligated balances from UNEP projects would be discussed further in the IPSAS Workshop following the Inter-agency coordination meeting.

89. The Chief Officer thanked agencies for their efforts to return balances and stressed the need to close all accounts and progress report issues as soon as possible.

(b) Terms of reference for the review of the administrative cost regime and its core unit funding budget (MLF/IACM.2015/2/23)

90. The Executive Committee would review the administrative cost regime at the first meeting of 2017 and the terms of reference for the review at the 75th meeting. The Secretariat drew the attention of agencies to the relevant sections of document MLF/IACM.2015/2/23 which included the objectives of the review (paragraph 3), the list of potential issues that might be addressed (paragraph 13), and the proposed methodology (paragraph 14). The Secretariat explained that a small team of experts would travel to each implementing agency and requested agencies to assist in planning the missions and coordinate a meeting between the review team and the agencies' financial officers.

91. UNEP suggested that the previous report by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) which had been financed by the Multilateral Fund, and the in-house assessment of UNEP [OzonAction] be taken into account. UNEP was ready to share the report.

92. UNDP pointed out that the core unit or administration may differ from one agency to the other depending on how centralized or decentralized it was. The World Bank agreed and would like to ensure that all agencies are using the same definitions vis-à-vis the components of administrative costs. UNIDO said it was important to look at the overall administrative cost regime and to agree on definitions (for example, the difference between a "core cost" and an "administrative cost") and pointed out a deficit may occur if the core costs are decreased while support cost stay the same. The term "to perform administrative oversight" in paragraph 13(c) should be reformulated.

93. The Secretariat thanked the agencies for their comments and noted that the review methodology was acceptable to all agencies. The final document for the Executive Committee will be prepared taking into account agencies' comments.

AGENDA ITEM 8: OTHER MATTERS

Submission of progress reports

94. The Secretariat advised that the Secretariat's initial comments on the agencies progress reports would be sent to them by 2 September 2015, and outlined a number of issues that would have to be addressed including: inconsistencies between the dates of project approval in the progress report and inventory of projects; possible reconciliation issues; funding after the project had been completed; changes in the value of ODP phase out compared with the previous progress report; and, inconsistencies in completion dates.

95. Another set of comments would be sent on 18 September 2015, which would contain the comments of the programme officers that reviewed the HPMPs or other projects focusing on the remarks column, fiduciary oversight, completion, disbursement, and milestones achieved.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

96. UNEP provided an update on its activities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the country's action plan to return to compliance. It was also noted that the NOU of the country had requested UNEP to directly implement its IS project. It was emphasized that IS projects can only be implemented by the institution officially appointed by the Government and, therefore, cannot be implemented by an agency. Given the UN restrictions prevailing in the country, where funds cannot be transferred to a Government institution, the Secretariat would propose to the Executive Committee that funding associated with the IS project should be returned to the Multilateral Fund until such time as the embargo is lifted.

97. UNEP also advised the Secretariat about the difficulties facing Yemen and that IS and HPMP disbursements were not possible in the country. It was agreed that all unused funds should be returned and that a report on the HPMP and IS project should be submitted to the Executive Committee to inform them of the situation in order to decide on any actions to be taken.

AGENDA ITEM 9: CLOSURE OF MEETING

98. The Chief Officer expressed his appreciation for the brain-storming sessions and feedback received during the meeting and wished agencies a safe journey. He invited bilateral and implementing agencies to send as soon as possible the project proposals to allow the Secretariat to review and finalize the documents for the 75th meeting. On behalf of the bilateral and implementing agencies UNDP thanked the Secretariat for its support and warm hospitality.

Annex I

REPORT ON THE INFORMATION WORKSHOP ON THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR ACCOUNTING STANDARDS 2 September 2015

1. At its 74th meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Treasurer to organize, together with the Secretariat, an information workshop to update bilateral and implementing agencies on the reporting requirement under the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) prior to the 75th meeting (decision 74/52(b)(iv)).

2. In response to decision 74/52(b)(iv), a half-day information workshop was held on 2 September 2015 and included information on the transition from the United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS) to IPSAS; progress reports of the Multilateral Fund; the accounts of the Multilateral Fund under IPSAS, and an introduction to UMOJA.

Presentation by the Treasurer

3. The Treasurer gave a presentation entitled the “UN Policy framework on IPSAS⁷” covering the recognition of revenue versus income; expense recognition and the delivery principle; changes in terminology from the UNSAS to IPSAS; and specific issues relating to implementing agencies. It was highlighted that:

- (a) The General Assembly approved the adoption of IPSAS, which was subsequently adopted by UNEP in January 2015 replacing UNSAS;
- (b) IPSAS does not recognize expenses upon transfer of funds from the Treasurer to implementing agencies or from implementing agencies to intermediaries. When funds are transferred from the Treasurer to the implementing agencies they are recorded as receivables until audited financial statements, which must contain actual expenditure data, are received from the agencies. At this point actual expenditures are recorded in the accounts of the Fund;
- (c) Under IPSAS, financial statements are audited every year; and
- (d) Obligations and unliquidated obligations are no longer recognized as expenses in accordance with the “delivery principle” whereby only once goods or services are delivered then expenditures are recognised.

Feedback from implementing agencies on their IPSAS status

4. UNDP stated that it is using Atlas⁸, which is IPSAS compliant. UNDP audited financial statement reflects actual expenditures as reported by the end beneficiaries to UNDP with the exception of the Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) of China where only disbursements from UNDP to FECO are reported. UNDP’s financial statement includes transaction related to the bilateral projects.

5. UNEP reported that it became IPSAS compliant in 2014. However, 2014 is a transition year since only some UNEP UNSAS transactions were converted into the 2014 IPSAS financial statement. As a

⁷ Available as a PowerPoint file enclosed with this report.

⁸ Atlas is a name for the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system used by UNDP and other UN agencies. UNDP uses Atlas to manage projects, finances, human resources, inventory and procurement. Atlas also forms the basis for UNDP’s internal control and accountability framework.

result UNEP's 2014 financial statement includes some obligations that have been converted into commitments. From 2015 UNEP has become fully IPSAS compliant.

6. UNIDO confirmed that it was IPSAS compliant, but UNIDO is tracking expenditures in both IPSAS and UNSAS. UNIDO's financial statement for its Montreal Protocol activities, as submitted to the Treasurer, includes obligations as part of the total expenditures⁹. UNIDO continued reporting as in the previous years, in UNSAS, similar to reporting to many other donors¹⁰. UNIDO was requested an Executive Committee decision or an official letter from the Chief Officer or from the Treasurer, requiring a change in the reporting modalities. The Treasurer indicated that he would write a letter.

7. The World Bank confirmed that it uses modified cash basis accounting for the Ozone Trust Fund. The World Bank's financial statement reflects expenditures as reported by the final beneficiaries to the World Bank and excludes obligations, and includes bilateral assistance projects.

Outcome of the workshop

Implementing agencies' financial statements and schedules

8. Implementing agencies shall continue submitting provisional financial statements on the understanding that financial statements are advanced copies of the audited financial statements. Implementing agencies' financial statements should exclude bilateral agencies' projects.

9. The Treasurer shall continue presenting the Multilateral Fund accounts to the Executive Committee in the same format, i.e., one schedule per agency, showing income, expenditure and balances in accordance with decision 74/52. However, implementing agencies are requested to submit to the Treasurer four statements of the accounts, as listed below:

- (a) Statement of financial position (balance sheet);
- (b) Statement of financial performance (income statement);
- (c) Statement of changes in net assets (fund balance); and
- (d) Cash flow statement.

10. UNIDO suggested reporting as per IPSAS from the year 2015 onwards on the understanding that an official request on this change would be sent to the implementing agencies and an agreement between the Secretariat, the Treasurer and the agencies would have to be made first on the reporting format and the required adjustments in the account statements when moving from UNSAS to IPSAS. However, the Secretariat and Treasurer indicated that IPSAS compliance was necessary for the current reports so that UNEP's accounts might be IPSAS compliant in 2014. As requested by UNIDO, the Treasurer would write to all agencies requesting IPSAS-compliant 2014 audited reports for the accounts of the Fund including the four statements mentioned above while UNIDO commented that it was not in a position to commit without further discussing the matter internally.

Terminology used in the progress and balances reports from the implementing agencies to the Secretariat

⁹ UNIDO explained that in its view, it was reporting according to what it called "Donors' requirements". The Secretariat explained that there was no donor requirement for reporting outside of the financial rule of the agency and that the only reason for the requirement for obligated funds in the annual progress and financial report was to match the requirement that the Accounts to report expenditures instead of just funds disbursed, which has always been the main measure of the extent funds were no longer under the control of the agency.

¹⁰ UNIDO also explained that some donors specifically requested UNIDO to provide an IPSAS compliant report, which UNIDO had prepared for those donors.

11. The progress report column on “Funds Obligated” will be labelled “Obligations/Commitments” for 2014 but “Commitments” thereafter.

12. Only “Funds Disbursed” from the Annual Progress and Financial Reports would be reconciled with “Expenses” under the IPSAS accounts of the Multilateral Fund. “Funds Disbursed” in the agencies’ progress report should be IPSAS compliant noting that UNDP and the World Bank had indicated that their reports were IPSAS-compliant. Fund advances would not be recorded as “Funds Disbursed” under IPSAS.

13. The balances report will continue to mention “Funds Disbursed” but will change “Obligated Balance” to “Commitments” and “Unobligated Balance” to “Balance of Funds Not-committed”.

14. UNDP and UNIDO stated that disbursements from FECO to final beneficiaries are recorded in annual progress reports in line with the audited financial statements submitted by FECO and in line with the decision made by the Executive Committee on this subject. The World Bank indicated that it would prefer to report “disbursed from FECO to final beneficiaries” based on statements received from FECO, which would be IPSAS-compliant.

15. It was understood that some “inspected obligations” would be included in UNEP’s 2014 “Funds Disbursed” but that no obligations would be included in “Funds Disbursed” in future reports.

Closure of the workshop

16. The Treasurer thanked participants for the productive discussions.

Annex II
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

UNDP, New York

Mr. Jacques Van Engel
Director, Montreal Protocol Unit
E-mail: jacques.van.engel@undp.org

Ms. Monica Gaba
Programme Analyst
Montreal Protocol Unit
E-mail: monica.gaba@undp.org

Mr. Kasper Koefoed-Hansen
Regional Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean
Montreal Protocol Unit
E-mail: kasper.koefoed@undp.org

Ms. Loise Nganga
Finance Specialist
Montreal Protocol Unit
E-mail : loise.nganga@undp.org

UNEP DTIE

Ms. Shamila Nair-Bedouelle
Head, OzonAction Branch
E-mail: shamila.nair-bedouelle@unep.org

Mr. James S. Curlin
Network and Policy Manager
OzonAction Branch
E-mail: jim.curlin@unep.org

Mr. Mikheil Tushishvili
Programme Officer
Ozonaction Branch
E-mail: Mikheil.Tushishvili@unep.org

Mr. Masakatsu Ohyama
Monitoring and Administration Officer
OzonAction Branch
E-mail: Masakatsu.Ohyama@unep.org

UNIDO

Mr. Ole Nielsen
Chief, Montreal Protocol Unit/Environment Branch
E-mail: o.nielsen@unido.org

Mr. Riccardo Savigliano
Industrial Development Officer
Montreal Protocol Unit/Environment Branch
E-mail: r.savigliano@unido.org

Mr. Akos Koeszegvary
Industrial Development Officer
Montreal Protocol Unit/Environment Branch
E-mail: A.Koeszegvary@unido.org

THE WORLD BANK

Ms. Mary-Ellen Foley
Senior Environmental Specialist
Climate Change Group
Implementing Agency Coordination Unit
E-mail: mfoley1@worldbank.org

Mr. Thanavat Junchaya
Senior Environmental Engineer
Climate Change Group
Implementing Agency Coordination Unit
E-mail: tjunchaya@worldbank.org

Ms. Iman Hasan
Resource Management Analyst
E-mail: not available

TREASURER

Mr. Girma Gina
Finance and Budget Officer
Resources Management Service, Office for Operations, UNEP
Email : girma.gina@unep.org

Mr. Christopher Taylor
Senior Fund Programme Management Officer
Office for Operations, UNEP
E-mail : Christopher.Taylor@unep.org

MULTILATERAL FUND SECRETARIAT

Mr. Eduardo Ganem
Chief Officer
E-mail: eganem@unmfs.org

Mr. Andrew R. Reed
Deputy Chief Officer
E-mail: areed@unmfs.org

Ms. Angelica Domato
Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer

E-mail: adomato@unmfs.org

Ms. Julia Anne Dearing
Information Management Officer
E-mail: jamdearing@unmfs.org

Mr. Djiby Diop
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: djibyd@unmfs.org

Ms. Laura Duong
Associate Database Officer
E-mail: laura@unmfs.org

Ms. Cecilia Concepcion T. Mercado
Senior Project Management Officer
E-mail: cmercado@unmfs.org

Mr. Alejandro Ramirez Pabon
Senior Project Management Officer
E-mail: alejandro@unmfs.org

Mr. Federico San Martino
Senior Programme Management Officer
E-mail: ico@unmfs.org

Ms. Xiaojuan Wang
Programme Management Officer
E-mail: xwang@unmfs.org

Ms. Elina Yuen
Associate Programme Management Officer
E-mail: elina@unmfs.org

Mr. Theodor Kapiga
Consultant
E-mail: tkapiga@unmfs.org

Minute writers

Ms. Manika Jain
Programme Assistant
E-mail: manika@unmfs.org

Mr. Joel Pare-Julien
Programme Assistant, Monitoring and Evaluation
E-mail: Joel@unmfs.org

Ms. Despina Psillou
Programme Assistant
E-mail: despina@unmfs.org

Ms. Frida Velarde

MLF/IACM.2015/2/24

Annex II

Programme Assistant

E-mail: frida.velarde@unmfs.org

Ms. Yollande Ezin

Programme Assistant

E-mail: yollande@unmfs.org

Annex III

**COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT SUBMITTED COUNTRY PROGRAMME DATA FOR 2014 AS
AT 18 SEPTEMBER 2015**

1. Antigua and Barbuda
2. Bangladesh
3. Bolivia
4. Botswana
5. Central African Republic
6. China
7. Dominica
8. Eritrea
9. Ethiopia
10. Guinea Bissau
11. Haiti
12. India
13. Lebanon
14. Mauritania
15. Mozambique
16. Myanmar
17. Nauru
18. Qatar
19. Saint Kitts and Nevis
20. Sao Tome and Principe
21. Saudi Arabia
22. Senegal
23. Somalia
24. South Africa
25. South Sudan
26. Suriname
27. Uganda
28. Yemen