



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.
Limited

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/29/12
27 October 1999

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Twenty-ninth Meeting
Beijing, 24-26 November 1999

DRAFT BUSINESS PLAN FOR THE YEAR 2000 OF UNDP

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FUND SECRETARIAT

1. The total value of investment projects currently proposed to be submitted by UNDP in 2000 is US \$41.06 million including 15 per cent over-programming (US \$36.3 million excluding agency fees) from project preparation of US \$1.5 million (including an expected US \$169,500 carryover from 1999 project preparation approvals and US \$226,000 for project preparation for contingency projects). This level of funding is expected to result in the phase-out of 3,508 ODP tonnes. The largest amount of funding is targeted for the refrigeration sector (US \$14.4 million) followed by the foam sector (US \$13.8 million). UNDP's project preparation is for the development of projects for presentation in 2000; it does not include funding to develop projects that will be submitted in future years. UNDP provided official letters of request from the countries for which activities are planned in UNDP's business plan except for projects in Burkina Faso, Nigeria, India, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam, Georgia, Bolivia, Mexico and Peru.
2. UNDP is expected to submit requests for US \$2.22 million (US \$1.97 million excluding agency fees) for 13 non-investment activities in 2000 comprising one technical assistance project at a cost of US \$56,500 and 12 institutional strengthening renewals at a total cost of US \$2.16 million (US \$1.9 million excluding agency fees).
3. UNDP specified performance indicators in an annex to its draft business plan. UNDP expects to disburse US \$45.4 million for investment projects and phase-out 6,000 ODP tonnes in 2000. UNDP plans to submit 75 per cent of the completion reports due and conduct activities in 22 countries. The cost of project preparation is expected to be 3 per cent of investment project funding. The cost-effectiveness of its projects is expected to be US \$10.44/kg. The speed of delivery until first disbursement for investment projects is targeted at 12 months and the speed of delivery until completion is targeted at 36 months.
4. UNDP's contingency list, Table 5b, contains projects valued at US \$7.6 million in four countries: Brazil, China, India, and Nigeria. These projects would replace projects that UNDP identified as having policy issues including the China solvent sector plan, refrigeration end users projects, and an SME window project in Brazil.

COMMENTS

LVCs and global programme for LVC refrigerant recovery and recycling

5. UNDP indicates that it is planning activities in four LVCs for 2000. The number of projects in LVCs has been declining. UNDP indicated that the Committee's conditions for recovery and recycling projects is making it difficult for agencies to develop such projects in LVCs. Delays in putting into place the required legislation range from 3 to 27 months, according to UNDP. To accommodate both the Committee's condition requiring legislation and the need to address phase-out in LVCs, UNDP is proposing a Global Refrigeration Recycling project (US \$400,000) for LVCs that would enable UNDP to provide funding for countries once the national legislative/regulatory measures are in place. UNDP expects that this project would be used by two to three LVCs in 2000.

Technical assistance for a project with net incremental savings

6. UNDP is proposing a US \$50,000 technical assistance project to an enterprise in Bahrain in the form of training and trials on the alternative technology chosen by the enterprise. UNDP reported that the Aulf Aluminium Rolling Mill Company had indicated a desire for investment project funding from the Multilateral Fund. A calculation of incremental costs was made that determined that the company had incremental capital costs of US \$1,176,200 but incremental operating savings of US \$1,649,388. Consequently, the project was not eligible for funding under the guidelines for investment projects. The company, nevertheless, is planning to convert from methyl chloroform and phase-out the consumption of 32.3 ODP tonnes. UNDP has included a technical assistance project for the enterprise. The Executive Committee may wish to consider if this is an eligible activity.

Performance indicators

7. At its 26th Meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to determine the level of ODS phase-out targets for each agency for each year for future business plans based on progress reports (Decision 26/8). The Secretariat's calculation of the phase-out target for UNDP in the year 2000 is 5,841 ODP tonnes from projects to be completed in 2000 plus the residual from the phase-out through 1999. The phase-out through the end of 1999 according to UNDP's progress report was projected to be 22,658 ODP tonnes (ODP to be phased out for projects completed through 1998 plus ODP to be phased out in 1999) but the draft 2000 business plan indicated that 14,583 ODP tonnes were phased out through 1999. This would leave a balance of 7,805 ODP tonnes when added to 5,841 ODP tonnes results in a phase-out target of at least 13,646 ODP tonnes for the year 2000.

8. UNDP's planned disbursement target for investment projects is over 70 per cent of disbursements against approvals through 1999. UNDP plans on submitting 75 per cent of project completion reports that are due during the year 2000. Last year, the Committee decided that all implementing agencies should have a target of 100 per cent. For the weighted indicator, distribution among countries, UNDP is planning investment activities in 22 countries in 2000 as opposed to the 37 countries included in UNDP's 1999 business plan.

9. UNDP's non-weighted investment project indicators are targeting cost of project preparation at 3 per cent of the value of project approvals. This is an improvement over its 1999 target of 3.5 per cent of the value of project approvals.

10. UNDP's speed of project completion is targeted to be slower than in 1999. For the year 2000, UNDP expects that its projects will be completed in 36 months as opposed to the 30 month target for the year 1999. The speed of delivery target is a cumulative target. This means that for all of the projects approved for UNDP through 1999, UNDP's targeted completion was 30 months and now for all of the projects approved through 2000 the target will be 36 months. As cumulative targets, the average increase in completion of projects to be completed in 2000 will represent an increase of much more than just six months.

11. UNDP did not provide a target for the indicator "Net emission/reduction of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion".

12. UNDP is also revising its targets for speed of delivery for non-investment projects. UNDP is targeting 12 months for first disbursement of non-investment projects through 2000 when its target for non-investment projects through 1999 was nine months. It is also revising its target for speed of completion for non-investment projects from 27 months for projects completed through 1999 to 36 months for non-investment projects completed through 2000.

Policy and financial issues

13. UNDP raised several policy and financial issues in its draft business plan including inter alia, the direction of its programme toward fewer LVCs and fewer countries, its ongoing development of financial mechanisms to allow for concessional loans, and increasing paperwork.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Executive Committee may wish to consider if UNDP should maintain the technical assistance for a project with net incremental savings in its 2000 business plan.
2. The Executive Committee may also wish to consider if UNDP's performance indicator targets should be maintained or modified in particular with respect to the following targets:
 - (a) ODP phased out from previous approvals.
 - (b) Distribution of projects among countries in the business plan.
 - (c) Satisfactory project completion reports received.
 - (d) Speed of delivery until project completion (both for investment and non-investment projects).
 - (e) Speed of delivery until first disbursement for non-investment projects.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND
OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL**
(29th Meeting, 24-26 November 1999, Beijing)

UNDP DRAFT 2000 BUSINESS PLAN: NARRATIVE
(Prepared: 8 October 1999)

A. UNDP's DRAFT 2000 BUSINESS PLAN RELATIONSHIP
TO THE 1999 UNDP PROGRAMME

UNDP DRAFT 2000 BUSINESS PLAN IN A HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1. A review of UNDP's 1991-1999 investment projects as of end-December 1999 (assuming remaining 1999 Business Plan approvals at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999), and the sectoral relationship to the UNDP Draft 2000 Business Plan shows the following trends by sector:

SECTOR	1991-1999 INV. PROJECTS		DRAFT 2000 BUSINESS PLAN	
	APPROVALS		PROPOSED BUDGET	
	\$ millions	Percent	\$ millions	Percent
Aerosols	7.73	3.3	1.00	2.7
Foams	121.12	51.6	13.84	38.1
Halons	2.70	1.1	0.20	0.6
Methyl Bromide	7.66	3.3	0.90	2.5
Refrigeration	84.83	36.1	14.40	39.6
Solvents	10.75	4.6	6.00	16.5
TOTAL	234.79	100.0	36.34	100.0

2. During 1991-99, the foams (51.6%) and refrigeration (36.1%) sectors in UNDP's portfolio together accounted for almost 88% of UNDP's cumulative approval total for investment projects, with much smaller shares for solvents (4.6%), aerosols (3.3%), methyl bromide (3.3%) and halons (1.1%).
3. UNDP's Draft 2000 Business Plan is based on evaluation of the requests received from Governments, taking into account ExCom directives in the many different areas. In the UNDP Draft 2000 Business Plan, the share of foams will fall from the 51.6% average during 1991-99 to 38.1% in 2000, that in refrigeration will rise from 36.1% to 39.6%, that of solvents will rise from 4.6% to 16.5% to cover expected approval of the first phase of the China solvents sectoral programme, that of aerosols will decrease from 3.3% to 2.7%, that of halons will decrease from 1.1% to 0.6%, and that of alternatives to methyl bromide use will decrease from 3.3% to 2.5%. A total of 3,508 ODP tonnes would be eliminated under UNDP's Draft 2000 Business Plan approvals.

4. Overall UNDP investment project cost-effectiveness (in \$/kg.) by year of approval is as follows:

Year	Cost-Effectiveness (US\$/kg.)
1992	9.5/kg.
1993	7.8/kg.
1994	7.5/kg.
1995	5.5/kg.
1996	7.1/kg.
1997	6.7/kg.
1998	7.09/kg.
1999 (prelim.)	7.06/kg.
2000 (estimated)	10.44/kg.

5. Overall investment programme cost-effectiveness decreased during 1992-95, from \$9.5/kg. in 1992 to \$5.5/kg. in 1995. By end-1995, however, most large cost-effective projects had already been approved, and UNDP was increasingly being requested to also start investment project preparation for low-volume ODS consuming countries (LVCs) where cost-effectiveness criteria do not apply. As a result, overall programme cost-effectiveness increased from \$5.5/kg. in 1995 to \$7.1/kg., declining slightly to \$6.7/kg. in 1997 and rising slightly to \$7.09/Kg. in 1998.
6. Indications in late-1999 are that UNDP's overall investment programme cost-effectiveness would be \$7.06/kg. in 1999, about the same as in 1998. This reflects the relatively fewer MeBr alternative demonstration projects which UNDP has been able to develop as well as the very cost-effective aerosols and halons projects which were approved. In 2000, UNDP's investment project portfolio cost-effectiveness is estimated at \$10.44/kg. including MeBr projects; the poorer cost-effectiveness would reflect the greater proportion of commercial refrigeration and solvent sector projects as also the larger number of group projects covers SMEs.
7. Thus, ODS phaseout investment projects in UNDP's Draft 2000 Business Plan would not be as cost-effective as in previous years. The reasons include the following:
- the completion of most large projects and many mid-sized projects
 - the greater number of mid-to-smaller sized enterprises left whose cost-effectiveness should be close to (or exceed) the sectoral/subsectoral CE threshold levels
 - projects in LVCs which often have smaller-sized enterprises and where cost-effectiveness threshold limits do not apply
 - an increasing proportion of higher-cost commercial refrigeration and solvent sector projects. UNDP hopes China will receive ExCom approval of its solvent sector financing plan in late-1999 or early 2000, which would increase the proportion of higher-cost solvent sector projects
 - an increasing number of sectoral/subsectoral ODS phaseout projects that, in general, cover a large number of SMEs.

SPECIAL AREA RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS

8. a) **Low-ODS Consuming Countries (LVCs).** In 1998, UNDP had programmes in 33 low-ODS consuming countries (Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Congo (Braz.), Costa Rica, Cuba, El-Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana,

Guatemala, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Tanzania, Trinidad & Tobago, Uganda, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe). In 1999, five additional LVCs - Belize, Chad, Fiji, Mali and Nepal – were added bringing the number to 38. In 2000, UNDP hopes to add Burkina Faso to this list. Thus by end-2000, UNDP should have programmes in a total of 65 countries comprising 39 LVCs and 26 medium-to-high level ODS consuming countries.

- b) **Refrigerant Recovery/Recycling in LVCs as Part of RMPs.** In its 1997 Business Plan, UNDP was to submit for approval 12 such programmes. However, at its 22nd Meeting in May 1997, the ExCom under Decision 22/25 (Development of Refrigeration Management Plans - RMPs) made development of national RMPs a precondition for other project activities in LVCCs so as to ensure sustainability. Further, such projects could only be submitted if fully justified by an RMP. Due to delays in agreement on RMP guidelines and the consequent delay in RMP preparation, six potential programmes could not be submitted in 1997; 5 were approved in 1998 (Burundi, Dominican Republic, El-Salvador, Gabon and Moldova), Niger was approved in March 1999, that for Nepal was approved in July 1999 and programmes for Belize, Chad, Fiji and Mali should be approved in late-1999. The ExCom's condition that national measures be in place before project implementation can start has seriously delayed ongoing project implementation and prevented UNDP from planning for several additional projects as LVCs struggle to put in place the required legislation. These delays have ranged from 3 months (El Salvador) to 6 months (Dominican Republic) to 8 months (Trinidad & Tobago) to 10 months (Bahrain, Georgia), to 12 months (Bahamas, Lesotho) to 13 months (Mozambique) and to over 27 months and still not resolved in Tanzania.
- c) **Special Provision for Global Programme in LVC Refrigerant Recovery/Recycling.** In previous years, UNDP had specified the names of several LVCs in its annual business plans with the intention of developing national refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes. The extended time taken by many of them for completion of RMPs and the additional time needed for several of them to draft the legislation to conform to the ExCom directive that national measures be in place before project implementation can start, has resulted in many of these programmes not being approved. For 2000, UNDP proposes an allocation of \$400,000 in its business plan set aside for LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes when ready. This would provide a window for this activity while, at the same time, not penalizing UNDP for non-approval of any specific country programme for reasons beyond the implementing agency's control.
- d) **Methyl Bromide (MeBr).** Following the decision of the 9th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol in Sept. 1997 and guidance received at the 23rd Executive Committee Meeting in November 1997, UNDP has been coordinating with UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank to harmonize activities in this area. UNDP had received requests and/or identified MeBr alternative demonstration proposals in 17 countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Peru, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Tanzania and Tunisia). UNDP received approval in 1998 for MeBr alternative demonstration projects in Argentina, Lebanon, Mexico and the Philippines. In March 1999 UNDP received approval for four projects in Costa Rica (2), Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe and expects to receive approval for projects in Malawi and Malaysia in November 1999. In 2000, projects are expected in Bolivia, Chile and Peru. UNDP's offer to assist several countries in this area have not been responded to by the Governments concerned. In addition some Governments (e.g. Peru) have requested one-year delays in the start of MeBr project preparation for no apparent reason. UNDP makes maximum use of both national consultants and qualified NGOs in its MeBr formulation activities in order to ensure project sustainability.

9. a) **Assisting Countries Meet their 1999 CFC Freeze Targets and the 50% reduction target for 2005.** While no investment projects approved in 1999/2000 will be completed in time to directly help countries meet their 1999 CFC freeze targets, the UNDP Draft 2000 Business Plan will do the following:
- For LVCs where the refrigeration sector is dominant and RMPs are a pre-requisite, UNDP is timing its investment project preparation activities to contribute to formulation of national refrigerant management plans. Where the potential for national refrigerant recovery/recycling projects exist, UNDP is strongly advising the respective Governments to urgently adopt the measures required by the Executive Committee to ensure programme sustainability. This will facilitate quick project implementation when the respective projects are approved by the Executive Committee.
 - UNDP, using the newly approved ExCom guidelines for the commercial refrigeration end user sector, will try to work in this area in Burkina Faso, Georgia and Sri Lanka which have requested our assistance in this area.
 - For mid-to-larger size countries, UNDP's strategy would concentrate on maintaining programme continuity since projects approved in 2000 would be completed in 2002-2003 thereby helping them comply with the next control measure of the Protocol.
- b) **Strategies for ODS Phaseout in Small-and-Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs)**
- During 1997-98, the Executive Committee approved UNDP umbrella projects in commercial refrigeration in Costa Rica, in rigid foam and commercial refrigeration in Guatemala, an umbrella project for rigid spray thermoware in India, umbrella projects in rigid spray foam and integral skin foam in Mexico, an umbrella foam project for
 - Paraguay, and an umbrella rigid foam project and the umbrella solvents (Phase II) in the Philippines.
 - In 1999, similar umbrella projects have continued to be developed (e.g. in India and Mexico). One project has been developed in India following the ExCom guidelines related to the SME Window.
 - In 2000, UNDP will continue using this approach which is exceedingly useful in dealing with the special needs of SMEs. A key objective is to prevent growth in SME consumption of ODS while the Fund is approving projects to eliminate ODS consumption in larger enterprises in the same country. It is expected that, due to their small scale, SME investment projects in 2000 and future years may have great difficulty meeting existing CE sectoral thresholds. UNDP has pioneered and will continue to develop new and innovative approaches to facilitate effective ODS phaseout in SMEs.
- c) **Increased Coverage in Africa.** In 1999, UNDP has work programmes in 22 African countries (3 mid-sized, 19 LVCCs). The three mid-size countries are Egypt, Morocco and Nigeria. The 19 LVCCs are Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Braz.), Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In UNDP's Draft 2000 Business Plan, the total number of countries in Africa would increase from 22 to 23 with the addition of Burkina Faso.
- c) **Sectoral Approaches.** UNDP is the lead agency assisting China in the development of its solvent sector strategy and financing plan. This sectoral approach was first presented to the ExCom for approval at its 27th Meeting in March 1999. The ExCom constituted a China Solvent Sector Working Group chaired by Sweden and comprising the Bahamas, Brazil, China, Japan, and the
- USA. This Working Group met during the 28th ExCom Meeting in July 1999 in Montreal and then in

Washington D.C. on 29th September 1999. It is next scheduled to meet in Beijing on Sunday 21st November. UNDP expects that the first tranche of \$6-7 million which would start the process of eliminating CFC-113 consumption would be funded in late-1999 or early 2000 to initiate the programme.

B. PLANNED BUSINESS ACTIVITIES: UNDP

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

10. **Table 1 on Funded Investment Projects by Sector (including recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative demonstration projects)** shows that, as of 31 December 1999 and including expected investment project approvals for UNDP at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999 which would complete UNDP's 1999 Business Plan submissions, UNDP should have 742 approved investment projects in 58 countries with cumulative budgets of \$234.8 million. This assumes that both MeBr and LVC projects can be formulated and approved. The sector shares for ongoing investment projects are aerosols (3.3%), foams (51.6%), halons (1.1%), methyl bromide (3.3%), refrigeration (36.1%) and solvents (4.6%). These 742 projects would be expected to eliminate 32,478 ODP tonnes/annum. Investment project disbursements by UNDP during 1991-1999 (excluding obligations), as per very preliminary estimates in Sept. 1999, would amount to \$125 million with 14,853 ODP tonnes eliminated.
11. During 2000, investment project disbursements are targeted at \$40.16million with 6,000 ODP tonnes to be eliminated. In the following years, project disbursements would total \$69.63 million with the remaining 11,625 ODP tonnes to be phased out. The level of expected disbursements by UNDP in 2000 is conditioned on the expected completion of several projects approved in late-1997 and in 1998 based on the 30-36 month duration based on implementation experience during 1997-99. It is also conditioned on the assumption that countries affected by the severe 1998 economic recession will continue recovering and maintain their economic growth in year 2000.
12. **Table 4, based on Table 1, shows Funded Investment Projects by Country.** UNDP should, by end-1999, have ongoing investment, recovery/recycling and MeBr projects in 58 countries, 21 in Africa, 16 in Asia/Pacific, 2 in Europe, and 19 in Latin America/Caribbean. This assumes that both MeBr and LVC projects can be formulated and approved. Table 4 shows that project approval shares by region are 11.8% for Africa, 54.8% for Asia/Pacific, 0.3% for Europe and 33.1% for Latin America/Caribbean. The shares of ODP phaseout by region are 12.3% for Africa, 59.6% for Asia/Pacific, 0.1% for Europe, and 28.0% for Latin America/Caribbean, reflecting both the larger-size countries and enterprises in the Asia/Pacific region and also the significant number of smaller countries currently being assisted in Africa and Latin America/Caribbean.
13. **Table 3 on Ongoing Non-Investment Projects** covers 46 ongoing non-investment projects, of which 22 are institutional strengthening projects or renewals. A total of \$16.24 million would have been approved by end-1999, of which \$13.40 million or 83% would have been disbursed by end-1999. In 2000, \$1.97 million in new project approvals are expected, all of which are institutional strengthening project renewals except for one \$50,000 technical assistance project. In 2000, expected disbursements would be \$1.70 million, leaving a balance of \$1.14 million for future years. The 22 ongoing institutional strengthening projects which last two years help explain why disbursements continue over several years.
14. The following 12 institutional strengthening renewal requests amounting to \$1,917,052 (excluding

support costs) will be submitted to the ExCom for approval in 2000:

a)	Brazil:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	270,000
b)	Colombia:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	212,000
c)	Cuba:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	114,666
d)	Indonesia:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	208,650
e)	Iran:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	133,470
f)	Kenya:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase III	116,667
g)	Lebanon:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase II	119,333
h)	Mexico:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase V	190,000
i)	Pakistan:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase II	172,666
j)	Trinidad/Tobago:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase II	44,000
k)	Uruguay:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase IV	116,000
l)	Venezuela:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase V	219,600

15. UNDP has one technical assistance project for submission to the ExCom for approval in 2000. Under this activity, UNDP will provide technology transfer to Gulf Aluminum Rolling Mill Company (Garmco) in Bahrain to assist it in eliminating 32.3 ODP tonnes of methyl chloroform. The formulated project document came up with a project costing of \$1,176,200; however, the operational savings were determined to be \$1,649,388 which resulted in no MFL grant. UNDP and the Government are requesting \$50,000 only to provide technical assistance to the enterprise to enable it to eliminate its methyl chloroform consumption on its own.

PROGRAMME EXPANSION

16. **Table 2 shows UNDP's request for investment project preparation by sector, including that for development of recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative demonstration projects.** This table excludes the contingency list (Table 5B) covering projects with policy issues. UNDP, by end-1999, could have a balance of \$0.15 million in previously approved project preparation funds. UNDP will prepare \$36.34 million in investment projects in 2000 covering regular programming as well as \$7.90 million in contingency projects for a total of \$44.24 million. UNDP is thus requesting \$1.19 million in additional project preparation assistance (\$0.99 million for projects in Table 5A and \$0.20 million for contingency projects in Table 5B) which would enable UNDP to formulate and submit for approval 114 investment and MeBr alternative demonstration projects under the regular programme (\$36.34 million) as well as 25 projects under the contingency list (\$7.90 million).
17. The regular programme would eliminate 3,508 ODP tonnes while the contingency programme would eliminate an additional 865 ODP tonnes. Under the regular programme, project value by sector would be: aerosols (2.7%), foams (38.1%), halons (0.6%), methyl bromide (2.5%), refrigeration (39.6%) and solvents (16.5%). Expected ODP phaseout by sector is: aerosols (7.0%), foams (45.7%), methyl bromide (2.1%), halons (1.1%), refrigeration (29.8%) and solvents (14.3%). The contingency programme covers the foam sector only. UNDP requests a project preparation advance of \$250,000 at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999 to enable it to continue with its project preparation activities until approval of the balance at the 30th ExCom Meeting in March 2000.
18. **Table 5, based on Table 2, shows UNDP's request for investment project preparation by country (including recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative demonstration projects) under the regular programme.** A total of 19 countries are covered: 2 in Africa, 8 in Asia/Pacific, 1 in Europe and 8 in Latin America/Caribbean. There is also a global programme for development of 2-3 national refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes in LVCs; while there are several candidate countries, UNDP is awaiting indications that they have started on the process of adopting draft measures/legislation as required by the ExCom before such projects can be prepared. Of total project

preparation funds of \$1.14 million (the \$0.15 million balance plus the requested \$0.99 million), Africa has 5% which includes project formulation in Burkina Faso and Nigeria, Asia/Pacific will have 54% covering project formulation in China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Syria and Vietnam. Latin America/Caribbean will have 39% covering investment project formulation in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Jamaica, Mexico and Peru. The one European country would be Georgia which would receive 2%. The one country which would receive its first investment project would be Burkina Faso.

19. **Table 5A, based on Table 5, presents project preparation requests disaggregated by country, sector and subsector.** It is self-explanatory. There are only four LVCs in the programme – Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Georgia and Peru – due to the increasing difficulty in developing projects in LVCs and the ready availability of cost-effective projects in non-LVCs. The difficulties in implementing LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling projects has already been discussed above. In the case of China, UNDP hopes for approval of the China solvent sector financing strategy and plan at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999, with approval of the first tranche funding of \$6-7 million, which is why only one project is denoted.
20. **Table 5B presents the contingency list of projects.** The total contingency list amounts to \$7.90 million which would eliminate 865 ODP tonnes in the foam sector. The rationale is the following:
- a) **Brazil:** Under the rigid foam sector allocation, \$1.3 million of the allocated \$2.5 million would cover SME Group projects. Since there is a requirement that the Government have a strategy to address these type of projects, in the event the strategy or aspects of it are not acceptable, UNDP would substitute \$1.3 million of other foam projects in their place.
 - b) **China:** UNDP hopes for approval of the China solvent sector financing strategy and plan at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999, with approval of the first tranche funding of \$6-7 million at that time. In the event the solvent sector financing strategy and financing plan is not approved and funded at that time nor in 2000, UNDP would substitute \$6 million of China foam projects in its place.
 - c) **Commercial Refrigeration End-users:** UNDP has proposed commercial refrigeration end-user projects in Burkina Faso, Georgia and Sri Lanka amounting in total to \$600,000. In the event these projects do not qualify for funding, UNDP would substitute in their place \$300,000 in foam projects each in India and Nigeria.

C. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

21. **Project Disbursements.** Estimated project disbursements by UNDP in 2000, excluding obligations, should total \$42.36 million comprising \$40.16 million on investment projects, \$1.70 million on non-investment projects and \$0.50 million of project preparation funds.
22. The disbursement targets are possible only if no critical delays are encountered, such as disagreements with Governments on implementation modalities, delays in signing project documents, inability of equipment suppliers to meet deadlines, inability of joint venture companies or companies that have accepted partial funding to provide their share in foreign exchange, and the tendency of some Governments to levy taxes/duties on equipment purchased through MLF projects, with enterprises refusing to complete their projects until the policies change. Total disbursements by year (excluding obligations) would be:

Year	Disbursements	Cumulative Disbursements
------	---------------	--------------------------

	(\$ millions)	(\$ millions)
1991	0.251	0.251
1992	0.518	0.769
1993	3.862	4.631
1994	6.467	11.098
1995	11.532	22.630
1996	29.501	52.131
1997	34.330	86.461
1998	33.544	120.005
1999 (prelim. est.)	35.000	155.005
2000 Target	42.360	197.365

23. The above will be possible only if enterprises are able to expeditiously complete their approved projects, including providing the needed counterpart contributions where mandated.
24. For the period 1991-1999, preliminary estimates show cumulative UNDP project disbursements of \$155.005 million as compared to total approvals of \$255.00 million giving a delivery rate of 60.8%. In 2000, net additional disbursements of \$42.36 million are anticipated. A comparison of disbursements on investment, non-investment and project preparation activities during 1991-1999 (estimate), in calendar year 2000 and cumulatively during 1991-2000 is as follows:

Period	Inv. Project Disbursements (\$ millions)	Non-Inv. Project Disbursements (\$ millions)	Project Prep. Disbursements (\$ millions)	Total Disbursements (\$ millions)
1991 - Dec 99 (prelim. est.)	130.505	18.000	6.500	155.005
2000 Target	40.160	1.700	0.500	42.360
1991-2000 Target	170.665	19.700	7.000	197.365

25. **1999 UNDP Investment Project Disbursement Target:** In its 1999 Business Plan, UNDP had targeted its total 1991-99 disbursement on investment projects to be \$125.000 million. Preliminary indications are that the actual figure would be around \$130.505 million. UNDP would thus have achieved 104.4% of its 1991-1999 disbursement target. The recovery from the severe economic recession in 1998 experienced by several developing countries where UNDP has ongoing investment projects - both in South-East Asia (e.g. Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand) and Latin America (e.g. Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela) – is a factor that has enabled UNDP to achieve its target.
26. **Investment Project Approvals in 1999** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had projected investment project approvals of \$33.91 million in 1999 excluding overprogramming. As of July 1999, UNDP had received \$16.52 million in project approvals, and \$19.18 million in submissions (including 15% overprogramming) for the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999 bringing UNDP's submission total to \$35.70 million which should enable UNDP to meet its investment project submission target of \$33.91 million. While UNDP met its target for investment project approvals, it was unable to prepare and submit \$3.5 million in MeBr alternative demonstration projects due to insufficient interest

from potential recipient countries, despite UNDP's best efforts to encourage these countries to prepare projects.

27. **ODP to be Phased Out from 1999 Business Plan Approvals:** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had a projected ODP phaseout target of 2,700 ODP tonnes for projects to be approved in 1999 (3,104 tonnes less 15% over-programming). UNDP investment projects approved at the 28th (July 1999) ExCom Meeting will eliminate 2,036 ODP tonnes. In addition, UNDP has submitted 82 projects (including over-programming) for consideration at the 29th ExCom Meeting in November 1999 which would eliminate an additional 2,890 ODP tonnes. Thus the submission total of 5,590 ODP tonnes ensures that UNDP would easily meet and significantly exceed its 1999 ODP approval target of 2,700 ODP tonnes.
28. **ODP Phased Out in 1999:** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had projected an ODP phaseout target of 3,800 ODP tonnes in 1999. During 1999, initial estimates show that actual ODP phaseout will far exceed this figure. UNDP would thus have met and exceeded its 1999 Business Plan ODP phaseout target.
29. **Speed of Investment Project Delivery.** Analysis of UNDP's speed of delivery and completion for investment projects shows the following:

Year	Months from Approval to First Disbursement	Months from Approval to Completion	Cost-Effectiveness
1992	18	29	9.5
1993	14	26	7.8
1994	14	32	7.5
1995	15	24	5.5
1996	9	22	7.1
1997	12	31	6.7
1998	14	32	7.1
1999 (estimate)	14	36	7.1
2000 (target)	14	36	10.4

30. Based on evaluation of UNDP's July 1999 Progress Report for the period ending December 1998, and since these detailed tables are only prepared once a year, UNDP will, for the most part, adjust its previously proposed estimates slightly as follows:
- The average length of time between investment project approval and first disbursement for investment projects averaged between 9-18 months for projects approved during 1992-96. In 1997 it was 12 months and in 1998, it was 14 months. UNDP has been able to keep this figure at 14 months in 1999 and proposes that the same target will hold for 2000.
 - UNDP's investment projects, approved during 1992-96, have taken between 22-32 months to complete their ODS phaseout. During 1997-98, due to very difficult circumstances facing many enterprises caused by the South-East Asian and Latin American stock market crashes and economic recessions, investment project completion was delayed at many enterprises and the period to completion jumped to 31-32 months.

- c) In July 1999, the 28th ExCom Meeting decided:
- Under decision 28/2 that projects could only be termed completed when all use of CFCs had stopped. Since UNDP had previously allowed enterprises to use up their stocks even after a project was considered completed, this would raise the duration of UNDP project completion.
 - Also under decision 28/2 is the proviso that formal agreements be entered into between the agency, the enterprise and the Government requiring destruction of CFC-using equipment and no further use of CFCs. This would take several additional months of paperwork to finalize.
 - Under decision 28/7, project balances should be returned to the Fund at the latest 12 months after project completion. UNDP had previously reported completion as the date when its Certificate of Completion was signed, with final disbursement normally taking place up to two years after that date. UNDP will no longer be able to use its Certificate of Completion date but rather its Hand-Over Protocol date which would allow it to meet all three of the above provisions.
- d) The result is that investment project duration will now take a full 36 months so as to ensure that the above ExCom provisions are adhered to. It should also be noted that the larger number of umbrella projects, often covering SMEs, take three years or more to complete, and this automatically adds to the overall implementation period.

31. **Speed of Non-Investment Project Delivery.** Analysis of UNDP's speed of delivery and completion for non-investment projects done on the basis of UNDP's Progress Report to the 28th ExCom Meeting in July 1999 showed the following:

Year	Months from Approval to First Disbursement	Months from Approval to Completion
1991	11	24
1992	16	33
1993	10	33
1994	6	24
1995	4	15
1996	6	24
1997	10	29
1998	13	36
1999 (estimate)	12	36
2000 (target)	12	36

32. The above table shows the following:
- a) The average length of time between non-investment project approval and first disbursement averaged 10-16 months during 1991-93, fell during 1994-96, rose to 10 months in 1997 and to 13 months in 1998. UNDP will try to cut it back to 12 months in both 1999 and 2000.
 - b) UNDP's non-investment projects, approved during 1991-96, have taken between 15-33 months to complete. In 1997 it averaged 29 months, rising to 36 months in 1998. UNDP is targeting the same 36 month figure in both 1999 and 2000. Most comprise two-year institutional strengthening renewals which often take between 30-36 months to complete their activities due to Governmental and UNDP financial and operational procedures for these

projects.

33. **ODS Phaseout.** UNDP had planned to eliminate 3,800 ODP tonnes in 1999. Actual ODP tonnes eliminated in 1999 will likely be higher than this target. With a cumulative total of at least 14,853 ODP tonnes eliminated as of end-December 1999, UNDP proposes to eliminate an additional 6,000 ODP tonnes in 2000 so that by end-2000 UNDP would have eliminated a total of 20,853 ODP tonnes/annum. This would amount to 64% of the expected 1991-2000 UNDP programme of 32,478 ODP tonnes. The actual and projected ODS phaseout expressed in ODP tonnes is as follows:

Year	ODP Tonnes/Yr Phased Out	Cumulative ODP Tonnes/Yr Phased Out
1992	0	0
1993	178	178
1994	227	405
1995	1,497	1,902
1996	1,658	3,560
1997	3,065	6,625
1998	4,428	11,053
1999(estimate)	3,800	14,853
2000(target)	6,000	20,853
Future years	11,625	32,478

34. **2000 ODS Phaseout as a Percentage of UNDP Programme.** The total ODP to be eliminated in 2000 under UNDP investment projects would be 6,000 ODP tonnes. This amounts to 18.5% of the total UNDP programme of 32,478 ODP tonnes.

35. **Diversity of the UNDP Portfolio.** The Executive Committee has requested implementing agencies to diversify their project portfolios to reach the largest number of potential recipient countries. The following table highlights UNDP's efforts in this area by comparing the programme portfolio expected as of end-1999 with that expected as of end-2000.

DIVERSITY CRITERIA	As of end-1999	As of end-2000
a) Total number of countries covered	61	62
b) Number of LVCs covered	38	39
c) Countries in the Africa region	22	23
d) Countries in the Asia/Pacific region	17	17
e) Countries in Latin America/Caribbean region	20	20
f) Countries in Europe/CIS region	2	2

36. **Project Costing and Use of Contingency Costs.** For many projects approved during 1995-1998, contingency costs have had to be utilized fully and in many cases additional funding from the recipient enterp

risewasessentialsinceequipmentcostshaveinseveralinstancesbeengoingupratherthandown.Thisexperienc
ewillcontinueinto1999and2000.Withthesmallersizeofenterprisesbeingcovered,projectcost-
effectivenessisalsonotasfavorable.Revisedbaselineequipmentcalculationswouldincreasethecounterpartfu
ndingrequiredfromrecipiententerprise.

37. Cost of Investment Project Preparation

a) During 1991-

98, \$5.37 million in project preparation funds disbursed resulted in the approval of \$183.0 million in inves
tment projects, giving a cost of preparation ratio of 2.93%. This was almost identical to UNDP's 1999 Bu
siness Plan estimate of 3%.

b) For 1999 it is too early to determine the cost of project preparations since over half of UNDP's 1999 investment program
me is yet to be approved by the Executive Committee. UNDP had previously assumed that the cost would
driseto3.5% reflecting the growing cost of investment project preparation as the projects get smaller and
more numerous, together with the increasing use of umbrella projects and MeBr alternative demonstrati
on projects which involve more substantive participation by national experts and additional Governmen
t ministries (e.g. Agriculture) as well as NGOs. However, given the small number of MeBr projects that
UNDP has been able to finalize, our revised estimate is that the cost of investment project preparation in 1
999 would likely remain around 3% and the same would be true in 2000.

38. Cost-Effectiveness of UNDP Investment Projects

a) The average cost-effectiveness of approved UNDP ODS phase out investment projects decreased during 1992-
95, it being \$9.5/kg. in 1992, \$7.8/kg. in 1993, \$7.5/kg. in 1994 and \$5.5/kg. in 1995. However, in 1996
the cost-effectiveness figure was \$7.1/kg. reflecting both a small number of large cost-
effective projects and a large number of small projects, especially in LVCCs. During 1997, a few large hi
ghly cost-effective projects were developed counterbalancing many smaller ones with a resulting cost-
effectiveness of around \$6.7/kg. In 1998 it rises slightly to \$7.1/kg. And preliminary indications are that it
will remain at this level in 1999 also.

b) For 2000, under the regular programme (excluding the contingency list), 114 projects would be prepare
d amounting to \$36.34 million that would eliminate 3,508 ODP tonnes. Overall programme cost-
effectiveness would be \$10.44/kg. And since there would only be 4-
7 LVC projects formulated, they should not significantly affect the above estimate.

D. POLICY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN 2000

39. a) Despite the strenuous attempts made by UNDP to convince Governments to go in for additional MeBr alternative
emonstration projects or even investment projects, the response has been very poor. And some Govern
ments have requested 6-
12 month delays in the start of MeBr project preparation. UNDP does make maximum use of both nation
al consultants and qualified NGOs in its MeBr formulation activities in order to ensure projects sustainabili
ty, and in some instances this has been of concern to the respective ozone units.

b) UNDP is faced with the situation that, in some larger ODS consuming countries (e.g. Brazil, India), where
as in previous years 2-
3 implementing agencies were involved in project formulation and submission, in 1999 and potentially in
2000, UNDP would be responsible for development of three-
quarters or more of the full ODS programme in these countries. With UNDP requested to put more of its
resources into such countries, the diversity of the UNDP portfolio will be reduced with activities in fewer c

ountries and fewer LVCs. UNDP is responding to recipient Government requests and should not be penalized in business plan performance evaluation if its number of countries thus decreases or if it consequently is active in fewer LVCs.

- c) Following the principle that priority has to be given to countries to enable them to meet the phase out provisions of the Protocol, UNDP in its draft 2000 business plan has also concentrated on countries that need assistance in order to meet the 50% ODS reduction target in 2005. However, UNDP has several pending requests from Governments (e.g. Malaysia, Philippines) who have already met the 50% ODS reduction target and want to proceed immediately towards 100% ODS phase out, often with supporting legislation in place or being formulated. The question is raised as to what sort of priority can be accorded to this latter group of countries, given the budgetary constraint of UNDP's 2000 business plan?
- d) The high demand by Governments that UNDP include consumption sector projects in its 2000 draft business plan has resulted both in UNDP transferring its proposed Venezuela production sector programme to the World Bank and also looking for a way to somehow handle the over \$15 million in requests for consumption sector projects over and above the UNDP 2000 business plan target. UNDP has already filled almost half of its potential 2001 business plan with this overflow of projects. A higher allocation would help UNDP meet more of its pending requests and assist the countries accelerate their ODS phase out.

E. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

- 40. a) UNDP has been accepting promissory notes since its legal agreement with the Executive Committee was suitably amended in 1998. Most of UNDP's project approvals in 1999 and 2000 can be covered by promissory notes, which will be encashed as needed. The reconciliation of UNDP allocations and interest income accounts as maintained by UNDP and the Fund Treasurer is moving ahead smoothly.
- b) UNDP is developing internal financial mechanisms to accommodate any future decision that would require UNDP to utilize the concessional loan modality on a limited basis.
- c) While UNDP is making strenuous efforts to keep its total project support costs within the 13% level for projects under \$500,000, we increasingly find that the cost of implementing small projects is very high and that UNDP Country Officers are also requesting reimbursement for actual costs incurred in supporting project implementation. UNDP will report to the ExCom in its next Progress Report on further developments.
- d) The increasing paperwork is seriously impacting the ability of UNDP to implement its projects effectively, with the rapid submission of investment and non-investment project completion reports posing particularly severe difficulties. UNDP had requested in its 1999 Business Plan that a process be developed to facilitate a reduction in the burden of paperwork. However, in 1999 the paperwork burden increased even further with even more stringent deadlines. UNDP again requests that some solution be found for this problem.

(BPlan2000A.doc)

ANNEX

Table 1

UNDP INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

	ITEMS	2000 TARGETS
	Weighted Indicators	
1	ODP phased out from previous approvals (ODP tonnes)	6,000
2	Funds disbursed (US\$) *	\$45,380,800
3	Satisfactory project completion reports received (percentage)	75%
4	Distribution of projects among countries in business plans (number)	22
	Non-Weighted Indicators	
1	Value of projects to be approved (US\$)	\$35,707,017
2	ODP from projects to be approved (ODP tonnes) **	3,050
3	Cost of project preparation (per cent of submission)	3.0%
4	Cost-effectiveness from projects to be approved (US\$/ODP in kg.)	\$10.44
5	Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	12 months
6	Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36 months
7	Net emission/reduction of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion	
	* Includes agency support costs of 13% but excludes 15% over-programming	
	** Adjusted to remove effect of the 15% over-programming	

Table 2

UNDP NON-INVESTMENT PROJECT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

	ITEMS	2000 TARGETS
	Weighted Indicators	
1	Number of projects to be completed	10
2	Funds disbursed (US\$) *	\$1,921,000
3	Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	12 months
4	Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36 months
	Non-Weighted Indicators	
1	Appropriate and timely policies initiated by countries as a result of networking, training, information exchange, country programme development and/or institutional strengthening (number of countries)	5 countries
2	Reduction in ODS consumption over and above that effected by investment projects (ODP tonnes)	100
	* Includes agency support costs of 13% but excludes 15% over-programming	

TABLE 1: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Sector: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Sector	Sub-Sector	No. Of Countries	Approvals by the Executive Committee through December 1999				Disbursement					
				Value \$	ODP From Approvals (4)	Num-ber of Projects	Cost Effective-ness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	Aerosol	Aerosol	29	7,734,027	1,994	38	3.88	3,402,016	1,584,581	2,747,429	474	517	1,003
UNDP	Foam	Foam Flexible PUF	87	23,374,988	5,075	88	4.61	14,685,679	3,178,413	5,510,896	2,459	891	1,725
UNDP	Foam	Foam General	13	15,823,190	2,032	57	7.79	3,622,173	4,462,940	7,738,077	773	429	830
UNDP	Foam	Foam Integral Skin	68	21,918,148	2,224	89	9.86	9,234,228	4,639,579	8,044,341	994	419	811
UNDP	Foam	Foam Polystyrene/Polyethylene	38	14,023,292	3,243	38	4.32	10,916,533	1,136,404	1,970,355	1,754	507	982
UNDP	Foam	Foam Rigid PUF	161	45,974,508	6,552	185	7.02	23,535,561	8,207,814	14,231,133	2,829	1,267	2,456
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Flowers	3	1,200,000	0	3	N/A	0	438,941	761,059	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Tobacco	2	573,350	0	2	N/A	136,675	159,729	276,946	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Tomato	3	800,000	0	1	N/A	0	292,627	507,373	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Strawberries	2	400,000	0	1	N/A	0	146,314	253,686	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Cucurbits	1	192,060	0	2	N/A	96,030	35,126	60,904	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Soil - Other	3	2,826,050	0	8	N/A	463,025	864,357	1,498,668	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Storage and Structural Use	5	1,666,348	0	4	N/A	383,174	469,365	813,809	0	0	0
UNDP	Halon	Halon Non-Recycling	11	1,746,434	1,658	15	1.05	493,711	458,226	794,496	699	326	633
UNDP	Halon	Halon Recycling	1	955,000	80	4	11.94	155,000	292,627	507,372	0	27	53
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Commercial	54	20,109,405	1,407	78	14.29	9,973,635	3,707,505	6,428,265	375	351	681
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic	34	27,982,087	3,259	41	8.59	20,274,009	2,819,494	4,888,584	2,362	305	592
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic Hydrocarbon	11	24,883,104	3,294	11	7.55	14,883,353	3,657,752	6,341,999	1,518	605	1,171
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration MAC & Compressors	4	2,867,374	0	5		1,508,548	497,037	861,789	0	0	0
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Recycling	39	8,985,404	1,058	43	8.49	5,398,024	1,312,207	2,275,173	428	214	416
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents CFC-113	21	8,227,055	532	22	15.46	4,503,809	1,361,905	2,361,341	154	129	249
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents TCA	6	2,529,661	70	7	36.14	1,334,816	437,056	757,789	34	12	24
TOTAL			51	234,791,485	32,478	742	7.23	125,000,000	40,160,000	69,631,485	14,853	6,000	11,625
Support Costs (13%)				30,522,893									
GRAND TOTAL				265,314,378									

Footnotes: (1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are funded or planned activities forming part of the 1998 business plan.

(2) Activities included in the table are all investment projects, Recovery/Recycling projects and MBr Demonstration Projects.

(3) In some cases, project implementation may have occurred but the financial transactions may not have been completed.

(4) The amount of ODP in the proposal that led to the approval.

(5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations.

TABLE 2: Programme Development by Sector: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Sector	Sub-sector	Number of Countries	Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
				Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	Aerosol	Aerosol	3	5,000	85,000	5	1,000,000	246	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Flexible PUF	1	15,000	0	1	342,000	55	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam General	2	0	50,000	11	1,400,000	225	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Integral Skin	2	10,000	110,000	16	3,300,000	200	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Rigid PUF	6	5,000	250,000	28	8,800,000	1,123	0			
UNDP	Fumigation	Fumigation Soil - Other	2	30,000	0	2	800,000	0	70			
UNDP	Fumigation	Fumigation Soil - Strawberries	1	25,000	0	1	100,000	0	3			
UNDP	Halon	Halon Recycling	1	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	40			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Commercial	8	40,000	300,000	32	11,697,000	802	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic	1	0	50,000	9	1,500,000	115	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Recycling	2	0	70,000	4	600,000	54	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration End-Users	3	0	75,000	3	600,000	35	0			
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents CFC-113	1	0	0	1	6,000,000	540	0			
Grand Total			19	150,000	990,000	114	36,339,000	3,395	113			
Support Costs				19,500	128,700		4,724,070					
Total incl. Support Costs				169,500	1,118,700		41,063,070					
Minus 15% Overprogramming							35,707,017					

TABLE 3: Ongoing Non-Investment Projects: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	LVC	Country	Region	Type	Functional Title / Subsector	Project Funding		Disbursements			Date Completed	Status
						Value (\$) through December 1999	Request (\$) for 2000 Plan *	Through December 1999	In 2000	After 1999		
UNDP		Argentina	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	359,500	0	225,329	80,206	53,966	Dec-98	
UNDP	Yes	Bangladesh	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	250,000	0	171,435	46,965	31,600	Dec-99	
UNDP		Bahrain	ASP	TAS	Solvents	0	50,000	0	25,000	25,000		
UNDP		Brazil	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	673,000	270,000	583,525	53,487	35,988	Dec-99	
UNDP		Brazil	LAC	TAS	SME Survey	100,000	0	90,063	5,940	3,997	Jun-99	
UNDP		China	ASP	CPG	Country Programme Preparation	425,000	0	365,794	35,392	23,814	Feb-98	
UNDP		China	ASP	DEM	Food stores refrig. demo project	76,000	0	76,000	0	0	Jun-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	750,000	0	665,642	50,428	33,930	Oct-98	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Design standards: cold storage	200,000	0	188,633	6,795	4,572	Dec-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Foam Sector Study: BHEARI	480,000	0	474,125	3,512	2,363	Jun-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Halon phaseout plan/codes/train.	280,000	0	277,446	1,527	1,027	Jul-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Halons phaseout: alter. systems	300,000	0	296,168	2,291	1,541	Dec-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	MBR-Survey	87,000	0	87,000	0	0	Jun-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	ODS Alternative Standards - SIOFM	362,500	0	362,500	0	0	Sep-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Refrigeration Quality control testing	70,000	0	68,850	687	462	Jun-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	SME Survey: small CFC plant convers.	90,000	0	90,000	0	0	Jun-97	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Solvents financing plan	200,000	0	172,348	16,530	11,122	Feb-98	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Solvents: Cleaning Applications Centre	489,400	0	483,180	3,718	2,502	Sep-97	
UNDP		Colombia	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	531,000	212,000	425,585	63,016	42,400	Dec-99	
UNDP		Costa Rica	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	429,247	0	398,896	18,143	12,208	Dec-00	
UNDP	Yes	Cuba	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	287,000	114,666	245,731	24,670	16,599	Dec-99	
UNDP		Dominican Republic	LAC	TAS	Demonstration project	78,000	0	75,829	1,298	873	Dec-97	
UNDP	Yes	Ghana	AFR	INS	Institutional Strengthening	290,200	0	265,486	14,774	9,940	Oct-98	
UNDP		Global	GLO	TAS	Global MAC TA	50,000	0	50,000	0	0	Jun-97	
UNDP		Global	GLO	TAS	Global MACs project	1,069,000	0	833,786	140,607	94,606	Jun-00	
UNDP		Global	GLO	TRA	Study tours (2) govt/industry rep	50,000	0	50,000	0	0	Jun-97	
UNDP		India	ASP	DEM	Aerosol Filling at 5 companies	176,250	0	149,786	15,820	10,644	Apr-98	
UNDP		India	ASP	DEM	Halon Sector Demo/Eval	309,000	0	306,446	1,527	1,027	Dec-97	
UNDP		India	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	1,004,700	0	833,157	102,546	68,997	Dec-00	
UNDP		India	ASP	TAS	Foam Strategy/action programme	200,000	0	184,418	9,315	6,267	Dec-97	
UNDP		Indonesia	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	524,780	208,650	509,481	9,145	6,153	Jun-97	
UNDP		Iran	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	400,200	133,470	356,908	25,880	17,413	Dec-99	
UNDP		Kenya	AFR	INS	Institutional strengthening	295,000	116,667	238,386	33,843	22,771	Dec-99	
UNDP		Lebanon	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	179,000	119,333	140,000	50,000	108,333	Dec-99	
UNDP		Malaysia	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	752,520	0	450,818	180,353	121,349	Oct-98	

TABLE 3: Ongoing Non-Investment Projects: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	LVC	Country	Region	Type	Functional Title / Subsector	Project Funding		Disbursements			Date Completed	Status
						Value (\$) through December 1999	Request (\$) for 2000 Plan *	Through December 1999	In 2000	After 1999		
UNDP		Malaysia	ASP	TAS	Aerosols: safety & TA programme	145,700	0	145,495	122	82	Dec-95	
UNDP		Mexico	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	475,000	190,000	352,362	73,311	49,327	Oct-00	
UNDP		Mexico	LAC	TAS	SME Survey of ODS use	60,000	0	60,000	0	0	May-98	
UNDP		Nigeria	AFR	INS	Institutional strengthening	500,000	0	284,418	128,872	86,710	Dec-97	
UNDP		Pakistan	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	431,667	172,666	248,163	109,696	73,808	Sep-97	
UNDP		Region: Africa	AFR	TAS	MBR Survey: Africa-ES	179,850	0	179,850	0	0	Dec-97	
UNDP		Sri Lanka	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	360,800	0	201,125	95,451	64,224	Dec-99	
UNDP		Thailand	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	667,000	0	499,846	99,922	67,232	Dec-99	
UNDP		Thailand	ASP	TAS	Aerosol safety programme	127,000	0	124,446	1,527	1,027	Dec-97	
UNDP	Yes	Trinidad and Tobago	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	110,000	44,000	75,261	20,766	13,973	Oct-00	
UNDP	Yes	Uruguay	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	435,000	116,000	330,860	62,253	41,887	Dec-99	
UNDP	Yes	Uruguay	LAC	TAS	Aerosol sector CFC phaseout.	54,000	0	54,000	0	0	May-97	
UNDP		Venezuela	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	878,592	219,600	650,498	136,351	91,743	Oct-00	
					SUBTOTAL	16,242,906	1,967,052	13,399,074	1,700,000	1,143,832		
					13% Overhead	2,111,578	255,717	1,741,880	221,000	148,698		
					GRAND TOTAL	18,354,484	2,222,769					

Subtotal Ongoing and New Requests	16,242,906	1,967,052	13,399,074	1,700,000	1,143,832
Completed Non-Investment Projects	4,833,439	0	4,818,911	0	0
SUBTOTAL Ongoing, New, Completed	21,076,345	1,967,052	18,217,985	1,700,000	1,143,832
13% Overhead	2,739,925	255,717			
GRAND TOTAL Ongoing, New, Completed	23,816,270	2,222,769			

Footnotes:

- (1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are planned activities.
- (2) Include funded activities
- (3) In some cases project implementation (eg ODS phaseout or workshop completion) may have occurred but financial transactions may not have been completed

TABLE 4: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Country: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Country	Region	LVC	Approvals by Ex. Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Phase Out		
				Value \$	ODP from Approvals	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	BENIN	AFR		100,000	11	2	9.09	0	36,578	63,422	0	4	7
UNDP	BURUNDI	AFR	1	130,027	5	2	26.01	15,277	41,974	72,776	0	2	3
UNDP	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	AFR	1	128,441	6	2	21.41	84,227	16,173	28,041	0	2	4
UNDP	CHAD	AFR		100,000	10	1	10.00	0	36,578	63,422	0	3	7
UNDP	CONGO (Braz)	AFR	1	201,200	19	1	10.59	128,826	26,473	45,901	0	6	13
UNDP	EGYPT	AFR		13,842,002	1,743	30	7.94	11,371,895	903,526	1,566,581	1,264	163	316
UNDP	GABON	AFR	1	244,570	12	2	20.38	53,468	69,902	121,200	0	4	8
UNDP	GAMBIA	AFR	1	63,500	11	1	5.77	40,886	8,272	14,342	0	4	7
UNDP	GHANA	AFR	1	673,000	366	2	1.84	532,850	51,265	88,885	255	38	73
UNDP	LESOTHO	AFR	1	56,095	3	1	18.70	36,190	7,281	12,624	2	0	1
UNDP	MADAGASCAR	AFR	1	200,000	25	2	8.00	0	73,157	126,843	0	9	16
UNDP	MALAWI	AFR	1	662,820	40	3	16.57	98,256	206,509	358,056	7	11	22
UNDP	MAURITIUS	AFR	1	649,208	38	4	17.08	541,503	39,397	68,308	30	3	5
UNDP	MOROCCO	AFR		3,480,667	637	12	5.46	1,559,601	702,696	1,218,370	274	124	239
UNDP	MOZAMBIQUE	AFR	1	415,809	6	1	69.30	74,674	124,782	216,353	5	0	1
UNDP	NIGER	AFR	1	103,058	6	1	17.18	53,468	18,139	31,451	0	2	4
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		4,803,300	937	34	5.13	1,542,443	1,192,770	2,068,086	286	222	429
UNDP	TANZANIA	AFR	1	489,054	77	3	6.35	103,684	140,962	244,408	8	23	46
UNDP	UGANDA	AFR	1	56,000	4	1	14.00	52,779	1,178	2,043	4	0	0
UNDP	ZAMBIA	AFR	1	506,320	7	2	72.33	97,331	149,602	259,387	7	0	0
UNDP	ZIMBABWE	AFR	1	668,048	0	2	N/A	53,468	224,804	389,776	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL FOR AFRICA:				27,573,119	3,963	109	6.96	16,440,825	4,072,018	7,060,276	2,142	620	1,201
UNDP	BAHRAIN	ASP	1	342,000	30	3	11.40	155,008	68,399	118,593	16	5	9
UNDP	BANGLADESH	ASP	1	322,920	124	1	2.60	204,782	43,213	74,925	0	42	82
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		62,841,009	8,771	86	7.16	28,410,631	12,594,091	21,836,286	2,949	1,982	3,840
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		15,520,730	3,145	100	4.94	6,539,714	3,285,114	5,695,901	616	861	1,668
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		4,908,771	579	38	8.48	1,213,049	1,351,837	2,343,885	121	156	302
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		2,250,000	225	6	10.00	0	823,015	1,426,985		77	148
UNDP	LEBANON	ASP		1,828,200	325	6	5.63	213,873	590,496	1,023,832	0	111	214

TABLE 4: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Country: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Country	Region	LVC	Approvals by Ex. Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Phase Out		
				Value \$	ODP from Approvals	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		17,357,608	2,663	67	6.52	13,025,073	1,584,773	2,747,762	1,991	229	443
UNDP	MONGOLIA	ASP	1	100,000	11	1	9.09	0	36,578	63,422	0	4	7
UNDP	NEPAL	ASP	1	200,000	18	3	11.11	0	73,157	126,843	0	6	12
UNDP	PAPUA NG	ASP	1	100,000	10	1	10.00	0	36,578	63,422	0	3	7
UNDP	PHILIPPINES	ASP		6,359,471	723	20	8.80	4,863,527	547,193	948,751	389	114	220
UNDP	SRI LANKA	ASP	1	1,932,156	66	8	29.28	902,397	376,670	653,089	9	19	38
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		2,644,368	252	11	10.49	0	967,268	1,677,100	0	86	166
UNDP	THAILAND	ASP		10,867,226	2,197	46	4.95	6,467,653	1,609,295	2,790,278	1,030	397	770
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		1,202,106	299	9	4.02	678,854	191,397	331,854	80	75	144
SUBTOTAL FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC:				128,776,565	19,438	406	6.62	62,674,562	24,179,074	41,922,929	7,201	4,166	8,071
UNDP	GEORGIA	EUR	1	106,750	4	1	26.69	67,855	14,227	24,668	0	1	3
UNDP	MOLDOVA	EUR	1	554,150	38	2	14.58	125,786	156,689	271,675	0	13	25
SUBTOTAL FOR EUROPE:				660,900	42	3	15.74	193,641	170,916	296,343	0	14	28
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		8,782,058	1,141	26	7.70	5,832,539	1,078,888	1,870,631	595	186	360
UNDP	BAHAMAS	LAC	1	151,400	13	1	11.65	95,758	20,353	35,289	0	4	9
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	946,000	24	4	39.42	131,435	297,955	516,610	0	8	16
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		23,203,058	3,011	78	7.71	10,057,192	4,808,551	8,337,314	1,880	385	746
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		400,000		1	N/A	0	146,314	253,686	0	0	0
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC		9,000,035	868	18	10.37	6,909,343	764,742	1,325,950	470	135	263
UNDP	COSTA RICA	LAC	1	1,821,840	89	5	20.47	733,537	398,084	690,219	27	21	41
UNDP	CUBA	LAC	1	288,505	52	2	5.55	233,836	19,997	34,672	51	0	1
UNDP	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	LAC	1	1,899,259	149	6	12.75	270,540	595,760	1,032,959	31	40	78
UNDP	EL SALVADOR	LAC	1	720,654	58	3	12.43	195,431	192,118	333,105	18	14	26
UNDP	GUATEMALA	LAC	1	947,163	81	5	11.69	747,924	72,878	126,360	39	14	28
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC	1	768,465	98	2	7.84	631,622	50,055	86,788	98	0	0
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		16,921,744	2,334	32	7.25	12,088,546	1,767,908	3,065,290	1,820	175	339
UNDP	PANAMA	LAC	1	966,761	110	4	8.79	492,820	173,360	300,581	55	19	36
UNDP	PARAGUAY	LAC	1	505,600	66	2	7.66	257,468	90,763	157,369	46	7	13
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	3,877,180	258	14	15.03	2,802,394	393,140	681,646	107	51	100
UNDP	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	LAC	1	333,560	36	2	9.27	135,710	72,371	125,480	0	12	24
UNDP	URUGUAY	LAC	1	1,102,375	115	5	9.59	1,004,008	35,981	62,386	108	2	5

TABLE 4: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Country: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Country	Region	LVC	Approvals by Ex. Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Phase Out		
				Value \$	ODP from Approvals	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	VENEZUELA	LAC		5,145,244	532	14	9.67	3,070,869	758,774	1,315,601	165	125	242
SUBTOTAL FOR LATIN AMERICA:				77,780,901	9,035	224	8.61	45,690,972	11,737,992	20,351,937	5,510	1,200	2,325
ALL REGIONS				234,791,485	32,478	742	7.23	125,000,000	40,160,000	69,631,485	14,853	6,000	11,625
SUPPORT COSTS (13%)				30,522,893									
GRAND TOTAL				265,314,378									

Footnotes:

- (1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are funded or planned activities corresponding to the 1998 business plan.
- (2) Activities included in the table are all investment projects, Recovery/Recycling projects and MBr Demonstration Projects.
- (3) In some cases, project implementation may have occurred but the financial transactions may not have been completed.
- (4) The amount of ODP in the proposal that led to the approval.
- (5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations
- (5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations

TABLE 5: Programme Development by Country: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agen- cy	Country			Project Prepararion		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
	Country	Re- gion	LVC	Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non- CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	BURKINA FASO	AFR	1	0	30,000	1	200,000	10	0			
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		0	25,000	8	1,000,000	160	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		0	75,000	16	9,000,000	890	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		50,000	110,000	12	5,500,000	576	0			
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		0	100,000	7	3,500,000	225	0			
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		0	130,000	19	4,150,000	290	0			
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		0	20,000	2	400,000	27	0			
UNDP	SRI LANKA	ASP	1	0	20,000	1	200,000	10	0			
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		15,000	25,000	5	950,000	95	0			
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		5,000	60,000	6	800,000	131	0			
UNDP	GEORGIA	EUR	1	0	25,000	1	200,000	15	0			
UNDP	GLOBAL	GLO		0	50,000	3	400,000	34	0			
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		0	50,000	7	1,500,000	160	0			
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	10			
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		0	200,000	17	6,000,000	555	0			
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		10,000	20,000	2	800,000	50	60			
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC		0	20,000	1	400,000	50	0			
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC		0	15,000	1	39,000	5	0			
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		25,000	15,000	3	1,000,000	112	40			
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	25,000	0	1	100,000	0	3			
Grand Total				150,000	990,000	114	36,339,000	3,395	113			
Support Costs				19,500	128,700		4,724,070					
Total incl. Support Cost				169,500	1,118,700		41,063,070					
Minus 15% Overprogramming							35,707,017					

TABLE 5A: Programme Development by Country, Sector and Sub-sector: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Country			Sub-sector	Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
	Country	Region	LVC		Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	BURKINA FASO	AFR	1	Refrigeration End-Users	0	30,000	1	200,000	10	0			
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		Foam General	0	25,000	8	1,000,000	160	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	75,000	15	3,000,000	350	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Solvents CFC-113	0	0	1	6,000,000	540	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Aerosol	0	50,000	2	600,000	150	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	1	1,100,000	151	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Integral Skin	10,000	30,000	6	800,000	50	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	40,000	0	3	3,000,000	225	0			
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	100,000	7	3,500,000	225	0			
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Refrigeration Domestic	0	50,000	9	1,500,000	115	0			
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	80,000	10	2,650,000	175	0			
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	20,000	2	400,000	27	0			
UNDP	SRI LANKA	ASP		Refrigeration End-Users	0	20,000	1	200,000	10	0			
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		Foam Flexible PUF	15,000	0	1	342,000	55	0			
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	25,000	4	608,000	40	0			
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Aerosol	5,000	15,000	2	200,000	46	0			
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Foam General	0	25,000	3	400,000	65	0			
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Refrigeration Recycling	0	20,000	1	200,000	20	0			
UNDP	GEORGIA	EUR	1	Refrigeration End-Users		25,000	1	200,000	15	0			
UNDP	GLOBAL	GLO		Refrigeration Recycling	0	50,000	3	400,000	34	0			
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	5	1,000,000	130	0			
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		Refrigeration Commercial	0	20,000	2	500,000	30	0			
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	Fumigation Soil - Other	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	10			
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam Integral Skin	0	80,000	10	2,500,000	150	0			
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	80,000	4	2,500,000	330	0			
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Refrigeration Commercial	0	40,000	3	1,000,000	75	0			
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		Fumigation Soil - Other	10,000	0	1	600,000	0	60			
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		Aerosol Sterilants	0	20,000	1	200,000	50	0			
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	20,000	1	400,000	50	0			
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC		Refrigeration Commercial	0	15,000	1	39,000	5	0			
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	5,000	15,000	2	800,000	112	0			
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		Halon Recycling	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	40			
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	Fumigation Soil - Strawberries	25,000	0	1	100,000	0	3			
Grand Total					150,000	990,000	114	36,339,000	3,395	113			
Support Costs					19,500	128,700		4,724,070					
Total incl. Support Cost					169,500	1,118,700		41,063,070					
Minus 15% Overprogramming								35,707,017					

TABLE 5B: Contingency Table: UNDP 2000 Draft Business Plan

8-Oct-99

Agency	Country			Sector and Sub-sector	Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
	Country	Region	LVC		Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam General	0	50,000	5	1,300,000	135	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Foam General	0	100,000	16	6,000,000	650	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	35,000	2	300,000	40	0			
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		Foam Rigid PUF	0	15,000	2	300,000	40	0			
Grand Total					0	200,000	25	7,900,000	865	0	0	0	0
Support Costs					-	26,000		1,027,000					
Total Incl Support Cost					-	226,000		8,927,000					
Minus 15% Overprogramming								7,587,950					