الأمم المتحدة

EP

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

Distr.

LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/48
8 March 2005

ARABIC

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

اللجنة التنفيذية للصندوق المتعدد الأطراف
لتنفيذ بروتوكول مونتريال
الاجتمـــــاع الخامس والأربعين
مونتريال، 4-8 نيسان/ أبريل 2005

تقرير عن عمليات اللجنة التنفيذية

(متابعة للمقرر 57/44)

خلفية الموضوع

1- ان اللجنة التنفيذية، في اجتماعها الرابع والأربعين في 2004، كانت قد تداولت طويلا بشأن ورقة مناقشة أعدتها الأمانة عن تشغيل اللجنة التنفيذية دون أن يكون لديها لجان فرعية، وبشأن احتمال اجراءات الموافقة في الفترات ما بين انعقاد الدورات (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69)، وقررت اللجنة أن تواصل خلال 2005 مناقشة الموضوعات المتعلقة بتخفيض عدد اجتماعات اللجنة التنفيذية وانشاء اجراءات للموافقات التي تتم ما بين دورات الانعقاد. وورقة المناقشة التي أعدت للاجتماع الرابع والأربعين يمكن أن تتاح لمن يطلبها.

2- في سبيل تسهيل مزيد من المناقشة، طلبت اللجنة التنفيذية من الأمانة (المقرر 57/44)، تقديم وثيقة تجمع آراء أعضاء اللجنة التنفيذية وتقدم تقريرا للعواقب المالية لمختلف السيناريوهات. وفي الوقت نفسه، طلبت اللجنة من الأطراف المعنية ومن الوكالات المنفذة تقديم تعليقات مكتوبة بحلول ميعاد 4 فبراير 2005، لادماجها في الوثيقة التي ستقوم الأمانة باعدادها.

3- على أثر الاجتماع، كتبت الأمانة في 12 يناير 2005 الى جميع أعضاء اللجنة التنفيذية العاملين في 2004 و 2005 سائلة ايـاهم تقديم تعليقات مكتوبة عن هذه القضية وأرفقت برسالتها الوثيقة UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69 ليستفيد منها الأعضاء الذين انضموا الى اللجنة التنفيذية في 2005.

4- ان الأمانة تقدم هذه الوثيقة لتقييم العواقب المالية للبدائل المقترحة لاعادة تنظيم عمل اللجنة التنفيذية، ويتضمن المرفق الأول تجميعا لاسهامات أعضاء اللجنة التنفيذية في هذا الموضوع في الاجتماع الرابع والأربعين والتعليقات المكتوبة التي وردت من الأعضاء حتى نهاية فبراير 2005.

العواقب المالية لبدائل اعادة تنظيم عمل اللجنة التنفيذية

أولا- مقدمة

5- ان هذه الورقة القصيرة ينبغي النظر فيها باعتبارها قسما اضافيا الى الوثيقة التي عنوانها "تقرير عن تشغيل اللجنة التنفيذية بدون لجان فرعية، واحتمال اجراءات الموافقة في الفترة ما بين دورات الانعقاد" UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69 التي قدمتها الأمانة الى الاجتماع الرابع والأربعين من اللجنة التنفيذية في نوفمبر 2004. وهذه الورقة تقدم الآثار التي تترتب، من ناحية التكاليف، على البدائل المقترحة في الوثيقة السابقة، وذلك استجابة لطلب اللجنة بالمقرر 57/44. وقد يكون من المسعف تذكر أن الوثيقة السابقة تضمنت بديلين هما اما الاستمرار في الممارسة الحالية المتمثلة في عقد ثلاث اجتماعات للجنة التنفيذية في السنة، أو تخفيض وتيرة الاجتماعات المنتظمة بجعلها اجتماعين فقط مع حفظ الاجتماع الثالث بوصفه اجتماعا اختياريا.

6- ان المناقشات التي جرت في الاجتماع الرابع والأربعين والتعليقات المكتوبة التي وردت من أعضاء اللجنة بعد الاجتماع قد أضافت بديلين آخرين هما الاستمرار في عقد ثلاث اجتماعات في السنة ولكن بجعلها أربعة أيام لكل دورة، وعقد اجتماعين كل سنة مرتبطين باجتماع الفريق العامل المفتوح العضوية، واجتماع الأطراف.

7- ان الغرض من هذه الورقة القصيرة هو تقدير تكاليف هذه البدائل باعتبارها معلومات اضافية لاتخاذ القرار بشأن اعادة تنظيم عمل اللجنة التنفيذية في المستقبل.

ثانيا- مفردات تكاليف اجتماعات اللجنة التنفيذية

8- لتسهيل المقارنة بين مختلف البدائل، تم وضع مفردات التكاليف مثل: سفر المندوبين، بدل الاعاشة اليومي، الوثائق، البنود الأخرى، وبقدر الامكان قسمت التكاليف الى وحدات قياسية مثل التكلفة اليومية لبدل الاعاشة، وتكلفة الوثائق لكل اجتماع وهلم جر. والمرجو أن يلاحظ أن هذا ليس محاولة لتقديم قائمة كاملة بمكونات التكلفة، وانما هي قائمة ببنود التكلفة المباشرة لعقد اجتماع للجنة التنفيذية، فهي لا تضم تبعا لذلك التغطية الكاملة لتكلفة مساهمة الأعضاء من غير بلدان المادة 5 ولا تكلفة الوكالات المنفذة وغيرها. غير أن نظرة سريعة مقدمة في نهاية الورقة الى التقدير الفضفاض لتكلفة مشاركة الأعضاء من غير بلدان المادة 5 والوكالات المنفذة.

9- ان تقدير التكلفة تم التوصل اليه بايجاد متوسط بيانات التكلفة الفعلية لعامي 2003 و 2004، مع مراعاة رقم الصفر للتضخم. والأرقام المذكورة قد تختلف تبعا لذلك عن النفقات الفعلية التي ذكرها أمين الخزانة، وقد تتغير في السنوات القادمة بفضل تغير مواقع الاجتماع وزمن الاجتماع وغير ذلك من المتغيرات. والافتراض هو أن عقد الاجتماعات يكون في مونتريال، الا اذا ذكر على وجه التحديد أن مكان الاجتماع هو خارج مونتريال، في سبيل أن يكون متشابكا باجتماعات أخرى متعلقة بالأوزون.

ثانيا-1 مكونات قياسية للتكاليف

السفر: تشمل تذاكر ذهاب واياب لمشاركة ثلاثة مندوبين من كل من الأعضاء السبعة من بلدان المادة 5، على الرغم من أن الأعضاء يمكن أن يتقاسموا المنافع مع البلدان التي يختارونها للعضوية. ومجموع التكلفة في نطاق هذه المكونة قد يتغير بسبب تغيرات البلدان الداخلة في اللجنة التنفيذية كل عام مما يؤدي الى تباين طرق الوصول الى الاجتماع. بيد أن متوسط نفقات السفر لكل اجتماع لواحد وعشرين مشاركا باعتبار الاجتماعات تعقد في مونتريال هو 64,000 دولار أمريكي.

بدل الاعاشة اليومي: يتضمن صرف اعاشة يومية لثلاث مندوبين من كل من البلدان السبعة الأعضاء في مجموعة المادة 5، طوال مدة انعقاد اجتماع اللجنة التنفيذية. وأسعار الاعاشة اليومية تضعها الأمم المتحدة في نيويورك للبلدان والمناطق المختلفة في العالم، وتعدل شهريا. وباستعمال مونتريال كمكان للاجتماع فان نفقات الاعاشة اليومية عن اليوم الواحد لواحد وعشرين مشاركا هي 5,500 دولار أمريكي، في اليوم الواحد، ولمدة سبعة أيام تشمل وقت السفر يمكن أن تكون التكلفة الاجمالية 40,000 دولار أمريكي.

ترجمة الوثائق: توفير الترجمة لوثائق الاجتماع سواء للوثائق السابقة للدورة أو لوثائق أثناء الاجتماع نفسه في أي من اللغات الرسمية الست من لغات الأمم المتحدة. وطوال عدة سنوات استعملت الأمانة الترجمة عن بعد لتوفير تكلفة السفر والاعاشة اليومية للمترجمين، بل على الرغم من أن هذه الوسيلة تجري على أساس جدول زمني يبلغ 24 ساعة لاستيعاب المترجمين الموجودين في أركان الدنيا الأربعة، لتوفير تقارير للآجتماع بجميع اللغات في وقت الاجتماع.

وعلى أساس خبرة السنتين السابقتين، فان متوسط عدد الكلمات المطلوب ترجمتها لكل اجتماع ولكل لغة هو حوالي 200,000 كلمة، تكلف حوالي 33,000 دولار أمريكي لترجمتها. وتدل الخبرة خلال السنتين السابقتين على أن ثلاث لغات في المعتاد يحتاج اليها الأمر في كل سنة، وأن تكلفة الترجمة لكل اجتماع بالنسبة للغات الثلاث هو حوالي 100,000 دولار أمريكي. ومما هو جدير بالذكر أن يلاحظ أن تكلفة الترجمة ليست مرتهنة بعدد الاجتماعات ولكن بعدد الكلمات المطلوب ترجمتها وبعدد اللغات التي تترجم اليها الوثائق. ولذا فان تخفيض عدد الاجتماعات من ثلاثة الى اثنين في السنة قد لا يخفض تخفيضا نسبيا تكلفة الترجمة لعدد الكلمات وعدد اللغات اللازم يظل كما هو.

تأجير المرافق: رصد أموال لتأجير قاعات الاجتماع والكومبيوترات وآلات تصوير الوثائق واستئجار خدمات المعاونين في الاجتماع. ومع افتراض استعمال المرافق في منظمة الطيران المدني الدولي (الايكاو) في مونتريال، فان تكلفة الاستئجار لكل اجتماع هي ثلاثون ألف دولار.

كتابة التقرير: هذا البند يفي بحاجات استئجار كتبة تقارير ذوي كفاءة مهنية، لاعداد مشروع تقرير الاجتماعات التي تعقد في الموقع باللغة الانجليزية. ويتضمن هذا الانفاق أجور الأفراد وتذاكر الذهاب والاياب والاعاشة اليومية للذين يتم تعيينهم من غير الموقع المحلي. وهناك فريق من خمسة أشخاص لازمين وتبلغ تكاليفهم حوالي 13,000 دولار أمريكي اكل اجتماع.

الترجمة الفورية: هذا البند يغطي تكاليف استئجار المترجمين الفوريين الى اللغات اللازمة لعقد الاجتماعات ويتضمن ذلك أجور الأفراد وتذاكر الذهاب والاياب والاعاشة اليومية لمن يعينون من غير الموقع المحلي. ويلزم قياسيا فريق من ثلاثة مترجمين لكل لغة، وتبلغ تكاليف الفريق حوالي 14,000 دولار أمريكي. واذا لزم الأمر ثلاث لغات، فان تكلفة كل اجتماع تصل الى 42,000 دولار أمريكي.

ارسال الوثائق: هذا البند يغطي شحن وثائق الاجتماع الى جميع المشاركين في الاجتماع والأعضاء الحاليين والمستجدين للجنة التنفيذية، والوكالات المنفذة والوكالات الثنائية والمراقبين. وتبعا لوزن الوثائق، فهناك متوسط يبلغ 3,500 دولار أمريكي أنفقت على هذه المكونة من النفقات على أساس كل اجتماع خلال السنتين السابقتين.

ثانيا-2 الاجتماعات المتعاقبة مع اجتماعات أخرى متصلة بالأوزون تعقد خارج مونتريال

10- حيث أن معظم حالات عقد اجتماعات اللجنة التنفيذية في تعاقب مع اجتماع الأطراف ومع الأفرقة العاملة المفتوحة العضوية، تسفر عن عقد الاجتماع خارج مونتريال، فان تقدير النفقات بموجب هذا السيناريو يفترض أن عقد الاجتماع خارج مونتريال من شأنه أن يخفض نفقات بعض المكونات السابق الاشارة اليها، ولكنه يقتضي نفقات اضافية في بعض البنود الأخرى. وهذا مفسر فيما يلي:

الوفورات: يمكن تحقيق وفورات في تكلفة تقاسم النفقات مع أمانة الأوزون بشأن سفر الأعضاء والأعضاء المستجدين في اللجنة التنفيذية، وكتبة التقرير والمترجمين الفوريين مع افتراض أن كلتا الأمانتين تستعملان نفس الأفرقة العاملة. وعلى أساس الخبرة السابقة، ان هناك 50 في المائة من التخفيض يمكن تحقيها في مصاريف السفر.

نفقات السفر والاعاشة اليومية للعاملين في الأمانة: هذه مكونة اضافية في التكاليف، كان يمكن تفاديها لو أن الاجتماع عقد في مونتريال. وباستعمال حالتي 2004 لتوضيح الموضوع، فان التكلفة يمكن أن تتراوح ما بين 65,000 دولار أمريكي (جنيف) و 100,000 دولار أمريكي (براغ). ويمكن أن تبلغ التكلفة في المتوسط 75.000 دولار أمريكي تحت هذا البند.

استئجار المرافق: ان هذا البند ينزع الى زيادة التكلفة في الأماكن التي تعقد فيها الاجتماع خارج مونتريال. ومرة أخرى فباستعمال الحالتين اللتين حدثتا في 2004، يمكن أن تبلغ التكلفة 50,000 دولار أمريكي (جنيف) و 135,000 دولار أمريكي (براغ) وكلاهما أعلى من الـ 30,000 دولار أمريكي التي تصرف للايكاو. ويبلغ المتوسط 70,000 دولار كمبلغ تقريبي جيد بشأن تكلفة استئجار الأماكن خارج مونتريال.

ثالثا- تكلفة البدائل

ثالثا-1 الابقاء على الوضع القائم المتمثل في عقد ثلاث اجتماعات، ومدة خمسة أيام لكل دورة اجتماع

العنصر	تكلفة كل اجتماع (دولار أمريكي)	عدد مرات الاجتماع	المجموع (دولار أمريكي)
السفر	64,000	3	192,000
الاعاشة اليومية	40,000	3	120,000
ترجمة الوثائق *	100,000	3	300,000
استئجار مرافق	30,000	3	90,000
كتابة التقرير	13,000	3	39,000
الترجمة الفورية *	42,000	3	126,000
الارسال	3,500	3	10,500
المجموع الكلي	**292,500**		**877,500**

هوامش:

من المفترض أن الأمر يحتاج الى ثلاث لغات في ترجمة الوثائق والترجمية الفورية

ثالثا–2 عقد ثلاثة اجتماعات مدة كل منها أربعة أيام

العنصر	تكلفة كل اجتماع (دولار أمريكي)	عدد مرات الاجتماع	المجموع (دولار أمريكي)
السفر	64,000	3	192,000
الاعاشة اليومية	34,500	3	103,500
ترجمة الوثائق *	100,000	3	300,000
استئجار مرافق	27,000	3	81,000
كتابة التقرير	11,000	3	33,000
الترجمة الفورية *	36,800	3	110,400
الارسال	3,500	3	10,500
المجموع الكلي	**276,800**		**830,400**

هوامش:
من المفترض أن الأمر يحتاج الى ثلاث لغات في ترجمة الوثائق والترجمية الفورية. وتخفيض عدد أيام الاجتماع من 5 الى 4 يؤدي الى تخفيض تكلفة استئجار المناطق بحوالي 3,000 دولار أمريكي، وتكلفة كتابة التقرير بحوالي 2,000 دولار أمريكي وتكلفة الترجمة الفورية بـــ 5,200 دولار أمريكي. ويؤدي ذلك أيضا الى تخفيض تكلفة الاعاشة اليومية ليوم واحد، وهي حوالي 5,500 دولار أمريكي.

ثالثا–3 عقد اجتماعين كل منهما 5 أيام في كل دورة

العنصر	تكلفة كل اجتماع (دولار أمريكي)	عدد مرات الاجتماع	المجموع (دولار أمريكي)
السفر	64,000	2	128,000
الاعاشة اليومية	40,000	2	80,000
ترجمة الوثائق *	150,000	2	300,000
استئجار مرافق	30,000	2	60,000
كتابة التقرير	13,000	2	26,000
الترجمة الفورية *	42,000	2	84,000
الارسال	4,000	2	8,000
المجموع الكلي	**343,000**		**686,000**

هوامش:
من من المفترض أن الأمر يحتاج الى ثلاث لغات في ترجمة الوثائق والترجمية الفورية ومن المفترض أيضا أن عـــدد الكلمـــات المطلـــوب ترجمتها لا يتغير بتخفيض مرات الاجتماع، وينتج عن ذلك أن التكلفة السنوية تظل كما هي غير أنها تتوزع على اجتماعين.

ثالثا–4 عقد اجتماعين مدة كل منهما 5 أيام، لكل دورة، تعقد في تعاقب مع اجتماعات أخرى متصلة بالأوزون خارج مونتريال

العنصر	تكلفة كل اجتماع (دولار أمريكي)	عدد مرات الاجتماع	المجموع (دولار أمريكي)
السفر	32,000	2	64,000
الاعاشة اليومية	40,000	2	80,000
ترجمة الوثائق *	150,000	2	300,000
استئجار مرافق	70,000	2	140,000
كتابة التقرير	8,000	2	16,000
الترجمة الفورية *	30,000	2	60,000
الارسال	4,000	2	8,000
سفر والاعاشة اليومية لموظفي الأمانة	75,000	2	150,000
المجموع الكلي	**409,000**		**818,000**

هوامش:
من المفترض ما يلي:

* يحتاج الأمر الى ثلاث لغات لترجمة الوثائق والترجمة الفورية
* ان عدد كلمات الترجمة لا يتغير بتخفيض عدد الاجتماعات وتبعا لذلك تظل التكاليف السنوية كما هي غير أنها توزع على اجتماعين.
* ان أفرقة كتابة التقارير والترجمة الفورية يحري تقاسمها بين أمانة الأوزون وأمانة الصندوق. ونتيجة لذلك فان تكاليف السفر الخاصة بكل عضو من فريق كتابة التقرير وفريق الترجمة الفورية تنخفض بمقدار 50 في المائة أي بمقدار 1000 دولار أمريكي على أساس افتراض أن تكلفة كل شخص منهم هي 2,000 دولار أمريكي.

رابعا- نظرة سريعة الى تكلفة مشاركة غير بلدان المادة 5 ومشاركة الوكالات المنفذة

11- يوجد عدد من الحدود في تقدير تكلفة مشاركة غير بلدان المادة 5 والوكالات المنفذة في اجتماعات اللجنة التنفيذية. فأولا، على الرغم من أنه يوجد 7 أعضاء من غير بلدان المادة 5 الا أنه من غير الممكن تحديد عدد المشاركين من كل من أعضاء اللجنة والجهات التي ينتمون اليها. وفي المقام الثاني من المفهوم أن بعض المشاركين يحضرون اجتماعات اللجنة التنفيذية بوصفهم خبراء استشاريين وتدفع اليهم أجور بالاضافة الى النفقات. هذه الأجور تشكل جزءا من تكلفة مشاركة الوفد في الاجتماع، بيد أنه يكون من الصعب على اليأمانة أن تقدم رقما تقديريا لهذه التكاليف. وثالثا فان نفقات الاعاشة اليومية تجرى المحاسبة عليها بشكل مختلف من بلد الى بلد، ويصعب تقديم مبلغ عام أو تقديري.

12- ان الحدين الأولين ينطبقان كذلك على تقدير تكلفة الوكالات المنفذة الأربع، على الرغم من أنها تطبق نفس أسعار بدل الاعاشة اليومي المعمول به في منظومة الأمم المتحدة. وتكلفة مشاركة الوكالات الثنائية ليست مقدمة على حدة، حيث أن المشاركة كثيرا ما تدخل في تصنيف مشاركة البلد العضو من غير بلدان المادة 5.

13- في سبيل بيان الخطوط العريضة لتكلفة مشاركة البلدان من غير بلدان المادة 5 ومشاركة الوكالات المنفذة الأربع هناك عدد من الافتراضات المبسطة التي تقدم على أساس التطبيق العملي بالنسبة لكل اجتماع يعقد في مونتريال ذاتها:

(أ) ان تكلفة المشاركين تشمل السفر فقط ولا تشمل بدل اعاشة يومي. ويمكن أن يتراوح ذلك بين 500 دولار أمريكي (أمريكا الشمالية) و 5,000 دولار أمريكي (آسيا وأوقيانيا) للشخص الواحد.

(ب) حسبت تكاليف مشارك واحد فقط من كل من غير البلدان المادة 5 ومن كل وكالة منفذة، ويحضر الجميع الاجتماعات بوصفهم ممثلين للحكومة أو للوكالة. ويصل العدد الى 11 مشاركا.

رابعا-1 تكلفة الحل البديل

	تكلفة كل اجتماع (دولار أمريكي)	عدد مرات الاجتماع	المجموع (دولار أمريكي)
الوضع القائم لثلاثة اجتماعات في السنة يبلغ كل منها 5 أيام	37,000*	3	111,000
ثلاث اجتماعات يبلغ كل منها 4 أيام	37,000	3	111,000
اجتماعان يبلغ كل منها 5 أيام	37,000	2	74,000
اجتماعان في تعاقب مع اجتماعات أخرى للأوزون	37,000	2	74,000

* على أساس افتراض 4 مشاركين من شمال أمريكا (500 دولار أمريكي 4x) و 7 من آسيا وأوروبا (5,000 دولار أمريكي 7x).

14- من المسلم به أن هذا التحليل مبسط جدا، ولكن حيث أن السفر هو التكلفة الكبرى في تكاليف المشاركين، فان هذا التحليل على درجة عالية من التقريب من التكاليف الفعلية، ويمكن استعماله لاجراء عملية اسقاط حسابي في حالة زيادة عدد المشاركين.

Annex I

INTERVENTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT THE 44TH MEETING AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS AS OF THE END OF FEBRUARY 2005

1. This annex contains the transcriptions of the interventions of members of the Executive Committee on the subject at the 44th Meeting. Minor language editing was done with due consideration for maintaining the integrity of the original statements. Written comments received from members are reproduced in a separate section after the transcriptions.

Transcriptions

Chair:

2. Thank you Secretariat for your comprehensive introduction. The United Kingdom has the floor.

United Kingdom:

3. Thank you Madam Chair. My delegation would like to thank the Secretariat very much for producing document 44/69, we feel it contains much food for thought on this extremely complex issue. My delegation is very keen that this topic be taken further forward, we think it's well worth looking at not least because, it, the idea was also included in the ICF evaluation, so therefore, we are needing to look at it anyway. However, before a decision can be taken on whether to continue with the present regime, or to remove one meeting from the present format, we think the ExCom needs to have a clearer picture of the challenges we are likely to face in the coming years. My delegation believes that at a minimum we would need to take at least three considerations into account. First, given that most larger volume consuming countries have now entered into agreements with the ExCom for sectoral or national phase-out plans, the costs of which have already been agreed in principle. We are envisaging that the focus of the work of the MLF would now be shifting to ensuring implementation of those agreements and ensuring that low volume consuming countries continue to be provided with the relevant assistance to enable them to comply with the control provisions of the Montreal Protocol. Second, as the Secretariat has highlighted, we envisage that in order to meet these new challenges the way in which tasks are distributed between the ExCom and the Secretariat might have to change. We might wish to give more responsibility for routine work to the Secretariat and as the Secretariat mentioned we may need to consider a procedure for intersessional approvals which would result in the delegation of new level of authority to the Secretariat under very specific conditions, and from the Secretariat's document it seems that this might take some time. Given that the third step would then be to adjust the organization of the work, and part of that decision might be on whether we need to keep the present frequency of meetings or reduce the number of meetings to two per year, or indeed even another option of cutting the length of the meetings but retaining three meetings. From what we understand from the Secretariat this does need to be approved by a MOP and clearly we have missed our chance this year. Therefore, the Secretariat's option B is not really an option, clearly again this is going to take time. To facilitate further discussion,

given that we are clearly not going to be able to move to a new system as of January 2005, we feel that it could be worth having more discussion and perhaps even more work done by the Secretariat on this issue. We don't feel there's any need to rush into a decision at this stage and that perhaps this could be an agenda item at our next meeting. We'd therefore like to propose, having heard, waited obviously until we've heard other Committee members commenting on this issue, that it may be necessary to have another policy paper from the Secretariat looking at, more closely at the future challenges that the ExCom's going to face. Thank you.

Chair:

4. I would like to thank the U.K. I give the floor to Cuba and afterwards Austria and then Argentina.

Cuba:

5. Thank you very much Madam Chair. I'd like to congratulate the Secretariat for presenting a very complete document which has all possible options in it and all possibilities as well. Of course, we are going to continue studying it in order to complete it but it is a very useful document which is going to help us in the analysis. This notwithstanding, in principle we will go to the substance of the problem which is getting rid of one of the meetings of the ExCom and also I'd like to talk about a practical and an economic problem. Everything that has been said is of course very important, has to do with rules and procedures that we have to study and develop. Therefore, in principle, I'd like to know how much we're going to save by this reduction because I don't know, perhaps we are going to have to increase the number of people in the Secretariat because we're giving it new tasks and in the end we're going to have to change our working methods. So I am not really sure because I haven't seen the economic repercussions of this. Apparently, this has to do with money, we have to figure out how much money we're going to save by getting rid of a meeting and how much money is going to be necessary in order to apply all this in terms of procedure. Secondly, until 2007 of course, no change can take place because we have to take into account procedures, measures, actions which have to be undertaken. However, there are still some things that are of great concerns to us because, for example, if something is not presented in one meeting we have to wait six more months. This can give rise to problems with compliance and we want to accelerate compliance, after all. There is another major decision that has to be taken. The ExCom works during these meetings and if we get rid of the meeting the Secretariat would be taking on responsibilities which normally are the Executive Committee's. We have to think thoroughly about this, we have to really study it. I agree with the U.K., that we have to study this in detail. We have to have full knowledge of all its implications, because in the end, we will have to take a decision, but what decision, why is it an economical decision, is it a political one? Are we going to divide the responsibilities of the functioning of the Fund, this is so important that I think that we have continue studying this topic and also I want to know what the other members of the ExCom think of this. Thank you.

Chair:

6. Thank you Cuba and now I give the floor to Austria.

Austria:

7. Thank you Madam Chair. Let me join the previous speakers in congratulating the Secretariat for this comprehensive analysis. It is a very difficult decision we have to take. We have to be clear that there are advantages and disadvantages, which they have been clearly analyzed. This delegation has got from the government the directive to reduce costs and if possible to reduce one meeting, so the prospective is to move towards two meetings, but of course, we know that it is not very simple to just cancel one meeting and move one half of the agenda to one meeting, to the first meeting maybe. If it's the second meeting then move it to the third meeting, so this could even result in an overload of work. With regards to the first part of the paper where the operation without sub-committees was shown, I think there is no doubt that this is a clear progress now that possibilities have been extended for members to participate in decision-making in the meeting. So I think the change we made last year was a change to the better and also to more transparency and I think this is also a first answer to the ICF analysis. Now going to a reduction from three to two meetings, well, besides the formal endorsement by the Meeting of the Parties, the crucial point in my view is the delegation of authority from this Committee to the Secretariat. Of course, if we prolong the time between meetings, we have to set up something to approve projects. It comes to my mind that we have a lot projects for countries at risk of non-compliance, here, I think this was already mentioned, then for those projects where all the contentious issues have been solved. Of course, the issue of implementation or project delays and also cancellation, these would be candidates for this automated or intersessional approval procedure. In my view, I think if we decided to go into this direction, we could build upon the existing procedure for bilateral projects simply to enlarge the scope that it covers all projects. As I mentioned before, it could also apply to the cancellation procedure, but I think the members of the Committee would have to be involved. So, as it is written in the document it should be on a no-objection basis. For example, a project A is submitted to the Secretariat, the Secretariat sends it out to the members with a comment and maybe sets a deadline. If there is agreement or no reaction then the project can move forward. So this would be a very simple procedure and I think this would be very useful for the future to have something like that in the Terms. Now looking at the time of implementation, if we decided to start in 2005, I think we already have planned for three meetings for next year and it's almost impossible to change now. As the Chair of next year, I think this could be a gigantic workload not only for the Chair but also for the Committee. So we might end up with, especially the second meeting of maybe six or seven days. That's something I also want to avoid, I think my colleagues also want to avoid. Especially if we think that we may have it back-to-back with a Meeting of the Parties and maybe also with Implementation Committee, so we should think of the timing. There is one advantage I would like to draw your attention to, and this is the time between the meetings. If we have a time interval of six months, there would be more time for the Secretariat to engage into negotiations with implementing agencies and also with countries and the same applies to the implementing agencies. So, I sometimes had the feeling from the implementing agencies and also from the Secretariat that there is certain rush from meeting to meeting and this could be a way out and make the process more relaxed. So, in summary, I think for next year we will still have three meetings, the earliest year to start with two meetings, in my opinion would be 2006 but of course on a trial basis. Maybe we would have also to consider 2007. I think we also have to endorse the current format of having the meeting in plenary and no sub-committees. Thank you.

Chair:

8. Thank you Austria for your contribution, I now give the floor to Argentina, afterwards, Japan, Belgium and Niger. Argentina, please go ahead.

Argentina:

9. Thank you Madam Chair. My delegation also would like to join others in thanking the Secretariat for the very detailed study it has undertaken of the different options for the Executive Committee in terms of its future work and the consequences of each of these options. We agree with the conclusions of the Secretariat as far as the advantages of the new system is concerned which has allowed for more participation of the members of the ExCom and also has avoided duplication of debate on the same subjects, however as we can all see, this has not decreased the volume of work that the ExCom has to undertake which is very high for the time being. Therefore, we think it is premature to decide at this moment to eliminate one of the annual meetings. Also, the need to change the mandate of the ExCom requires that we wait at least one more year in order to change the frequency of the meetings. We think that it would be wise to study this item during the first two meetings of 2005 in order to take a decision before the next Meeting of the Parties which could change the mandate if the ExCom considers it desirable. We think that if an amendment were to be proposed on this, it would have to give some sort of flexibility to the Executive Committee. We could do this by giving us the possibility of holding two or three meetings if necessary and an amendment in paragraph 8 of the mandate which would be in harmony with rule 4.1 of the rules of procedure of the ExCom which could be the following: "The ExCom shall hold at least two meetings a year." I think that with this proposal we can cover the U.K.'s proposal in terms of having three meetings of a shorter duration or two meetings per year. In terms of establishing an intersessional period procedure, we can start studying this possibility with a view to the future, however, this subject deserves much debate in future meetings. Independently of the solution, in future we have to guarantee equitable participation of all members of the ExCom in the decision-making process. This is the reason why my delegation prefers to extend the procedure of non-objection which had been suspended in '95 for other matters as well as bilateral ones. As far as what the Secretariat proposes in 3.4 of the document which is the delegation of authority, my delegation thinks that the Executive Committee should maintain the authority to approve. Therefore, the system which is to be adopted, independently of the form it takes, has to guarantee the fair participation of all members and the distribution of documentation in good time before the meeting in order to guarantee the translation into all UN languages. Also, we have to take into account that we have to consider the needs of countries which are at the risk of non-compliance which should be the main objective of our future work. Therefore, Madam Chair, the economical study, the financial study requested by Cuba is very useful for all of us, for example Austria. Austria said that all governments are asking for budgetary reductions and also I support what the U.K. has asked for, we should maintain this topic in the agenda of our next meeting. Thank you very much.

Chair:

10. Thank you very much Argentina, Japan you have the floor please (not translated, was in Spanish).

Japan:

11. Thank you Madam Chair and I don't think that an amendment to the Terms of Reference is necessary for us to meet only twice a year. We also would like to meet at least three times a year, and that is the mandate for us, so, there's no justification for making a change in the mandate. In view of the kind of the uncertainties expressed in the future we really have to retain our liberty to meet three times in the future if it is necessary. I wonder whether we can meet in extraordinary sessions, but I think the "at least three" means that we can meet more than three, but we can meet less than three. We do not need to change the Terms of Reference. We can just decide to meet twice and that's our decision and should we have any authorization or permission from the Meeting of the Parties, the answer is no. So, one problem is now resolved because there's no constraint on us to apply this starting from next year to having two meetings. Now I think it's possible to have two meetings but the most important thing is, we have to have business plans approved in the previous year for the year it is pertaining to. So, if we meet next year only twice, so this meeting has to agree on the business plan for year 2005. Our current pattern of approving or the considering business plan is quite awkward because we approve the business plan for the particular year as late as the end of the first quarter of the year. So we approved the 2004 business plan as late as March because of that we are already cutting into the operational period. Business plan is a planning document, so, we have to approve that, one year before, before we start implementing it. This is a real lacuna and also deficiency of our system. So, if we agree on the making some change in the pattern of the meeting, we really have to reform that part of the lacuna, that part of the deficiency.

12. I think, the arranging the Executive Committee meetings back-to-back with the OEWG would enormously contribute to the economy or savings. There's no doubt about that. Delegations coming from A5 as well as non-A5 countries are paying a lot of energies and time to attend meetings. So I think that obviously two times are enough and that would represent an enormous economy and of course those who are involved in the protection of atmosphere have to attend other meetings, and that is also the advantage to those who are working in similar areas. And, now, how we can we proceed to intersessional approval. I think Argentina is right and that the members of the Executive Committee have to be responsible of the decisions taken by the Executive Committee. We will never delegate that authority to the Secretariat, but we can always authorize the Secretariat to make a commitment up to a certain level at US $X million. Under that level, the Chief Officer is authorized to take a decision to enter into commitment and of course we will review and approve that retroactively. If that ceiling is exceeded, the Chief Officer has to enter into intersessional consultation by sending letters and faxes. I hate to see that the teleconferencing would be organized in a very awkward time in Tokyo. But anyway, intersessionally and through the intersessional communication, we shall authorize the Chief Officer to exceed the kind of the cap she is given. I think that the existence of the pre-approved business plan would certainly facilitate that process. Since there are already concrete elements in the business plan, delegations can react to the Chief Officer's proposals. Using the business plan as guide we will ask agencies and Secretariat to inform at the end of each meeting members of the Executive Committee what are in the pipeline. I don't think that all of a sudden new projects could be proposed. Since the preparatory assistance is given and the planning is there, the agencies and the Secretariat should be in a position to brief us or indicate us what are in their pipelines. If we have such a list, that would constitute the basis for intersessional consultation. If

the ceiling given to the Secretariat on commitment authority is exceeded, then the delegations would be quick enough to give their answers.

13. So, I would like to mention that the work programmes might be subject to the approval within the commitment authority given to the Chief Officer and the amounts that are proposed under the work programme are relatively modest. It would not require any agreement for the Chief Officer to enter into commitment. Institutional strengthening projects are also possible. If there are any needs to deal quickly with compliance, with regard to countries at risk, we can authorize the Chief Officer to proceed with the commitment if these projects are submitted. So, we have ample possibility of implementing this system. I remember that in the past the Terms of Reference of our Committee gave the Secretariat the authority to process any project below US $½ million. If there is any doubt about the aspect of the incrementality of the cost exceeding US $500,000 it should be for discussion by the Executive Committee. That was the original decision taken when the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee were established by the contracting Parties. So, contracting Parties anticipated the flexible manner to work and do not micro manage the Secretariat work. That idea is still embodied in those who have participated to establish the Executive Committee. I think we have ample chance for agreeing on something and then we will apply this starting from next year. This delegation needs not insisting on having two meetings starting in 2005, but we shall take a decision to meet only twice, starting in year 2006, and in preparation for that we have to work out the mechanism of the intersessional approval. What is the authority we can give to the Chief Officer, what is the mechanism for agreeing among the Parties intersessionally and what is the basis, documentary basis or information basis for that. So, I hope that this could be well taken by the Secretariat and Mr. Lang will ponder on it. Thank you.

Chair:

14. I'd like to thank Japan and I now give the floor to Belgium.

Belgium:

15. Thank you Madam Chair and let me start also by thanking the Secretariat for its clear analysis. I find the document so clear that to my simple mind at least it's rather easy to take a decision and I'll explain a little bit of it as briefly as possible. Let me first say that yes, we should endorse the suggestion that we continue with the plenary ExCom without sub-committees. I think it is working alright, but it's very early to decide on that because we haven't finished yet our first year and this is the only meeting that I've heard the mention at least of night sessions. Scary. So, we have at least to continue a year and evaluate that. Now, I take the point of Argentina and this is not the change to a plenary ExCom without sub-committees. The new pattern is very interesting at least for me because I'm learning a lot about the project approval, and I've never been involved in that and I was able to stay awake. It has not diminished our workload, so, I'm really very hesitant to consider reducing meetings. I've expressed that before. First, it's not becoming, it's not clear at least to me that we have less work. We acted upon the development of the previous system with the sub-committees, and we have to give us a little more time and see how the workload evolves, develops, diminishes or whatever, and then come to a logical conclusion whether or not to change to two meetings and

not try to force this change upon us, because I have the impression that we are going too fast on this and I could envisage a sort of intermediate phase which would be, having three, still three ExCom meetings, but 4 days long or 3 days long. It should flow naturally out of the work and the decreasing in workload should give us that indication. Now, eventually we may reduce to two meetings. I'm not really opposed to it. I think this whole issue has to be viewed in the context of reaching the ultimate objectives of the Montreal Protocol and I think this is the overriding principle before we start discussing anything. I would not like to see the introduction of changes that are going to put at risk of reaching the objectives of the Montreal Protocol and we have said it over and over again that we are at a crucial point. We are geared towards compliance very clearly and I think that's the right way to go and it is very important. So I would really be very hesitant to take any measure that might jeopardize that. Let me be very clear on that. Having said that and if it so appears that we can change eventually to two meetings with all the provisos that I've said, well, then first of all let us get a clear legal advice whether we need an amendment or not, because that's not clear among people in the room. I subscribe to the intervention of Cuba, and if one of the reasons is also economic, then we should try to get to a system of two meetings that does not require the same amount of travel for ExCom members as it is now. Let's then move up the Open Ended Working Group to May, so that we can be back-to-back to MOP and OEWG both. So, let me support the U.K. suggestion and of all other speakers before me that we take this in a very serene way and that we continue thinking about it at next meeting. I don't think we need a clear decision now, but let's give us ourselves the time to think this over with, with prudence and not rush into things. Thank you.

Chair:

16. Thank you Belgium. Niger please and then the United Kingdom, Iran and Canada.

Niger:

17. Thank you Madam. We would join other speakers in expressing sincere thanks to the Secretariat for putting forward this document studying the practice of ExCom, it's full of useful information. Like the United Kingdom, Cuba and other delegations, we feel that it's very premature to move to two meetings if we compare the current regime which has only been in place for a year, and then it's already a very laborious regime compared to the previous one with two sub-committees. Like the delegate of Cuba, we feel that we need to think about increasing staff and if we have two meetings in 2006 and 2007, instead of talking about evening meetings, perhaps we should extend the number of days. That would take us through the weekends, for example, and that would make conference staff and personnel costs a lot more expensive. So, keeping the regime without the sub-committees is one which we feel has worked. For intersessional developments maybe a video conference might be possible as Japan has suggested, but we would tend to disagree with Japan on this system. We would prefer to work morning, afternoon, and night than start going down that road, but in any event we feel it's very premature to go this way and we think that at the 46th Meeting of the Executive Committee we could come back to discussing this again. Thank you.

Chair:

18. Thank you Niger. United Kingdom.

United Kingdom:

19. Thank you Madam Chair. I didn't actually ask for the floor, but I'm very happy that you offered it to me. We were actually very pleased to hear all the support around the room for my delegation's view that this topic definitely deserves consideration at the next meeting and possibly the one after. We do think however, that it should be possible for this group to reach a decision on this in time to present something to the next Meeting of the Parties and we think that this would time in very nicely with the report that we are going to need to provide on the ICF consulting evaluation and would hope that we could resolve the issue in time to do that. Thank you.

Chair:

20. Thank you United Kingdom. Iran to be followed by Canada, Iran please.

Iran:

21. Thank you Madam. I would like to thank the Secretariat for this paper. There are a number of issues we would like to bring up. As far the intersessional approvals are concerned, this delegation doesn't believe it is the level of funding associated with any particular project which is important, it is rather the nature of decision-making. In some instances the Committee has had lengthy discussion on proposals for a few thousand dollars, so what kind of ceiling to which the Secretariat can make approval. Plus the fact that in decision-making there are a number of people present in the ExCom. The number maybe 40, 50 or even more, so it is the collective wisdom which is applied to making decisions. Secondly, we'd like to say that we are quite happy with the present arrangement of the meeting without the sub-committees, and the benefit is that everybody has the chance to take part in the discussions. The third thing is that we have apparently missed one component or one benefit of the meetings which is the interaction between delegates and contact groups, informal meetings when we are considering to reduce the number of meetings to two. A lot of work has been done at the margin of the meeting with the implementing agency, with the Secretariat, with each other, this has helped to reach understanding on various issues. We think this is important and maybe Secretariat can take this into account to see how much of the problem is resolved informally. As to the economy and efficiency, I personally don't like to be travelling all the time, but we have been willing to do so because we make some achievement. As for the economy, we think the suggestion by the delegate of Japan is quite helpful, and that they could be arranged with other meetings related to Montreal Protocol. In summary we think that it is premature to make any decision with the amount of information we have before us now, we should give some more time to see whether it is feasible or not. Thank you.

Chair:

22. Thank you Iran, Canada please.

Canada:

23. Thank you Madam Chair. I'll try to be brief as well at this stage, because I think there seems to be some emerging consensus that we could continue to consider the issue of having two meetings next year but that we're not able to actually take a decision on this at this meeting. Let me first of all also thank the Secretariat for quite a thoughtful and comprehensive document. It made it easy for us to all understand the issues involved. We'd point out that the document argues that the main driver for the frequency of the meetings of the Executive Committee has been the burden and complexity of its work. Therefore, we agree with Belgium and other delegates that the main arguments for reducing the number of meetings from three to two would be that the workload or the complexity would somehow be reduced, or that somehow the work can be dealt with more efficiently through the application of standardized approaches. At this point it is not evident that we would be able to do this by 2006, it's possible, but we're really not sure, we know that there will be increasingly a diminishing number of projects to approve, so it is possible. As well, if the ExCom were to adopt an intersessional procedure for approving projects, the workload during meetings could be reduced somewhat further.

24. At this stage, we think that the Secretariat has provided quite comprehensive documentation and we're not sure what more the Secretariat can present to us, we'd have to see how things go. Cuba has mentioned the further information, financial information which perhaps the Secretariat could include a brief document on this by the next meeting as well as if there are any other important outstanding issues which were not reflected in the present document then perhaps the Secretariat could include those in a further document for the next meeting. But we think that the document we have before us basically gives us a pretty comprehensive view of the picture and we have to see whether there will be an actual reduction of work as time goes on. With respect to the intersessional procedure for approving projects, we will recall that the reason why we asked the Secretariat to present a paper on this at the last meeting was not principally related to having two meetings but was related to the issue of compliance and not delaying projects if there was an urgency for compliance of the recipient country. So we would support actually applying a non-objectional procedure for approving projects as described by the Secretariat to areas with, and without established policy and guidelines where there is compliance as an issue. This could be combined with a procedure delegating authority to the Secretariat to approve projects in areas where there are well established guidelines in place. So, this would be according to the Secretariat's paper in paragraph 45, we would support basically their option 4. We think this option may provide some additional work to ExCom members between sessions, but it has a low risk of compromising ExCom responsibility. Furthermore, it would provide some relief to the overall workload of the ExCom and a solution to compliance related urgent requests. With respect to the organization of work without the sub-committees, we think that this year has worked fairly well, so we support the current process of considering all issues during the plenary. Thank you.

Chair:

25. Thank you Canada, Hungary has the floor.

Hungary:

26. Thank you Madam Chairperson. First, I also thank the Secretariat for the very thorough analysis. There is only one point I would like to express my partial disagreement with one of the statements of the study and this is in paragraph 74(b), that lists the disadvantages of the possible two meeting format. It says that "since the new scheduling under the two meeting format may not provide the opportunity to hold meetings back-to-back with the Open-ended Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties", it is the last bullet point, I think there is no special difficulty to hold the second meeting back-to-back with Meeting of the Parties, because it is usually held in November or sometimes in December and if the Ozone Secretariat can hear the suggestion of our distinguished Belgian colleague to bring forward the Open-ended Working Group in May, both meetings can be held back-to-back. So, my delegation has the opinion that the two meeting format might be introduced and Argentina suggested a very flexible way how to introduce and when. Concerning the working method, the plenary session without sub-committees proved to be appropriate, so, I would suggest to follow that method. Thank you very much.

Chair:

27. Thank you Hungary. Well if there are no further speakers, I'm going to try to sum up what's been said about this item. On the whole, I think there are two points on which there is consensus, the first is the advantage of having done away with the sub-committees. No delegation has objected to this, no one's calling for a reversion to the sub-committees. Belgium, I think suggested we keep things going as they are for a year then take another look at it, but I think we can adopt this procedure and endorse the way in which the Executive Committee operates at present for a further year. The other point where there is consensus is the need for more thorough consideration in the course of the next year of the possibility of reducing meetings from three to two a year. There are delegations which have pointed out that this could be done. Argentina for example, suggested a formula for amending the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee, specifically paragraph 8 of the Terms of Reference, which says "the Executive Committee shall hold three meetings a year while retaining the flexibility to take advantage of the opportunity provided by other Montreal Protocol meetings to convene additional meetings where special circumstances make this desirable". So it's clear, the Executive Committee can, under the Terms of Reference have three meetings or more as they stand, but not fewer, so to reduce it to two, there would be a need to amend those Terms of Reference and only the Meeting of the Parties can do that. But anyway, Argentina's proposal is on the table, it does provide for flexibility when it says two or more meetings, if necessary.

28. As regards the establishment of an intersessional procedure, some delegations pointed out that the authority for approval of projects should remain with the Executive Committee others suggested some delegation of authority in the Secretariat, or in Japan's case, in the person of the Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund. However, it seems clear that this matter needs to be studied further and Japan and Niger have established that some video conference system might be explored in this regard. Canada pointed out that the intersessional procedure is not necessarily tied to the question of reducing to two meetings, rather it's just to facilitate approval of projects where there may have been difficulties with the regard to compliance by the country concerned and on the whole there is a fair measure of consensus that perhaps the non-objection

procedure currently used by bilateral agencies which has been used in the past by them could be extended to such cases and Austria, Canada and others took that view. There's also consensus that the two meeting should not involve an increase in the workload of these meetings, and there should be an attempt to find a way of holding them in conjunction with other meetings under the Montreal Protocol. Belgium suggested moving the Open-ended Working Group meeting to May which is something that would have to be agreed upon with the Ozone Secretariat. My proposal is that the Secretariat might perhaps compile all of these opinions in one document. There have been a lot of them and perhaps as Cuba requested, it might provide some information on the financial implications, or financial advantages of adopting one or other of the options before us, and the delegations which haven't spoken should have the chance to transmit their comments to the Secretariat on these matters and then a document would be submitted to the next meeting of the Executive Committee. Now is that an acceptable way of proceeding to delegates? Belgium please.

Belgium:

29. Yes, it is, for me it's completely acceptable. If I understood you well, we would still have some time to submit written comments on this issue after the meeting. I was going to suggest that, but you're quicker than me. I would also like to know the opinion of the implementing agencies on this because they are now working at a very clear structure of meetings and, and, as we know from this document and from experience, any change may relieve workload, and it may not. I think, I remain of the opinion that it is way too early to make the switch, I think that Canada has supported that. We have to give it more time and I mean, 2006 is too early in my mind, let me be very clear about that. We will have to see how the workload evolves for some time but my suggestion would be to also invite the implementing agencies to submit comments on this eventual two meeting innovation. Thank you.

Chair:

30. Thank you Belgium, Japan has the floor.

Japan:

31. Madam Chair. I wish to know whether there is any consensus on the desirability of having back-to-back meetings with the OEWG? I think nobody wanted to have two more meetings than the actual two meetings which are, you know, made in conjunction with the OEWG and MOP. In fact, you know, we have only one meeting which is not organized back-to-back to the Meeting of the Parties or the OEWG. So we are not increasing that number and because of the back-to-back arrangement we have been able to come only three times a year to the Executive Committee. I think there's a consensus on that. In order to enable the Secretariat to make further proposals on the intersessional consultation arrangement, I think the information on the projects in pipeline and the status of compliance record would be very useful. We mentioned that point and hope that that point, would need some more consideration in the future. Thank you.

Chair:

32. Thank you Japan. Well, it's clear that nobody wants to increase the number of meetings and of course what you said about projects in the pipeline is valid and so is your proposal for the business plan to be submitted to the last meeting of the previous year. All of that will be taken into account by the Secretariat when it prepares the document which collates everything that's been said by you at this meeting. Cuba has the floor.

Cuba:

33. Thank you Madam. I think the major conclusion we've drawn is that there's not a general consensus, yet we need to continue studying the question. The only thing that there is consensus on is that this should continue to be discussed and it's important for all the aspects to be taken into account. We can look at it again at the next meeting but that is the only consensus, thank you.

Chair:

34. Cuba, from your last statement, I understand that you disagree with continuing with the current procedure of continuing meetings without the sub-committees.

Cuba:

35. Madam Chairman. I was only referring to this idea of having two or three meetings, but as to whether the Executive Committee without the sub-committees has been a success, well, it's been a comprehensive success. We have the fullest understanding and support for this. It was not that aspect that I was commenting, it's on the other one, which needs to be studied further and checked.

Chair:

36. Well, all the delegations agree with continuing through 2005 discussing this matter and seeing how the workload evolves in the Executive Committee and to go on studying the matter. Well, the opinions will be compiled by the Secretariat in a document taking on board the opinions of delegations in the Executive Committee over the course of the next year. If there are no further opinions on this matter, then it may be so decided.

Chair:

37. Do any agencies wish to take the floor? The World Bank. UNDP.

UNDP:

38. No, we, we're fine with suggestion that we send written comments by the deadline, we definitely haven't had time to analyze the impact on the cash flow, especially on some of the national plans and things like that, so we would like to look more carefully on this before we send comments. Thank you.

Chair:

39. Thank you UNDP. Well, the deadline for written comments will be February 4th.

Written Comments

Brazil

- In assisting the ExCom to decide on the convenience of holding two meetings a year instead of three, the Secretariat might want to identify commonalities and differences between Multilateral Fund (MLF) procedures and those of the GEF, which holds two meetings a year. This comparative analysis might include project approval, frequency of business plan and fund balance reviews, monitoring and evaluation procedures and other matters. We believe that the MLF and the GEF each has its own identity and purposes, which justify their mutual independence and their different proceedings. However, some lessons might be learned by the MLF from the GEF, **as far as meetings' dynamics is concerned**. In this sense, it is not the case of applying GEF's proceedings regarding budget, business plans and monitoring and evaluation to the MLF, but of assessing how these and other issues are presented before GEF Council members and analyzed by the GEF Council, **therefore impacting on the duration and frequency of meetings**.

- It is not clear to us why the reduction of ExCom meetings would prevent the Committee from holding sessions back-to-back with OEWG and MOP meetings (§ 228 of ExCom44 report). This explanation could be made more explicit in the new Secretariat's paper. We look forward, in this sense, to seeing the cost estimates to be produced by the Secretariat for the various scenarios.

- An intersessional approval procedure on a non-objection basis would be an important element if the ExCom is to hold two meetings a year. As stated in paragraph 230 of ExCom 44 report, the current interim procedure is a good basis for a new interim procedure. In crafting this procedure, we should avoid the risk of increasing instead of simplifying the workload of all participants in this process (ExCom members, Secretariat, agencies, interested Parties) or of rendering this workload highly unpredictable. We also believe ExCom meetings should remain the primary *locus* of decision-making within the Multilateral Fund. Intersessional review of projects should therefore respond to a compliance imperative of an interested Party and be guided by criteria regarding the relevance and urgency of projects submitted for intersessional approval. There might be a need for a cost ceiling to projects eligible for intersessional review, as well as a limit to the number of projects that can be presented for intersessional review (precedence to be determined by compliance needs, for instance). Exemption of the cost ceiling rule could be granted to projects already analyzed in a prior ExCom meeting, to which specific adjustments were sought and which are submitted to intersessional approval upon explicit recommendation by the ExCom.

- As regards the proposed text for a possible amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Committee (§226 of ExCom44's report), Brazil could go along with it. Alternatively, the text could read "at least two and no more than three" meetings a year.

Mauritius

The comments for Mauritius are as below:

We would like to associate ourselves with all the various implications highlighted in the Secretariat document as well as points raised by members in the previous ExCom meeting on the review of the structure of the meeting. We wish to emphasize on a few points:

- Current transitional period of the Committee from a project-focused operating environment to one enabling compliance.

  In this context, sufficient meetings have to be held to undertake future workload especially in terms policies and procedures to enable it to monitor the implementation of the national ODS phase-out programmes and assist Article 5 countries in meeting their Montreal protocol phase-out schedules in a timely manner.

In view of the above, Mauritius has two proposals for the immediate and medium term as follows:

(a) Immediate term: Three meetings format continues for at least one year

(b) Medium term: The holding of the number of meetings be left open and schedule as per the workload.

United Kingdom

The report prepared by the Secretariat provided a good start for thinking about this issue and we thank the MLF for preparing it.

With regards to the operation of the ExCom without Sub-committees we agree that the new regime started in 2004 should continue.

With regards to continuing with the present regime (3 meeting/year) or to remove one meeting from the present format, we feel that the following considerations should be taken into account before making a final decision:

1. The future role of the MLF relating to supporting compliance: Most larger volume-consuming countries have now entered into agreements with the ExCom for sectoral or national-phase-out plans, the costs of which have been agreed in principle. The focus of the work of the MLF should now be on ensuring implementation of agreements and ensuring that the remaining low-volume consuming countries continue to be provided with relevant assistance to enable them to comply with the control provisions of the MP.

2. The need to eventually identify new tasks for ExCom and the Secretariat in order to meet the new challenge, which may result in adjusting the distribution of tasks between ExCom and the Secretariat .We might wish to give more responsibility concerning routine work to the Secretariat and consider a procedure for intersessional approvals resulting in the delegation of a new level of authority to the Secretariat under specific conditions.

After clarifying these points we could then adjust the organization of work accordingly. Part of this would be a decision on whether we would need to keep the present frequency of meetings or reduce the number of meetings to two per year.

To facilitate our discussion we believe it would be very helpful if we could have a new policy paper from the Secretariat covering the options we have, on the basis of a thorough analysis of all the possible changes we might be confronted with in the next 12 month or so, including those already contained in the Evaluation report presented to MOP last week.

We would also need to carefully consider whether any proposed change to the meeting regime actually resolves the issue of frequency of travel or simply reduces the number of days.

France

Here are a few comments to the document:

Point 2: We would prefer the wording "identify the CHANGE of tasks" rather than "identify new tasks", as it may be that some tasks will be reduced. If there are only two ExCom meetings per year, it would be interesting to count how many preparation (reading, preparing comments, attending) work days will be reduced all together, which can be shifted to other tasks.

Point 3: We agree to take the decision of reducing the number of meetings from three to two with intersessional approvals after analyzing the organization of the workload. We would suggest to include the other meetings, such as the inter-agency meetings in the analysis.

Considering such additional meetings is also linked to the last paragraph. Here we would like to add that it is not only the issue of the frequency of travel or the reduction of the number of days, but also a question of costs (travel costs + person/days of work): when we count the interagency meetings, we are talking of up to five trips/meetings for ExCom preparation.

UNDP

1. UNDP would definitely prefer a regimen with 2 rather than 3 meetings a year as it would reduce the number of deadlines for submission of documents. This in turn would allow more time to devote efforts to implementation/formulation of programmes, and assist

countries in these efforts, rather than running from one deadline to the next throughout the year.

2. The model proposed by the MLFS is definitely a good proposal, but as mentioned during the last Interagency Coordination meeting, UNDP would much prefer following scheduling throughout the year to avoid overloading most of the work at the last meeting of the year:

> July meeting: Would deal with Progress Reports (including financial aspects) and submissions that were delayed a year earlier, plus a portion of the submissions of the year itself. This meeting would be back-to-back with the OEWG to save costs. The meeting would prepare the yearly report for consideration at the MOP which typically takes place in Oct-Nov of each year.
>
> December meeting: Would deal with the next year's business plans and approve PRP funds needed to allow IA's to get on with their next year's work from early January on. Results from recommendations from the MOP and ImpCom meetings (typically held in Oct-Nov) which might affect the business plans would promptly be incorporated by the IA's in the business plans. This meeting would also deal with remaining submissions of the year concerned.

3. Observations:

- While the last ExCom would not be back-to-back with the MOP, this cost-saving aspect would be recuperated as the July-meeting would be back-to-back with the OEWG.

- The annoyance of splitting up the progress report between the two meetings would be avoided in our proposal.

- Allowing inter-sessional approvals such as is done in the GEF would reduce workloads at the 2 remaining ExComs to a level that is likely to be workable. This last proposal may only apply for projects for which mutual agreement is reached between the MLFS and the IAs and would anyway be in the list for blanket approval. Such projects would then be posted for 2 weeks on the intranet accessible for comments by ExCom Members.

- Submissions of tranche requests in Agreements must be adjusted accordingly as to avoid delays in implementation. The possibility of advancing tranches which are due in March to the year before need to be considered on a case by case basis.