



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/7*
18 October 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-fifth Meeting
Bali, Indonesia, 13-17 November 2011

2011 CONSOLIDATED PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

* Re-issued for technical reasons

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issuance of the document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
I. Overview of PCRs received and due	3
II. Analysis of project completion reports for investment projects	5
(a) PCRs received and due	5
(b) Ozone-depleting substances (ODS) phase-out achieved	5
(c) Implementation delays	6
(d) Completeness of information	6
(e) Overall assessment and rating	7
III. Analysis of non-investment project completion reports	7
(a) PCRs received and due	7
(b) Funding, delays, phase-out and assessment	8
(c) Quality of information received	9
IV. Schedule for submission of PCRs in 2012	9
V. Improve consistency of data reported in PCRs and in annual progress reports	9
VI. Lessons learned from investment and non-investment projects	10
VII. Action expected from the Executive Committee	14

Annexes:

- I Statistics
- II Lessons learned reported in project completion reports

Executive summary

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Executive Committee with an overview of the results reported in the project completion reports (PCRs) received during the reporting period, i.e., since the 62nd meeting in November 2010. A draft of the report was sent to the implementing agencies as well as the bilateral agencies. Comments received were taken into account when finalizing the report. PCRs scheduled for submission by the implementing agencies for 2012 are shown in Table IV in Annex I. The total number of PCRs received for investment projects in the year 2011 decreased to 12 (compared to 17 in 2010) while the total number of PCRs still due on completed investment projects has increased from 22 to 24. For non-investment projects, the number of PCRs received in 2011 increased from 60 to 71 and the number of outstanding PCRs decreased from 110 to 95. UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank did not follow fully the agreed delivery schedule for the first three quarters of 2011.

2. The 12 PCRs submitted on investment projects were reviewed with respect to phase-out achieved, implementation delays, and completeness of information and data consistency, overall assessment and lessons learned. Most of the 71 PCRs on non-investment projects contain substantial information and analysis.

3. A number of interesting lessons were reported. Some refer to the terminal phase-out management plan (TPMP) implementation, others to the refrigerant management plan (RMP), methyl bromide projects and various aspects of project implementation. A number of these lessons are presented in Annex II. A select number of these are summarized in section VII of this report. The full list is available on request and on the intranet of the Fund Secretariat in the evaluation section under PCRs.

4. While no particular decision is required by the Executive Committee on the lessons learned, as they do not concern issues that have not yet been addressed by the Executive Committee, they provide interesting insight into project execution for all those preparing and implementing projects in the implementing and bilateral agencies, financial intermediaries, project management units (PMUs) as well as national ozone units (NOUs). Regional network meetings could be a useful forum for discussing lessons learned regarding the implementation of projects in the regions. The Fund Secretariat also takes them into account for the review of projects and phase-out agreements.

5. The recommendations for the Executive Committee's consideration set out at the end of the document relate to the scheduling of next year's submission of PCRs by the agencies, further improvements in data consistency, the provision of missing information, the need to develop project completion report formats for MYAs and the use of lessons learned reported in PCRs for future project preparation and implementation.

I. Overview of PCRs received and due

6. The total number of PCRs received for investment projects in the year 2011 decreased to 12 (compared to 17 in 2010) while the total number of PCRs still due on completed investment projects has increased from 22 to 24. For non-investment projects, the number received in 2011 increased from 60 to 71 and the number of outstanding PCRs decreased from 110 to 95. UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank did not follow fully the agreed delivery schedule for the first three quarters of 2011 (see Table I in Annex I).

7. By 9 September 2011 UNDP, which implements by far the largest number of investment projects, delivered 1 compared to 4 PCRs on investment projects scheduled for submission by the end of September this year, and 15 compared to 12 PCRs on non-investment projects. UNEP submitted 32 compared to 74 PCRs on non-investment projects scheduled for submission by the end of August this year, and UNIDO sent 9 compared to scheduled 11 PCRs on investment projects by the end of September

this year, as well as an additional 3 PCRs on non-investment projects. The World Bank did not submit any PCR compared to 5 PCRs scheduled for investment projects and 3 PCRs scheduled for non-investment projects that were scheduled by the end of September this year.

8. Since the inception of the Multilateral Fund, implementing agencies and bilateral agencies have submitted, as of 9 September 2011, a total of 1,805 PCRs on investment projects and 937 PCRs on non-investment projects, representing 98.7 per cent (compared to 98.8 per cent last year) and 90.8 per cent (88.8 per cent last year) of PCRs respectively for projects completed as of 31 December 2010. Tables 1 and 2 below present more detailed data by agency including comparative figures for the previous two reporting periods.

Table 1

INVESTMENT PROJECTS OVERVIEW

(Except multi-year projects)

Agency	Completed projects up to December 2010	Total PCRs received for projects completed up to December 2010	PCRs still due	PCRs received in the reporting period		
				2009	2010	2011 ¹
France	15	11	4	0	0	0
Germany	19	19 ²	0	3	1	N/A
Italy	7	7 ³	0	N/A	N/A	2
Japan	6	6	0	1	N/A	N/A
Spain	1	1	0	1	N/A	N/A
UNDP	888	884 ⁴	4	7	2	1
UNIDO	437	437 ⁵	0	10	13	9
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
United States of America	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
World Bank	453	437 ⁶	16	1	1	0
Total	1,829	1,805	24	23	17	12

¹ After the 62nd meeting of the Executive Committee (4 December 2010 to 9 September 2011).

² In addition, Germany submitted 1 PCR for multi-year project.

³ In addition, Italy submitted 1 PCR for multi-year project.

⁴ In addition, UNDP submitted 2 PCRs on cancelled projects and 1 PCR for multi-year project.

⁵ In addition, UNIDO submitted 2 PCRs for cancelled projects, 9 cancellation reports and 14 PCRs for multi-year projects.

⁶ In addition, the World Bank submitted 2 PCRs on cancelled projects.

9. UNEP has the largest number of PCRs due (57 for non-investment projects), followed by the World Bank which has 16 PCRs due for investment and 9 for non-investment projects completed by the end of 2010. UNDP has four PCRs due for investment and 6 for non-investment projects. For several bilateral agencies, the combined numbers of PCRs still due for investment and non-investment projects range between 2 and 12 (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 2

NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS OVERVIEW

(Except project preparations, country programmes, multi-year projects, and ongoing projects like networking and clearing-house activities as well as institutional strengthening projects)

Agency	Completed projects up to December 2010	Total PCRs received for projects completed up to December 2010	PCRs still due	PCRs received in the reporting period		
				2009	2010	2011 ¹
Australia	24	24 ²	0	0	0	17
Austria	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Canada	56	53	3	5	1	1
Denmark	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Finland	5	5	0	0	3	N/A
France	26	14	12	0	1	0
Germany	54	51	3	4	10	0
Israel	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Japan	10	8	2	N/A	N/A	0
Poland	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Singapore	2	0	2	0	0	0
South Africa	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spain	3	3	0	2	N/A	N/A
Sweden	5	4 ³	1	N/A	3	3
Switzerland	3	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
UNDP	249	243 ⁴	6	28	12	15
UNEP	405	348 ⁵	57	31	25	32
UNIDO	108	108 ⁶	0	6	5	3
United States of America	40	40	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
World Bank	37	28	9	2	0	0
Total	1,032	937	95	78	60	71

¹ After the 62nd meeting of the Executive Committee (4 December 2010 to 9 September 2011).

² In addition, Australia submitted 1 project cancellation report and 1 PCR for ongoing project.

³ In addition, Sweden submitted 3 PCRs for multi-year projects and 3 PCRs on transferred projects.

⁴ In addition, UNDP submitted 2 PCRs on transferred projects, 1 PCR for multi-year project and 1 PCR for ongoing project.

⁵ In addition, UNEP submitted 11 PCRs for multi-year projects.

⁶ In addition, UNIDO submitted 3 PCRs for multi-year projects.

II. Analysis of project completion reports for investment projects

(a) PCRs received and due

10. The largest number of PCRs on investment projects was received from UNDP, particularly for foam and refrigeration projects. However, refrigeration is the sector with the largest number of PCRs due, followed by aerosol and foam projects. Refrigeration (6), aerosol (4) and foam (4) projects combined account for 58.3 per cent of the 24 PCRs still due from all agencies for investment projects completed by the end of 2010 (see Table II in Annex I). The backlog of PCRs on early investment projects completed by the end of 2001 has been eliminated and only two remain for projects completed before 2005.

11. The 12 PCRs received in the reporting period (4 December 2010 to 9 September 2011) represent projects completed in 10 countries.

(b) Ozone-depleting substances (ODS) phase-out achieved

12. ODS phase-out in the projects covered by the 12 PCRs is found to be as planned in most cases, the total phase-out reported being slightly more than the planned amount (see Table 3 below). Moreover,

the ODS phase-out data reported in the PCRs are different in one of the 12 reports from those reported in the 2010 progress report. A significant difference is noted for this project, which is being clarified with the agencies concerned. However, the number of cases with such differences and the level of differences is less than last year.

Table 3

ODS PHASED OUT BY PROJECTS WITH PCRS SUBMITTED

Agency	Number of projects	PCRs		2010 progress report	
		ODP phase-out planned	ODP phased out	ODP phase-out planned	ODP phased out
Bilateral	2	183.6	183.6	183.6	183.6
UNDP	1	192.3	249.6	192.3	192.3
UNIDO	9	622.9	622.9	622.9	622.9
Total	12	998.8	1,056.1	998.8	998.8

(c) Implementation delays

13. Out of 12 projects, 8 showed delays ranging from 3 months to 49 months; three PCRs were completed before the scheduled date and one PCR was on time. In 33.3 per cent of the 12 projects, delays of more than 12 months occurred compared to 50 per cent of projects for which PCRs were received last year. Average delays reported in the PCRs in 2011 decreased to 12 months (from 15 months) and the average project duration decreased from 49 months to 42 months (see Table 4 below).

14. The limited number of PCRs covered in the analysis does not allow for a discussion of any trend. Delays are most frequently attributed to the supplier (3), enterprise (3), external factors (3), followed by the implementing agency (1), and funding (1).

Table 4

IMPLEMENTATION DELAYS

(Total figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Agency	Number of projects	Average delays as per PCRs (months)	Average delays as per 2010 progress reports (months)	Average duration as per PCRs (months)	Average duration as per 2010 progress reports (months)
Bilateral	2	3.02	3.02	27.37	27.37
UNDP	1	6.07	24.33	43.60	61.87
UNIDO	9	14.87	20.17	45.43	53.15
Total	12 (17)	12.16 (14.81)	17.43 (13.38)	42.27 (49.18)	49.25 (47.94)

(d) Completeness of information

15. Key information was more regularly provided than last year, for example the list of annual consumption of ODS and substitutes was included in 91.7 per cent of the PCRs, compared to 81.3 per cent last year (see Table 5 below). Information still frequently is not complete, in particular with regard to annual consumption of ODS and substitutes (8.3 per cent of the PCRs compared to 12.5 per cent in 2010) and the list of operating cost details (8.3 per cent compared to zero per cent in 2010).

Table 5

**INFORMATION PROVIDED IN INVESTMENT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTS
RECEIVED DURING THIS REPORTING PERIOD**

(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

	Provided		Incomplete		"Not applicable"*	
	Number of projects	Percentage %	Number of projects	Percentage %	Number of projects	Percentage %
List of annual consumption of ODS and substitutes	11	91.7 (81.3)	1	8.3 (12.5)	0	0.0 (6.3)
List of capital equipment	12	100.0 (93.8)	0	0.0 (6.3)	0	0.0 (0.0)
Operating cost details	2	16.7 (12.5)	1	8.3 (0.0)	9	75.0 (87.5)
List of destroyed equipment	3	25.0 (25.0)	0	0.0 (0.0)	9	75.0 (75.0)

* According to indications of implementing agencies

(e) Overall assessment and rating

16. During the reporting period, implementing agencies rated 66.7 per cent of projects as highly satisfactory, which is an increase from 56.3 per cent in the previous year; 25 per cent were rated as satisfactory, compared to 37.5 per cent in 2010, and 8.3 per cent as less satisfactory compared to 6.3 per cent reported in the year before (see Table 6 below).

Table 6

**NEW OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION BY THE AGENCIES
IN THE NEW PCR FORMAT**

(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Assessment	Bilateral	UNDP	UNIDO	Total	Percentage of total %
Highly satisfactory	2	1	5	8	66.7 (56.3)
Satisfactory			3	3	25.0 (37.5)
Less satisfactory			1	1	8.3 (6.3)
Total	2	1	9	12	100.0

III. Analysis of non-investment project completion reports

(a) PCRs received and due

17. Seventy-one PCRs were received for non-investment projects, the majority of which are for technical assistance projects implemented mainly by UNDP, UNEP and the bilateral agencies. UNEP has submitted more PCRs than in previous years; however the backlog of delayed PCRs has reduced compared to last year. For bilateral technical assistance projects there are still 17 PCRs due, as well as 5 PCRs on training projects (see Table III in Annex I). This review does not include country programmes, project preparation, or UNEP's recurrent activities (including networking), which do not require PCRs as per decision 29/4.

(b) Funding, delays, phase-out and assessment

18. Total actual expenditures for all completed non-investment projects with PCRs were reported to be 75 per cent of the planned expenditures indicating some overall savings (see Table 7). These data need to be reconfirmed once the final financial figures become available.

Table 7

**BUDGETS, PHASE-OUT AND DELAYS REPORTED IN PCRS RECEIVED
FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS**

(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Agency	Number of projects	Approved funds (US \$)	Funds disbursed (US \$)	ODP to be phased out (ODP tonnes)	ODP phased out (ODP tonnes)	Average delays (months)
Bilateral	21	890,500	595,603	268.2	18.2	44.13 (27.21)
UNDP	15	2,374,406	1,364,121	132.1	129.2	31.58 (26.08)
UNEP	32	1,893,413	1,848,509	56.8	56.5	28.28 (21.23)
UNIDO	3	169,200	164,407	11.2	11.2	36.88 (11.18)
Total	71	5,327,519	3,972,640	468.4	215.1	30.85 (23.19)

19. The delays experienced in project implementation continue to show a great deal of variance. Out of 71 non-investment projects, 2 were completed on time. Delays were experienced in 52 projects ranging from one month to 74 months and 17 projects did not report on the actual completion date. In 36 cases, or 50.7 per cent of the projects, delays of more than 12 months occurred. Nineteen projects reported delays between 37 and 74 months. The agencies concerned were Australia, UNDP and UNEP, mainly for components of RMPs such as customs training, implementation and monitoring of recovery and recycling, technical assistance or demonstration projects, along with Canada, Sweden and UNIDO.

20. UNDP shows an increase in average delays (31.58 months compared to 26.08 months last year). The average delay in UNEP's projects increased from 21.23 to 28.28 months, and delays in UNIDO's projects increased from 11.18 to 36.88 months. The overall average delay for non-investment projects is 30.85 months beyond the planned completion date, showing an increase compared with 23.19 months in 2010.

21. The difference in ODP phase-out planned and reported as achieved is almost entirely due to four projects implemented by UNDP, UNEP and Sweden for which the actual ODS phase-out was reported to be less than planned.

22. 5.6 per cent of the projects were marked as "highly satisfactory", which is less than last year (16.7 per cent); 31 per cent were rated as "satisfactory as planned" which is less than last year when this figure was 57.4 per cent, and 60.6 per cent as "satisfactory though not as planned" which is more than last year when this figure was 22.2 per cent (see Table 8). The validity of such assessments can only be verified during evaluations. In several projects rated as "satisfactory though not as planned", no clear explanation for this rating has been provided. One out of 54 non-investment projects did not report any assessments and one reported the assessment as "not applicable".

Table 8

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS BY AGENCIES**(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)**

Assessment	Bilateral	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total	Percentage of total %
Highly satisfactory		2	1	1	4	5.6 (16.7)
Satisfactory or satisfactory and as planned		11	9	2	22	31.0 (57.4)
Satisfactory though not as planned	20	1	22		43	60.6 (22.2)
Not applicable		1			1	1.4 (1.9)
Not provided	1				1	1.4 (1.9)
Total	21	15	32	3	71	100.0%

(c) Quality of information received

23. Most PCRs for non-investment projects contain substantial information and analysis. However, the sections on causes of delays and corrective actions taken are not always provided. Usually governmental, agency, design and external factors are given as causes for delays.

24. Furthermore there is no set of standardized indicators for similar activities or for measuring impact. A concise and standardized definition of indicators for outputs and outcomes would facilitate the understanding of problems, reduce the time of drafting reports, improve communication, increase the meaningfulness of reporting, and allow for comparison among various experiences.

25. Comments on draft PCRs have been provided by NOUs for 53 (74.6 per cent) of the 71 reports received, and by the implementing agencies in 67 (94.4 per cent) of the 71 cases. This is an increase compared to last year when 75.9 per cent of the reports received contained comments from the implementing agencies. NOUs also commented more regularly than last year when they had done so in 48.1 per cent of the reports received.

IV. Schedule for submission of PCRs in 2012

26. The implementing agencies submitted, as in previous years, schedules for submission of PCRs due. Table IV in Annex I shows PCRs due for projects completed as of 31 December 2010 and takes into account the number of outstanding PCRs as of 9 September 2011. The implementing agencies will, in addition to the above schedule, submit PCRs in 2012 for projects completed during 2011.

V. Improve consistency of data reported in PCRs and in annual progress reports

27. Decision 62/6(b)(i) requested implementing agencies, in cooperation with the Fund Secretariat, to establish full consistency of data reported in the PCRs, in the inventory and the annual progress reports by the end of January 2011. The Fund Secretariat provided all agencies with detailed information on data completeness and inconsistencies of PCRs received in comparison to the inventory and the progress reports. All cases of incomplete information and data inconsistencies in PCRs received in 2003 and 2004 have now been resolved, while this process still continues with UNDP and the World Bank (for some PCRs received in 2005) (see Table V in Annex I), with several agencies for PCRs received in 2006 (see Table VI in Annex I), the World Bank for PCRs received in 2007 (see Table VII in Annex I), several agencies for PCRs received in 2008 (see Table VIII in Annex I), UNDP for PCRs received in 2009 (see Table IX in Annex I) and with several agencies for PCRs received in 2010 (see Table X in Annex I).

28. During the reporting period, 11 PCRs were received with incomplete information and 48 with data inconsistencies (see Table XI in Annex I). Regarding PCRs with incomplete information, the number has decreased (11 PCRs compared to 12 PCRs last year). The total number of PCRs with data inconsistencies also decreased (48 PCRs compared to 49 PCRs last year).

29. In order to improve consistency of data and facilitate the preparation of PCRs, agencies can, since July 2004, download key project data from the website of the Fund Secretariat. When indicating the project number or title, the first page of the PCR forms will be automatically filled in with data from the Fund Secretariat's project inventory database, including actual data and remarks from the last progress reports. However, the continued high number of reports with inconsistencies appears to indicate that this facility is still not regularly used.

VI. Lessons learned from investment and non-investment projects

Lessons from the implementation of RMP projects

Project design and preparation

- The need for appropriate government structures, adequate funding and regular monitoring is mentioned in several PCRs.
- In Chad the project was not warmly received at its inception because of low level of incentive and a complex disbursement mechanism. Several interventions both by national and international consultants, as well as a readjustment of some of the parameters to better account for the realities of the country allowed for the situation to be redressed eventually.
- In Gabon, while implementing the national programme for recovery and recycling of refrigerants a significant effort was made to familiarize a government counterpart that had no experience in UNDP procedures such as the national execution (NEX) modality.

Project implementation

- Project implementation in Haiti demonstrates that appropriate follow up is critical when national challenges overtake the government environmental agenda. It was concluded that serious lack of resources may additionally hinder the progress of projects since the government counterpart contribution is more difficult to secure. An additional challenge is the lack of appropriate government structure to support the implementation of the projects during post disaster period.
- The project in Peru shows that in order to avoid the sub use of equipment and accessories for recovery and recycling, it is necessary to implement a plan of regular visits to beneficiaries to check on their conditions and frequency of use, establishing mechanisms to reallocate equipment when the use conditions are not met.
- The Peru project also concludes that to maintain a permanent and timely contact with the technicians it is necessary to stimulate technical partnerships through incentives such as free training courses for members only. It is also useful to schedule more frequent training events and sector technical update. Another effective measure is to hire a professional on a permanent basis as a National Consultant to be responsible for monitoring, coordination and implementation of projects and carry out procedures in support of the Ozone Technical Office.

Technical issues

- In Sierra Leone technicians and equipment owners/end-users participated in specialized workshops on hydrocarbon technology and best practices in retrofits. This provided incentives for retrofits to hydrocarbons, which have low ODP and GWP impacts. Therefore, awareness-raising campaigns and training are essential to the success of such end-user programmes to: (1) comprehensively identify eligible CFC equipment users, and (2) ensure that the country has qualified technicians trained in safe retrofit techniques.
- It concludes projects of this type should plan for the procurement of additional spare parts for the equipment/tools supplied as without such supplies equipment may fail irreversibly and become of no use to technicians. The project also points out that recovery machines which, according to their technical specifications, were supposed to be portable, were in fact far too heavy to be carried by one technician during daily activities.
- The PCR for Bangladesh stresses that small-size electric recovery machines are better for recovery activities in developing countries.

Lessons from the implementation of TPMPs*Project design and project preparation*

- The PCR for the project in Serbia stresses that a feasibility study significantly contributes to the achievement of planned results and that strategic research is a key for identifying and reaching target groups.
- In Brazil, pilot projects were a valuable tool to validate the use of new technologies in an article 5 country context.

Project implementation

- In the Republic of Moldova during the implementation of the project, the main challenge was the price difference between the replacement hydrofluorocarbon-based MDIs and the traditional CFC-based medicine. Furthermore, the country fully depends on imports of MDIs with no local production, and the only solution to equalize the prices was to amend legislation to promote alternative MDIs and work with importers to explain the coming governmental policies.
- The project in Sierra Leone benefited from cooperation with other departments such as the Police and Military, as well as with service providers such as Power and Water departments. At the same time, institutional changes in the government may adversely impact the project; an established government structure is essential to ensure the required high-level coordination of project activities.
- A lesson from the CFC phase-out in Afghanistan is that awareness-raising, customs training together with regulatory measures should be deployed simultaneously.
- The lessons yielded by the TPMP project in Bhutan reflects the need for enforcement support: the NOU found it most important to support the customs and enforcement officers in the implementation of the CFC phase-out period because ODS import only accounts for a small fraction of overall trade and in the context of other issues such as narcotics smuggling, human trafficking, weapons, etc. ODS issues usually take a lesser priority. Adding to the existing

workload of the custom officers, the difficulty of ODS detection and identification frequently hinders actions.

Communication and cooperation

- Bhutan has benefitted from the South-South cooperation network and the efforts and coordination of the UNEP CAP team. The project concluded that it is extremely important to promote awareness on the ozone issues among public and all other stakeholders and consumers. The public needs to be aware of the restrictions, market choices and environmental benefits of ODS phase-out.
- The same project concluded upon the importance of synergies with other environmental trade issues. In addition to the ODS issue, monitoring and enforcement of other trade-related environmental regulations such as those related to movement of hazardous waste (Basel Convention), endangered species (CITES), biodiversity (Biosafety Protocol) and persistent organic pollutants (POPs) are relevant to customs. In order to enhance synergies, a broader strategy could be developed to address all these issues in an integrated manner (e.g. by conducting training and workshops which cover all these issues together). This would have the double benefit of reducing transaction costs of customs authorities while optimizing the benefit for the environment and of the cooperation between environmental policy makers and customs authorities.
- In Maldives existing regulations, design and implementation of ozone related projects, including awareness activities, are executed with the endorsement and approval of a technical advisory committee. Endorsement by the committee of ODS-related decisions gives strength to the phase-out efforts and facilitates smooth and effective promotion and implementation of phase-out activities by various national level stakeholders. Members in the committee from different ministries serve as focal points for the NOU. Therefore ODS control was executed with very close cooperation from all the members of the committee. The involvement of national stakeholders and other relevant ministries is an important lesson learned from CFC phase-out.
- Border dialogues are a useful bilateral/multilateral cooperation mechanism to combat the illegal trade in ODS in Nepal, especially when the country is imposing strict import limits. In the same country the industry association in the refrigeration and air conditioning sector plays a key role to assist the NOU in liaising with the servicing technicians/workshop, organizing the technicians training workshop and sustaining the good practices learned.

Cultural issues

- In Sierra Leone, to capture attention from diverse public and private sectors, Krio, which is the local dialect, was extensively used for communication. In any future projects, some funds should be allocated to publish documents in local languages.

Geo-political issues

- The case of Romania shows that, as in other new European Union (EU) member states, the EU membership served as an extra motivation for rapid phase-out, especially among technicians and companies eager to be able to compete on the EU market.

Lessons from the implementation of methyl bromide projects

Project design, project preparation

- In Dominican Republic the “tailor-made” agreements for each farmer provide a guarantee for the success of implementing the alternative, as there is a clear commitment for its replacement. In addition, the provision of requested supplies facilitates the adoption of the alternative by farmers. Obviously, in the case of the Dominican Republic this is easier due to the limited number of farmers using methyl bromide, which are distributed among a few sectors and regions. In countries with a higher number of farmers the possibility of organizing agreements farm by farm is limited.
- The project in Syria demonstrates that defining the roles of stakeholders at the start of project implementation and good cooperation between agency, counterpart, government and suppliers helps ensure timely implementation. Furthermore the investment project was suffering from a significant delay due to repeated bidding for equipment and services by the implementing agency because the initial offers were significantly above the project’s budget. The agency should take into consideration a wider technical know-how with reference to project planning and implementation so that such delays can be avoided.
- In Sierra Leone the technique of “stakeholder analysis” was very effective. The findings helped the NOU convince the various stakeholders of the significance of their roles and functions in the project. Furthermore, the involvement of the Law Officer’s Department and the Parliamentary Oversight Committee in the project’s day-to-day activities accelerated the introduction of the ODS regulations.

Project implementation

- The project in Malaysia concluded that: a) fumigation and laboratory work should be conducted by fumigators or qualified specialists; b) it is better to select a fumigant approved in Malaysia. Alternative fumigants for the project were not registered in the country and required consent and approval from appropriate government departments such as the Pesticide Board which caused delays in project implementation; and c) it is useful to conduct a monthly progress meeting to improve coordination among various agencies.
- Issues related to training and workshops were identified in Kenya. The PCR concludes that short, simple presentations, combined with hands-on experience utilizing the interactive modules and case studies in which participants practice what they are learning, are most effective in developing mastery of the material. Furthermore the establishment of a Training/Demonstration Centre was effective in piloting the alternatives in one place where growers, extension workers and all interested parties were able to appreciate the efficacy of the alternatives.
- In Zimbabwe the inclusion of staff from contracting companies in the training teams was important, as 70 per cent of the national tobacco crop in the country is grown under the contract system.

Communication and cooperation

- In Sierra Leone sensitization and awareness-raising among key stakeholders and policy makers is necessary for the sustainability of the total phase-out of methyl bromide. The results of a national survey on the use of methyl bromide in Sierra Leone, as well as the information and

awareness-raising materials from UNEP provided the basis for all the training and awareness-raising workshops.

- Technology adoption in Zimbabwe was successful due to active involvement of all stakeholders, awareness raising through the use of electronic and print media and in particular, training. However logistical and administrative issues reduced participation and commitment. The PCR for Zimbabwe also notes that polystyrene trays used in large quantities do not biodegrade easily. Ways need to be found to recycle these plastic trays.
- In Kenya valuable time was saved and a quick start-up at the country level achieved through building synergies with existing projects in other African countries, for example Zimbabwe and Uganda, where methyl bromide in soil fumigation has already been phased out, and drawing on the experiences of previous demonstration projects.

VII. Action expected from the Executive Committee

30. The Executive Committee might wish to consider:

- (a) Taking note of the 2011 consolidated project completion report including the schedule for submission of project completion reports (PCRs) due and the lessons learned in Annex II;
- (b) Requesting implementing agencies and bilateral agencies concerned:
 - (i) To establish by the end of January 2012, in cooperation with the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, full consistency of data reported in the PCRs in the inventory and in the annual progress reports;
 - (ii) To provide, by the end of January 2012, the information still missing in a number of PCRs;
 - (iii) To clear by the end of January 2012 the backlog of PCRs on projects completed before the end of 2006;
- (c) Inviting all those involved in the preparation and implementation of projects to take into consideration the lessons learned drawn from PCRs when preparing and implementing future projects.

Annex I
STATISTICS

Table I

SCHEDULE FOR PLANNED SUBMISSION OF PCRS IN 2011 AND ACTUAL DELIVERY

	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNDP	July 2011					1 TAS, 1 DEM	
	August 2011					8 TAS	
	September 2011	Investment	4	1 FOA			
		Technical Assistance			12		2 DEM, 3TAS
Total		4	1	12		15	
Status at September 9, 2011				-3		+3	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNEP	November 2010	Technical Assistance			11		
		Training			1		
	December 2010	Technical Assistance			8		
		Training			2		
	January 2011	Technical Assistance			3	2	
		Training				6	
	February 2011	Technical Assistance			6	18	
		Training			4	3	
	March 2011	Technical Assistance			6	2	
		Training			5		
	April 2011	Technical Assistance			5		
		Training			3		
	May 2011	Technical Assistance			3	1	
		Training			2		
	June 2011	Technical Assistance			6		
		Training			3		
	July 2011	Technical Assistance			3		
		Training			2		
August 2011	Technical Assistance						
	Training			1			
Total				74	32		
Status at September 9, 2011						-42	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNIDO	February 2011	FUM	2	1 PAG			
	April 2011	FUM	1				
	June 2011			1 FUM			
	July 2011	FUM	3	3 FUM		1 TAS	
	August 2011				3 FUM, 1 ARS	2 TAS	
	September 2011	FUM	5				
Total			11	9		3	
Status at September 9, 2011				-2		+3	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
World Bank*	March	Methyl bromide (1), Halon (1), Foam (1)	2		1		
	July	Methyl bromide (2), Halon (1), Phaseout Plan (1)	2		2		
	September	Halon	1		--		
	November	Aerosol (3), Sterilants (1), Refrigeration (1)	5		--		
	Total			10	0	3	0
Status at September 9, 2011				-5		-3	

*Table includes expected PCRs for projects completed up through December 2009 with outstanding PCRs (18 total) *minus* PCRs that will be submitted by 31 December 2010 (expected 5). The Bank will, in addition to the above schedule, be submitting PCRs in CY2011 for projects completed through 2010 and up to 30 June 2011.

Table II

**PCRS FOR INVESTMENT PROJECTS RECEIVED AND DUE BY IMPLEMENTING AGENCY, SECTOR AND YEAR
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL THE END OF 2010)**

Agency	Sector	PCR(s) Received in:															PCR(s) Due in ¹								
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
UNDP	Aerosol	1	-	9	4	11	-	-	4	3	5	2	-	-	-	39	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Foam	20	34	79	83	117	87	82	77	7	21	7	3	-	1	618	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Halon	-	-	3	13	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Refrigeration	1	22	2	33	9	22	39	42	1	4	3	1	-	-	179	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Solvent	3	-	-	19	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sterilant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	25	56	93	152	137	110	122	126	11	31	13	6	1	1	884	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	4	
UNIDO	Aerosol	6	6	10	6	4	2	-	7	-	1	-	-	1	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Foam	8	22	3	22	11	15	11	14	8	2	1	1	-	118	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	6	1	6	3	2	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Halon	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	4	-	-	-	2	1	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Refrigeration	12	25	11	32	14	22	24	34	7	4	-	1	-	186	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Solvent	5	13	5	3	3	5	5	4	9	-	1	-	1	54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	32	66	29	63	35	48	42	64	24	13	3	10	5	3	437	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
World Bank	Aerosol	4	6	6	-	1	-	2	5	2	-	-	-	-	26	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Foam	18	25	38	20	20	18	8	26	12	6	6	-	-	197	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	Halon	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	3
	Multiple Sectors	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Others	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Production	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Refrigeration	18	24	22	26	15	16	12	21	9	7	1	-	1	172	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2
	Solvent	15	4	3	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	27	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Sterilant	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	59	60	73	48	36	34	23	56	24	16	7	-	1	-	437	2	6	3	1	2	-	1	1	16	
Bilateral	Aerosol	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Foam	-	-	3	2	2	2	-	5	6	6	1	1	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Halon	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Refrigeration	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	2	-	-	11	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3
Solvent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	-	1	5	2	3	2	-	7	11	7	5	3	1	-	47	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	4	
Grand Total	116	183	200	265	211	194	187	253	70	67	28	19	8	4	1,805	2	7	3	2	3	1	3	3	24	

¹ 6 months after projects completion according to the Progress Report

Table III

**PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT RECEIVED AND DUE FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL THE END OF 2010)**

Agency	Sector	See PCR(s) Received so far for Year Due															PCR(s) Due in ¹												
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Before 1997	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
UNDP	Demonstration	-	-	5	-	-	6	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	3	4
	Technical Assistance	-	6	39	17	7	5	1	15	8	21	29	27	12	11	198	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2
	Training	-	18	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	24	50	17	7	11	2	17	8	21	33	27	12	14	243	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	3	6
UNEP	Technical Assistance	9	53	3	18	22	18	5	6	1	7	7	8	9	16	182	-	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	1	14	11	3	40
	Training	8	34	1	2	21	15	20	10	5	4	7	25	5	9	166	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	1	2	6	3	3	17
	Total	17	87	4	20	43	33	25	16	6	11	14	33	14	25	348	-	1	1	1	1	4	1	5	3	20	14	6	57
UNIDO	Demonstration	-	-	-	6	7	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Technical Assistance	-	6	8	-	4	1	3	4	3	15	9	6	2	3	64	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Training	-	1	1	-	5	6	7	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	-	7	9	6	16	10	13	8	3	16	9	6	2	3	108	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Bank	Demonstration	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Technical Assistance	5	4	6	-	1	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	4	9
	Training	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	6	7	6	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	2	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	1	4	9
Bilateral	Demonstration	5	5	12	-	3	1	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Technical Assistance	-	-	13	1	1	9	14	15	8	5	15	7	13	17	118	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	2	2	9	17
	Training	1	3	19	1	9	6	5	6	6	2	2	-	2	-	62	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	5
	Total	6	8	44	2	13	16	20	21	16	7	17	8	15	17	210	2	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	1	3	3	10	23
Grand Total	29	133	113	45	80	70	62	63	34	57	75	74	43	59	937	2	1	2	2	1	6	1	6	7	25	19	23	95	

¹6 months after projects completion according to the Progress Report

Table IV

**SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF OUTSTANDING PCRS IN 2012
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL 31 DECEMBER 2010)**

UNDP	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	September 2012			1
	Total		1	8
Total PCRs Due as of 9 September 2011			4	6
UNEP	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	November	Technical assistance		1
		RMP		2
	February	Technical Assistance		7
		RMP		11
		ODS		1
	May	Training		1
		RMP		13
		TAS		5
	July	Training		1
July	RMP		15	
	Total			57
Total PCRs Due as of 9 September 2011			N/A	57
UNIDO	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	December 2012	FUM	1	
	December 2012	FUM	1	
	December 2012	ARS	1	
		Total		3
Total PCRs Due as of 9 September 2011			N/A	N/A
World Bank*	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	February	Aerosol (1) Methyl Bromide (1)	0	2
	March	Phaseout Plan (1) Aerosol (2) Solvents (1) Refrigeration (1)	5	0
	June	Halon (3)	1	2
		Total		6
Total PCRs Due as of 9 September 2011			16	9

*Table includes expected PCRs for projects completed up through December 2010 with outstanding PCRs (23 total) *minus* PCRs that will be submitted by 31 December 2011 (expected 13). The Bank will, in addition to the above schedule, be submitting PCRs in CY2012 for projects completed through 2011 and up to 30 June 2012.

Table V

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2005 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Canada		Germany		Japan		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1	1	1	33	31			32	32	11	10	79	76
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		94%				100%		91%		96%
Data Inconsistencies																
Date Approved	3	3					3	3							6	6
Planned Date of Completion			1	1			15	15			2	2	2	1	20	19
Revised Planned Date of Completion	3	3			2	2	23	22	3	3			27	26	58	56
Date Completed	2	2	1	1	2	2	22	22	1	1	1	1	6	6	35	35
Funds Approved	1	1	1	1									6	6	8	8
Funds Disbursed	1	1					4	4			1	1	5	5	11	11
ODP To Be Phased Out							2	2					3	3	5	5
ODP Phased Out							4	4			1	1	3	3	8	8
Total	10	10	3	3	4	4	73	72	4	4	5	5	52	50	151	148
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		99%		100%		100%		96%		98%

Table VI

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2006 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Australia		Canada		France		Germany		Japan		Poland		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1	2		8	8					5	5	1	1	9	9	35	16	62	41
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		0%		100%		N/A		N/A		100%		100%		100%		46%		66%
Data Inconsistencies																						
Date Approved	1	1			1		1	1											3	2	6	4
Planned Date of Completion	1	1	2	2	1										1	1			17	4	22	8
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1	5	5	1		4	4							3	3	1	1	43	8	58	22
Date Completed	2	2			2		3	3	1	1	1						1	1	5	3	15	10
Funds Approved			2	2	1		1	1											4	0	8	3
Funds Disbursed			4	4	1										1	1			4	0	10	5
ODP To Be Phased Out							2	2									1	1	5	2	8	5
ODP Phased Out			1	1	1		8	8	1	1							1	1	5	2	17	13
Total	5	5	14	14	8	0	19	19	2	2	1	0			5	5	4	4	86	21	144	70
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		0%		100%		100%		0%		N/A		100%		100%		24%		49%

Table VII

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2007 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Canada		France		Germany		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	2	2			7	7	26	26			3	3	10		48	38
Solved as % of Total		100%				100%		100%				100%		0%		79%
Data Inconsistencies																
Date Approved									1	1			1		2	1
Planned Date of Completion									1	1			1		2	1
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1					1	1			5	5	15		22	7
Date Completed			1	1	6	6	9	9	1	1	1	1	5		23	18
Funds Approved											1	1	3		4	1
Funds Disbursed									1	1			4		5	1
ODP To Be Phased Out			1	1	2	2	12	12	2	2	1	1	2		20	18
ODP Phased Out			1	1	7	7	12	12			1	1	1		22	21
Total	1	1	3	3	15	15	34	34	6	6	9	9	32	0	100	68
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		0%		68%

Table VIII

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2008 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Australia		Canada		France		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1					17	17	1	1	4	4	3		27	24
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%						100%		100%		100%		0%		89%
Data Inconsistencies																		
Date Approved									1	1			1	1	1		3	2
Planned Date of Completion	1	1	1	1			1	1	2	2			2	2	1		8	7
Revised Planned Date of Completion									6	6	3	3	1	1			10	10
Date Completed	1	1			1				14	14					1		18	15
ODP To Be Phased Out			1	1					12	12	2	2			1		16	15
ODP Phased Out			1	1					14	14	2	2			1		18	17
Total	2	2	3	3	1		1	1	49	49	7	7	4	4	5		73	66
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%			0%		100%		100%		100%		100%		0%	90%

Table IX

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2009 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Canada		Germany		Japan		Spain		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	2	2	5	5					14	13	1	1	2	2	24	23
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%						93%		100%		100%		96%
Data Inconsistencies																
Date Approved									1	1					1	1
Revised Planned Date of Completion			3	3					3	3			1	1	7	7
Date Completed	1	1			1	1	1	1	8	8	1	1			12	12
ODP To Be Phased Out	1	1	2	2	1	1			4	4	2	2			10	10
ODP Phased Out	1	1	2	2			1	1	9	9			1	1	14	14
Funds Approved									1	1					1	1
Funds Disbursed	1	1							1	1	2	2			4	4
	4	4	7	7	2	2	2	2	27	27	5	5	2	2	49	49
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Table X

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2010 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Canada		Finland		France		Germany		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information			1				3	3			5	5			3	3	12	11
Solved as % of Total				0%				100%				100%				100%		92%
Data Inconsistencies																		
Date Approved							1	1			1	1					2	2
Planned Date of Completion											3	3					3	3
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1					3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	11	11
Date Completed							1	1			4	4					5	5
ODP To Be Phased Out					1		7	7			2	2					10	9
ODP Phased Out							4	4			4	4	1	1	3	3	12	12
Funds Approved													1	1			1	1
Funds Disbursed													5	5			5	5
Solved as % of Total	1	1			1	0	16	16	1	1	17	17	8	8	5	5	49	48
Solved as % of Total		100%				0%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		98%

Table XI

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2011 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 4 October 2011)**

	Australia		Canada		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1						7		2		1	1	11	1
Solved as % of Total								0%		0%		100%		9%
Data Inconsistencies														
Date Approved									1		1	1	2	1
Planned Date of Completion	1												1	0
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1		1		3		10		4		1	1	20	1
Date Completed	1				2		3				3	3	9	3
ODP To Be Phased Out	1				1		2		1				5	0
ODP Phased Out							5		1				6	0
Funds Approved	1				1								2	0
Funds Disbursed					2						1	1	3	1
	5	0	1	0	9	0	20	0	7	0	6	6	48	6
Solved as % of Total		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%		100%		13%

Annex II

LESSONS LEARNED REPORTED IN PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTS

A. INVESTMENT PROJECTS

- (a) Phase-out of CFC consumption in the manufacture of aerosol metered-dose inhalers (MDIs) in the Islamic Republic of Iran:
 - (i) Establishment of a Science and Technology Committee at local and/or regional levels by UNEP/ROAP with expectation to help the Montreal Protocol to make the best of potential resources of the region, was a good idea which led to the cooperation of all involved countries of the region towards a smooth transfer of technology in general and to ensure specifically the process of replacement of CFC-MDIs with HFA-MDIs, which can help realize the concept of “thinking globally and acting locally” (IRA/ARS/52/INV/183);
- (b) Terminal umbrella project for phase-out of the use of CFC-11 in the manufacture of polyurethane foam in Argentina:
 - (i) The staggered implementation worked very well. News about the success of the first phase motivated other enterprises to complete the required information to participate and in this way helped in the success of the project (ARG/FOA/38/INV/132);
- (c) Technical assistance for the elimination of methyl bromide in grain and storage facilities in Georgia:
 - (i) Best results can be obtained when combining different methyl bromide alternatives and when adopting sound crop management practices (GEO/FUM/47/INV/20);
- (d) Phase-out of methyl bromide in grain storage (second tranche) in the Syrian Arab Republic:
 - (i) Working with farmers and in rural areas with some poor facilities has created some additional problems normally not foreseen in the project document;
 - (ii) Consideration should be given to the fact that the date of the project approval does not necessary coincides with the starting of sowing season;
 - (iii) Demonstrating to farmers alternatives to methyl bromide is an effective way to raise awareness and commitments to a phase-out (SYR/FUM/41/INV/89);
- (e) Terminal phase-out management plan of CTC production/consumption for process agent uses in Romania:
 - (i) Financial and other commitments of a project beneficiary should be officially agreed and cleared by the Government of Romania prior submission of a project document for approval by the Executive Committee (ROM/PAG/50/INV/36).

B. NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS

- (a) Implementation of monitoring and control of ODS and ODS based equipment for the refrigerant management plan (RMP) in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:
 - (i) The active engagement of the National Ozone Unit (NOU) at the regional and national levels is imperative in the successful completion of the RMP;
 - (ii) Periodic letters to the relevant minister on the status of implementation of the Montreal Protocol activities is useful in keeping and maintaining political support (STV/REF/25/TRA/03);
- (b) Implementation of the RMP: MAC recovery and recycling of CFC-12 in Sierra Leone:
 - (i) Seminars and trainings are a key factor in the successful implementation of the programme. However, the provision of spare parts and the development of up-to-date curricula for technicians are paramount as there are always new ways to successfully carry out their work. CFC control legislation, which was introduced first in 2008 and then improved in 2011 (ban on CFC import and use), was also strategically important to the programme's objectives (SIL/REF/41/TAS/07);
- (c) Implementation of the RMP: training of trainers in good practices of refrigeration in Suriname:
 - (i) Periodic letters to the relevant minister on the status of implementation of the Montreal Protocol activities is useful in keeping and maintaining political support;
 - (ii) The NOU will establish a monitoring mechanism to ensure that the objectives of the training programme are met and will produce a follow-up report on the status of implementation of the training programme (SUR/REF/41/TRA/06);
- (d) Implementation of the RMP: monitoring the activities within the RMP in Suriname:
 - (i) It is a challenge to identify local experts who are available and willing to work on a project-by-project basis;
 - (ii) Lack of expertise is one of the critical factors that can delay all the activities;
 - (iii) The two local technicians (for specific tasks) that were finally hired for the project implementation and oversight had a very high quality and were instrumental for the success and sustainability of the project SUR/REF/44/TAS/10;
- (e) Region: LAC – Demonstration project for integrated management of the centrifugal chiller sub-sector in the Caribbean, focusing on application of energy-efficient CFC-free technologies for replacement of CFC-based chillers:
 - (i) The Global Environment Facility (GEF) Secretariat has a different project cycle than the Multilateral Fund Secretariat, and it is a challenge to combine the two funding sources – this is especially the case in multi country projects;

- (ii) The implementation of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) in the GEF made it more challenging to prepare the regional medium-sized projects and submit it to the GEF Secretariat (LAC/REF/47/DEM/36);
- (f) Technical assistance to achieve compliance with the 20 per cent phase-out of methyl bromide in Mexico:
 - (i) One of the lessons learned through the project is the importance of initial awareness-raising and training sessions prior to implementing methyl bromide phase-out, in order to share and discuss objectives, strategies and results of previously approved demonstration projects, as well as to raise the interest of methyl bromide users in participating in phase-out activities. While this was successfully undertaken under this project, one weakness was that the technicians in methyl bromide-using enterprises, who were later responsible for the “hands-on” work in implementing alternatives, were not sufficiently involved in this initial awareness-raising/training stage. In the future, such technicians need to be involved from the very beginning in order to facilitate the application and ongoing use of alternatives to methyl bromide fumigation;
 - (ii) When soliciting the participation of private companies in a pilot project of this nature, it is important to provide decision-makers not only with information on technical economic and environmental feasibility, but also a financial analysis. This aspect had not been initially integrated in the documentation presented to companies to support their decision-making process and was underlined by some as a problem. Likewise, following the completion of the pilot project, the results analysis and reports should include an evaluation of economic and financial aspects of the pilot project so as to provide the best information possible to companies to help them prepare adequately for the upcoming methyl bromide ban;
 - (iii) As the methyl bromide structure sub-sector represented only 10 per cent of the country’s methyl bromide consumption, the project proposal did not include specific objectives and activities for this sub-sector. Instead, the proposal only set out broad activities and objectives at the national level. While Environment Canada was not involved in preparing the project proposal, after the project was approved, it worked with Mexico to develop the specific objectives, activities, work plan, budget breakdown, and expected results for the project. While this was a useful and necessary exercise, it should have been done at the project development stage in order to avoid delays (MEX/FUM/42/TAS/122);
- (g) Terminal phase-out management plan (first tranche) in Nepal:
 - (i) The import licensing and quota system is a very effective measure to control ODS import and ensure the country is in compliance;
 - (ii) Although the country is not an ODS producer and does not regularly export ODS to any other countries, the flexibility to allow exports of ODS with strict controls is necessary to address unwanted ODS, if any;
 - (iii) Border dialogues are a useful bilateral/multilateral cooperation mechanism to combat the illegal trade of ODS, especially when the country is imposing strict import limits;

- (iv) The industry association in the refrigeration and air conditioning sector plays a key role in assisting the NOU to liaise with the servicing technicians/workshop; organizing the technicians training workshop; and sustaining the good practices training (NEP/PHA/52/TAS/21);
- (h) Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche) in Maldives:
 - (i) One of the most important lessons learned from CFC phase-out has been the criticality of the institutional structure in implementation of phase out projects. Once the Ozone Office was set up firmly, government efforts were strengthened as it continued during the TPMP implementation;
 - (ii) Existing regulations, designing and implementation of ozone-related projects, including awareness activities, are executed with the endorsement and approval of the Technical Advisory Committee on Montreal Protocol and Vienna Convention. Endorsement of the committee on ODS-related decision gives strength to the phase-out efforts and facilitates smooth and effective promotion and implementation of phase-out activities by various national level stakeholders. Members in the committee from different ministries serve as focal points for the NOU. Therefore ODS control was executed with very close cooperation from all the members of the committee. Involvement of national stakeholders and other relevant ministries is an important lesson learned from CFC phase-out;
 - (iii) Import bans imposed on methyl bromide, halons, methyl chloroform, bromochloromethane and carbon tetrachloride were fully enforced. The government was successful in taking over and managing and controlling the excess amount of CFC-12 that was imported into the country and reselling it as per the Plan of Action submitted to the Implementation Committee (decision XIV/6). Together with the comprehensive legal framework, awareness activities, technician and customs training activities helped the country to promote non-CFC technologies and import of ODS alternative-using equipment (MDV/PHA/58/TAS/18);
- (i) Policy assistance for the design and implementation of an ODS import/export licensing system in Argentina:
 - (i) The NOU (OPROZ) played an essential role in coordinating activities with other institutions such as the ministries of foreign affairs, industry, economics and trade. In addition, the links established with the private sector should be praised, since these facilitated the negotiation of the licensing system through dialogue with relevant stakeholders and certainly contributed to its institutional strength;
 - (ii) Monitoring the progress of local legislation processes requires the insight of a national player. As such, OPROZ did a remarkable follow up of the ODS legislation proposal and certainly helped UNEP to understand its singularities, when comparing to other legal systems in the region. Hence the joint approach between UNEP and local authorities is highly recommendable (ARG/SEV/30/TAS/104).
