



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/66/19
20 March 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-sixth Meeting
Montreal, 16-20 April 2012

**OPTIONS FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME FOR THE 2012-2014 TRIENNIUM
(DECISION 65/18)**

Background

1. At its 65th meeting, the Executive Committee decided to request “(c)(i) The implementing agencies to consider the options in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/20 and other possible options for an administrative cost regime for 2012-2014 and to report thereon to the Fund Secretariat; (c)(ii) The Fund Secretariat, taking into account the input provided by the implementing agencies as per sub-paragraph (c)(i) above, to provide a further assessment of administrative costs for the 2012-2014 triennium to the 66th meeting, including options that were discussed during the 65th meeting” and “(d) At its 66th meeting, to consider further requesting the implementing agencies to provide an estimation of the use of administrative costs for reporting, project implementation and internal requirements” (decision 65/18). The Committee also approved the 2012 core unit budget at a rate of increase over 2011 levels of 0.7 per cent for UNDP and UNIDO and 0.68 per cent for the World Bank.

Historical growth rate

2. The 64th Executive Committee meeting requested the Fund Secretariat in the context of progress reporting, to “consider in the context of its review of administrative costs to be submitted to the 65th meeting pursuant to decision 62/25(c): a. whether the current administrative cost regime continued to be appropriate in light of the changing roles and portfolios of implementing agencies; b. options for ensuring that the overall administrative cost ratio remained within the historical average or lower” (decision 64/6(c)(iii)).

Administrative cost options

3. The status quo administrative cost regime and the implementing agencies’ proposals are defined in Table 1.

Table 1

**EXISTING ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME, THE AUSTRALIAN PROPOSAL
PRESENTED TO THE 65TH MEETING, AND THE IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES'
PROPOSALS FOR AN ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME FOR THE 2012-2014 TRIENNIUM
(US \$)**

Status quo for UNDP, UNIDO, and World Bank	Up to 3% increase in core unit costs; 7.5% for \$250,000 and above; 9% below \$250,000			
Australian proposal	.Below \$250,000: 9%; .\$250,001-\$5,000,000: 7.5%; .\$5,000,001-\$20,000,000: 7%; .\$20,000,001-\$50,000,000: 6.5%; .\$More than \$50,000,000: 6%			
Agency	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4
UNDP	Australian proposal 7% fee minimum to new BP figures for 2012-2014 total values instead of total agreement	Australian proposal 7% fee minimum for all HPMPs and core unit with 0.7% increase		
UNEP	Status quo for UNEP only: 13% to \$500,000, 11% to \$5 million, above negotiated: no fee on INS, up to 3% increase in CAP			
UNIDO	.Below \$500,000: 9%; .\$500,001-\$5,000,000: 7.5%; .\$500,000,001 and up: 7%	.Below \$500,000: 9%; .\$500,001 and above: 7%; .\$Remaining tranches for China: 7%	.Below \$250,000: 9%; .\$250,001 and above: 7%; .\$Remaining tranches for China: 7%	Status quo and core unit with 0.7% increase
World Bank	.Below \$250,000: 9%; .\$250,001-\$10,000,000: 7.5%; .\$10,000,001-\$30,000,000: 7%; .\$30,000,001 and up: 6.5%			

Note (1): 7.5 per cent for IS for UNDP, UNIDO, and the World Bank and 7.5 per cent for project preparation.

Note (2): UNEP is assumed to be under existing regime as per decision 26/41 except in Australia's proposal.

Note (3): All options assume the status quo for bilateral agencies.

Note (4): Growth in core unit and CAP costs is assumed to increase at up to 3 per cent except UNDP proposal 2 and UNIDO proposal 4 for core unit cost growth.

Note (5): No existing MYA agency fee arrangements approved to-date are changed

4. The other options also under consideration by decision 65/18 were presented by the Secretariat or by a member at the 65th meeting.

5. The administrative cost assessment in Annex I is based on the 2012-2014 business plan as submitted to the 66th meeting and the historical average of 1991-2011. It shows by agency and alternative business plan scenario the results of the assessment in terms of an estimated value for administrative costs including core unit costs where applicable and the resulting ratios of administrative costs on project costs for comparison to the historical average.

Impact of over-budgeting in business plans

6. The overall administrative costs to project cost ratio would be 11.38 per cent¹ based on the values in the 2012-2014 business plans as submitted by the agencies. This would mean that to achieve the objective of decision 64/6(c)(iii), i.e. to ensure that the overall administrative cost ratio remained within

¹ This is compared to 12.1 per cent under the status quo that was presented at the 65th meeting. The difference is due to: the lower agency fees for core unit costs and the CAP, 65th approvals versus their business plan values, and the values in the 2011-2014 business plans that were understated.

the historical average or lower, any of the options could be adopted except the status quo with a 3 per cent growth in core unit costs. However, since the values in the business plans for 2012-2014 exceed the replenishment level (US \$450 million) by US \$102.9 million, other scenarios should be considered since the Executive Committee does not have the authority to commit to more resources during the triennium.

7. The analysis based on business plan values as submitted cannot be used since these values exceed the budget of the Multilateral Fund. Therefore the Secretariat assessed three alternative scenarios, two of which addressed reductions in the production sector value and one with pro-rated reductions in new activities that would result in business plan values equalling the US \$450 million budget. Table 2 presents a summary of the outcome of the various options under these three scenarios.

Table 2

ADMINISTRATIVE COST ON PROJECT COST RATIOS BY SCENARIO AND OPTION

Agency	As per Business Plan						Australia Proposal	UNDP		UNIDO proposal				World Bank proposal Proposal 1
	2012-2014 with status quo (UNEP proposal)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% support costs and core unit for 2012-2014 3% lower than 2011	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% and core unit 3% increase	Flat fee at 11.24% (no core units)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6.75% and core unit 3% increase	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 7.25% and core unit zero growth		Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4	
Pro-rated BP to US \$450 million	12.31%	11.27%	11.68%	11.24%	12.00%	11.94%	11.54%	12.05%	11.84%	12.06%	12.02%	12.02%	12.10%	11.85%
No Production Sector	12.66%	11.84%	12.27%	11.24%	12.46%	12.31%	11.98%	12.44%	12.22%	12.44%	12.39%	12.38%	12.44%	12.27%
50% of Production Sector	11.93%	11.03%	11.40%	11.24%	11.66%	11.59%	11.15%	11.67%	11.48%	11.67%	11.63%	11.62%	11.74%	11.47%

8. Under the pro-rated scenario, all new HCFC consumption, HCFC production, and ODS disposal activities are prorated to the balance of US \$169.3 million to fully utilize the US \$450 million budget of the triennium. The only option that remains within the historical average is the flat fee of 11.24 per cent for all agencies, while the proposal for an agency fee of 6 per cent for Chinese projects with a 3 per cent reduction in core unit costs and the Australian proposal, each achieve a rate of below 11.7 per cent. It should be noted that under this scenario, the total value of administrative costs to all of the implementing agencies would be within a range of US \$1.4 million (from US \$14.3 to US \$15.7 million) for the triennium under any of the options.

Impact of the production sector

9. While the values for the HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) in the consumption sector are within established cost-effectiveness guidelines, alternative scenarios associated with the value of approvals for the production sector have not yet been established. Since the value of the production sector could reach up to US \$128 million (based on the business plans), any fee for the production sector could have a positive impact on the reduction of the overall administrative cost ratio for approved projects due to the fact that its likely value will warrant the lowest rate in all scenarios. At a value above US \$30 million for the production sector, the agency fee under the World Bank's proposal would be 6.5 per cent. At a value above US \$50 million, the Australian proposal would have a lower rate of 6 per cent. However, at this stage it is unclear and it is also possible that the appropriate agency fee for the production sector will depend upon the level of support that will be required by the implementing agency.

10. Without the production sector, there would be a surplus of US \$25 million in the budget, but the overall administrative cost of the Fund for the status quo would be 12.66 per cent. Annex I shows that only the flat fee option would enable the Fund to achieve the historical average ratio of administrative costs on projects approvals.

11. Table 2 and Annex I show that the scenario where the production sector allocation (US \$64 million) is half of the value in the business plans (US \$128 million) would raise the overall administrative cost ratio of the Multilateral Fund to 11.93 per cent. The three options (flat fee for all agencies, 6 per cent for Chinese projects with 3 per cent lower core unit costs than that in 2011, and the Australian proposal) would enable the Multilateral Fund to remain within the historical average ratio of administrative costs on project approvals under the 50 per cent production sector cost scenario that would still leave the Fund about US \$39 million over budget.

Observations

12. The Secretariat's flat fee of 11.24 per cent for each agency would result in all three scenarios being within the historical average. The flat fee would however provide more funds to UNEP and the World Bank than they have requested in their proposals and is not recommended.

13. The proposals for a 6 per cent agency fee for Chinese projects, with a 3 per cent lower core unit costs than that in 2011, and the Australian proposal are within the historical ratio of administrative costs on project approvals for the 50 per cent production sector cost scenario. However, UNDP could not participate since all of these options have rates below 7 per cent and its agency rules do not allow its participation in projects with agency fees below 7 per cent.

14. The second UNDP proposal would achieve the lowest administrative cost to project cost ratio among the proposals and allow UNDP to participate in all projects including those where it is lead agency (e.g. China and India). The Executive Committee may wish to consider this option as it would provide for a minimum agency fee of 7 per cent on projects above US \$5,000,001.

15. UNIDO indicated that any change in the administrative cost regime would have to be approved by its Director General except the status quo scenario with a 0.7 per cent annual growth of the core unit. The administrative cost to project cost ratio (12.10 per cent) for this scenario would not remain within the historical average. It would provide US \$330,768 more in funding to the agencies than the UNDP second proposal. The Executive Committee may wish to consider both the UNDP and the UNIDO proposals to allow for a 0.7 per cent annual growth of the core unit costs.

16. The World Bank has suggested that a fixed rate of increase for core unit costs does not necessarily address inflation. It proposed that a projected growth rate based on an agreed international benchmark or other financial indicator could be applied across the Multilateral Fund every one to two years and that it would serve as the maximum level an agency could apply when proposing its core unit budget. The use of core unit funding would continue to be justified by ex-post reporting on expenditures under each agreed expenditure category. The Executive Committee may wish to consider allowing core unit costs to grow at an inflation rate defined annually or biennially at the Fund level by benchmarking an internationally-recognized norm.

17. The UNDP second proposal could present difficulties to the World Bank for administering its Montreal Protocol projects as a whole, combined with an undefined, further reduction in fees for larger-sized projects (namely in the production sector). Moreover, the Bank indicated that at this point in time it is unknown what the scope of administrative duties would entail under an HCFC production sector project.

18. The scenario without a production sector shows the impact on the overall administrative cost to project cost ratio. Funds for the production sector will likely reduce the overall administrative cost to project cost ratio due to the size of funding for the sector and the fact that the lowest agency fee rates are for projects with values over US \$30 million. The Executive Committee may wish to consider the production sector on a case-by-case basis.

19. Only the Australian proposal would change the funding for UNEP projects and reduce the status quo by US \$183,831 for UNEP during the triennium. UNEP highlighted the fact that 95 per cent of its projects are valued at under US \$250,000 as well as the fact that smaller projects require similar reporting to larger projects with less agency fees. Decision 26/41 applies to UNEP and bilateral agencies although UNEP does not receive an agency fee for institutional strengthening (IS) and receives an 8 per cent agency for its Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP). The Executive Committee may wish to consider whether any change is warranted to the administrative cost regime applicable to UNEP.

Estimate of administrative costs for reporting and the next report on administrative costs

20. There have been four systems of administrative costs under the Multilateral Fund since its inception. Initially, UNDP, UNEP and UNIDO received a flat agency fee at a rate of 13 per cent of the value of project approvals as well as project preparation and country programme preparation activities, while the World Bank received an administrative, legal and financial budget as a funding element in its annual work programme that included project preparation and country programme preparation as administrative costs. It also received 3 per cent of support costs on funds approved for each individual project to cover the fees of its financial intermediaries responsible for project execution.

21. The first independent assessment was performed by the former Deputy Executive Director of UNEP and resulted in all agencies, including the World Bank receiving a 13 per cent fee (see UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/12/6, paragraph 41; UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/14/12, and decision 18/10(b)). The second independent assessment by Coopers and Lybrand resulted in a third change to the administrative cost regime (see decision VIII/4, paragraph 6; and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/26/67). The new administrative cost regime was initially applied to all agencies, but currently remains fully operational only for bilateral agencies, and applies partially to UNEP (decision 26/41). Prior to the 38th meeting, the Executive Committee allocated resources according to agency shares (45 per cent for the World Bank, 30 per cent for UNDP, and 25 per cent for UNIDO) for investment projects. As a result of this change, UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank received a core unit budget with a reduced rate of support costs for individual activities (see decisions 37/68(c) and 38/68). This is the current regime for those agencies.

22. Another independent assessment was based on a terms of reference that was considered at the 51st meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/51/44 and decision 51/38). The study was conducted by Price Waterhouse Coopers and presented to the 55th meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/55/48 and decision 55/44), and was followed up by an issues paper presented by the Fund Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/19). The Executive Committee agreed to maintain the existing administrative cost regimes for the bilateral and implementing agencies for the 2009-2011 triennium and requested implementing agencies to provide sufficient actual data in order to monitor the differences between administrative cost income and the costs incurred (decision 56/41(b) and (c)). At its 62nd meeting, the Executive Committee was asked if it wished an independent assessment or an assessment by the Secretariat. The Committee decided “that the extension of the administrative cost regime for the 2012-2014 triennium could be based on the report on 2012 core unit costs to be prepared by the Fund Secretariat by the 65th meeting” (decision 62/25(c)). The Secretariat presented document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/65/20 to the 65th meeting at which time the Committee requested the current document to be prepared as mentioned above (decision 65/18(c) and (d)).

23. In addressing the issue of assessing administrative costs on the basis of likely expenditures instead of approvals, the Secretariat raised the possibility of an administrative cost regime that is based on

annual pre-approved budgets that might be considered, starting with the 2015-2017 triennium, because this would mean avoiding the need to have balances of funds awaiting expenditures and would provide a clearer understanding of the use of the agency fee component of administrative costs. The agency fee component was a percentage of delivery for UN agencies and therefore excess or under expenditure could occur unless the system were changed. If the Committee wishes to consider a different administrative cost regime for the 2015-2017 triennium, it should note this possibility in any agreement for stage II of HPMPs whose multi-year agreement might need to account for the possibility of a different administrative cost regime.

24. In assessing the appropriateness of the existing regime in light of the changing roles and portfolios of implementing agencies and the impacts of streamlining reporting requirements, the Secretariat asked the implementing agencies to provide information on the extent to which their administrative costs were used for reporting requirements, project implementation, and internal administrative requirements. UNEP assessed 10 per cent of its CAP budget as having been applied for submitting and following up project proposals, participating in project formulation activities with country offices, and following up on implementation status, including country visits and preparing progress reports. UNDP and the World Bank indicated that they would have to conduct detailed analyses to assess the various cost components of their administrative costs.

25. At the 65th meeting, the Secretariat asked if the Executive Committee wished to request the implementing agencies to provide a cost analysis of the use of administrative costs for reporting, project implementation and internal requirements. The Committee decided to continue the discussions at the 66th meeting (decision 65/18(d)). The Executive Committee may wish to consider asking for this information and any other assessments of administrative costs in the context of a review of administrative costs for the 2015-2017 triennium by requesting the Secretariat, with input from interested Members, to propose the terms of reference for an assessment of administrative costs for the 2015-2017 triennium to the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS

26. The Executive Committee may wish to:

- (a) Note the information on the assessment of options for an administrative cost regime for the 2012-2014 triennium as contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/66/19;
- (b) Consider any change to the existing administrative cost regime for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank for the 2012-2014 triennium in light of decision 64/6(c)(iii)b. and the Secretariat's analysis and observations on the options considered above, in particular with respect to:
 - (i) A minimum fee of 7 per cent for projects above US \$5,000,001;
 - (ii) Allowing core unit costs to grow:
 - a. At a rate of up to 0.7 per cent per year;
 - b. At an inflation rate defined annually or biennially at the Fund level by benchmarking an internationally-recognized norm;
 - (iii) Agency fees for the production sector on a case-by-case basis;

- (c) Consider any change to the existing administrative cost regime for UNEP; and
- (d) Request the Fund Secretariat, with input from interested Members of the Executive Committee, to propose the terms of reference of the assessment of the administrative cost regime for the 2015-2017 triennium to the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee.

Annex I

ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE COST OPTIONS

Agency	Historical Average 1991-2011	As per Business Plan						Australia Proposal	UNDP		UNIDO proposal				World Bank proposal	Pro-rated BP to US \$450 million
		2012-2014 with status quo (UNEP proposal)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% support costs and core unit for 2012-2014 3% lower than 2011	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% and core unit 3% increase	Flat fee at 11.24% (no core units)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6.75% and core unit 3% increase	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 7.25% and core unit zero growth		Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4		
Annual income for administrative activities (US dollars)																
UNDP	3,807,979	4,552,456	4,229,096	4,410,106	3,658,461	4,481,281	4,407,258	4,357,261	4,477,161	4,383,601	4,481,270	4,471,478	4,465,999	4,458,896	4,433,044	4,297,898
UNEP	832,663	1,569,532	1,569,532	1,569,532	2,426,523	1,569,532	1,569,532	1,385,701	1,570,277	1,570,277	1,570,277	1,570,277	1,570,277	1,569,532	1,570,277	1,349,559
UNIDO	4,082,422	4,957,155	4,559,405	4,740,415	4,267,787	4,848,785	4,799,559	4,735,578	4,855,033	4,759,798	4,858,993	4,809,545	4,802,032	4,863,596	4,792,096	4,425,287
World Bank	4,549,899	6,650,005	5,828,893	5,986,196	7,143,978	6,318,101	6,433,807	5,859,825	6,358,632	6,277,326	6,358,632	6,353,225	6,353,225	6,568,699	6,094,931	5,112,308
TOTAL (including bilateral)	13,432,721	18,346,926	16,804,704	17,324,027	18,124,315	17,835,476	17,827,933	16,961,516	17,884,253	17,614,154	17,892,323	17,827,677	17,814,684	18,078,501	17,513,499	15,720,141
Percentage of approvals																
UNDP	13.52%	13.99%	12.99%	13.55%	11.24%	13.77%	13.54%	13.39%	13.76%	13.47%	13.77%	13.74%	13.72%	13.70%	13.62%	14.73%
UNEP	8.97%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	11.24%	7.27%	7.27%	6.42%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	7.27%	6.86%
UNIDO	12.60%	13.06%	12.01%	12.48%	11.24%	12.77%	12.64%	12.47%	12.79%	12.54%	12.80%	12.67%	12.65%	12.81%	12.62%	14.32%
World Bank	9.75%	10.46%	9.17%	9.42%	11.24%	9.94%	10.12%	9.22%	10.00%	9.88%	10.00%	10.00%	10.00%	10.33%	9.59%	11.87%
TOTAL (including bilateral)	11.24%	11.38%	10.42%	10.74%	11.24%	11.06%	11.06%	10.52%	11.09%	10.92%	11.10%	11.06%	11.05%	11.21%	10.86%	12.31%
Pro-rated BP to US\$450 million																
Annual income for administrative activities (US dollars)																
UNDP	N/A	4,297,898	3,974,538	4,155,548	3,279,232	4,226,723	4,152,700	4,147,968	4,237,486	4,142,642	4,239,008	4,232,249	4,228,506	4,204,339	4,192,084	N/A
UNEP	N/A	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	2,211,290	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,229,683	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	1,349,559	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	4,425,287	4,027,537	4,208,547	3,472,286	4,316,917	4,267,690	4,225,637	4,337,214	4,249,858	4,347,436	4,311,807	4,306,448	4,331,727	4,271,171	N/A
World Bank	N/A	5,112,308	4,505,373	4,662,676	4,839,482	4,887,492	4,931,805	4,585,708	4,919,733	4,838,427	4,919,733	4,916,440	4,916,440	5,031,002	4,769,856	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	15,720,141	14,392,096	14,911,419	14,348,837	15,315,780	15,236,844	14,729,459	15,384,454	15,120,949	15,396,200	15,350,517	15,341,415	15,451,716	15,123,132	N/A
Percentage of approvals																

Agency	Historical Average 1991-2011	As per Business Plan						Australia Proposal	UNDP		UNIDO proposal				World Bank proposal Proposal 1	Pro-rated BP to US \$450 million
		2012-2014 with status quo (UNEP proposal)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% support costs and core unit for 2012-2014 3% lower than 2011	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% and core unit 3% increase	Flat fee at 11.24% (no core units)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6.75% and core unit 3% increase	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 7.25% and core unit zero growth		Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4		
UNDP	N/A	14.73%	13.62%	14.24%	11.24%	14.49%	14.23%	14.22%	14.52%	14.20%	14.53%	14.51%	14.49%	14.41%	14.37%	N/A
UNEP	N/A	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	11.24%	6.86%	6.86%	6.25%	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	6.86%	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	14.32%	13.04%	13.62%	11.24%	13.97%	13.81%	13.68%	14.04%	13.76%	14.07%	13.96%	13.94%	14.02%	13.83%	N/A
World Bank	N/A	11.87%	10.46%	10.83%	11.24%	11.35%	11.45%	10.65%	11.43%	11.24%	11.43%	11.42%	11.42%	11.68%	11.08%	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	12.31%	11.27%	11.68%	11.24%	12.00%	11.94%	11.54%	12.05%	11.84%	12.06%	12.02%	12.02%	12.10%	11.85%	N/A
No Production Sector																
Annual income for administrative activities (US dollars)																
UNDP	N/A	4,552,456	4,229,096	4,410,106	3,658,461	4,481,281	4,407,258	4,357,261	4,477,161	4,383,601	4,481,270	4,471,478	4,465,999	4,458,896	4,433,044	N/A
UNEP	N/A	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	2,403,030	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,367,913	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	1,545,212	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	4,945,905	4,548,155	4,729,165	4,250,927	4,837,535	4,788,309	4,724,328	4,843,783	4,748,548	4,847,743	4,798,295	4,790,782	4,852,346	4,780,846	N/A
World Bank	N/A	3,662,171	3,388,913	3,546,216	2,666,211	3,604,194	3,537,282	3,433,681	3,567,252	3,485,946	3,567,252	3,563,008	3,563,008	3,580,865	3,472,333	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	15,323,522	14,329,154	14,848,477	13,606,195	15,085,999	14,895,838	14,506,333	15,056,558	14,786,459	15,064,628	15,001,144	14,988,152	15,055,098	14,854,586	N/A
Percentage of approvals																
UNDP	N/A	13.99%	12.99%	13.55%	11.24%	13.77%	13.54%	13.39%	13.76%	13.47%	13.77%	13.74%	13.72%	13.70%	13.62%	N/A
UNEP	N/A	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	11.24%	7.23%	7.23%	6.40%	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	7.23%	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	13.08%	12.03%	12.50%	11.24%	12.79%	12.66%	12.49%	12.81%	12.56%	12.82%	12.69%	12.67%	12.83%	12.64%	N/A
World Bank	N/A	15.44%	14.29%	14.95%	11.24%	15.19%	14.91%	14.48%	15.04%	14.70%	15.04%	15.02%	15.02%	15.10%	14.64%	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	12.66%	11.84%	12.27%	11.24%	12.46%	12.31%	11.98%	12.44%	12.22%	12.44%	12.39%	12.38%	12.44%	12.27%	N/A
50% of Production Sector																
Annual income for administrative activities (US dollars)																
UNDP	N/A	4,552,456	4,229,096	4,410,106	3,658,461	4,481,281	4,407,258	4,357,261	4,477,161	4,383,601	4,481,270	4,471,478	4,465,999	4,458,896	4,433,044	N/A
UNEP	N/A	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	2,414,777	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,376,807	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	1,557,372	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	4,951,530	4,553,780	4,734,790	4,259,357	4,843,160	4,793,934	4,729,953	4,849,408	4,754,173	4,853,368	4,803,920	4,796,407	4,857,971	4,786,471	N/A

Agency	Historical Average 1991-2011	As per Business Plan						Australia Proposal	UNDP		UNIDO proposal				World Bank proposal Proposal 1	Pro-rated BP to US \$450 million
		2012-2014 with status quo (UNEP proposal)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% support costs and core unit for 2012-2014 3% lower than 2011	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6% and core unit 3% increase	Flat fee at 11.24% (no core units)	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 6.75% and core unit 3% increase	Proposed 2012-2014 based on status quo, China 7.25% and core unit zero growth		Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 1	Proposal 2	Proposal 3	Proposal 4		
World Bank	N/A	5,156,088	4,608,903	4,766,206	4,905,094	4,961,147	4,985,544	4,646,753	4,962,942	4,881,636	4,962,942	4,958,116	4,958,116	5,074,782	4,783,632	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	16,835,224	15,566,929	16,086,252	15,865,255	16,460,738	16,361,885	15,733,925	16,470,033	16,199,934	16,478,103	16,414,038	16,401,045	16,566,799	16,183,670	N/A
Percentage of approvals																
UNDP	N/A	13.99%	12.99%	13.55%	11.24%	13.77%	13.54%	13.39%	13.76%	13.47%	13.77%	13.74%	13.72%	13.70%	13.62%	N/A
UNEP	N/A	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	11.24%	7.25%	7.25%	6.41%	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	7.25%	N/A
UNIDO	N/A	13.07%	12.02%	12.49%	11.24%	12.78%	12.65%	12.48%	12.80%	12.55%	12.81%	12.68%	12.66%	12.82%	12.63%	N/A
World Bank	N/A	11.82%	10.56%	10.92%	11.24%	11.37%	11.42%	10.65%	11.37%	11.19%	11.37%	11.36%	11.36%	11.63%	10.96%	N/A
TOTAL (including bilateral)	N/A	11.93%	11.03%	11.40%	11.24%	11.66%	11.59%	11.15%	11.67%	11.48%	11.67%	11.63%	11.62%	11.74%	11.47%	N/A
