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**2021 CONSOLIDATED PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT**

**Background**

# The issue of outstanding projects completion reports (PCRs) has been regularly addressed by the Executive Committee over time. At its 87th meeting, the Committee *inter alia* urged bilateral andimplementing agencies (IAs) to submit to the 88th meeting the outstanding PCRs for multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects, or to provide reasons for failing to submit such reports; and also urged the lead and cooperating IAs to coordinate their work closely in finalizing their portion of PCRs to allow the lead IA to submit the completed PCRs on schedule (decision 87/25(b) and (c)).

# Pursuant to decision 87/25(b) and (c), the list of all PCRs due was sent to bilateral and IAs on 5 August 2021. The new list containing outstanding PCRs and those due for 2022, as per the updated progress reports, was sent again to bilateral and IAs on 12 October 2021.

MYA PCRs received

# Of the 212 MYAs completed, bilateral and IAs submitted 204 PCRs prior to the 88th meeting, with an outstanding balance of eight as shown in Table 1. The list of the five PCRs submitted after the 88thmeeting is attached in Annex I to the present report.

# **Table 1. Overview of MYA PCRs**

| **Lead agency** | **Completed** | **Received prior to the 87th meeting** | **Received after the 87th meeting** | **Outstanding** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Canada | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| France | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 |
| Japan | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| UNDP | 46 | 44\* | 1 | 1 |
| UNEP | 62 | 61\*\* | 1 | 0 |
| UNIDO | 58 | 57 | 0 | 1 |
| World Bank | 26 | 18 | 3 | 5 |
| **Total** | **212** | **199** | **5** | **8** |

# \* In addition, UNDP submitted one PCR for an ongoing MYA project.

\*\* In addition, UNEP submitted one PCR for an ongoing MYA project.

# An analysis of the aggregated funds disbursed, ODS tonnes phased out and delays in the completion of five MYA PCRs is summarized in Table 2.

# **Table 2. Overview of the budget, ODS phased out and delay of MYA PCRs submitted after the 87thmeeting**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lead agency** | **MYA funds (US$)** | | **Phase-out**  **(ODP tonnes)** | | **Average of delays (in months) [[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| **Approved** | **Disbursed** | **Approved** | **Actual** |
| UNDP | 9,441,674 | 7,890,283 | 135 | 131 | 0 |
| UNEP | 475,000 | 438,002 | 5.8 | 2.9 | 0 |
| World Bank | 173,500,000 | 173,500,000 | 124,741\* | 144,599\* | 11 |
| **Grand Total** | **183,416,674** | **181,828,285** | **124,882** | **144,733** | **6.6** |

\* The World Bank’s total phase-out includes a production phase-out consisting of 82,222 approved ODP tonnes and 93,799 actual ODP tonnes, respectively phased-out.

**Reasons for delays**

HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs)

# Common reasons for delay were reported to be administrative issues, such as delays in signing the Agreement, the lengthy administrative processes for some project approval and their registration in the relevant government ministries. In the Asia Pacific region, the issue was resolved by the rapid staffing of UNDP’s Montreal Protocol Unit, which provided the necessary project oversight.

# Project implementation issues were mainly due to a project design flaw, such as the cancellation of activities that could not be implemented, which resulted in a reallocation of funds to training activities; or lack of components in the global market (i.e., compressors, expansion valves) and very high operational costs, which delayed the initiation of the conversions to HFC-32. When market conditions improved, enterprises were able to start production of HFC‑32‑based refrigeration and air-conditioning (RAC) equipment and supply to local market.

# Limited communication between the IA and government ministries and disagreement on the procurement mechanism led to delays in one project. The Ministry of Environment considered project funds an integral part of their resources and expected to be responsible for the procurement processes according to government regulations, but argued that the IA organized procurement of goods without government approval in contravention of their signed Agreement. The IA on the other hand, had to follow its internal procurement rules. This issue caused substantial delays in signing the project document. To mitigate the delay, the IA initiated the bidding processes and documentation for the procurement of project equipment.

# Other delays were due to staff turnover leading to the loss of institutional knowledge, and transportation delays in equipment delivery in the country.

# Halon sector plan

# The relocation and refurbishing of a research institute delayed the completion of two technical activities and two special initiatives, and a technical problem in the equipment delivered by the supplier delayed the completion of the sector plan.

# Additionally, after 2010 one local producer remained with a large halon stock, as those stocks that were produced before 2010, were classified as “newly produced ODS” and could not be exported to other Article 5 countries after that year. The project was completed in 2011 and the PCR, submitted in 2021, does not provide the information on the fate of this stock.

# Process agent

# Delays in the process agent sector plan were due to the enterprises’ late submission of subproject completion report. Once the reports were submitted and the last payments were made, the project was completed successfully.

# **Lessons learned**[[3]](#footnote-3)

# Project completion reports for MYAs identified areas of improvement in *inter alia* communication, mechanisms for certification, data collection and capacity-building, cost consideration in adopting new technologies, increased resources for research and development (R&D)-related phase-out and technology transition, as described below.

HPMPs

# Key aspects for the successful implementation of HPMPs include the importance of having solid and adaptive procurement plans, and having a team of technical consultants over a long period of time to support implementation, strengthening and cooperating closely with the refrigeration association.

# Essential requirements to successfully implement HPMPs include having an effective certification system for technicians, a strong mechanism for data collection, adapting the training needs to the new challenges arising during implementation. For example, the integration of Montreal Protocol issues in the curricula of customs officers and environment inspectors training schools would foster the sustainability of the HCFC phase-out. These will be important aspects to keep in mind when implementing the Kigali Amendment.

# Lessons from the HPMPs also highlight the importance to consider the global supply chain of alternatives and their components when designing and initiating project implementation. For example, one project on the adoption of HFC-32 demonstrated the dependence on the import of RAC components, and the inadequacy of the global markets to supply HFC-32-based components. Small and medium foam enterprises face limited choices in adopting suitable alternative technologies; this was particularly relevant when addressing flammability issues of the alternative technology or when high capital cost is required to adapt safety and security measures for the adoption of cyclopentane technology, and/or the limited availability and high price of HFO pre-blended polyols.

# Another lesson for successful project implementation stems from the need to establish a continuous and open dialogue with stakeholders to support transparency of implementation and communicate effectively on the global supply chain challenges. Information exchange between enterprises (national and international) is important for creating awareness and improve process efficiency. Once established, a number of enterprises gained confidence to continue participating in the project. Similarly, in some cases, the exchange of experiences between Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries were important to support the deployment of the technician’s certification scheme. The same applied to the exchange of experiences between private sector stakeholders, to provide the confidence required to initiate the programmes. The networks created as result of this project need to be maintained and reinforced.

# Conversely, the lack of adequate communication between one IA and the project stakeholders accounted for important misunderstandings, which in one case resulted in the change of IA in the following phase of this project. There also seems to be a need to clarify the level of delegation of authority to the IA’s local representative to make the processes of project implementation more efficient. Procurement‑related issues need to be well defined upfront in the design of the project so as to avoid potential delays in the phase of implementation.

Halon and process agents sector plans

# An important lesson is the sector plan approach that allowed one country to carry out projects according to the domestic situation. Many technical assistance and special activities were completed, supported by strict management procedures and operating mechanisms, ensuring a smooth phase-out process.

# The concept of approval in principle of an overall sector plan with annual tranches up-front with the Multilateral Fund was important for the country and the industry. Indeed, knowing the total funding and annual tranche amounts allowed the industry to plan the phase-out in the most cost-effective way and limited the impacts both at the national and enterprise levels. Due to the duration of the sector plan, it was important that the country had the flexibility to use the funding on the ODS phase-out activities. Good cooperation and communication between stakeholders has been a key success factor, namely through the IA’s assistance in annual programme preparation, project verification, policy-making, and project management.

# Project preparation played an important role in the halon recycling project, which had to rely on recovered and reclaimed halon to cover future demands for critical uses such as civil aviation. In order to have a better understanding of potential availability of halons, the country conducted a number of studies. The establishment of a national halon recycling and management system was one of the most important activities outlined in the sector phase-out plan.

# In one project, plant closure was technically the only phase-out approach for ODS process agent due to the non-availability of substitute technology, which resulted in a loss for the enterprises in the production market. Technology transfer avenues have not been established between Article 5 and non‑Article 5 countries regarding the alternative technologies for phasing out CTC as process agent; as a result, the enterprises in the country only have limited phase-out approaches and need to bear large uncertainties in the implementation of CTC phase‑out. One enterprise was an exception and chose emission control technology, based on its in-house technology, but made great effort to reach the final target, as it did not receive any official help from foreign enterprises or experts on technology exchange. Since the substitute technologies are not available for all products and the foreign technologies are patent protected and not transferable, local R&D would have been necessary for the phase-out of ODS process agent; thus, the country would have appreciated to be able to use some of the funds to support the necessary R&D activities.

# The aim of the process agent sector plan (phase II) was to phase-out CTC used in process agent applications which had been added since the approval of phase I. The country agreed that it would not request more assistance if additional process applications were added to the list, but would instead use the phase II sector plan funding and its own funds for the phase-out of such applications. For example, heavy boiling residues (HBR) from CTC production contain some CTC and have been used for other purposes and sold to waste management enterprises for destruction. It was decided that it could not be sold and it had to be destroyed in-house. In order to ensure that all the CTC producers had the necessary in-house destruction capacity, they were offered funding from phase II of the sector plan to adjust existing destruction capacity or to set up new destruction facilities.

Individual PCRs received

# Of the total 1,863 investment projects that have been completed, bilateral and IAs have submitted 1,854 PCRs, with a balance of nine outstanding PCRs, as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. PCRs submitted for investment projects**

| **Agency** | **Completed** | **Received prior**  **87th meeting** | **Received after the**  **87th meeting** | **Outstanding** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Canada | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| France | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 20 | 19 | 0 | 1 |
| Italy | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| Japan | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Spain | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| United States of America | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| UNDP | 898 | 897 | 0 | 1 |
| UNIDO | 452 | 449 | 0 | 3 |
| World Bank | 457 | 455 | 0 | 2 |
| **Total** | **1,863** | **1,854** | **0** | **9** |

# Of the 1,264 non-investment projects[[4]](#footnote-4) that have been completed, bilateral and IAs have submitted 1,234 PCRs, with a balance of 30 outstanding PCRs, as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4. PCRs submitted for non-investment projects**

| **Agency** | **Completed** | **Received prior 87th meeting** | **Received after the 87th meeting** | **Outstanding** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Canada | 57 | 57 | 0 | 0 |
| France | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| Germany | 62 | 60 | 1 | 1 |
| Japan | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Russian Federation | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| UNDP | 299 | 295 | 0 | 4 |
| UNEP | 498 | 472 | 11 | 15 |
| UNIDO | 160 | 154 | 0 | 6 |
| World Bank | 44 | 41 | 0 | 3 |
| Others[[5]](#footnote-5) | 91 | 91 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **1,264** | **1,221** | **13** | **30** |

# The list of non-investment received after the 87th meeting is contained in Annex II to the present document. The aggregated results relevant to disbursement, actual phase-out and delays are shown in Table 5.

# **Table 5. Overview of the budget, ODS phased out and delay of individual projects submitted after the 87th meeting**

| **Agency** | **Number of projects** | **Funds (US $)** | | **Phase- out**  **(ODP tonnes)** | | **Average duration/delays (months)[[6]](#footnote-6)** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Approved** | **Disbursed** | **Approved** | **Actual** | **Duration** | **Delays** |
| Germany | 1 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 13 |
| Russian Federation | 1 | 591,600 | 591,235 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 7 |
| UNEP | 11 | 330,000 | 275,770 | 0 | 0 | 26.18 | 0 |
| **Total** | **13** | **951,600** | **897,005** | **0** | **0** | **27.84** | **0** |

**Reasons for delays**

# Verification reports were delayed due to a variety of reasons ranging from travel restrictions, short time frame to conduct the verification, incomplete information and misclassification of Harmonized System (HS) codes. These issues were all resolved through the cooperation between the consultants, the IAs and the different stakeholders at the country level.

# Due to the travel restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, one auditor was unable to visit the country to conduct in-person discussion meetings with the stakeholders and verify the original documents. The NOU facilitated virtual meetings between the auditor and stakeholders, coordinated with them and sent all required information and documents to the auditor through e-mail.

# One country mentioned that the time allocated between the reception of the 2019 information from the stakeholders (e.g., customs) and the due submission date of the verification report in 2020, for consideration by the Secretariat to review the next tranche request, was too short given the amount of information to review, thus leading to delays. Timing was an issue for the auditor in charge of conducting four simultaneous verifications in the Pacific Island Countries (PIC) to maintain the consistency in consumption data validation and analysis. Some of the verifications in the PIC were conducted for the first time, which resulted in delays due to the lack of stakeholders’ experiences and the need to fully understand the scope and details of the required cooperation. In some countries, Customs and Border Protection was unable to provide customs declaration due to confidentiality laws; missing documentation or incomplete/insufficient information was presented in initial reports; delays in retrieving data from the Automated System for Customs Data (ASYCUDA) were due to misclassification of HS codes; and customs declaration of shipments were not documented by the NOU.

# One technical assistance project to create centres for excellence experienced delays in implementation due to the challenges in identifying and replacing beneficiaries for the regional centre of excellence and the related lengthy bidding processes. Other delays resulted from internal political reforms that impeded the launch of some activities and timely transfer of funds.

# **Lessons learned**[[7]](#footnote-7)

# Recurring lessons stemmed from, *inter alia*: communication, data classification and training needs; new project with stakeholders lacking experience; travel restrictions; regulation enforcement; and the necessity for a thorough assessment of the country’s overall situation and needs.

# Verification reports

# Verification reports contained a series of recommendations for ongoing and future projects, many reports raised the issue of the travel restrictions. This slowed the process and encumbered data collection. Discrepancies in data reporting were resolved through enhanced cooperation and communication with the relevant stakeholders and coordination by the NOU, which allowed the verifier to complete the assignment.

# One report mentioned the frequent changes in personnel, in the customs department especially, which resulted in a lack of counterpart for the NOU in the customs department to keep up the necessary monitoring over time. It recommended that governmental institutions in charge should establish mechanisms to maintain constant communication channels independently from staff turnover.

# Periodical data reconciliation among the different sources is important to report accurately the country’s consumption data. Three countries mentioned that although they had implemented the post‑clearance reporting requirement as per the recommendation from the previous verification, this was only applied to the shipments documented by the NOU. The verification process identified missing shipping declaration from the Customs Department, which were not taken into account by the NOU. One of the countries mentioned that Customs data recording was in the process of moving to an online system, which would facilitate data reconciliation in the future.

# The verification report recommended to one government to enforce import quota and licensing system and prosecute importers who do not follow the regulation.

# Centre for excellence

# There is a need to thoroughly assess the country’s situation in the project design at the inception phases. For example, a lack of vocational schools and universities, qualified specialists, co-financing sources as well as temporary political instability in a given country at the time of project implementation can result in substantial implementation delays. These factors should be included in the risk framework at the design phase of the project proposal.

# Another lesson stressed the importance of end-users (i.e., refrigeration systems owners and potential customers) training in similar future projects’ implementation, as they are the real decision-makers on the local markets.

# In one case, the centre for excellence project was approved with a budget reduced by over 30 per cent compared to the initial proposed budget. According to the bilateral agency, this resulted in a lower number of trained technicians; the bilateral agency suggested that these funds be allocated in phase II of the project and that they may be directly taken from the country’s contribution to the Multilateral Fund.

# **Outstanding MYA PCRs and PCRs**

# The Secretariat notes with appreciation the efforts by some of the bilateral and IAs to address the backlog of outstanding PCRs. Annexes III to V contain the lists of outstanding PCRs. The Secretariat stresses, once again, the importance of submitting all outstanding PCRs, and in particular, those for stage I of the HPMPs that are mandatory for the approval of stage II.[[8]](#footnote-8)

# **RECOMMENDATION**

# The Executive Committee may wish:

## To note the 2021 consolidated project completion report (PCR) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/88/19;

## To urge bilateral and implementing agencies to submit, at the 90th meeting, outstanding PCRs for multi-year agreements (MYAs) and individual projects, or to provide reasons for failing to do so;

## To urge lead and cooperating agencies to coordinate their work closely in finalizing their portion of PCRs to allow the lead implementing agency to submit the completed PCRs on schedule;

## To urge bilateral and implementing agencies when submitting their PCRs, to report clear and relevant lessons learned, aiming at actionable recommendations for improvement in future project implementation or replicability of good practices; and

## To invite all those involved in the preparation and implementation of MYAs and individual projects to take into consideration the lessons learned from PCRs, where applicable, when proposing and implementing future projects.

## **Annex I**

**MYA PCRs RECEIVED**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **MYA sector** | **Lead agency** | **Cooperating agencies** |
| China | Halon | World Bank |  |
| China | Process agent (phase I) | World Bank |  |
| China | Process agent (phase II) | World Bank |  |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo (the) | HCFC phase-out plan (stage I) | UNEP | UNDP |
| Indonesia | HCFC phase-out plan (stage I) | UNDP | UNIDO/World Bank/Australia |

**Annex II**

**INDIVIDUAL PCRs RECEIVED**

| **Code** | **Agency** | **Project Title** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| COI/PHA/80/TAS/26 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| DJI/PHA/80/TAS/24 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| EUR/REF/76/DEM/16 | Russian Federation | Development of a regional centre of excellence for training and certification and demonstration of low-global warming potential alternative refrigerants |
| GAB/PHA/80/TAS/35 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| LAO/PHA/82/TAS/32 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| MON/PHA/82/TAS/28 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| NEP/PHA/82/TAS/39 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| SAM/PHA/82/TAS/22 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| SOI/PHA/82/TAS/15 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| TOG/PHA/80/TAS/31 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| TON/PHA/82/TAS/14 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| TTR/PHA/82/TAS/14 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase-out management plan |
| ZIM/PHA/75/TAS/52 | Germany | Verification report for stage I of HCFC phase-out management plan |

**Annex III**

**OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUAL PCRs**

| **Project Number** | **Agency** | **Project Title** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ALB/PHA/82/TAS/37 | UNIDO | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| ARM/PHA/84/TAS/23 | UNDP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| ASP/REF/76/DEM/59 | UNEP | Promoting alternative refrigerants in air-conditioning for high ambient countries in West Asia (PRAHA-II) |
| BKF/PHA/84/TAS/40 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| BOT/PHA/80/TAS/20 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| BZE/PHA/82/TAS/35 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| CPR/ARS/56/INV/473 | UNIDO | Sector plan for phase-out of CFCs consumption in Metred‑Dose Inhalers sector |
| CUB/PHA/82/TAS/60 | UNDP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| DOM/REF/81/INV/64 | Canada | Conversion of a commercial refrigerator manufacturing line at Fábrica de Refrigeradores Comerciales, SRL (FARCO) from HFC-134a and R-404A to propane (R-290) as refrigerant |
| ERI/PHA/82/TAS/17 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| FIJ/PHA/82/TAS/35 | UNDP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| GAM/PHA/82/TAS/36 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| GBS/PHA/82/TAS/25 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| GLO/REF/47/DEM/268 | World Bank | Global chiller replacement project (China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines) |
| GLO/SEV/47/TAS/269 | Portugal | Communication and cooperation support to Portuguese speaking countries (Angola, Cape Verde, East Timor, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique and Sao Tome and Principe) |
| GLO/SEV/63/TAS/309 | World Bank | Resource mobilization for HCFC phase-out co-benefits study |
| IND/HAL/34/INV/315 | World Bank | Halon production and consumption sector phase out plan |
| JOR/FUM/29/INV/54 | Germany | Complete phase-out of the use of methyl bromide in Jordan |
| JOR/PHA/38/INV/77 | World Bank | National ODS phase-out plan: aerosol, foam, MAC service and solvent sectors |
| JOR/REF/81/INV/103 | UNIDO | Conversion of large commercial unitary roof top air‑conditioning units of up to 400kW manufacturing facility from HFC (R134a, R-407C, R-410A) to propane R‑290 as refrigerant at Petra Engineering Industries Co. |
| LEB/REF/81/INV/03+ | UNIDO | Conversion from HFC-134a and HFC-404A to R-600a and R‑290 in domestic refrigeration at Lematic Industries |
| LIR/PHA/85/TAS/29 | Germany | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| MAG/PHA/82/TAS/31 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| MEX/REF/81/INV/187 | UNDP | Conversion of domestic refrigeration manufacturing facility from HFC-134a to isobutane as a refrigerant and conversion of compressors manufacturing facility from HFC-134a-based to isobutane-based at Mabe Mexico |
| MEX/REF/81/INV/188 | Canada | Conversion of domestic refrigeration manufacturing facility from HFC-134a to isobutane as a refrigerant and conversion of compressors manufacturing facility from HFC-134a-based to isobutane-based at Mabe Mexico |
| MLW/PHA/82/TAS/44 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| MOG/PHA/84/TAS/14 | UNIDO | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| NER/PHA/82/TAS/34 | UNIDO | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| ODS alternative surveys | World Bank | Survey of ODS alternatives at the national level |
| SAU/REF/76/DEM/28 | UNIDO | Demonstration project on promoting HFO-based low-global‑warming potential refrigerants for air-conditioning sector in high ambient temperatures |
| SRL/PHA/82/TAS/51 | UNDP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| STP/PHA/82/TAS/29 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| STV/PHA/77/TAS/24 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| SWA/PHA/80/TAS/24 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| TKM/PHA/82/TAS/14 | UNIDO | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| UGA/PHA/82/TAS/25 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| URT/PHA/82/TAS/38 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| YUG/PHA/82/TAS/49 | UNIDO | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |
| ZAM/PHA/82/TAS/35 | UNEP | Verification report on the implementation of the HCFC phase‑out management plan |

**Annex IV**

**OUTSTANDING PCRs BY DECISION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **MYA Sector/Title** | **Lead agency and Cooperating agency** |
| Saudi Arabia | HCFC phase-out plan (stage I) | **UNIDO**/UNEP/Japan |

**Annex V**

**OUTSTANDING MYA PCRs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **MYA Sector/Title** | **Lead agency and Cooperating agency** |
| Argentina | HCFC phase-out plan (stage I) | **UNIDO/**World Bank/Italy |
| Argentina | Production CFC | **World Bank** |
| Bahamas | CFC phase-out plan | **World Bank** |
| China | CFCs/CTC/Halon accelerated phase‑out plan | **World Bank**/United States of America |
| Costa Rica | HCFC phase-out plan (stage I) | **UNDP** |
| Philippines | CFC phase-out plan | **World Bank**/Sweden/UNEP |
| Viet Nam | Methyl bromide | **World Bank** |
| Yemen | Methyl bromide | **Germany** |

1. Online meetings and an intersessional approval process will be held in November and December 2021 due to coronavirus disease (COVID-19) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The total average is based on the total of five MYA PCRs received as presented in Annex I. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Detailed description can be found in the MYA PCR lessons learned database: [http://www.multilateralfund.org/myapcr/search.aspx](http://www.multilateralfund.org/pcrmya/search.aspx) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Excluding project preparation, country programmes, multi-year projects, networking, clearing-house activities, and institutional strengthening projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Including PCRs completed and received from the following countries: Australia (25), Austria (1), Czech Republic (2), Denmark (1), Finland (5), Israel (2), Italy (1), Poland (1), South Africa (1), Spain (4), Sweden (5), Switzerland (3), and United States of America (40). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The total average is based on the total of 13 individual PCRs received. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Lessons learned from the individual PCRs can be found in the PCR lessons learned database: <http://www.multilateralfund.org/pcrindividual/search.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Decision 81/29. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)