



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52/Corr.1  
24 April 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Executive Committee of  
the Multilateral Fund for the  
Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Nineteenth Meeting  
Montreal, 8-10 May 1996

**Corrigendum**

**GUIDELINES FOR RENEWAL OF  
INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS**

- Page 2, paragraph 4:           **Replace** 5,000-10,000 for Category 2 **with** 1,000-10,000  
  **Replace** less than 5,000 for Category 3 **with** less than 1,000
- Page 4, paragraph 13:       **Replace** the sentence: "The survey showed that most countries had  
  direct responsibility for collecting consumption data."  
  **with:**  
  "The survey showed that most NOUs have direct responsibility for  
  collecting consumption data."
- Part II                           **Replace** pages 7 to 11 **with** the following pages 7 to 12

## **Part II**

### **SECOND PHASE OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING**

23. The review of the first phase of the institutional strengthening shows a varying degree of need for continued support. While in some countries project approvals could reach their peak levels within the next two to three years accompanied by a period of project implementation and monitoring, other countries may experience a decreasing degree of project development. In the latter countries, activities would relate more to project implementation and monitoring. This means that resource demand for institutional strengthening of countries in the second phase could differ from year to year depending mainly on human resources required for activities such as data collection, project monitoring, etc. Consequently long term extensions in the second phase may not be appropriate.

24. During the first phase creation of awareness at the strategic/national level was considered important for the promotion of the phase-out activities. The effort to create awareness was supported or facilitated by other national and regional activities supported by the Fund, including seminars and workshops organized by UNEP and UNDP with the support of other implementing agencies, and regional networks of ODS officers organized by UNEP. Undoubtedly, these activities will continue to be supported by the Fund and they will continue to enrich and provide technical back-stopping for national experts and ozone officers. In the second phase, therefore, attention should focus on countries with significant phase-out specific activities where the need for funding to facilitate project development, implementation or monitoring for ODS phase-out is felt the most.

25. It may be recalled that the Parties at their 7th Meeting in Decision VII/22, Annex V, Action 7 requested the implementing agencies to review institutional strengthening experience and present a combined paper to the Executive Committee which will include guidelines on the possible proportionate commitment of Article 5 countries in such areas as financial, organizational and human resource support, with a view to enhancing effectiveness of ODS phase-out strategies.

#### **Requests for Renewal of Institutional Strengthening**

26. Thus far four countries have applied for renewals and/or extension of their institutional strengthening projects. Three of the requests, i.e. those of Egypt, Mexico and Venezuela have already been approved for a six-month period in the first instance. Funds approved were based on the original approvals pro-rated for six months. Table 1 below shows the requests for renewals/extensions of the first phase of the institutional strengthening that have already been made to the Executive Committee (17th to 19th Meetings) or were included in the responses to the institutional strengthening questionnaires.

**Table 1: Estimated Resources Required for Renewal/Extension of Institutional Strengthening as Contained in Responses to the Questionnaire**

Country	Amount Approved in first phase (US \$)	Amount Requested for Extension (US \$)	Period of Extension (years)
China	450,000	1,161,870	3
Colombia	317,790	250,000	2
Egypt	263,450	194,700	2
Ghana	160,000	37,000	1
India	430,600	515,000	3
Jordan	170,000	231,000	3
Malaysia	322,520	440,000	3
Mexico	350,000	95,000	1
Thailand	400,000	90,000	2
Tunisia	280,000	298,000	4
Uruguay	173,800	29,000	0.5
Venezuela	329,192	326,208	3

27. The requests for extensions or renewals range from one year to three years, and in a few cases with possibility for requests for further three year extensions. The amounts requested are mainly for personnel, where in a few cases of the large consumers, the number of staff and corresponding costs are increased and operational costs remain almost the same, when compared with their budgets of the first phase.

#### **Funding of Second Phase of Institutional Strengthening**

28. The factors which were taken into consideration in developing the guidelines for funding of the second phase included the following:

- The varying degrees of need for continued support.
- The requirement to match resources to actual needs.
- Accountability and performance of supported units.
- The need to manage resources for promoting actual elimination of ODS.
- The need to optimize the use of Fund resources for project development, implementation and monitoring.
- The impact of the technical backstopping provided to Article 5 countries through UNEP's clearing house mechanism and networking activities.

29. Account was also taken of Decision VII/22, Annex V, Action 7 of the 7th Meeting of the Parties. It was assumed that the implementing agencies would submit their report to the Executive Committee by its 21st Meeting.

30. Another rationale for the proposed guidelines was to achieve a phase-down rather than sudden curtailment of the support, particularly in countries with minimal levels of activity. This could provide a necessary transition period for governments to review and if necessary absorb some of the operations within its machinery.

31. On the basis of the above considerations, the following guidelines were proposed:

### **Guidelines for the Funding of Second Phase of Institutional Strengthening**

32. Countries may be classified into the following categories for purposes of determining the levels of funding. Classification of each country at the time of the request will be done by the Fund Secretariat in consultation with the implementing agency responsible for the institutional strengthening and will be subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee.

#### (a) Categories of Countries

Category I:	Very low volume ODS consuming countries where there has not been any significant investment projects, but main activity has been refrigeration servicing
Category II:	Low volume ODS consuming countries where most of the investment projects have been developed and are under implementation and remaining activity is refrigeration servicing.
Category III:	Medium volume ODS consuming countries where significant level of project development has been achieved, i.e. 60-70 per cent of required investment activities has been developed and where implementation is ongoing.
Category IV:	Large ODS consuming countries where significant portion of required investment projects remains to be developed and implemented.

#### (b) Basis of Definition of Categories

The assessment of the volume of activity for the purpose of defining the category of a country will be based on the country programme or its update where it has been updated, report on the progress of implementation of the country programme and the latest consumption data reported to the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.

33. Pending completion of Action 7 of Annex V to Decision VII/22 of the 7th Meeting of the Parties, the Executive Committee may wish to consider the following proposals for the extension/renewal and funding of institutional strengthening. The proposals are based on the above classification of countries.

(a) Category I Countries

In cases, where the country determines and justifies the need for extension at the completion of the project, and demonstrates actual effectiveness in the use of funds, an amount not exceeding the equivalent of one year's portion of current financial support, excluding the cost of equipment, may be approved within the work programme of the implementing agency responsible for institutional strengthening project for further support on a one-off basis. Where such request has not been made, the project may be considered to have ended.

(b) Category II Countries

For this category of countries, further funding may be provided for one year on a one-off basis. Funding may be based on the current level of annual personnel cost and 50 per cent of the annual operational cost.

(c) Category III Countries

Extension may be given for one year in the first instance, renewable for a further one year. Funding for the first year may be based on the current personnel cost and 75 per cent of the operational cost, while that of the second year may be based on 60 per cent of the personnel cost and 50 per cent of the operational cost. Where the need for further extensions beyond two years arise, these may be based on 50 per cent of personnel cost and 50 per cent of operational cost. Extensions beyond the two year limit may be based on needs justified in the Terminal Report and Action Plan. The cost calculations are based on the yearly equivalent of the current costs of the first phase of the institutional strengthening project excluding cost of equipment and contingency.

(d) Category IV Countries

Extension may be given for one year in the first instance at full current annual cost of personnel and operational costs (excluding the cost of equipment and the 10 per cent contingency included in the budget of the first phase). It may be subject to renewal annually for up to four years. However, assessment of funding for the second and third years of extension would be based on whether the Executive Committee considered the country to be a category IV or a category III country at the time of application for extension. Funding for extension beyond three years may be assessed based on category III.

34. Any request for extension of institutional strengthening in the cases of Categories II-IV shall be accompanied by a terminal report prepared in collaboration with the implementing agency which was responsible for the previous projects and a plan of action for the following year. These documents should provide evaluation of the institutional strengthening and justification for further support. The request, terminal report and plan of action should be submitted through the

implementing agency except in the case of institutional strengthening undertaken through bilateral cooperation which has ended. The terminal report and the plan of action may follow the format contained in Annex II.

35. The disbursement by the implementing agency concerned of the approved funds shall commence as promptly as possible following approval of such funds. Where delays are encountered for a period exceeding three months, the implementing agency shall report to the Executive Committee giving reasons for the delay and recommending any possible actions to remedy the situation.

36. The earliest date for submission of request for extension of institutional strengthening shall be six calendar months prior to the completion date of the previous phase.

37. The completion date of a previous phase of institutional strengthening shall be the last month covered by the last installment of funds disbursed by the implementing agency.

38. The completion dates for the first phase of institutional strengthening, will be based on the rate of disbursements as reported by the implementing agencies to the 19th Meeting of the Executive Committee, except where the actual date of the last installment of the institutional strengthening funds disbursed by the implementing agency is indicated in the terminal report or the latest progress report of the implementing agency.

## **CONCLUSION**

39. Institutional strengthening is an essential activity for facilitating the phase out of the ODS. The need for institutional strengthening is particularly critical in the initial years after a country becomes a Party to the Protocol, when the stakeholders and the general public have to be made aware and sensitized to the need for taking actions to phase out. By providing support to every eligible country that becomes a Party to the Protocol, augmented by considerable amount of funds for national and regional workshops and networking, the need for the critical support appears to have been met to a large extent. Hence the need to focus on funding related mainly to expediting the phase out of ODS.

40. Implementing agencies in the implementation of approved projects rely on organizations outside the ozone units. UNDP employs the UN Office of Project Services (UNOPS) to implement its projects and UNIDO implements the projects through engineering contracts, while the World Bank relies on a local financial intermediary trained for the purpose. Therefore as projects enter their implementation phases the external direct assistance to industries increases, potentially reducing the role of ozone offices to periodic monitoring of implemented activities, which may result in potential reduction in resource demand.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Fund Secretariat recommends as follows:

1. Subject to a possible review on completion of the report referred to in Decision VII/22, to consider and adopt the guidelines contained in paragraphs 32-38 and their relevant annexes for considering extensions or renewals of institutional strengthening.
2. To designate an implementing agency to coordinate the task requested by the Parties in Decision VII/22, and to present the joint report to the 20th Meeting of the Executive Committee.



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52  
12 April 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Executive Committee of  
the Multilateral Fund for the  
Implementation of the Montreal Protocol

Nineteenth Meeting  
Montreal, 8-10 May 1996

**GUIDELINES FOR RENEWAL OF  
INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS**

**Introduction**

Need for institutional strengthening

1. The Executive Committee, at its 5th Meeting in November 1991, recognized the need to provide limited funding from the Multilateral Fund for institutional strengthening of Article 5 countries, since it might, in exceptional cases, be an essential element in achieving the objectives of the Fund and the Montreal Protocol. The level of such funding for each country was to be determined by the Executive Committee on the basis of recommendations from the Secretariat, taking into consideration the amount of controlled substances consumed in that country and the linkage between the institutional strengthening and implementation of projects.
2. The need for institutional strengthening has been expressed in various forums and reports of the Montreal Protocol. Both the Report Under Paragraph 8 of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol and the Report on the Study of the Financial Mechanism of the Montreal Protocol stress the importance of functioning ozone protection units (OPUs) in the phase out of ODS in Article 5 countries.



Executive Committee Decision on institutional strengthening

3. The Executive Committee first approved eligibility of institutional strengthening at its 7th Meeting in June 1992, when it decided inter alia that:

- (a) Article 5 countries who request it be considered for support for institutional strengthening and that such considerations be made on their individual merits (case-by-case basis). In considering the requests on a case-by-case basis, the peculiar circumstances influencing ODS phase-out in the country should be considered together with the recommended funding level;
- (b) The main objective of such support should be to provide necessary resources to an eligible country to enable it strengthen a mechanism within the country to facilitate expeditious implementation of projects for speedy and effective phase-out of the controlled substances in the country, as well as ensuring effective liaison between the country on the one hand, and the Executive Committee, the Fund Secretariat, and the implementing agencies on the other;

4. The paper which the Fund Secretariat prepared as a basis for providing institutional support to eligible Article 5 countries gave indicative ceilings and categories of funding as well as elements of the financial support. The levels and categories of funding applicable for a period of three years, were as follows:

- Category 1: Large consuming countries (above 10,000 tonnes ODP - Up to US \$400,000)
- Category 2: Medium consuming countries (5,000-10,000 tonnes ODP - Up to US \$300,000)
- Category 3: Small consuming countries (less than 5,000 tonnes ODP - Up to US \$170,000)

5. In practice, the upper limit of consumption for some of the countries receiving US \$400,000 or above has been lower than 10,000 tonnes ODP. The Category 2 consumers have ranged between less than 1,000 tonnes ODP to less than 5,000 tonnes ODP. The small consuming countries have ranged from less than 10 tonnes ODP to less than 500 tonnes ODP. However it has been found very difficult to fit the very small consuming countries into the funding pattern of the category 3 countries, in regard to the objectives of institutional strengthening established at the 7th Meeting.

6. Three elements of institutional support were approved for funding, namely office equipment, personnel cost and operational cost. Equipment was expected to be 3 to 7 per cent of the institutional strengthening funds while personnel cost and operational cost were expected to be in the ranges of 30 to 50 per cent and 45 to 55 per cent respectively, depending on the funding. Thus personal computers, fax machines and photocopiers have been supplied to most of the units set up through institutional strengthening to provide basic infrastructure for information processing and dissemination, as well as improve their facility for communication. Operational

costs included elements such as costs of post and telecommunication, stationery, maintenance of equipment, and in some cases creation of awareness. In a few cases, separate projects were even funded for information and awareness.

### **Overview of the First Phase of the Institutional Strengthening**

7. In order to provide an overview and assessment of the first phase of the institutional strengthening, the Fund Secretariat administered questionnaires to 35 countries which had had their institutional strengthening approved before June 1994. The questionnaires were distributed on 27 December 1995 and the responses were due back on 15 February 1996. As at 31 March 1996, 13 countries had responded while 22 had not.

8. As part of the overview, the most recent progress reports of the implementing agencies on institutional strengthening, the reporting of Article 5 countries to the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with Articles 7 and 9 of the Montreal Protocol, report on implementation of the country programmes, implementing agency/government agreements on implementation of institutional strengthening and UNEP's report on training and networking were reviewed.

#### Funding of institutional strengthening

9. As at 31 December 1995, a total of US \$10,598,959 had been approved for 61 countries for institutional strengthening at different levels of funding based on projected scope of work of the units to be supported, determined on the basis of ODS consumption and the depth of sectoral phase-out activities. The level of funding ranged from US \$31,900 to US \$450,000 for a three year period.

#### Implementation of Approved Funds.

10. The process of institutional strengthening appears to occur in the following sequence:

- Identification/establishment of a unit by interested government
- Request for funding either as a stand-alone project through an implementing agency or as part of the process of country programme presentation
- Approval of funds by the Executive Committee
- Transfer of funds from implementing agency to country following conclusion of project agreement.

11. Information provided in reports on progress of implementation of country programmes and the limited response to the survey on institutional strengthening indicated inter alia that:

- Institutional strengthening is considered by all governments to be a most important activity of the Fund, provision of which appears to be taken as an entitlement.

- All governments attempt to establish a unit at an early stage irrespective of the level of consumption of the country or the extent and proposed timing of its ODS phase-out activities. Thus, there appears to be situations where institutional strengthening has been approved for considerable length of time but no activities seem to have taken place.
- There has been considerable time lag between approval of funds and start of disbursement of the approved funds by implementing agencies, ranging from about four to eighteen months.
- In view of the time lag, the actual starting dates of the projects vary considerably from the date of approval of the projects. In some cases, however, it is conceivable that some units might actually have started operation prior to receipt of funds, especially in situations where recipient governments provided advance support. In such cases, however the last installment should be as close as possible to the originally proposed completion date as it is expected that the agency would have reimbursed any advance provided by the government.
- Schedule of disbursement of funds by implementing agencies varied from 3 months to 1 year.

#### Roles and Responsibilities of Ozone Protection Units

12. Almost all the countries responding to the questionnaire indicated that the following activities were carried out almost exclusively by the ozone units:

- Identification and selection of beneficiary enterprises for projects
- Organization and co-ordination of missions and activities of consultants of agencies
- Engagement of local experts for project preparation
- Planning and negotiations on ozone protection activities
- Organization or promotion of activities to create public awareness.

Activities such as the signing of agreements, receipt and/or authorization and disbursement of project funds from the Multilateral Fund are mainly the responsibilities of other government agencies. In a few cases the office shares this role or has sole responsibility. The offices also claim to play significant roles in monitoring of progress of investment projects even where there are financial intermediaries which are also financed through the Multilateral Fund. However, where there are Financial Intermediaries working for the World Bank, such agents mainly operate independent of the ozone office.

13. Countries are obligated under the Montreal Protocol to track their ODS consumption and report data regularly to the Ozone Secretariat, and when requested, also to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat. The survey showed that most countries had direct responsibility for collecting consumption data. However, data transmission to external agencies is done mainly through a higher authority in the Ministry or Department or another Ministry such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

14. The respondents of the questionnaire also related their work to the activities approved by the Executive Committee for implementation in their countries. Additionally, countries such as China, Egypt, Ghana, India and Malaysia provided detailed reports on training activities, information and awareness programmes, regulations made etc.

15. Having regard to the facilitative role of the ozone units in the phase-out process, attempt was made to link the volume of approved activities with the level of responsibilities of the ozone offices. Annex I provides a summary of approved projects, the baseline ODS consumption data as contained in country programmes and the volume of projects approved in the country. Assuming that the ozone units fully play facilitative and coordinating roles, it can be seen that there is substantial variance in the level of responsibilities. Some seem to have played a major role in the programme of their countries, while others appear to have had smaller roles.

16. The following can also be deduced from Annex I:

- (a) A group of larger consuming countries where approved investment projects will lead to significant reduction in the number of enterprises requiring assistance. Such countries include Egypt, Sudan, Romania, Turkey, Colombia and Ecuador.
- (b) A group of large consuming countries where, in spite of significant progress being made in development and approval of investment projects there is still a significant number of enterprises to be covered. Such countries include Algeria, China, India, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela.
- (c) A group of smaller ODS consuming countries with a limited number of enterprises requiring conversion, where most of the enterprises have been covered by approved projects. These include countries such as Cameroon, Ghana, Mozambique, Swaziland, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Peru and Uruguay.
- (d) A group of low consuming countries where there are virtually no investment activities and where in some cases no activities appear to have taken place although the ozone unit is supposed to be functional.

17. In terms of data reporting and communication with the Secretariats dealing with the Protocol and Multilateral Fund matters, attempt was also made to assess the responsiveness of the ozone units. The frequency of reporting of data to the Ozone Secretariat taking into consideration reporting of baseline, 1993 and 1994 data and frequency in providing requested feedback to the Fund Secretariat were rated (on a score of 0-6) for the sample of 35 countries. While a large number appeared to be responsive, about 25% of the sample were rated as low in their responsiveness to these obligations. Five countries were completely delinquent in data reporting for the years 1993 and 1994.

### Operational Agreements

18. Implementing agencies at the request of the Fund Secretariat, provided either a copy of their institutional strengthening agreements or samples of project documents agreed between them and recipient countries. While the general objectives were the same and followed the broad terms of reference agreed by the Executive Committee there were differences in some details such as reporting requirements and allowable expenditure. For example, there were some instances where it appeared that funds had been expended on external travel, rent and furniture, which are not eligible expenditures.

### Adequacy of Funds

19. In several cases the funds were reported to have covered the professional staff fully, but in others the approved funds were reported to have covered from 37% to 73% of professional staff salaries. This was much lower for support staff where it ranged from 6% to 80%. Some countries also reported paying part of the cost of equipment and/or the operational cost.

### Regional Networks

20. Since March 1993, the amount of US \$1.57 million has been approved for UNEP to support regional networks of ozone officers. The networks are managed by a Networks Manager at UNEP IE and coordinated by Regional Coordinators based in UNEP Regional Offices. The cost of running the networks including the salaries and travel costs of the Network Manager and the Regional Co-ordinators as well as the cost of participation of all ozone officers in the network activities are met annually through funds allocated to UNEP from the Multilateral Fund. The ODSNET/SEAP, however, has been supported so far mainly by the Government of Sweden.

21. Thus far, five networks have been organized in Africa, South East Asia and the Pacific and Latin America and the Caribbean, as follows:

- ODS Officers Network for Africa - English (ODSONET/AF-E)
- ODS Officers Network for Africa - French (ODSONET/AF-F)
- ODS Officers Network for South Asia and Pacific (ODSONET/SEAP)
- ODS Officers Network for Central America (ODSONET/LA-C)
- ODS Officers Network for South America (ODSONET/LA-S)

22. These networks, which meet twice in the year, have become additional support from the Fund for the ODS officers and will continue to provide a vehicle for enhancing their efficiency. Reports indicate that within the period of operation of the existing networks, the activities of the networks have resulted inter-alia in:

- building of regional consensus on key technology and policy issues;
- increased technology awareness;
- increased phase out activities;
- effectiveness in adapting public awareness material prepared by others; and
- increased awareness about the Montreal Protocol and access to the Multilateral Fund.

## Part II

### SECOND PHASE OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

23. The review of the first phase of the institutional strengthening shows a varying degree of need for continued support. While in some countries project approvals could reach their peak levels within the next two to three years accompanied by a period of project implementation and monitoring, other countries may experience a decreasing degree of project development. In the latter countries, activities would relate more to project implementation and monitoring. This means that resource demand for institutional strengthening of countries in the second phase could differ from year to year depending mainly on human resources required for activities such as data collection, project monitoring, etc. Consequently long term extensions in the second phase may not be appropriate.

24. During the first phase creation of awareness at the strategic/national level was considered important for the promotion of the phase-out activities. The effort to create awareness was supported or facilitated by other national and regional activities supported by the Fund, including seminars and workshops organized by UNEP and UNDP with the support of other implementing agencies, and regional networks of ODS officers organized by UNEP. Undoubtedly, these activities will continue to be supported by the Fund and they will continue to enrich and provide technical back-stopping for national experts and ozone officers. In the second phase, therefore, attention should focus on countries with significant phase-out specific activities where the need for funding to facilitate project development, implementation or monitoring is felt the most.

#### Requests for Renewal of Institutional Strengthening

25. Thus far four countries have applied for renewals and/or extension of their institutional strengthening projects. Three of the requests, i.e. those of Egypt, Mexico and Venezuela have already been approved for a six-month period in the first instance. Funds approved were based on the original approvals pro-rated for six months. Table 1 below shows the requests for renewals/extensions of the first phase of the institutional strengthening that have already been made to the Executive Committee (17th to 19th Meetings) or were included in the responses to the institutional strengthening questionnaires.

Table 1: Requests for Renewals/Extension of institutional strengthening

Country	Amount Approved in first phase (US \$)	Amount Requested for Extension (US \$)	Period of Extension (years)
China	450,000	1,161,870	3
Colombia	317,790	250,000	2
Egypt	263,450	194,700	2
Ghana	160,000	37,000	1
India	430,600	515,000	3
Jordan	170,000	231,000	3
Malaysia	322,520	440,000	3
Mexico	350,000	95,000	1
Thailand	400,000	90,000	2
Tunisia	280,000	298,000	4
Uruguay	173,800	29,000	0.5
Venezuela	329,192	326,208	3

26. The requests for extensions or renewals range from one year to three years, and in a few cases with possibility for requests for further three year extensions. The amounts requested are mainly for personnel, where in a few cases of the large consumers, the number of staff and corresponding costs are increased and operational costs remain almost the same, when compared with their budgets of the first phase.

#### **Funding of Second Phase of Institutional Strengthening**

27. The factors which were taken into consideration in developing the guidelines for funding of the second phase included the following:

- The varying degrees of need for continued support.
- Accountability of supported units.
- The need to channel resources for promoting actual elimination of ODS.
- The need to optimize the use of Fund resources for project development, implementation and monitoring.
- The impact of the technical backstopping provided to Article 5 countries through UNEP's clearing house mechanism

28. On the basis of the above considerations, the following guidelines were proposed for consideration:

### **Guidelines for the Funding of Second Phase of Institutional Strengthening**

29. Countries may be classified into the following categories for purposes of determining the levels of funding. Classification of each country at the time of the request will be done by the Fund Secretariat in consultation with the implementing agency responsible for the institutional strengthening and will be subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee.

(a) **Categories of Countries**

Category I:	Very low volume ODS consuming countries where there has not been any significant investment projects, but main activity has been refrigeration servicing
Category II:	Low volume ODS consuming countries where most of the investment projects have been developed and are under implementation and remaining activity is refrigeration servicing.
Category III:	Medium volume ODS consuming countries where significant level of project development has been achieved, i.e. 60-70 per cent of required investment activities has been developed and where implementation is ongoing.
Category IV:	Large ODS consuming countries where significant portion of required investment projects remains to be developed and implemented.

(b) **Basis of Definition of Categories**

The assessment of the volume of activity for the purpose of defining the category of a country will be based on the country programme or its update where it has been updated, report on the progress of implementation of the country programme and the latest consumption data reported to the Ozone Secretariat in accordance with Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol.

30. The following proposals which are based on the above classification of countries may be considered for the extension and funding of institutional strengthening:

(a) Category I Countries

In cases, where the country determines and justifies the need for extension at the completion of the project, an amount not exceeding the equivalent of one year's portion of current financial support, excluding the cost of equipment, may be approved within the work programme of the implementing agency responsible for institutional strengthening project for further support on a one-off basis. Where such request has not been made, the project may be considered to have ended.

(b) Category II Countries

For this category of countries, further funding may be provided for one year on a one-off basis. Funding may be based on the current level of annual personnel cost and 50 per cent of the annual operational cost.



(c) Category III Countries

Extension may be given for one year in the first instance, renewable for a further one year. Funding for the first year may be based on the current personnel cost and 75 per cent of the operational cost, while that of the second year may be based on 60 per cent of the personnel cost and 50 per cent of the operational cost. Where the need for further extensions beyond two years arise, these may be based on 50 per cent of personnel cost and 50 per cent of operational cost. Extensions beyond the two year limit may be based on needs justified in the Terminal Report and Action Plan. The cost calculations are based on the yearly equivalent of the current costs of the first phase of the institutional strengthening project excluding cost of equipment and contingency.

(d) Category IV Countries

Extension may be given for one year in the first instance at full current annual cost of personnel and operational costs (excluding the cost of equipment and the 10 per cent contingency included in the budget of the first phase). It may be subject to renewal annually for up to four years. However, assessment of funding for the second and third years of extension would be based on whether the Executive Committee considered the country to be a category IV or a category III country at the time of application for extension. Funding for extension beyond three years may be assessed based on category III.

31. Any request for extension of institutional strengthening in the cases of Categories II-IV shall be accompanied by a terminal report of the previous project, as well as a plan of action for the following year. The terminal report and the plan of action may follow the format contained in Annex II.

32. The disbursement by the implementing agency concerned of the approved funds shall commence as promptly as possible following approval of such funds. Where delays are encountered for a period exceeding three months, the implementing agency shall report to the Executive Committee giving reasons for the delay and recommending any possible actions to remedy the situation.

33. The earliest date for submission of request for extension of institutional strengthening shall be six calendar months prior to the completion date of the previous phase.

34. The completion date of a previous phase of institutional strengthening shall be the last month of the last installment of funds disbursed by the implementing agency.

35. The completion dates for the first phase of institutional strengthening, will be based on the rate of disbursements as reported by the implementing agencies to the 19th Meeting of the Executive Committee, except where the actual date of the last installment of the institutional

strengthening funds disbursed by the implementing agency is indicated in the terminal report or the latest progress report of the implementing agency.

## **CONCLUSION**

36. Institutional strengthening is an essential activity for facilitating the phase out of the ODS. The need for institutional strengthening is particularly critical in the initial years after a country becomes a Party to the Protocol, when the stakeholders and the general public have to be made aware and sensitized to the need for taking actions to phase out. By providing support to every eligible country that becomes a Party to the Protocol, augmented by considerable amount of funds for national and regional workshops and networking, the need for the critical support appears to have been met to a large extent. Hence the need to focus on funding related mainly to expediting the phase out of ODS.

37. Implementing agencies in the implementation of approved projects rely on organizations outside the ozone units. UNDP employs the UN Office of Project Services (UNOPS) to implement its projects and UNIDO implements the projects through engineering contracts, while the World Bank relies on a local financial intermediary trained for the purpose. Therefore as projects enter their implementation phases the external direct assistance to industries increases, potentially reducing the role of ozone offices to periodic monitoring of implemented activities, which may result in potential reduction in resource demand.

38. The phase down in funding of institutional strengthening, rather than abrupt cessation in funding particularly for Category II countries provides transition period for systems in these countries to absorb back personnel who have operated outside these systems for a period of time.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Fund Secretariat recommends as follows:

1. To consider and adopt the guidelines contained in paragraphs 29-35 and their relevant annexes for considering extensions or renewals of institutional strengthening.

Annex I

INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS AND VOLUME OF APPROVED ACTIVITIES  
(As of 31 December 1995)

Region/Country	ODS Cons. Tonnes ODP	Date Approved	Amount Approved US \$	Funds Approved for Projects	# of Approved Projects	% of Cons. Covered	Remarks
<b>1) AFRICA</b>							
Algeria	2,220	Nov. 1993	297,000	7,904,300	12	26	3 projects approved, project preparation in all sectors ongoing.
Benin	41	Nov. 1993	50,000	100,000	3	0	Activity mainly refrigeration servicing. One foam project under preparation.
Botswana	35	July 1994	90,200	130,200	2	0	No activity initiated. Main activity servicing in refrigeration
Burkina Faso	32	Nov. 1993	83,500	172,500	4	72	Main activity servicing in refrigeration
Cameroon	103	Nov. 1993	161,000	3,516,460	4	172	Investment projects for main sector (refrigeration) nearing completion.
Central Afr. Rep.	31	Nov. 1995	45,600	110,600	3	0	Main activity servicing in refrigeration
Congo	33	July 1995	62,920	87,920	3	0	Main activity servicing in refrigeration
Côte d'Ivoire	247	July 1994	122,800	236,810	5	20	Project preparation in major sectors ongoing. Major activity servicing in refrigeration
Egypt	2,762	June 1993	263,450	27,246,680	44	83	Investment project developed in foam and domestic & commercial refrigeration sector complete. Phase out in other sectors advanced
Ghana	101	Oct. 1992	160,000	1,047,200	7	362	Foam sector projects complete. Main activity servicing refrigeration
Guinea	44	Nov. 1995	50,000	93,000	2	0	No activity initiated. Main activity servicing refrigeration
Kenya	128	March 1993	175,000	851,079	8	46	Refrigeration sector projects developed
Malawi	60	March 1994	77,000	126,500	4	0	Main sector servicing refrigeration
Mauritania	17	Sept. 1994	38,874	224,774	5	12	Main sector refrigeration, main investment activity under way
Mauritius	69	June 1993	50,000	734,208	7	54	Main investment activities almost completed
Mozambique	32	Dec. 1994	92,400	688,915	4	128	Main sector refrigeration. Main investment project initiated
Namibia	41	Nov. 1995	61,765	101,765	2	0	Main activity refrigeration servicing. No activity initiated
Niger	18	Dec. 1994	74,800	117,800	2	0	Main activity refrigeration servicing. No activity initiated

\* Please note: Cons. means consumption

Region/Country	ODS Cons. Tonnes ODP	Date Approved	Amount Approved US \$	Funds Approved for Projects	# of Approved Projects	% of Cons.* Covered	Remarks
Nigeria	N/A	March 1993	300,000	3,926,386	10	5	(estimated) Investment activities commenced in refrigeration sector. Activities in other sectors under way.
Senegal	101	Nov. 1993	175,000	282,000	5	79	Main activity refrigeration servicing. One foam sector project under preparation
Seychelles	4	July 1994	31,900	76,900	3	0	Main activity refrigeration servicing. Preparation of recycling project under way
Sudan	606	March 1994	168,300	725,912	4	47	Main sectors aerosol & refrigeration. Project for complete phase-out in aerosol sector initiated. Project in refrigeration under way
Swaziland	100	Dec. 1994	67,320	132,320	2	0	80% of consumption phased out in refrigeration manufacturing
Tunisia		Oct. 1992	280,000	2,393,407		16	Several projects in all sectors being initiated
Uganda	14	July 1994	64,515	107,015		0	Main activity refrigeration servicing. Recycling project being prepared
Zambia	22	March 1993	75,600	207,700		0	Main activity refrigeration servicing. Recycling project being prepared
Zimbabwe	320	July 1994	171,050	613,350		15	Main sector refrigeration. Recycling project initiated. Project preparation in refrigeration and halon sectors
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3,289,994</b>				
<b>2) ASIA AND PACIFIC</b>							
Bangladesh	233	Sept. 1994	150,000	587,920	5	53	Main sectors aerosol/refrigeration. Aerosol sector phase out 1996. Project preparation in ref. sector
China	55,948	Feb. 1992	450,000	94,557,338	155	56	Projects in all sectors in various stages of preparation or implementation
Fiji	46	March 1994	65,890	90,890	2	0	No activity initiated
India	13,111	Oct. 1992	430,600	19,650,508	68	13	Projects in all sectors in various stages of preparation or implementation
Indonesia	6,567	July 1993	314,780	13,694,385	42	34	Projects in all sectors in various stages of preparation or implementation
Iran	2,445	Oct. 1992	200,200	15,152,891	11	95	Main sectors foam/refrigeration. Projects to complete foam sector phase out and large part of refr. initiated
Jordan	779	June 1992	170,000	5,721,906	25	79	Aerosol sector phase out almost complete. Several projects in other sectors
Malaysia	4,193	March 1993	322,520	22,983,968	84	88	Projects in all sectors ongoing
Maldives	5	March 1994	41,250	66,250	2	0	No activity initiated
Pakistan	N/A	Sept. 1994	259,000	2,442,783	8	N/A	Foam & refrigeration projects under way and others under preparation

Region/Country	ODS Cons. Tonnes ODP	Date Approved	Amount Approved US \$	Funds Approved for Projects	# of Approved Projects	% of Cons. Covered	Remarks
Philippines	2,536	March 1993	209,000	18,207,597	42	51	Foam & refrigeration projects under way and others under preparation (40 projects)
Sri Lanka	231	March 1994	154,680	1,032,586	7	11	Main sector refrigeration. Projects approved for complete phase out.
Syria	1,332	June 1993	235,180	7,049,582	12	29	Main sectors aerosol, foam, refrigeration. Projects initiated in all sectors
Thailand	8,893	March 1993	400,000	20,680,791	50	27	Projects in all sectors in various stages of preparation and implementation
Vietnam	348	July 1995	137,280	1,490,240	11	67	Projects for foam and aerosol sectors approved for complete phase out. Other sector projects initiated
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3,540,380</b>				
<b>3) EUROPE</b>							
Romania	1,556	July 1995	168,443	2,324,623	7	60	Aerosol 60% of consumption. 80% covered by investment project. Refrigeration sector projects initiated
Turkey	3,607	Oct. 1992	300,000	12,154,869	20	55	Projects in foam & refrigeration sectors ongoing
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>468,443</b>				
<b>4) LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</b>							
Argentina	4,402	Sept. 1994	359,500	26,867,365	42	30	Main sectors foam, refrigeration. Several projects under preparation or in implementation
Barbados	39	Dec. 1994	136,000	341,170	4	36	Main activity refrigeration servicing
Bolivia	76	Nov. 1995	91,000	121,000	3	0	Main sector refrigeration. Project preparation just been initiated
Brazil	8,918	July 1993	403,100	13,535,102	42	15	Main sectors foam/refrigeration. Several projects under preparation/implementation
Chile	1,055	June 1992	215,200	2,152,218	13	69	Phase-out approach based on economic incentive per kg ODS phased out
Colombia	1,923	March 1994	317,790	8,882,425	16	38	Major sectors foam/refrigeration/halon. Several projects initiated in foam/refrigeration sectors
Costa Rica	240	Oct. 1992	213,160	808,400	8	11	Main sector refrigeration. One investment project in refrigeration
Cuba	331	July 1993	172,000	391,000	4	15	Main sector refrigeration. One project in recycling.
Dominican Rep.	278	July 1995	155,000	571,000	7	10	Main sectors foam /refrigeration. Project preparation in sectors. 3 demonstration projects ongoing
Ecuador	742	March 1993	204,000	2,344,157	18	46	Main sectors aerosol/refrigeration. Projects to phase out half aerosol consumption under way. Project preparation in foam/refrigeration
Guatemala	284	June 1993	172,000	968,663	9	19	Main sector refrigeration. 3 projects under implementation

Region/Country	ODS Cons. Tonnes ODP	Date Approved	Amount Approved US \$	Funds Approved for Projects	# of Approved Projects	% of Cons. Covered	Remarks
	10,184	June 1992	285,000	17,520,025	41	30	Preparation/implementation of projects ongoing
Mexico		Dec. 1994	65,000				
Panama	233	June 1993	172,500	692,965	7	18	Main sector refrigeration. One foam and one recycling project under implementation
Peru	297	July 1995	154,000	2,769,651	12	70	Main sector refrigeration. Development of investment project in refrigeration & foam sectors almost completed (7 projects)
Uruguay	314	July 1993	173,000	2,921,326	20	55	Main sectors refrigeration/foam. 4 projects in foam and 4 in refrigeration phase out almost complete projects in sector
Venezuela	3,194	March 1993	329,192	14,880,108	40	20	Main sectors refrigeration/foam. One foam project completed. Phase out 50% sector consumption. Several technical assistance, demonstration and investment projects in refrigeration
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3,257,942</b>				
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>10,556,759</b>				

**ANNEX II****FORMAT FOR PREPARING TERMINAL REPORT AND ACTION PLAN FOR  
INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS****I. Terminal Report**

The Terminal Report should:

1. Provide information which would enable the Executive Committee to determine exactly when the institutional strengthening project became operational and when it ended for purposes of determining the mode of its extension, if required. This could be done by providing the actual schedule of disbursement of the approved funds, indicating the last month which the disbursement covers.
2. Indicate the level of resources provided and the level of their utilization (providing a breakdown).
3. Indicate in concrete terms the results of the project, particularly the impact on ODS reduction.
4. Provide information on further work needed to be done to phase out ODS and for how long.
5. Brief financial statement on how the funds were expended.
6. Appendix I provides a format for the terminal report.

**II. Plan of Action**

1. The Plan of Action for institutional strengthening should indicate the volume of work to be accomplished and the expected output, particularly in terms of ODS reduction.
2. Appendix II provides a format for the Plan of Action.

**Appendix I**

**TERMINAL REPORT**

(To be completed by the Ozone Office in collaboration with the Implementing Agency)

1. Country:
2. Implementing Agency:
3. Amount Approved for institutional strengthening:
4. Date Approved:
5. Project Duration (Original):
6. Project Duration (Revised):
7. Schedule of Disbursements:

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
Date						
Amount						
Period Covered						

Project costs

8. Breakdown of Approved Costs:
  - (a) Total amount;
  - (b) Equipment component;
  - (c) Professional staff;
  - (d) Support staff;
  - (e) Operational cost;
  - (f) Component of operational cost granted for public awareness; and
  - (g) Contingency.
9. Indicate the items for which the contingency was expended:

Personnel

10. Professional staff engaged (titles and periods of engagement):



11. Supporting staff engaged (titles and periods of engagement):

12. Consultants engaged (professions and period of engagement):

13. Describe, separately, the main tasks of each staff member and consultant indicated above:

---

---

---

---

---

---

14. Describe the output of the office (e.g. projects identified, companies assisted, agencies whose missions were facilitated, project implementation involved in, indicating specific role played, ODS phased out, training activities organized, publications, etc.):

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

15. Work needed to be done, e.g. companies and sectors for which projects are required, etc.:

---

---

---

---

---

---

16. Brief financial statement indicating expenses made.

**Appendix II**

**Extension of institutional strengthening**

**Plan of Action**

1. Country:
2. Implementing Agency:
3. Period of Extension: From month/year - month/year  
(This should be based on the approved guidelines)
4. Consumption at the time first country programme was approved (year):
5. Current consumption (ODP tonnes):
6. Projected consumption at the end of period of extension (ODP tonnes):
7. Current consumption by (year) sector (ODP tonnes):

Aerosol	
Foam	
Halon	
Refrigeration	
Solvent	

8. Level of activity by sector:

	<b>Number of Projects Approved</b>	<b>Cost US \$</b>	<b>ODS to be Phased Out</b>	<b>ODS Phased Out</b>	<b>Number of Projects Remaining to be Developed</b>
Aerosol					
Foam					
Halon					
Refrigeration					
Solvent					
Other					

9. Summary of planned activities (describe per quarter) indicating expected outputs as follows:

Year/Quarter	Planned actions	Output

10. Number of staff required:

Professional staff (Indicate number and titles)

Support staff (Indicate number and titles)

11. Describe the specific duties of each staff member and the period for which his/her services will be required in relation to (9) above: