



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
Limited

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/12  
26 February 2000

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Thirtieth Meeting  
Montreal, 29-31 March 2000

**2000 BUSINESS PLAN OF UNDP**



## COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE FUND SECRETARIAT

### COMMENTS

1. The Executive Committee considered the draft business plans of the implementing agencies at its 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting. The Committee made specific recommendations for revisions to the draft business plans. This document presents a summary of planned 2000 activities of UNDP and highlights the changes made to UNDP's 2000 business plan since the 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting, lists the UNDP's business plan performance indicators, and provides recommendations for the consideration of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance.

#### Planned 2000 activities of UNDP

2. The total value of investment projects currently proposed to be submitted by UNDP in 2000 is US \$40,44 million including 15 per cent over-programming (US \$35.79 million excluding agency fees) from project preparation of US \$1.44 million (including an expected US \$215,830 carryover from 1999 project preparation approvals and US \$248,600 for project preparation for contingency projects). This level of funding is expected to result in the phase-out of 4,566 ODP tonnes. The largest amount of funding is targeted for the foam sector (US \$15.2 million) followed by the refrigeration sector (US \$11.01 million). US \$977,450 of UNDP's project preparation is for the development of projects for presentation in 2000; it does not include funding to develop projects that will be submitted in future years.

3. UNDP is expected to submit requests for US \$3.81 million for 21 non-investment activities in 2000 comprising four technical assistance projects at a cost of US \$418,100 and 17 institutional strengthening renewals at a total cost of US \$3.39 million.

4. UNDP's contingency list, Table 5b, contains projects valued at US \$9.32 million in five countries: Brazil, China, India, Iran, and Nigeria. These projects would replace projects that UNDP identified as having policy issues including rigid foam PUF in Brazil, domestic refrigeration in China, foam in Nigeria, flexible foam and halon recycling in Libya, a global end use refrigeration sector, and the China solvent sector plan.

#### Changes from the Draft Business Plan

5. After reviewing UNDP's draft business plan, the Executive Committee requested UNDP to finalise its business plan taking into account that:

- (a) The technical assistance project with net incremental savings should not be included,
- (b) The activities in the halon sector should be increased, and
- (c) UNDP should modify its performance indicators for cost-effectiveness, use 13,646 ODP tonnes as a phase-out target, reassess its speed of delivery indicators, and that UNDP had changed its project completion report target to 100 per cent (Decision 29/14).

6. In response to Decision 29/14, UNDP:

- Deleted the technical assistance project with net incremental savings that was included in its draft business plan,
- Increased the number of halon activities, and
- Changed some of its performance indicators.

7. UNDP increased its activities in the halon sector by adding two halon banking proposals (one from Egypt and the other from Libya) and increased the value of the halon banking proposal in Mexico. As a result, UNDP has three halon projects in its final 2000 business plan.

8. UNDP also modified its draft business plan by:

- Reducing the value of activities in 20 projects while only increasing the value of four projects
- Adding rigid foam projects in Indonesia and Malaysia; foam projects in Argentina, Iran, Peru, the Philippines, and Tanzania;
- Adding a methyl bromide project in Malawi, and
- Adding a hydrocarbon domestic refrigeration project in China,
- Adding a global end users project.

9. Most of the foam projects and the methyl bromide project were prepared and ready for submission to the 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee. The refrigeration project in China is in response to a request from China following the 29<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

#### Global projects for end users and recovery and recycling

10. As mentioned above, UNDP added a global project for refrigeration end users covering up to six countries. UNDP also expanded the global project for recovery and recycling that was included in its draft business plan from covering 3 countries to 6 countries.

11. The Secretariat requested UNDP to identify a project for each country separately instead of grouping the countries together into a global project. UNDP felt that due to the non-weighted business performance indicator, distribution of countries in the business plan, it was concerned about identifying specific countries. The Secretariat noted that a country should only be included in the business plan if the implementing agency believes that the country has all of the pre-requisites required by the Executive Committee in place.

#### **New non-investment activities**

12. UNDP is planning to develop RMPs for Brazil, India, and Nigeria at US \$100,000 each. Whilst the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting took decisions (27/21, 27/25, etc.) in which the Committee allowed only three trial projects for non-LVCs, it is understood that this matter will be discussed by the Executive Committee at its 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

13. UNDP is requesting US \$100,000 to develop an RMP for Brazil. UNDP has already received US \$100,000 for an SME survey. The Government of Brazil is requesting the transfer

to UNDP of the Brazilian recovery and recycling project from the World Bank. The Executive Committee decided that the request for transfer of the project “CFC-12 collection, recycling and conservation programme for household refrigerator maintenance and repair shops in Brazil” (BRA/REF/07/TAS/07) to UNDP should be dealt with by the Sub-Committee on Project Review in the light of the current policy on recovery and recycling projects” (Decision 28/16). The Secretariat has advised that a revised proposal should be presented to the Project Review Sub-Committee since the original project was prepared and approved in June 1992.

14. UNDP indicated that the RMP exercise is an all-encompassing comprehensive study and analysis of the refrigeration sectors including both SMEs and larger enterprise plus various areas such as supermarket chains, fisheries, meat-processing plants, breweries, hotels, automobile garages repairing MACs, servicing of refrigerated trucks, air conditioning, chillers, etc. UNDP noted that the SME will provide input especially for the smaller enterprises, but it will not address all of the components of an RMP.

15. Both UNDP and UNIDO are requesting funds for an RMP in Nigeria, notwithstanding the fact that Nigeria has not ratified the London Amendment and the fact that all of the refrigeration projects approved for Nigeria (US \$4.6 million) have been implemented by UNIDO. UNDP indicated that it is seeking clarification from Nigeria.

### **Performance indicators**

16. A summary of UNDP’s investment project performance indicators is provided below in Table 1. UNDP’s performance indicators in its final business plan have changed, as follows, from those presented in its draft business plan by:

- Improving the cost-effectiveness measurement from US \$10.44/kg. to US \$8/kg. for its 2000 portfolio. This was achieved by adding more halon sector projects and a very cost-effective methyl bromide investment project in Malawi.
- Increasing the number of distribution among countries from 22 to 32 countries.

17. UNDP did not change its performance indicator for project completion reports to 100 per cent nor did it change the ODP to be phased out to 13,646 ODP tonnes as specified in Decision 29/14(e). UNDP chooses to maintain its targets while the decisions of the Committee have established different targets against which the Committee will assess the performance of UNDP’s 2000 business plan.

18. UNDP did not provide the non-weighted, investment project performance indicator, “net emission/reductions of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion (tonnes)”.

Speed of delivery performance indicators

19. Decision 29/14(f) requested UNDP to reassess its speed of delivery indicators, i.e., to improve them. UNDP maintained the same speed of delivery indicators for non-investment projects and for project duration for investment projects as was presented in the draft business plans. However, UNDP's target for the speed of delivery for first disbursement, changed from 12 months in the draft business plan to 14 months in the final business plan.

20. UNDP indicated that the 14 month target is what has been achieved in UNDP's latest progress report. UNDP indicated that the reason the speed of delivery for first disbursement is longer include: umbrella projects take longer for contracting processes to be completed, more counterpart funding after approval to cover all of the original requested funding, and methyl bromide demonstration projects take longer to start because they involve many national stakeholders.

Table 1  
Investment Project Performance Indicators

ITEMS	Year 2000 Targets
<b>Weighted indicators</b>	
ODP phased out from previous approvals (ODP tonnes)	6,000 (UNDP's own target), but 13,646 ODP tonnes was established for UNDP by Decision 29/14
Funds disbursed (US\$)*	\$45,200,000**
Satisfactory project completion reports received (percentage)	50% (UNDP's own target), but 100% was established for UNDP by Decision 29/14
Distribution of projects among countries in business plans (number)	33
<b>Non-weighted indicators</b>	
Value of projects to be approved (US\$)*	\$35,169,550
ODP from projects to be approved (ODP tonnes)	4,566
Cost of project preparation (per cent of submission)	3%
Cost-effectiveness from projects to be approved in 1999 (US\$/ODP in kg)	\$7.8
Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	14 months
Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36 months
Net emission/reduction of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion (ODP tonnes)	N/p

\*Including agency fees, but not over-programming.

\*\*The fund disbursed is based on US \$40 million plus agency fees.

21. A summary of UNDP's non-investment project performance indicators is provided below in Table 2. UNDP's performance indicators are the same as was presented in its draft business plan with the exception of an increase of US \$16,000 in the funds disbursed target and a reduced target of six non-investment projects to be completed in 2000. The number of projects to be completed in 2000 was reduced because some projects were completed in 1999 that were not expected to be completed until 2000.

Table 2  
Non-Investment Performance Indicators

<b>ITEMS</b>	<b>Year 2000 Targets</b>
<b>Weighted Indicators</b>	
Number of Projects to be Completed	8
Funds Disbursed (US\$)*	\$2,033,013**
Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	12 months
Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36 months
<b>Non-weighted indicators</b>	
Appropriate and timely policies initiated by countries as a result of networking, training, information exchange, country programme development and/or institutional strengthening (number of countries)	5
Reduction in ODS consumption over and above that effected by investment projects (ODP tonnes)	30

\*Including agency fees.

\*\*The fund disbursed is based on US \$1,799,127 plus agency fees.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Fund Secretariat recommends that the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Finance Sub-Committee consider:

1. The eligibility of the global project in the end user sector.
2. Requesting a target for the non-weighted, investment project indicator, “net emission/reduction of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion (tonnes)”.
3. Recommending to the Executive Committee to endorse the 2000 business plan of the UNDP in the light of its consideration of Recommendation 1 above, while noting that endorsement did not denote approval of the projects identified therein nor their funding levels
4. Recommending to the Executive Committee to approve the performance indicators for UNDP set out in Tables 1 and 2 of the Fund Secretariat’s comments in the light of its consideration of Recommendation 2 above.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MULTILATERAL FUND  
OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
(30th Meeting, 29-31 March 2000, Montreal)**

**UNDP REVISED 2000 BUSINESS PLAN: NARRATIVE  
(Revised: 15 February 2000)**

A. UNDP REVISED 2000 BUSINESS PLAN RELATIONSHIP  
TO THE 1999 UNDP PROGRAMME

UNDP REVISED 2000 BUSINESS PLAN IN A HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1. A review of UNDP's 1991-1999 ongoing investment projects as of end-December 1999 and the sectoral relationship to the UNDP Revised 2000 Business Plan shows the following trends by sector:

SECTOR	1991-1999 INV. PROJECTS		REVISED 2000 BUSINESS PLAN	
	APPROVALS		PROPOSED BUDGET	
	\$ millions	Percent	\$ millions	Percent
Aerosols	6.23	2.7	0.85	2.4
Foams	122.55	53.8	15.44	43.1
Halons	1.92	0.9	1.15	3.2
Methyl Bromide	2.46	1.1	1.15	3.2
Refrigeration	84.08	36.9	11.20	31.3
Solvents	10.51	4.6	6.00	16.8
TOTAL	227.75	100.0	35.79	100.0

2. During 1991-99, the foams (53.8%) and refrigeration (36.9%) sectors in UNDP's portfolio together accounted for 90.7% of UNDP's cumulative approval total for investment projects, with much smaller shares for solvents (4.6%), aerosols (2.7%), methyl bromide (1.1%) and halons (0.9%).
3. UNDP's Revised 2000 Business Plan is based on evaluation of the requests received from Governments, and takes into account 29<sup>th</sup> ExCom directives in the many different areas, including the need to increase the percentage share of halons projects. In the UNDP Revised 2000 Business Plan, the share of foams will fall from the 53.8% average during 1991-99 to 43.1% in 2000, that in refrigeration will fall from 36.9% to 31.3%, that of solvents will rise from 4.6% to 16.8% to cover expected approval of the first phase of the China solvents sectoral programme, that of aerosols will decrease slightly from 2.7% to 2.4%, that of halons will increase from 0.9% to 3.2%, and that of alternatives to methyl bromide use will increase from 1.1% to 3.2%. A total of 4,566 ODP tonnes would be eliminated under UNDP's Revised 2000 Business Plan approvals.



4. Overall UNDP investment project cost-effectiveness (in \$/kg.) by year of approval is as follows:

Year	Cost-Effectiveness (US\$/kg.)
1992	8.1/kg.
1993	7.7/kg.
1994	7.4/kg.
1995	5.3/kg.
1996	7.1/kg.
1997	6.7/kg.
1998	6.3/kg.
1999	8.1/kg.
2000 (estimated)	7.8/kg.

5. Overall investment programme cost-effectiveness decreased during 1992-95, from \$8.1/kg. in 1992 to \$5.3/kg. in 1995. By end-1995, however, most large cost-effective projects had already been approved, and UNDP was increasingly being requested to also start investment project preparation for low-volume ODS consuming countries (LVCs) where cost-effectiveness criteria do not apply. As a result, overall programme cost-effectiveness increased from \$5.3/kg. in 1995 to \$7.1/kg. in 1996, declining slightly to \$6.7/kg. in 1997 and further to \$6.3/kg. in 1998.
6. However, in 1999, UNDP's overall investment programme cost-effectiveness rose to \$8.1/kg. This was primarily the result of three factors: (a) \$1.13 million in approval for MeBr alternative demonstration projects which did not result in ODS phaseout; (b) a greater number of small-scale foam projects which raised the foam sector cost-effectiveness from \$6.5/kg. in 1998 to \$7.4/kg. in 1999; and (c) a greater number of smaller-size refrigeration projects which raised the refrigeration sector cost-effectiveness from \$11.0/kg. in 1998 to \$13.8/kg. in 1999. In 2000, UNDP's investment project portfolio cost-effectiveness is estimated to be around \$7.8/kg. given the somewhat similar distribution of projects expected.
7. In UNDP's Revised 2000 Business Plan, the cost-effectiveness of ODS phaseout investment projects is expected to decline slightly to \$7.8/kg. but would still be worse than in previous years for the following reasons:
- the completion of most large projects and many mid-sized projects
  - the greater number of mid-to-smaller sized foam and refrigeration sector enterprises left whose cost-effectiveness may be close to (or exceed) the sectoral/subsectoral CE threshold levels
  - projects in LVCs which often have smaller-sized enterprises and where cost-effectiveness threshold limits do not apply; UNDP has proposed global projects to cover LVCs in refrigerant recovery/recycling and in the commercial refrigeration end-user sector
  - the impact of the first phase of China's solvent sector financing plan for which approval is expected in March 2000, increasing the proportion of higher-cost solvent sector projects.
  - a few sectoral/subsectoral ODS phaseout projects that, in general, cover a large number of

SMEs.

## SPECIAL AREA RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS

8. a) **Low-ODS Consuming Countries (LVCs).** In 1998, UNDP had programmes in 33 LVCs and in 1999 had added four new LVCs - Belize, Chad, Fiji and Nepal. Thus by end-1999 UNDP had programmes in 37 LVCs (Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Braz.), Costa Rica, Cuba, El-Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Tanzania, Trinidad & Tobago, Uganda, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe). In 2000, through its global refrigerant recovery/recycling project and its global commercial refrigeration end-user project, UNDP anticipates adding at the very minimum three additional LVCs, so that by end-2000, UNDP should have programmes in a total of 67 countries comprising 40 LVCs and 27 medium-to-high level ODS consuming countries.
- b) **Refrigerant Recovery/Recycling in LVCs as Part of RMPs.** In its 1997 Business Plan, UNDP was to submit for approval 12 such programmes. However, at its 22nd Meeting in May 1997, the ExCom under Decision 22/25 made development of national RMPs a precondition for other project activities in LVCs so as to ensure sustainability. Further, such projects could only be submitted if fully justified by an RMP. Due to delays in agreement on RMP guidelines and the consequent delay in RMP preparation, six potential programmes could not be submitted in 1997; 5 were approved in 1998 (Burundi, Dominican Republic, El-Salvador, Gabon and Moldova) and another 5 were approved in 1999 (Belize, Chad, Fiji, Nepal and Niger). The ExCom's condition that national measures be in place before project implementation can start has seriously delayed ongoing project implementation as LVCs struggle to put in place the required legislation. These delays have ranged from 3 months (El Salvador) to 6 months (Dominican Republic) to 8 months (Trinidad & Tobago) to 10 months (Bahrain, Georgia), to 12 months (Bahamas, Lesotho) to 13 months (Mozambique) and to over 32 months and still not resolved in the case of Tanzania.
- c) **Special UNDP Provision in 2000 for Global Projects in LVC Refrigerant Recovery/Recycling and in LVC Commercial Refrigeration End-user Sector Programmes** In previous years, UNDP had specified the names of several LVCs in its annual business plans with the intention of developing national refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes. The extended time taken by many of them to complete their RMPs and the additional time needed to draft the legislation to conform to the ExCom directive that national measures be in place before project implementation can start, had resulted in many of these programmes not being approved and UNDP unable to meet its indicator due to no fault of its own. For 2000, UNDP includes in its business plan an allocation of \$681,570 which could cover up to six LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes when ready, and an additional \$840,000 which could cover up to six LVC projects in the commercial refrigeration end-user sector which also has policy/legislative measures criteria. This would provide windows for these activities while, at the same time, not penalizing UNDP for non-approval of any specific country project for reasons beyond its control.
- d) **Methyl Bromide (MeBr).** UNDP has been coordinating closely with UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank to harmonize activities in this sector. UNDP received approval in 1998 for MeBr alternative demonstration projects in Argentina, Lebanon, Mexico and the Philippines, and in 1999 for projects in Costa Rica (2), Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Zimbabwe. In 2000, projects are expected in Bolivia, Chile, Malawi and Peru, several of which would be "investment" type projects. UNDP's offer to assist several countries in this area have not been responded to by the Governments

concerned. In addition some Governments have requested 6-12 month delays in the start of MeBr project preparation. UNDP makes maximum use of both national consultants and qualified NGOs in its MeBr formulation activities in order to ensure project sustainability.

## SPECIAL INITIATIVES

### 9. a) **Assisting Article 5 Parties Meet the 50% CFC and Halons Reduction Target for 2005**

UNDP's Revised 2000 Business Plan will assist Article 5 Parties meet the 50% CFC and Halons reduction target for 2005 through the following:

- In LVCs where the refrigeration sector is dominant, UNDP is timing its investment project preparation to contribute to formulation of refrigerant management plans in close cooperation with UNEP. Where the potential for recovery/recycling projects exists, UNDP is advising Governments to urgently adopt the measures required by the ExCom to ensure programme sustainability. This will facilitate quick project implementation when the respective projects are approved by the ExCom. For 2000, UNDP includes in its business plan an allocation of \$681,570 which could cover up to six LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes when ready. The six countries would come from a potential list that includes Congo (DRC), Djibouti, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Suriname, Western Samoa and Yemen.
- For LVCs where the potential for commercial refrigeration end-use projects exist and where the countries are in position to meet the July 1999 ExCom guidelines on legislative measures and strategies, UNDP includes in its 2000 business plan an allocation of \$840,000 which could cover up to six LVC projects in this area. The six countries would come from a potential list that includes Benin, Burkina Faso, Centrafrique, Chad, Congo-Braz., Cote d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Panama, Senegal and Sri Lanka. A survey has been initiated.
- As requested at the 29<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting, UNDP has increased its allocation for halons sector projects from \$200,000 in its draft 2000 business plan to \$1,150,000 in its revised 2000 business plan.
- For mid-to-larger size countries, Libya would enter into the UNDP programme for the first time. For other countries, UNDP's strategy would concentrate on maintaining programme continuity since projects approved in 2000 would be completed in 2002-2003 thereby helping them comply with the 2005 control measure of the Protocol.

### b) **Strategies for ODS Phaseout in Small-and-Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs)**

- During 1997-98, the ExCom approved UNDP umbrella projects in com. ref. in Costa Rica, in rigid foam and com. ref. in Guatemala, for rigid spray thermoware in India, in rigid spray foam and integral skin foam in Mexico, in foam for Paraguay, and in rigid foam and in solvents (Phase II) in the Philippines.
- In 1999, the ExCom set up a special \$10 million SME window. However two conditions to access the Window proved hard for countries to meet – first, that no country could get over \$1 million; and second, that a country needed to submit an official sector strategy specifying all remaining ODS consumption in that sector and how much would be covered by the specified project. Brazil had several group SME projects ready but, due to the \$1 million limitation by country, did not want to give certain group projects an unfair advantage over others; as a result Brazil decided not to access the window at all, despite the lower funding level that resulted. Only one UNDP SME foam project in India was able to meet both conditions and was approved in 1999.
- In 2000, UNDP will continue using the group project approach to meet the special needs of SMEs. A key objective is to prevent growth in SME consumption of ODS while the Fund is approving projects to eliminate ODS consumption in larger enterprises in the same

country. Due to their small scale, SME investment projects in 2000 may have great difficulty meeting existing CE thresholds. UNDP pioneered and will continue to develop new and innovative approaches to facilitate effective ODS phaseout in SMEs.

- c) **Increased Coverage in Africa.** In 1999, UNDP had work programmes in 21 African countries (3 mid-sized, 18 LVCs). The three mid-size countries are Egypt, Morocco and Nigeria. The 18 LVCCs are Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Braz.), Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Niger, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In UNDP's Revised 2000 Business Plan, the total number of countries in Africa will increase by one – Libya – and could increase further if projects in the refrigerant recovery/recycling and commercial refrigeration end-user subsectors are approved.
- d) **Sectoral Approaches.** UNDP is the lead agency assisting China in the development of its solvent sector strategy and financing plan. This sectoral approach was first presented to the ExCom for approval at its 27th Meeting in March 1999. The ExCom constituted a China Solvent Sector Working Group chaired by Sweden and comprising the Bahamas, Brazil, China, Japan, and the USA. This Working Group met during the 28<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in July 1999 in Montreal, in Washington D.C. on 29<sup>th</sup> September 1999 and during the 29<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in Nov. 1999 in Beijing. The assumption is that a draft agreement would be finalized and approved at the 30<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in March 2000, at which time approval of the first tranche of \$6 million would start the process of eliminating CFC-113 consumption in China.

## B. PLANNED BUSINESS ACTIVITIES: UNDP

### ONGOING ACTIVITIES

- 10. **Table 1 on funded investment projects by sector (including recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative demonstration projects)** shows that, as of 31 December 1999, UNDP should have 745 approved investment projects in 55 countries with cumulative budgets of \$227.75 million. The sector shares for funded investment projects are aerosols (2.7%), foams (53.8%), halons (0.9%), methyl bromide (1.1%), refrigeration (36.9%) and solvents (4.6%). These 745 projects would be expected to eliminate 33,278 ODP tonnes/annum. Investment project disbursements by UNDP during 1991-1999 (excluding obligations), as per very preliminary estimates, would amount to \$125 million with 14,853 ODP tonnes already eliminated.
- 11. During 2000, investment project disbursements are targeted at \$40 million with 6,000 ODP tonnes to be eliminated. In the following years, project disbursements would total \$62.75 million with the remaining 12,425 ODP tonnes to be phased out. The level of expected disbursements by UNDP in 2000 is conditioned on the expected completion of several projects approved in late-1997 and in 1998 based on the 30-36 month duration based on implementation experience during 1997-99. It is also conditioned on the assumption that countries affected by the severe 1998 economic recession will continue recovering and maintain their economic growth in year 2000.
- 12. **Table 4, based on Table 1, shows funded investment projects by country.** UNDP by end-1999 had 745 funded investment, recovery/recycling and MeBr projects in 55 countries (19 in Africa, 15 in Asia/Pacific, 2 in Europe, and 19 in Latin America/Caribbean). Table 4 shows that project approval shares by region are 11.0% for Africa, 56.7% for Asia/Pacific, 0.2% for Europe and 32.1% for Latin America/Caribbean. The shares of ODP phaseout by region are 12.2% for Africa, 59.9% for Asia/Pacific, 0.1% for Europe, and 27.8% for Latin America/Caribbean, reflecting both

the larger-size countries and enterprises in the Asia/Pacific region and also the significant number of smaller countries currently being assisted in Africa and Latin America/Caribbean.

13. **Table 3 on Non-Investment Projects** covers ongoing projects and new requests in 2000:
- a) There are 32 ongoing non-investment projects comprising 22 institutional strengthening and 10 technical assistance/demo projects. As of end-1999 budgets were \$6.95 million of which \$4.00 million would have been disbursed by Dec. 1999, and the balance in 2000/2001.
  - b) In 2000, there would be four requests for RMP development in larger ODS consuming countries – Brazil, Colombia, India and Nigeria – amounting to \$370,000.
  - c) In 2000, the following 17 institutional strengthening renewal requests amounting to \$3,005,719 (excluding support costs) will be submitted to the ExCom for approval:
 

1) Brazil:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	270,000
2) China:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 4	300,000
3) Colombia:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	212,000
4) Cuba:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	114,666
5) Ghana:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 4	107,000
6) Indonesia:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	208,650
7) Iran:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	133,470
8) Kenya:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	116,667
9) Lebanon:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 2	119,333
10) Malaysia:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 4	215,000
11) Mexico:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 5	190,000
12) Nigeria:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 2	200,000
13) Pakistan:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 2	172,666
14) Thailand:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 3	266,667
15) Trin/Tobago:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 2	44,000
16) Uruguay:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 4	116,000
17) Venezuela:	Institutional Strengthening: Phase 5	219,600

## PROGRAMME EXPANSION

14. **Table 2 shows UNDP's request for investment project preparation by sector, including that for development of recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative projects.** UNDP, by end-1999, could have a balance of \$191,000 in project preparation funds. UNDP will prepare \$35.79 million in investment projects in year 2000 under its regular programme. UNDP is thus requesting \$865,000 in additional project preparation assistance in 2000; an advance of \$250,000 was received at the 29<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in Nov. 1999 and the remaining balance of \$615,000 is being requested so UNDP can formulate and submit for approval 109 investment and MeBr alternative projects.
15. This programme would eliminate 4,566 ODP tonnes, and project value by sector would be: aerosols (2.4%), foams (43.1%), halons (3.2%), methyl bromide (3.2%), refrigeration (31.3%) and solvents (16.8%). Expected ODP phaseout by sector is: aerosols (4.9%), foams (41.9%), methyl bromide (4.5%), halons (18.7%), refrigeration (19.0%) and solvents (11.1%).
16. **Table 5, based on Table 2, shows UNDP's request for investment project preparation by country (including recovery/recycling and MeBr alternative demonstration projects) under the regular programme.** A total of 21 countries are covered: 5 in Africa, 8 in Asia/Pacific, and 8 in Latin America/Caribbean. UNDP has also included in its 2000 business plan two global programmes - an allocation of \$681,570 which could cover up to six LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling programmes when ready, and an additional \$840,000 which could cover up to

six LVC projects in the commercial refrigeration end-user sector which also has policy/legislative measures criteria. This would provide windows for these activities while, at the same time, not penalizing UNDP for non-approval of any specific country project for reasons beyond its control.

17. Of total project preparation funds under the regular programme, Africa has 8% which includes project formulation in Egypt, Libya, Malawi, Nigeria and Tanzania; Asia/Pacific will have 45% covering project formulation in China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Malaysia, Philippines, Syria and Vietnam; Latin America/Caribbean will have 36% covering investment project formulation in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Jamaica, Mexico and Peru. The remaining 11% would be spent on preparing projects under the two global LVC projects in refrigerant recovery/recycling and in the commercial refrigeration end-user sector; upto 12 LVCs could be expected to be covered under this programme, many of them having a first-time investment project under the Multilateral Fund.
18. **Table 5A, based on Table 5, presents project preparation requests disaggregated by country, sector and subsector.** It is self-explanatory. There are five specific LVCs identified in the programme – Bolivia, Jamaica, Malawi, Peru and Tanzania. However, as mentioned above, the global LVC project in refrigerant recovery/recycling could be expected to include up to 6 LVCs, while the global LVC project in the commercial refrigeration end-user sector could have an additional six LVCs. However, since their inclusion would involve the decision on RMPs to be taken by the ExCom as well as each specific country's ability to adopt the necessary policy measures – an aspect not within the control of UNDP – no specific guarantee is made as to how many of them could ultimately have projects formulated and approved in 2000. In the case of China, UNDP hopes for approval of the China solvent sector financing strategy and plan at the 30th ExCom Meeting in March 2000 with approval of the first tranche funding of \$6 million, which is why only one project is denoted under the China solvent sector entry.
19. **Table 5B presents the contingency list of projects.** The total contingency list amounts to \$9.48 million which would eliminate 1,192 ODP tonnes in the foam and commercial refrigeration sectors. It would require \$220,000 in project preparation assistance in total if all categories have to be utilized. The rationale is the following:
  - a) **Brazil:** \$1.27 million has been allocated for SME group projects in rigid foam. UNDP submitted and received approval in November 1999 for the more cost-effective SME group projects. UNDP is uncertain at this time whether the higher level of counterpart funding required for the remaining SME group projects would be forthcoming. In the event it is not, UNDP would substitute mid-size Brazilian foam projects in their place.
  - b) **China:** UNDP expects approval of the China solvent sector financing plan at the 30th ExCom Meeting in March 2000, along with the first tranche funding of \$6 million. In the event the plan is not approved and funded in March 2000 or latest by July 2000, UNDP would substitute \$6 million of China flexible and rigid foam projects in its place.
  - c) **Commercial refrigeration end-users:** UNDP has included in its 2000 business plan an allocation of \$840,000 to cover up to six potential LVC commercial refrigeration end-use projects where countries can meet the July 1999 ExCom guidelines on legislative measures and strategies. The six countries would come from a list that includes Benin, Burkina Faso, Centrafrique, Chad, Congo-Braz., Cote d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Panama, Senegal and Sri Lanka. In the event some or all of these projects fail to materialize, UNDP would substitute commercial refrigeration and foam projects in Brazil, India, Iran and Nigeria in their place.
  - d) **Libya:** In the event the Libya CP is not approved in 2000, the \$400,000 budgeted will be used instead for commercial refrigeration or foam projects in India and Iran.

- e) **Nigeria:** In the event Nigeria is unable to ratify the London Amendment and its projects cannot be approved, UNDP would substitute foam and commercial refrigeration projects in Brazil, India and Iran in their place.

## C. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

20. **Project Disbursements in 2000** Estimated project disbursements by UNDP in 2000, excluding support costs, should total \$42.3 million comprising \$40.00 million on investment projects, \$1.8 million on non-investment projects and \$0.50 million of project preparation funds.
21. The disbursement targets are possible only if no critical delays are encountered, such as disagreements with Governments on implementation modalities, delays in signing project documents, inability of equipment suppliers to meet deadlines, inability of joint venture companies or companies that have accepted partial funding to provide their share in foreign exchange, and the tendency of some Governments to levy taxes/duties on equipment purchased through MLF projects, with enterprises refusing to complete their projects until the policies change. Total disbursements by year (excluding obligations) would be:

Year	Disbursements (\$ millions)	Cumulative Disbursements (\$ millions)
1991	0.251	0.251
1992	0.518	0.769
1993	3.862	4.631
1994	6.467	11.098
1995	11.532	22.630
1996	29.501	52.131
1997	34.330	86.461
1998	33.544	120.005
1999 (prelim. est.)	35.000	155.005
2000 Target	42.300	197.305

22. The above will be possible only if enterprises are able to expeditiously complete their approved projects, including providing the needed counterpart contributions where mandated.
23. For the period 1991-1999, preliminary estimates show cumulative UNDP project disbursements of \$155.005 million as compared to total approvals of \$257.55 million giving a delivery rate of 60.2%. And in 2000, net additional disbursements of \$42.3 million are anticipated. A comparison of disbursements on investment, non-investment and project preparation activities during 1991-1999 (estimate), in calendar year 2000 and cumulatively during 1991-2000 is as follows:

Period	Inv. Project Disbursements (\$ millions)	Non-Inv. Project Disbursements (\$ millions)	Project Prep. Disbursements (\$ millions)	Total Disbursements (\$ millions)
1991 - Dec 99 (prelim. est.)	130.445	18.060	6.500	155.005

2000 Target	40.000	1.800	0.500	42.300
1991-2000 Target	170.445	19.860	7.000	197.305

24. **1999 UNDP Investment Project Disbursement** In its 1999 Business Plan, UNDP had targeted its total 1991-99 disbursement on investment projects to be \$125 million. Preliminary indications are that the actual figure would be around \$130.445 million. UNDP would thus have achieved its 1991-1999 disbursement target. The recovery from the severe economic recession in 1998 experienced by several developing countries where UNDP has ongoing investment projects - both in South-East Asia (e.g. Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand) and Latin America (e.g. Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Venezuela) – is a factor that has enabled UNDP to achieve its target.
25. **2000 UNDP Investment Project Disbursement Target:** In its revised 2000 Business Plan, UNDP has set a target of \$40 million as its investment project disbursement target in year 2000. Since anticipated disbursements as of end-1999 should be around \$130.445 million, by end-2000 this figure should be around \$170.445 million. The ExCom mandated target for end-2000 cumulative disbursement would be 70% of funded investment projects as of end-1999, or 70% of \$227.75 million which is \$159.425 million. Thus UNDP hopes to significantly exceed the ExCom's mandated disbursement target by end-2000.
26. **Investment Project Approvals in 1999** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had projected investment project approvals of \$33.91 million in 1999, excluding overprogramming. As of December 1999, UNDP had received \$36.02 million in investment project approvals. UNDP has thus received approval for 106% of what it had projected to receive. While UNDP exceeded its target for investment project approvals, it was unable to prepare and submit \$3.5 million in MeBr alternative demonstration projects due to insufficient interest from potential recipient countries, despite UNDP's best efforts to encourage these countries to prepare projects.
27. **ODP to be Phased Out from 1999 Business Plan Approvals:** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had a projected ODP phaseout target of 2,700 ODP tonnes for projects to be approved in 1999 (3,104 tonnes less 15% over-programming). UNDP investment projects approved in 1999 will eliminate 4,444 ODP tonnes. Thus UNDP was 165% above its target for ODP to be phased out from 1999 Business Plan approvals.
28. **ODP Phased Out in 1999:** UNDP's 1999 Business Plan had projected an ODP phaseout target of 3,800 ODP tonnes in 1999. During 1999, initial estimates show that actual ODP phaseout was around 4,068 ODP tonnes, though full reports from all UNDP Country Offices are still awaited. UNDP has thus met its originally specified target for ODP to be phased out in 1999.
29. Reasons contributing to why UNDP was unable to meet the ExCom specified 1999 ODP phaseout target and why UNDP will have difficulty in meeting its 2000 ODP phaseout target of 6,000 ODP tonnes include the following:
- a) UNDP, in its 1998 Progress Report Narrative submitted to the 28<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in July 1999, had specified many reasons for implementation delays – due to technical reasons, financial reasons, external causes, enterprise management problems, ExCom mandated legislation requirements, etc. Those have contributed significantly to implementation delays. However, another major cause was UNDP's own underestimation during 1994-97 of the time required for project implementation; UNDP kept specifying in its project



proposals durations of 12 months, then 18 months, then 24 months when implementation was taking much longer than that. This misjudgement has also contributed to the seemingly long delays; more realistic implementation schedules as used by other agencies would not have caused this problem.

- b) The 28<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting in July 1999 decided that projects could be termed completed only when all use of CFCs had stopped. UNDP had previously allowed enterprises to use up their stocks even after a project was considered completed. However, since mid-1999, UNDP has had to wait for enterprise CFC stocks to be depleted before it can close projects and take credit for ODP phaseout, even though the conversion to non-ODS equipment may have taken place months earlier. So from mid-1999 no project will be termed "completed" when the actual equipment conversion takes place unless the above condition is met. This will significantly slow down UNDP's ODP phaseout reporting rate.
- c) The same ExCom decision also had a proviso that formal agreements be entered into between the agency, the enterprise and the Government requiring destruction of CFC-using equipment and no further use of CFCs. This would have to be done before the project could be closed, whereas in the past UNDP had permitted this destruction to take place between the time the project had been operationally completed and when the legal Hand-Over Protocol was signed. As a result, UNDP now has to wait for ODS equipment destruction to take place and be verified, which will further slow the ODP phaseout that can be claimed.
- d) The third part of that same ExCom decision had specified that project balances should be returned to the Fund at the latest 12 months after project completion. UNDP had previously reported completion as the date when its Certificate of Completion was signed, with final disbursement normally taking place upto two years after that date. UNDP will no longer be able to use its Certificate of Completion date but rather its Hand-Over Protocol date, which would further delay the reporting of actual ODP phaseout.

30. **Speed of Investment Project Delivery.** Analysis of UNDP's speed of delivery and completion for investment projects shows the following:

Year	Months from Approval to First Disbursement	Months from Approval to Completion	Cost-Effectiveness (\$/kg.)
1992	18	29	8.1
1993	14	26	7.7
1994	14	32	7.4
1995	15	24	5.3
1996	9	22	7.1
1997	12	31	6.7
1998	14	32	6.3
1999 (estimate)	14	36	8.1
2000 (target)	14	36	7.8

31. Based on evaluation of UNDP's July 1999 Progress Report for the period ending December 1998, and since these detailed tables are only prepared once a year, UNDP will, for the most part, adjust its previously proposed estimates slightly as follows:

- a) The average length of time between investment project approval and first disbursement for investment projects averaged between 9-18 months for projects approved during 1992-96. In 1997 it was 12 months and in 1998, it was 14 months. UNDP has been able to keep this figure at 14 months in 1999 and proposes that the same target will hold for 2000.
- b) UNDP's investment projects, approved during 1992-96, have taken between 22-32 months to complete their ODS phaseout. During 1997-98, due to very difficult circumstances facing many enterprises caused by the South-East Asian and Latin American stock market crashes and economic recessions, investment project completion was delayed at many enterprises and the period to completion jumped to 31-32 months.
- c) See paras 4-8 which describe the trends in investment project cost-effectiveness.
- d) In July 1999, the 28<sup>th</sup> ExCom Meeting decided that projects could only be termed completed when all use of CFCs had stopped (and stocks exhausted), and that formal agreements were required between the enterprise and the Government requiring destruction of CFC-using equipment and no further use of CFCs before projects could be termed completed. Further the requirement that project balances be returned to the Fund at the latest 12 months after project completion has forced UNDP to use its later Hand-Over Protocol date to signify project completion rather than the Certificate of Completion which is normally done much earlier. The above factors, together with the longer time needed for project implementation due to technical, financial, external and other factors documented in UNDP's July 1999 progress report, justify why investment project duration will now take a full 36 months. It should also be noted that umbrella projects, often covering SMEs, take three years or more to complete, and this automatically adds to the overall implementation period.

32. **Speed of Non-Investment Project Delivery.** Analysis of UNDP's speed of delivery and completion for non-investment projects done on the basis of UNDP's Progress Report to the 28th ExCom Meeting in July 1999 showed the following:

Year	Months from Approval to First Disbursement	Months from Approval to Completion
1991	11	24
1992	16	33
1993	10	33
1994	6	24
1995	4	15
1996	6	24
1997	10	29
1998	13	36
1999 (estimate)	12	36
2000 (target)	12	36

33. The above table shows the following:

- a) The average length of time between non-investment project approval and first disbursement

averaged 10-16 months during 1991-93, fell during 1994-96, rose to 10 months in 1997 and to 13 months in 1998. UNDP will try to cut it back to 12 months in both 1999 and 2000.

- b) UNDP's non-investment projects, approved during 1991-96, have taken between 15-33 months to complete. In 1997 it averaged 29 months, rising to 36 months in 1998. UNDP is targeting the same 36 month figure in both 1999 and 2000. Most comprise two-year institutional strengthening renewals which often take between 30-36 months to complete their activities due to Governmental and UNDP financial and operational procedures for these projects.

34. **ODS Phaseout in 2000** By end-1999 UNDP would have eliminated at least 15,121 ODP tonnes. In 2000, UNDP proposes to eliminate an additional 6,000 ODP tonnes so that by end-2000 UNDP would have eliminated a total of 21,121 ODP tonnes/annum. This would amount to 63.5% of the expected 1991-2000 UNDP programme of 33,278 ODP tonnes. The actual and projected ODS phaseout expressed in ODP tonnes is as follows:

Year	ODP Tonnes/Yr Phased Out	Cumulative ODP Tonnes/Yr Phased Out
1992	0	0
1993	178	178
1994	227	405
1995	1,497	1,902
1996	1,658	3,560
1997	3,065	6,625
1998	4,428	11,053
1999	4,068	15,121
2000 (target)	6,000	21,121
Future years	12,157	33,278

35. **2000 ODS Phaseout as a Percentage of UNDP Programme.** The total ODP to be eliminated in 2000 under UNDP investment projects would be 6,000 ODP tonnes. This amounts to 18% of the total approved UNDP programme of 33,278 ODP tonnes.

36. **Diversity of the UNDP Portfolio.** The Executive Committee has requested implementing agencies to diversify their project portfolios to reach the largest number of potential recipient countries. The following table highlights UNDP's efforts in this area by comparing the programme portfolio expected as of end-1999 with that expected as of end-2000.

DIVERSITY CRITERIA	As of end-1999	As of end-2000
a) Total number of countries covered	59	63
b) Number of LVCs covered	37	40
c) Countries in the Africa region	20	24
d) Countries in the Asia/Pacific region	17	17
e) Countries in Latin America/Caribbean region	20	20
f) Countries in Europe/CIS region	2	2

37. UNDP, under its global LVC refrigerant recovery/recycling project, hopes to have projects for the first time in some of the following potential countries: Congo (DRC), Djibouti, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Suriname, Western Samoa and Yemen. UNDP also hopes to have potential commercial refrigeration end-use projects for the first time in countries that could include Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Mali and Senegal. However, since UNDP has no way of knowing how many of these countries are in position to meet ExCom guidelines on legislative measures and strategies, no specific guarantee is made except to say that at the very minimum three new LVCs will enter the UNDP programme in 2000.
38. **Project Costing and Use of Contingency Costs.** For many projects approved during 1995-1999, contingency costs have had to be utilized fully and in many cases additional funding from the recipient enterprises was essential since equipment costs have in several instances been going up rather than down. This has been documented in several submitted investment project completion reports. This experience will likely continue into 2000. With the smaller size of enterprises being covered, project cost-effectiveness is also not as favorable. Revised baseline equipment calculations would increase the counterpart funding required from recipient enterprises.
39. **Cost of Investment Project Preparation**
- a) During 1991-99, preliminary estimates show \$6.50 million in project preparation funds disbursed resulted in the approval of \$227.75 million in investment projects, giving a cost of preparation ratio of 2.85%. This was almost identical to UNDP's 1999 Business Plan estimate of 3%, and very similar to the 1991-98 actual ratio of 2.93%.
  - b) For 2000, preliminary UNDP estimates are that its cost of investment project preparation ratio would be 3.0%. However, the ever-increasing ExCom requirements on more specific and detailed ODS consumption data not only for the enterprise in question but for the sector/subsector, together with the increasing number of SME group projects which would entail data analysis covering a large number of smaller enterprises could raise this cost in 2000.
40. **Cost-Effectiveness of UNDP Investment Projects**
- a) The average cost-effectiveness of approved UNDP ODS phaseout investment projects decreased during 1992-95, it being \$8.1/kg. in 1992, \$7.7/kg. in 1993, \$7.4/kg. in 1994 and \$5.3/kg. in 1995. However, in 1996 the cost-effectiveness figure was \$7.1/kg. reflecting both a smaller number of large cost-effective projects and a larger number of small projects, especially in LVCs. During 1997, a few large highly cost-effective projects were developed counterbalancing many smaller ones with a resulting cost-effectiveness of around \$6.7/kg. In 1998 it fell slightly to \$6.3/kg., before rising significantly to \$8.1/kg. in 1999.
  - b) For 2000, under the regular programme, 109 projects would be prepared amounting to \$35.79 million that would eliminate 4,566 ODP tonnes. Overall programme cost-effectiveness would be \$7.8/kg., slightly better than in 1999 due to the additional halons projects in the revised business plan. If a significant number of LVC projects in the global programmes covering refrigerant recovery/recycling and commercial refrigeration end-users are submitted, the overall cost-effectiveness figure could rise to around \$8.5/kg.

41. **Summary of UNDP Investment Project Performance Indicators:**

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	YEAR 2000 TARGETS
<b>Weighted indicators</b>	
ODP phased out from previous approvals (ODP tonnes): UNDP target	6,000
ODP phased out from previous approvals (ODP tonnes): ExCom target	13,646
Funds disbursed (US\$) including R&R and MeBr projects a/	\$45,000,000
Satisfactory project completion reports received (%age): UNDP target	50%
Satisfactory project completion reports received (%age): ExCom target	100%
Distribution of projects among countries in business plan (number) b/	33
<b>Non-weighted indicators</b>	
Value of projects to be approved (US\$)	\$35,790
ODP from projects to be approved (ODP tonnes)	4,566
Cost of project preparation (% of submission)	3.0
Cost-effectiveness from projects to be approved (US\$/ODP in kg.)	\$7.80/kg.
Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	14
Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36
Net emission/reduction of ODP resulting from implementation delays/early completion (tonnes)	To be determined

a/ Includes agency support costs but excludes 15% over-programming.

b/ This will be valid only if the two global projects in refrigeration recovery/recycling and commercial refrigeration end-users are approved, otherwise it will be 21 countries. And if the Libya CP is not approved, the number would decrease to 20

42. **Summary of UNDP Non-investment Project Performance Indicators:**

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	YEAR 2000 TARGETS
<b>Weighted indicators</b>	
Number of projects to be completed	8
Funds disbursed (US\$) a/	\$2,025,000
Speed of delivery until first disbursement (months from approval)	12
Speed of delivery until project completion (months from approval)	36
<b>Non-weighted indicators</b>	
Appropriate and timely policies initiated by countries as a result of networking, training, information exchange, country programme development and/or institutional strengthening (number of countries)	5
Reduction in ODS consumption over and above that effected by	30

investment projects (ODP tonnes)	
----------------------------------	--

a/ Includes agency support costs but excludes 15% over-programming.

## D. POLICY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN 2000

43. a) Despite the strenuous attempts made by UNDP to convince Governments to go in for additional MeBr alternative demonstration projects or even investment projects, the response has been very poor. And some Governments have requested 6-12 month delays in the start of MeBr project preparation. UNDP does make maximum use of both national consultants and qualified NGOs in its MeBr formulation activities in order to ensure project sustainability, and in some instances this has been of concern to the respective ozone units. And in some cases, even when UNDP has the potential to finalize MeBr alternative projects, Governments have informed UNDP that priority should be given to other consumption sector projects.
- b) UNDP is faced with the situation that, in some larger ODS consuming countries (e.g. Brazil, India), whereas in previous years 2-3 implementing agencies were involved in project formulation and submission, in 1999 and potentially in 2000, UNDP would be responsible for development of half to three-quarters of the full ODS programme in these countries. With UNDP requested to put more of its resources into such countries, the diversity of the UNDP portfolio will be reduced with activities in fewer countries and fewer LVCs. UNDP is responding to recipient Government requests and should not be penalized in business plan performance evaluation if its number of countries thus decreases or if it consequently is active in fewer LVCs.
- c) Following the principle that priority has to be given to countries to enable them to meet the phaseout provisions of the Protocol, UNDP in its draft 2000 business plan has also concentrated on countries that need assistance in order to meet the 50% ODS reduction target in 2005. However, UNDP has several pending requests from Governments (e.g. Malaysia, Philippines) who have already met the 50% ODS reduction target and want to proceed immediately towards 100% ODS phaseout, often with supporting legislation in place or being formulated. Is the treatment of such projects in UNDP's 2000 business plan acceptable?
- d) The high demand by Governments that UNDP include consumption sector projects in its 2000 draft business plan has resulted both in UNDP transferring its proposed Venezuela production sector programme to the World Bank and also looking for a way to somehow handle the over \$15 million in requests for consumption sector projects over and above the UNDP 2000 business plan target. UNDP has already filled almost half of its potential 2001 business plan with this overflow of projects. A higher allocation would help UNDP meet more of its pending requests and assist the countries accelerate their ODS phaseout.

## E. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

44. a) UNDP has been accepting promissory notes since its legal agreement with the Executive Committee was suitably amended in 1998. While UNDP did not have to encash any promissory notes in 1999, it will have to do so in 2000 and will in first-half 2000 be sending the Fund Treasurer an encashment schedule. The reconciliation of UNDP allocations and interest income accounts as maintained by UNDP and the Fund Treasurer is proceeding. In early 1999, however, UNDP initiated a major corporate software change to

its existing financial, accounting and project reporting system. Problems associated with migrating data from one system to another have caused significant delays in interim reporting. UNDP is working towards closing its 1999 balance of accounts on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2000 and producing financial statements soon thereafter. It is quite possible, however, that these accounts will not fully reflect all disbursements made and may have to be termed preliminary by UNDP. While official quarterly financial statements due in 1999 could not be provided, UNDP will provide the Fund Treasurer with proforma statements covering those periods.

- b) UNDP is developing internal financial mechanisms to accommodate any future decision that would require UNDP to utilize the concessional loan modality on a limited basis.
- c) While UNDP is making strenuous efforts to keep its total project support costs within the 13% level for projects under \$500,000, we increasingly find that the cost of implementing small projects is very high and that UNDP Country Offices are also requesting reimbursement for actual costs incurred in supporting project implementation. UNDP will report to the ExCom in its next Progress Report on further developments.
- d) The increasing paperwork continues to seriously impact on the ability of UNDP to implement its projects effectively, with the rapid submission of investment and non-investment project completion reports posing particularly severe difficulties. UNDP had requested in its 1999 Business Plan that a process be developed to facilitate a reduction in the burden of paperwork; however in 1999 the paperwork burden increased even further with even more stringent deadlines. UNDP appreciates the decision taken at the 29<sup>th</sup> ExCom whereby UNDP's detailed schedule to clear up its backlog of 224 project completion reports by 31 December 2000 was accepted. That timetable is being met. However, this will put a further strain on UNDP as it tries, at the same time, to submit PCRs for projects completed more recently.

(UNDP.BPlan2000C.doc)

TABLE 1: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Sector: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan

February 15, 2000

Agency	Sector	Sub-Sector	No. Of Countries	Approvals by the Executive Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
				Value \$	ODP From Approvals (4)	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)			
UNDP	Aerosol	Aerosol	9	6,226,631	1,698	35	3.67	3,402,016	1,099,555	1,725,060	474	399	825
UNDP	Foam	Foam Flexible PUF	16	23,356,906	5,212	94	4.48	14,685,679	3,375,500	5,295,727	2,459	897	1,856
UNDP	Foam	Foam General	8	6,728,076	1,023	16	6.58	3,622,173	1,209,053	1,896,850	773	81	169
UNDP	Foam	Foam Integral Skin	11	20,858,334	2,125	93	9.82	9,234,228	4,524,985	7,099,121	994	368	763
UNDP	Foam	Foam Polystyrene/Polyethylene	11	13,993,787	3,245	38	4.31	10,916,533	1,197,901	1,879,353	1,754	486	1,005
UNDP	Foam	Foam Rigid PUF	16	57,621,911	8,369	236	6.89	23,535,561	13,268,996	20,817,354	2,829	1,804	3,736
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Cucurbits	1	180,500	-	1	N/A	96,030	32,882	51,588	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Flowers	1	193,500	-	1	N/A	-	75,325	118,175	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Tobacco	1	273,350	-	1	N/A	136,675	53,204	83,471	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Tomato					N/A	-	0	0	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Strawberries					N/A	-	0	0	0	0	0
UNDP	Fumigants	Fumigants Soil - Other	4	1,099,400	4	4	N/A	463,025	247,725	388,650	0	1	3
UNDP	Fumigants	Storage and Structural Use	2	711,150	-	2	N/A	383,174	127,673	200,303	0	0	0
UNDP	Halon	Halon Non-Recycling	4	1,296,434	1,613	11	0.80	493,711	312,481	490,242	699	298	616
UNDP	Halon	Halon Recycling	2	621,200	350	7	1.77	155,000	181,480	284,719	0	114	236
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Commercial	18	21,698,024	1,550	79	14.00	9,973,635	4,564,022	7,160,367	375	383	792
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic	13	26,693,401	3,116	35	8.57	20,274,009	2,498,915	3,920,477	2,362	246	508
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic Hydrocarbon	2	24,883,104	3,294	11	7.55	14,883,353	3,892,663	6,107,089	1,518	578	1,198
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration MAC & Compressors	3	1,714,514	-	4	N/A	1,508,548	80,178	125,788	0	0	0
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Recycling	38	9,090,730	1,041	49	8.73	5,398,024	1,437,482	2,255,225	428	200	413
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents CFC-113	6	6,193,068	402	21	15.41	4,503,809	657,588	1,031,671	154	81	167
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents TCA	3	4,320,856	236	7	18.31	1,334,816	1,162,393	1,823,646	34	66	136
TOTAL			55	227,754,876	33,278	745	6.84	125,000,000	40,000,000	62,754,876	14,853	6,000	12,425
Support Costs				29,488,057									
GRAND TOTAL				257,242,933									

Footnotes: (1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are funded or planned activities forming part of the 1998 business plan.

(2) Activities included in the table are all investment projects, Recovery/Recycling projects and MBr Demonstration Projects.

(3) In some cases, project implementation may have occurred but the financial transactions may not have been completed.

(4) The amount of ODP in the proposal that led to the approval.

(5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations



**TABLE 2: Programme Development by Sector: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan**
**February 15, 2000**

Agency	Sector	Sub-sector	Number of Countries	Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
				Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	Aerosol	Aerosol	3	5,000	50,000	4	850,000	225	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Flexible PUF	5	20,000	45,000	6	1,501,700	239	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam General	2	0	50,000	9	1,120,000	176	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Integral Skin	2	10,000	100,000	16	3,170,000	200	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Polystyrene/Polyethylene	1	20,000	0	1	25,000	4	0			
UNDP	Foam	Foam Rigid PUF	10	10,000	250,000	28	9,624,750	1,296	0			
UNDP	Fumigation	Fumigation Soil - Other	3	36,000	0	3	1,000,000	0	202			
UNDP	Fumigation	Fumigation Soil - Strawberries	1	25,000	0	1	150,000	0	5			
UNDP	Halon	Halon Recycling	3	25,000	20,000	3	1,150,000	0	853			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Commercial	8	40,000	155,000	20	7,284,000	558	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Domestic	1	0	20,000	3	980,000	78	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Dom HC	1	0	35,000	1	1,265,000	95	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration Recycling	2	0	80,000	7	831,570	75	0			
UNDP	Refrigeration	Refrigeration End-Users	1	0	60,000	6	840,000	60	0			
UNDP	Solvents	Solvents CFC-113	1	0	0	1	6,000,000	500	0			
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>21</b>	<b>191,000</b>	<b>865,000</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>35,792,020</b>	<b>3,506</b>	<b>1060</b>			
<b>Support Costs</b>				<b>215,830</b>	<b>977,450</b>		<b>40,444,983</b>					
							<b>Minus 15% Overprogramming</b>	<b>35,169,550</b>				
							<b>Adding the Prep.Assistance</b>	<b>36,147,000</b>				

TABLE 3: Ongoing Non-Investment Projects: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan											February 15, 2000	
Agency	LVC	Country	Region	Ty-pe	Functional Title / Subsector	Project Funding		Disbursement			Date Completed	Status
						Value (\$) through Dec 1999	Request (\$) for 2000 Plan *	Through Dec 1999	In 2000	After 2000		
UNDP		Argentina	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	599,200	0	300,000	59,840	239,360	Dec-01	
UNDP		Bangladesh	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	250,000	0	100,000	30,000	120,000	Dec-01	
UNDP		Brazil	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	270,000	270,000	81,000	140,940	318,060	Apr-00	INS extension
UNDP		Brazil	LAC	TAS	SME Survey	100,000	0	94,400	5,600	0	May-99	
UNDP		Brazil	LAC	TAS	RMP Development	0	100,000	0	20,000	80,000	Dec-01	New request (RMP)
UNDP		China	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	300,000	300,000	90,000	156,600	353,400	Dec-00	INS extension
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Design standards: cold storage	200,000	0	188,800	11,200	0	Mar-99	
UNDP		China	ASP	TAS	Halons phaseout: alter. systems	300,000	0	283,200	16,800	0	Jun-99	
UNDP		Colombia	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	212,000	212,000	63,600	110,664	249,736	Mar-00	INS extension
UNDP		Colombia	LAC	TAS	RMP Development	0	70,000	0	14,000	56,000	Dec-01	New request (RMP)
UNDP	Yes	Costa Rica	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	216,174	0	108,087	21,617	86,470	Apr-01	
UNDP		Cuba	LAC	INS	Institutional strengthening	114,666	114,666	34,400	59,856	135,077	Dec-00	INS extension
UNDP	Yes	Ghana	AFR	INS	Institutional Strengthening	107,000	107,000	32,100	55,854	126,046	Dec-00	INS extension
UNDP		Global	GLO	TAS	Global MAC	250,000	0	236,000	14,000	0	Dec-99	
UNDP		India	ASP	DEM	Demo/eval/TA: non-halons technology	176,250	0	166,380	9,870	0	Sep-99	
UNDP		India	ASP	DEM	Halon Sector Demo/Eval	309,000	0	291,696	17,304	0	Jun-99	
UNDP		India	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	574,200	0	287,100	57,420	229,680	Apr-01	
UNDP		India	ASP	TAS	National fire codes/standards halons	88,000	0	0	17,600	70,400	Dec-02	
UNDP		India	ASP	TAS	Strategy/action prog. for foams	200,000	0	188,800	11,200	0	Dec-99	
UNDP		India	ASP	TAS	TAS for SME's in aerosol products	155,000	0	0	31,000	124,000	Dec-02	
UNDP		India	ASP	TAS	RMP Development	0	100,000	0	20,000	80,000	Dec-01	New request (RMP)
UNDP		Indonesia	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	208,650	208,650	196,966	53,414	166,920	Dec-99	INS extension
UNDP		Iran	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	133,470	133,470	125,996	34,168	106,776	Dec-99	INS extension
UNDP		Kenya	AFR	INS	Institutional strengthening	116,667	116,667	35,000	60,900	137,434	Jul-00	INS extension
UNDP		Lebanon	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	179,000	119,333	53,700	81,505	163,128	May-00	INS extension
UNDP		Malaysia	ASP	INS	Institutional Strengthening	215,000	215,000	64,500	112,230	253,270	Dec-00	INS extension
UNDP		Mexico	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	190,000	190,000	57,000	99,180	223,820	Jul-00	INS extension
UNDP		Nigeria	AFR	INS	Institutional strengthening	300,000	200,000	283,200	56,800	160,000	Dec-99	INS extension
UNDP		Nigeria	ASP	TAS	RMP Development	0	100,000	0	20,000	80,000	Dec-01	New request (RMP)
UNDP		Pakistan	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	259,000	172,666	244,496	49,037	138,133	Dec-99	INS extension
UNDP	Yes	Sri Lanka	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	206,240	0	103,120	20,624	82,496	Dec-01	
UNDP		Thailand	ASP	INS	Institutional strengthening	266,667	266,667	80,000	139,200	314,134	Jul-00	INS extension
UNDP	Yes	Trinidad and Tobago	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	66,000	44,000	62,304	12,496	35,200	Dec-99	INS extension
UNDP	Yes	Uruguay	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	116,000	116,000	34,800	60,552	136,648	Jul-00	INS extension
UNDP	Yes	Uruguay	LAC	TAS	Aerosol sector CFC phaseout.	54,000	0	50,976	3,024	0	Jul-99	
UNDP		Venezuela	LAC	INS	Institutional Strengthening	219,600	219,600	65,880	114,631	258,689	Jul-00	INS extension
					SUBTOTAL	6,951,784	3,375,719	4,003,500	1,799,127	4,524,876		
					Incl Support Cost	7,855,516	3,814,562					
					<b>SUMMARY TABLE:</b>							
					Subtotal Ongoing and New Requests	6,951,784	3,375,719	4,003,500	1,799,127	4,524,876		
					Completed Non-Investment Projects	14,514,621	0	14,056,122	-	0		
					SUBTOTAL Ongoing, New, Completed	21,466,405	3,375,719	18,059,622	1,799,127	4,524,876		
					Support Cost	2,790,633	438,843					
					GRAND TOTAL Ongoing, New, Completed	24,257,038	3,814,562					
<b>Footnotes:</b>					(1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are planned activities.							
					(2) Include funded activities							
					(3) In some cases project implementation (eg ODS phaseout or workshop completion) may have occurred but financial transactions may not have been completed							

TABLE 4: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Country: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan

February 15, 2000

Agency	Country	Region	LVC	Approvals by Ex. Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Phase Out		
				Value \$	ODP from Approvals	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	BURUNDI	AFR	1	130,027	5	2	26.01	15,277	44,670	70,081	0	2	3
UNDP	CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	AFR	1	128,441	6	2	21.41	84,227	17,212	27,003	0	2	4
UNDP	CHAD	AFR	1	213,707	9	2	23.75	-	83,191	130,516	0	3	6
UNDP	CONGO (Braz)	AFR	1	201,200	19	1	10.59	128,826	28,174	44,201	0	6	13
UNDP	EGYPT	AFR	1	13,454,216	1,713	28	7.85	11,371,895	810,597	1,271,724	1,264	146	303
UNDP	GABON	AFR	1	244,570	12	2	20.38	53,468	74,391	116,711	0	4	8
UNDP	GAMBIA	AFR	1	63,500	11	1	5.77	40,886	8,803	13,811	0	4	7
UNDP	GHANA	AFR	1	673,000	366	2	1.84	532,850	54,557	85,593	255	36	75
UNDP	LESOTHO	AFR	1	66,094	4	1	16.52	36,190	11,641	18,263	2	1	1
UNDP	MALAWI	AFR	1	262,820	40	2	6.57	98,256	64,061	100,503	7	11	22
UNDP	MAURITIUS	AFR	1	486,927	38	4	12.81	541,503	-21,245	-33,331	30	3	5
UNDP	MOROCCO	AFR	1	2,980,667	637	11	4.68	1,559,601	553,187	867,879	274	118	245
UNDP	MOZAMBIQUE	AFR	1	125,808	7	1	17.97	74,674	19,905	31,228	5	1	1
UNDP	NIGER	AFR	1	103,058	6	2	17.18	53,468	19,304	30,286	0	2	4
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR	1	4,937,130	1,106	33	4.46	1,542,443	1,321,470	2,073,217	286	267	553
UNDP	TANZANIA	AFR	1	499,053	78	3	6.40	103,684	153,908	241,461	8	23	47
UNDP	UGANDA	AFR	1	56,000	4	1	14.00	52,779	1,254	1,967	4	-	-
UNDP	ZAMBIA	AFR	1	106,320	7	1	15.19	97,331	3,499	5,490	7	-	-
UNDP	ZIMBABWE	AFR	1	212,850	-	1	na	53,468	62,044	97,338	0	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR AFRICA:</b>				<b>24,945,388</b>	<b>4,068</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6.13</b>	<b>16,440,825</b>	<b>3,310,622</b>	<b>5,193,941</b>	<b>2,142</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>1,299</b>
UNDP	BAHRAIN	ASP	1	650,312	37	3	17.58	155,008	192,810	302,494	16	7	14
UNDP	BANGLADESH	ASP	1	636,645	137	3	4.65	204,782	168,114	263,749	0	45	92
UNDP	CHINA	ASP	1	62,045,540	8,835	97	7.02	28,410,631	13,093,260	20,541,648	2,949	1,917	3,969
UNDP	FIJI	ASP	1	96,755	5	1	19.35	-	37,664	59,091	0	2	3
UNDP	INDIA	ASP	1	17,644,383	3,758	112	4.70	6,539,714	4,322,780	6,781,888	616	1,023	2,119
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP	1	5,132,339	619	37	8.29	1,213,049	1,525,685	2,393,605	121	162	336
UNDP	IRAN	ASP	1	2,730,975	250	8	10.92	-	1,063,103	1,667,872	0	81	169
UNDP	LEBANON	ASP	1	1,148,253	179	5	6.41	213,873	363,732	570,649	0	58	121
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP	1	17,475,640	2,703	69	6.47	13,025,073	1,732,499	2,718,069	1,991	232	480
UNDP	NEPAL	ASP	1	97,471	6	2	16.25	-	37,943	59,528	0	2	4
UNDP	PHILIPPINES	ASP	1	6,308,601	723	20	8.73	4,863,527	562,532	882,541	389	109	225
UNDP	SRI LANKA	ASP	1	1,475,506	60	6	24.59	902,397	223,097	350,011	9	17	34
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP	1	2,085,037	187	5	11.15	-	811,655	1,273,382	0	61	126
UNDP	THAILAND	ASP	1	10,900,854	2,223	45	4.90	6,467,653	1,725,738	2,707,463	1,030	389	804
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP	1	802,106	220	4	3.65	678,854	47,979	75,273	80	46	94
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC:</b>				<b>129,230,417</b>	<b>19,942</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>6.48</b>	<b>62,674,562</b>	<b>25,908,592</b>	<b>40,647,263</b>	<b>7,201</b>	<b>4,149</b>	<b>8,592</b>
UNDP	GEORGIA	EUR	1	116,749	4	1	29.19	67,855	19,033	29,861	0	1	3
UNDP	MOLDOVA	EUR	1	254,150	22	1	11.55	125,786	49,969	78,395	0	7	15
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR EUROPE:</b>				<b>370,899</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14.27</b>	<b>193,641</b>	<b>69,002</b>	<b>108,256</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC	1	8,397,489	1,134	28	7.41	5,832,539	998,473	1,566,477	595	176	363
UNDP	BAHAMAS	LAC	1	161,399	13	1	12.42	95,758	25,553	40,089	0	4	9
UNDP	BELIZE	LAC	1	61,125	2	1	30.56	-	23,794	37,331	0	1	1
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	146,000	14	1	10.43	131,435	5,670	8,895	0	5	9
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC	1	23,614,565	3,390	85	6.97	10,057,192	5,277,559	8,279,814	1,880	492	1,018
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC	1	8,558,340	808	18	10.59	6,909,343	641,915	1,007,082	470	110	228
UNDP	COSTA RICA	LAC	1	1,834,478	87	8	21.09	733,537	428,570	672,371	27	20	40
UNDP	CUBA	LAC	1	283,338	52	2	5.45	233,836	19,270	30,232	51	0	1
UNDP	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	LAC	1	1,801,560	189	8	9.53	270,540	595,989	935,031	31	51	107
UNDP	EL SALVADOR	LAC	1	730,653	58	3	12.60	195,431	208,349	326,873	18	13	27
UNDP	GUATEMALA	LAC	1	947,163	81	5	11.69	747,924	77,559	121,680	39	14	28
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC	1	768,465	99	2	7.76	631,622	53,270	83,573	98	0	1

TABLE 4: Ongoing (Investment, Recycling and Methyl Bromide) Projects by Country: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan

February 15, 2000

Agency	Country	Region	LVC	Approvals by Ex. Committee through December 1999				Disbursement			Phase Out		
				Value \$	ODP from Approvals	Number of Projects	Cost Effectiveness	Through December 1999 (\$)	In 2000 (\$)	After 2000 (\$)	Through December 1999 (ODP)	In 2000 (ODP)	After 2000 (ODP)
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		15,862,878	2,243	28	7.07	12,088,546	1,469,257	2,305,076	1,820	138	285
UNDP	PANAMA	LAC		666,761	85	3	7.84	492,820	67,711	106,230	55	10	20
UNDP	PARAGUAY	LAC	1	405,600	56	1	7.24	257,468	57,664	90,468	46	3	7
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	3,377,180	248	12	13.62	2,802,394	223,750	351,035	107	46	95
UNDP	TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO	LAC	1	343,559	36	2	9.54	135,710	80,911	126,939	0	12	24
UNDP	URUGUAY	LAC	1	1,102,375	115	5	9.59	1,004,008	38,292	60,075	108	2	5
UNDP	VENEZUELA	LAC		4,145,244	532	13	7.79	3,070,869	418,228	656,146	165	120	247
<b>SUBTOTAL FOR LATIN AMERICA:</b>				<b>73,208,172</b>	<b>9,242</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>7.92</b>	<b>45,690,972</b>	<b>10,711,783</b>	<b>16,805,416</b>	<b>5,510</b>	<b>1,215</b>	<b>2,517</b>
<b>ALL REGIONS</b>				<b>227,754,876</b>	<b>33,278</b>	<b>745</b>	<b>6.84</b>	<b>125,000,000</b>	<b>40,000,000</b>	<b>62,754,876</b>	<b>14,853</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>12,425</b>
<b>SUPPORT COSTS</b>				<b>29,488,057</b>									
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>				<b>257,242,933</b>									

- Footnotes:
- (1) Implementing agencies will only provide data for those sectors/categories for which there are funded or planned activities corresponding to the 1998 business plan.
  - (2) Activities included in the table are all investment projects, Recovery/Recycling projects and MBr Demonstration Projects.
  - (3) In some cases, project implementation may have occurred but the financial transactions may not have been completed.
  - (4) The amount of ODP in the proposal that led to the approval.
  - (5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations
  - (5) Disbursements do NOT include obligations

**TABLE 5: Programme Development by Country: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan**

**February 15, 2000**

Agency	Country			Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
	Country	Region	LVC	Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	EGYPT	AFR		5,000	0	1	450,000	0	338			
UNDP	LIBYA	AFR		0	35,000	3	400,000	41	110			
UNDP	MALAWI	AFR	1	6,000	0	1	300,000	0	132			
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		0	30,000	8	970,000	160	0			
UNDP	TANZANIA	AFR	1	5,000	0	1	290,700	39	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		0	70,000	9	8,890,000	815	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		50,000	80,000	12	5,020,000	523	0			
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		0	65,000	7	2,420,000	271	0			
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		5,000	50,000	8	3,250,000	295	0			
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		0	50,000	6	1,220,000	151	0			
UNDP	PHILIPPINES	ASP		0	15,000	1	234,000	40	0			
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		15,000	20,000	5	822,000	95	0			
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		5,000	50,000	3	390,000	56	0			
UNDP	GLOBAL	GLO	1	0	120,000	12	1,521,570	120	0			
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		0	55,000	6	1,445,000	187	0			
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	10			
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		0	160,000	17	5,810,000	555	0			
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		10,000	20,000	2	680,000	50	60			
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC		0	15,000	1	410,000	60	0			
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC	1	0	15,000	1	39,000	5	0			
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		25,000	15,000	2	854,750	39	405			
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	45,000	0	2	175,000	4	5			
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>191,000</b>	<b>865,000</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>35,792,020</b>	<b>3,506</b>	<b>1060</b>			
<b>Support Costs</b>				<b>215,830</b>	<b>977,450</b>		<b>40,444,983</b>					
							<b>Minus 15% Overprogramming</b>					
							<b>35,169,550</b>					
							<b>Adding the Prep.Assistance</b>					
							<b>36,147,000</b>					

**The contents of the GLOBAL Programme is explained in the following two footnotes:**

Footnote 1: Will cover R&R projects to be formulated jointly with UNEP. While this entry is shown as only one line in the table, it will actually cover an estimated 6 LVC countries out of the following list of 9 countries: Djibouti, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua-New-Guinea, Paraguay, Surinam, Yemen (In a few countries it is uncertain at this stage whether R&R can be developed : D.R.Congo, Maldives, Western Samoa)

Footnote 2: Will also cover End-User Sector for Commercial Refrigeration. While this entry is shown as only one line in the table, it will actually cover an estimated 6 LVC countries out of the following list of 16 countries: Benin, Burkino Faso, Centrafrique, Chad, Congo-Br, Cote d'Ivoire, El-Salvador, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guinee, Mali, Niger, Panama, Senegal, Sri Lanka. A survey has been initiated.

Footnote 3: The result of this global approach as proposed, is that UNDP could submit projects in between 5 - 17 LVC's depending on how many have the prerequisite policy measures in place, as mandated by the ExCom.

TABLE 5A: Programme Development by Country, Sector and Sub-sector: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan

February 15, 2000

Agency	Country			Sub-sector	Project Preparation		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years			Policy Issue	
	Country	Region	LVC		Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000		
UNDP	EGYPT	AFR		Halon Recycling	5,000	0	1	450,000	0	338					
UNDP	LIBYA	AFR		Foam Flexible PUF		15,000	2	250,000	41	0				yes	
UNDP	LIBYA	AFR		Halon Recycling		20,000	1	150,000	0	110				yes	
UNDP	MALAWI	AFR	1	Fumigation Soil - Other	6,000	0	1	300,000	0	132					
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		Foam General	0	30,000	8	970,000	160	0				yes	
UNDP	TANZANIA	AFR	1	Foam Flexible PUF	5,000	0	1	290,700	39	0					
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	35,000	7	1,625,000	220	0					
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Refrigeration Dom HC	0	35,000	1	1,265,000	95	0					
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Solvents CFC-113	0	0	1	6,000,000	500	0				yes	
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Aerosol	0	20,000	2	580,000	150	0					
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Integral Skin	10,000	30,000	6	770,000	50	0					
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	1	1,070,000	151	0					
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	40,000	0	3	2,600,000	172	0					
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	40,000	5	1,160,000	154	0					
UNDP	INDONESIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	25,000	2	1,260,000	117	0					
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	5,000	0	1	900,000	115	0					
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	30,000	4	1,370,000	102	0					
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Refrigeration Domestic	0	20,000	3	980,000	78	0					
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	4	940,000	124	0					
UNDP	MALAYSIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	20,000	2	280,000	27	0					
UNDP	PHILIPPINES	ASP		Foam Flexible PUF	0	15,000	1	234,000	40	0					
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		Foam Flexible PUF	15,000	0	1	342,000	55	0					
UNDP	SYRIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	20,000	4	480,000	40	0					
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Aerosol	5,000	10,000	1	90,000	25	0					
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Foam General	0	20,000	1	150,000	16	0					
UNDP	VIET NAM	ASP		Refrigeration Recycling	0	20,000	1	150,000	15	0					
UNDP	GLOBAL (footnote 1)	GLO	1	Refrigeration Recycling	0	60,000	6	681,570	60	0					
UNDP	GLOBAL (footnote 2)	GLO	1	Refrigeration End-Users	0	60,000	6	840,000	60	0				yes	
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		Foam Flexible PUF	0	15,000	1	385,000	64	0					
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	25,000	4	775,000	103	0					
UNDP	ARGENTINA	LAC		Refrigeration Commercial	0	15,000	1	285,000	20	0					
UNDP	BOLIVIA	LAC	1	Fumigation Soil - Other	20,000	0	1	200,000	0	10					
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam Integral Skin	0	70,000	10	2,400,000	150	0					
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	2	1,170,000	165	0					
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	2	1,270,000	165	0				yes	
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Refrigeration Commercial	0	30,000	3	970,000	75	0					
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		Aerosol Sterilants	0	20,000	1	180,000	50	0					
UNDP	CHILE	LAC		Fumigation Soil - Other	10,000	0	1	500,000	0	60					
UNDP	COLOMBIA	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	0	15,000	1	410,000	60	0					
UNDP	JAMAICA	LAC	1	Refrigeration Commercial	0	15,000	1	39,000	5	0					
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		Foam Rigid PUF	5,000	15,000	1	304,750	39	0					
UNDP	MEXICO	LAC		Halon Recycling	20,000	0	1	550,000	0	405					
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	Foam Polystyrene/Polyethylene	20,000	0	1	25,000	4	0					
UNDP	PERU	LAC	1	Fumigation Soil - Strawberries	25,000	0	1	150,000	0	5					
Grand Total					191,000	865,000	109	35,792,020	3,506	1060	0	0	0		
Total incl. Support Cost					215,830	977,450		40,444,983							
					Minus 15% Overprogramming			35,169,550							
					Adding the Prep.Assistance			36,147,000							

Footnote 1: Will cover R&R projects to be formulated jointly with UNEP. While this entry is shown as only one line in the table, it will actually cover an estimated 6 LVC countries out of the following list of 9 countries: Djibouti, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Papua-New-Guinea, Paraguay, Surinam, Yemen (In a few countries it is uncertain at this stage whether R&R can be developed : D.R.Congo, Maldives, Western Samoa)

Footnote 2: Will cover End-User Sector for Commercial Refrigeration. While this entry is shown as only one line in the table, it will actually cover an estimated 6 LVC countries out of the following list of 16 countries: Benin, Burkino Faso, Centrafrique, Chad, Congo-Br, Cote d'Ivoire, El-Salvador, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Guinee, Mali, Niger, Panama, Senegal, Sri Lanka. A survey has been initiated.

TABLE 5B: Contingency Table: UNDP 2000 Revised Business Plan

February 15, 2000

Agency	Country			Sector and Sub-sector	Project Prepararion		Project Submission Year of Plan (2000)				Project Submissions - Following Years		
	Country	Re-gion	LVC		Surplus PRP from 1999	PRP in 2000	Number of Projects in 2000	Value \$ in 2000	CFC ODP in 2000	Non-CFC ODP in 2000	Number of Projects after 2000	Value \$ after 2000	ODP after 2000
UNDP	BRAZIL	LAC		Foam General	0	30,000	5	1,640,000	172	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Foam Flexible PUF	0	40,000	4	2,000,000	322	0			
UNDP	CHINA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	60,000	8	4,000,000	511	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	2	420,000	60	0			
UNDP	INDIA	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	10,000	2	400,000	27	0			
UNDP	IRAN	ASP		Refrigeration Commercial	0	20,000	2	600,000	40	0			
UNDP	NIGERIA	AFR		Foam Rigid PUF	0	30,000	2	420,000	60	0			
<b>Grand Total</b>					<b>0</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9,480,000</b>	<b>1192</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Support Costs</b>					-	<b>28,600</b>		<b>1,232,400</b>					
<b>Total Incl Support Cost</b>					-	<b>248,600</b>		<b>10,712,400</b>					
<b>Minus 15% Overprogramming</b>								<b>9,105,540</b>					
								<b>Adding the Prep.Assistance</b>					<b>9,354,140</b>