



联合国
环境规划署

Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/57
25 October 2002
CHINESE
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

执行蒙特利尔议定书
多边基金执行委员会
第三十八次会议
2002年11月20日至22日，罗马

以效绩为基础的全行业和全国 ODS 淘汰协定/
计划的编制、执行和管理准则修订稿（根据第
37/67 号决定采取的行动）

说明

本文件载有以效绩为基础的全行业和全国 ODS 淘汰计划编制、执行和管理准则，已根据第 37/67 号决定对这些准则进行了修订。修订工作是分两步完成的。第一次修订汇集了在第三十七次会议上就 UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/37/65 号文件发表的修订提案、评论和询问以及秘书处作出的答复，秘书处于 2002 年 9 月初完成了这次修订，并将其送交执行委员会成员以供审查和发表进一步评论。

共有执行委员会的 5 个成员和 3 个执行机构就第一次修订稿发表了评论（见附件三）。秘书处在编写这一稿的《准则》时酌情采纳了这些评论，并在案文中用***黑体加斜体***标明了这些改动。然而，仍有若干问题需要执行委员会进行更多的审议和作出决定。与这些问题有关的案文在具体段落中用***[黑体加斜体]***表示，有关段落之后还附有关于所涉问题的简短说明。

此外，秘书处还编写了作为以效绩为基础的淘汰计划的一部分所签署协定的标准案文草稿。该草稿见《准则》的附件二。

导言

1. 自从 1997 年以来, 多边基金便在其业务中采用了以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰供资协定, 这种协定正越来越多地为某些第 5 条国家所采用, 将其优先选择为对本国全行业和/或全国淘汰方案进行管理的模式。以效绩为基础的淘汰计划的优点, 是使执行委员会的供资承诺与有关国家履行《蒙特利尔议定书》所规定义务的承诺挂钩, 因此, 这些计划中的效绩目标必须符合各种受控物质的淘汰时间表。
2. 迄今为止所编制和执行的计划显示出很大程度的相似性和趋同性, 但在某些方面, 这些计划之间仍存在格式和实质内容上的差异。由于这样的计划正在成为多边基金的最主要的供资模式, 当前制定这些准则的努力提供了一个机会, 以便把在运用这个供资模式方面所积累的经验正式化, 并在那些迄今尚未采取一致办法的方面实现统一。
3. 然而, 我们还意识到, 各国的情况和需要都有所不同。《准则》如果试图囊括所有情况, 将是不现实的。因此, 在制定《准则》的时候采用了一个开放的方式, 其目的是规定出在制订和执行这样的以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划时应该遵循的普遍原则和程序。与此同时, 应该留出足够的余地, 以使《准则》的使用者能够对其予以扩展和调整, 以便使之符合自己的具体需要。准则中所提出的具体例子以及为年度执行方案所提议的格式尤其如此, 大多属于启发性质。
4. 准则包括四个部分: 第一部分—目的、适用性、定义、结构和提交期限; 第二部分—以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰提案的内容; 第三部分—关于以效绩为基础的淘汰计划的协定所具备的内容; 第四部分—以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划的执行。

第一部分—目的、适用性、定义、结构和提交期限

目的

5. 《以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划的编制、执行和管理准则》(下文简称《准则》) 的目的是为编制、执行和管理以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划规定出标准的程序。《准则》的使用者可以对准则进行扩展和调整, 以使之符合自己的具体需要。

适用性

6. 《准则》应该适用于执行委员会将签署的使其在原则上同意作出资金承诺, 并根据在有关计划中商定和具体规定的效绩目标, 分若干年支付这些承付资金的所有计划。这些计划所规定的效绩目标在最起码的程度上, 应该符合《蒙特利尔议定书》就有关计划中包括的所有受控物质所规定的、并适用于有关国家的淘汰时间表。这些计划包括行业一级以及国家一级 ODS 淘汰计划。全国淘汰计划可以包括某个受控物质的全部剩余消费量、《蒙特利尔议定书》下某个附件/类别中的各种受控物质, 或一个国家内的所有受控物质。
7. 一般而言, 不应把《准则》适用于旨在完成某个次级行业的淘汰工作的项目或方案, 次级行业的例子包括: 泡沫塑料行业下的硬质泡沫塑料、软质泡沫塑料、聚苯乙烯/聚乙烯

次级行业，或制冷行业的家用制冷、商用制冷、所谓的制造业制冷和汽车空调次级行业。除非剩余的消费量很高，足以有理由举办一个次级行业淘汰计划，否则，这样的次级行业项目应该或是列入一个全行业计划，或是列入一个涉及所有附件 A/一类物质的淘汰计划，或是作为一个编组和/或结束性总体项目来举办。

定义

8. 现将为《准则》的目的所使用的术语定义如下：

- **物质：**受《蒙特利尔议定书》控制的某个消耗臭氧层物质。
- **附件/类别：**《蒙特利尔议定书》中对各种物质进行编组的附件和类别。这些附件/类别包括：
 - 《蒙特利尔议定书》附件 A 一类物质，包括 CFC-11、CFC-12、CFC-113、CFC-114 和 CFC-115；
 - 《蒙特利尔议定书》附件 A 二类物质，包括哈龙 1211、哈龙 1301 和哈龙-2402；
 - 附件 B 一类（CFC-13）、二类（CTC）和三类（TCA）物质；和
 - 附件 E：甲基溴。
- **行业：**制造或使用一种或多种 ODS 的工业行业。这些行业包括：
 - ODS 生产；
 - 气雾剂；
 - 泡沫塑料；
 - 制冷；
 - 清洗；
 - 计量吸入器；
 - 消毒剂；
 - 消防；
 - 甲基溴的所有受控用途；和
 - 加工剂。
- **全行业 ODS 淘汰计划**的目标是淘汰某个工业行业中某个受控物质的所有符合供资条件的消费量或产量；对于甲基溴，则是淘汰甲基溴的某种受控应用。
- **全国 ODS 淘汰计划**的目标是消除某个国家内某一种和某几种受控物质的全部符合供资条件的消费量，这些物质的例子包括附件 A 一类物质（各类 CFC）、附件 A 二类物质（哈龙）或附件 E 物质（甲基溴的所有受控应用）。

结构

9. 以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划应该包括两个部分：一项以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰提案, 和一个将在法律上使执行委员会和有关国家对计划所涉期间作出的承诺正式化的协定。在能够核准提供资金之前, 必须提交第一次年度执行方案以作为该计划的补充, 这个方案将成为核准第一期资金的依据。

提交期限

10. *除非另有协议, 否则应在执行委员会举行会议之前 14 个星期提交全国/全行业淘汰计划, 并同时提交协定草案和第一次年度执行方案提案, 以便秘书处能够进行详尽的审查。秘书处在进行此种审查时可以聘用顾问, 并可以酌情派遣其工作人员和顾问前往有关作实地考察。这种考察的经费应从秘书处的预算中拨款 (预算项目 1200 - 顾问费)。*

第二部分 - 以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰提案应具备的内容

一般信息

11. 淘汰提案应该包括一般信息, 例如: 国名; 提案类型 (全行业/全国淘汰计划); 提案所涉受控物质的数目; 提案所涉行业和持续时间。

提案的影响

12. 提案应该说明以下影响: 每一种受控物质将被淘汰的 ODP 吨数; 对全国消费量的影响; 这种影响与履约之间的关系。对于附件 A 一类中开列的各类 CFC, 提案应该提供以下数据: 在第 35/57 号决定所确定起点的数量; 自起点以来已提供淘汰资金的消费量; 截至提交提案时尚未得到淘汰资金的符合供资条件的剩余消费量; 如果是全行业计划, 应说明提案中的淘汰量在尚未得到淘汰资金的剩余消费量中所占百分比。

13. 关于其他受控物质, 提案应该提供以下数据: 在提交提案之前的最近两年所报告的符合供资条件的消费量; 已经得到淘汰资金, 但截至提交提案时尚未淘汰的消费量; 在减去得到淘汰资金但尚未淘汰的消费量之后, 得出的截至提交提案时尚未得到淘汰资金的符合供资条件的消费量; 提案中的消费量在尚未得到淘汰资金的消费量中所占百分比。应该特别注意确定不符合供资条件的消费量所占百分比, 这些消费量指的是在 1995 年 7 月 25 日之后安装的生产能力所致消费量。

14. 应该根据《蒙特利尔议定书》为所涉受控物质规定的控制时间表来评估所提议的消费量削减时间表。提议的消费量削减时间表应该至少符合《蒙特利尔议定书》的控制时间表。

数据的收集及核对

15. 提案应该提供以下数据: 提案所涉每一种受控物质的符合供资条件的剩余消费量在各行业之间的分布情况, 即说明每个行业的剩余消费量; 得到淘汰资金但尚未淘汰的消费量; 在减去得到淘汰资金但尚未淘汰的消费量之后, 得出的截至提交提案时尚未得到淘汰资金

的消费量。

16. 应在提案中说明在收集数据并对其进行核对时所采用的程序，包括说明参与机构的名称、数据的来源和所采用的方式。如果采用了抽样方式，应该说明样本的代表性。数据来源应该适当地多样化，以保证数据的可信性和可靠性。这些数据来源应该涉及 ODS 供应过程的所有环节，即，把所涉物质的订购、进口、分销商和制造厂家都包括在内。这些来源可以包括，在并不限于：海关、关于工业使用情况的数据、企业普查、压缩机制造厂家的数据和其他数据来源。

执行战略和执行计划

17. 提案应该说明为实现提议的年度削减量将采取的战略，特别是说明为了实现提案中的各项目标，将以何种方式在有关国家内管理 ODS 的供应和需求。应在说明中讨论减少 ODS 供应的政策工具，例如进口配额、价格控制措施和 ODS 非法贸易管制措施。还应说明为逐步减少对 ODS 的需求将采取的步骤（例如在计划减少制冷设备维修业的需求的同时完成对制造业的改造）。

18. 上述战略应该包括一个以本国实际情况为基础的执行时间框架。为此目的，需要评估如果只进行很少的投资，但同时进行有的放矢的宣传运动，可以减少多少当前的消费量，并根据实际减少的消费量对这种宣传运动的效果进行评价。

19. 应该制定每个行业的执行方案，说明将如何逐年减少对 ODS 的需求。应该在方案中说明工业界和政府的活动所作出的贡献。这种说明应该包括以下方面的年度数据：将实现的削减量；进行中项目的削减量；制造业中新完成的改造项目的削减量；维修业的削减量；政府的政策性控制措施作出的贡献。

20. 关于制冷设备维修行业，提案应该说明为减少对各类 CFC 的依赖将实施的战略。这项战略可以包括像以下这样的措施：法律和经济奖惩措施，以及针对供应商、维修技师和设备业主的惩罚性措施；维修技师的培训；宣传活动；通过海关对使用 CFC 的新设备和新车实行控制；禁止引进针对售后市场的使用 CFC 的汽车空调系统；逐步淘汰现有的使用 CFC 的设备和车辆；逐步增加再循环的 CFC 的供应。

增支费用

21. 提案应该提供增支费用的计算依据和理由。

22. 关于工业改造，应该尽量提供以下数据：企业数目、提案所涉行业/次级行业、企业的 ODS 消费量和基准设备、生产能力的安装日期、生产水平、所涉国家有关行业/次级行业内得到淘汰资金的项目的平均成本效益值、向非第 5 条国家的出口数量。应该利用这些数据来计算每个次级行业的增支费用。如果查明单个项目的淘汰费用可能超过 100 万美元的大型企业，应该在计划中附上分项目，并以通常方式确定这些分项目的增支费用。

23. 在制冷设备维修行业，提供的数据应该包括国内可以长期维持的维修厂的估计数目、

维修厂的典型基准设备、制冷设备维修业当前的技师估计人数、每个维修厂每年的平均 CFC 消费量估计数、所需要的回收和再循环设备的数目、需要这些设备的理由，包括提供每年的 ODS 回收数量估计数、以及其他细节。

24. *[关于非投资活动,应该根据第 35/57 号决定计算在总的 ODP 基准数量中淘汰的数量。]*

所涉问题: 第 35/57 号决定所规定的 12.1 美元/公斤的成本效益为计算非投资活动的费用提供了一个办法, 然而, 这个办法不适用于在以效绩为基础的淘汰计划中计算非投资活动的费用。

25. 关于管理费用, 应该提供数据来说明除了在体制建设项目之下提供资金之外, 再为项目管理提供经费的理由, 并说明将接受这项经费的项目管理部门的作用和责任。

管理

26. 应该说明为执行淘汰提案所建立的管理结构。应该在这项说明中清楚地指明政府部门、工业机构、学术机构和顾问将各自承担的责任。管理部门的问责制度至关重要。因此, 应该指定一个政府实体来对项目的管理负责。

27. 还应该介绍参与淘汰提案的管理和实施的执行机构。如果参与的执行机构不止一个, 应该指定主要执行机构与合作机构, 并为每个参与的执行机构确定清楚的作用和责任。

监测和评价

28. 应该清楚地说明将对所涉计划进行的财务监督和实务工作监督, 在这方面, 应该说明参与机构的名称、每个机构的作用和责任、提出报告的类型和时间间隔。应该作出适当的规定, 以保证能够独立地确认协定中规定的各项效绩指标的实现情况, *包括在多边基金的监测和评价工作方案中列入定期评价活动。*

效绩指标和付款时间表

29. 付款时间表应该规定每年为实现效绩目标所需支付的资金数额。效绩目标除其他外包括: ODS 消费量的上限、年度 ODS 淘汰量目标、以及拟议在所涉年份举办的投资活动和非投资活动。

第三部分—关于以效绩为基础的淘汰计划的协定应具备的内容

一般信息

30. 关于淘汰计划的协定应该列入一般信息, 例如: 国名; 计划的类型 (全行业淘汰计划或全国淘汰计划); 协定所涉受控物质; 协定的有效期; 在原则上同意提供的经费总额。

协定的影响

31. 协定应该说明每一种受控物质将被淘汰的 ODP 吨数。对于附件 A 一类中开列的各类 CFC，协定应该提供以下数据：在第 35/57 号决定所确定起点的的数据；自起点以来已提供资金淘汰的消费量；截至提交协定时尚未得到淘汰资金的符合供资条件的剩余消费量；如果是全行业计划，应说明协定中的淘汰量在尚未得到淘汰资金的剩余消费量中所占百分比。

32. 关于其他受控物质，协定应该提供以下数据：在提交协定前的最近两年所报告的符合供资条件的消费量；已经得到淘汰资金，但截至提交协定时尚未淘汰的消费量；在减去得到淘汰资金但尚未淘汰的消费量之后，得出的截至提交协定时尚未得到淘汰资金的符合供资条件的消费量；协定中的消费量在尚未得到淘汰资金的消费量中所占百分比。

绩效目标、成就指标和付款时间表

33. 应该为所涉受控物质的年度削减数量规定绩效目标，首先是规定协定核准年份的绩效目标。绩效目标应该至少达到《蒙特利尔议定书》为所涉每一种受控物质规定的控制时间表中的目标。

34. 应该为每个年度目标规定指标，以用于核实及核对目标的实现情况。应该尽量使这些指标能够核查和量化。例如，这些指标可以包括：受控物质的进口数据和消费数据（供应和需求）、投资项目和相关淘汰工作的完成情况、运行中的回收和再循环中心的数目、应该在特定日期之前颁布和实施的政府政策，例如进口控制措施、以及其他可以量化的指标。

35. 付款时间表应该规定每年为实现绩效目标所需支付的资金数额。*[这样的时间表应该符合执行委员会关于提供资金的指南。]*

36. 可以像下面这样用表格形式开列这三个组成部分：

年份	绩效目标 (ODP 吨数)	《蒙特利尔议定书》的控制时 间表所允许的消费量 (ODP 吨数)	成就指标	付款数 (美元)

付款条件

37. 应该清楚地阐明有关国家政府应该在发放年度付款之前履行的条件。这些条件除其他外，应该包括：独立地确认已经在淘汰资金所涉期间实现商定的目标，为下一个供资期间提交了一份年度执行方案，以及确认已经进行了在上一个年度执行方案中开列的活动。

年度供资周期的划分

38. 应该在协定中划分年度供资周期，包括说明：应在每年的什么时间向执行委员会提交

资金申请；应在什么时间就上一个供资期间的目标的执行情况提交独立核查报告；应在什么时间提交新的供资期间的年度执行方案。该计划应该注意到为稽核淘汰效绩所需要的时间，从而明确指出，将把以前的哪一个供资期间作为核查的基础。

使用所核准资金的灵活性

39. 可以[必须]在协定中列入一个条款，说明应该允许有关国家根据国内不断变化的情况，为实现商定目标在重新调配已核准的资金或部分资金方面具有的灵活性。然而，应该结合年度执行方案核准这种对资金的重新调配，并在核查报告中予以说明。

所涉问题：关于灵活性的条款应该是强制性的还是仅供选择？

监测和评价

40. 应该清楚地说明将对所涉计划进行的财务监督和实务工作监督，在这方面，应该说明参与机构的名称、每个机构的作用和责任、提出报告的类型和时间间隔。应该作出适当的规定，以保证能够独立地确认协定中规定的各项效绩指标的实现情况，包括由秘书处的高级监测和评价干事进行定期评价。

关于未能履行承诺的规定

41. 应该针对未能履行在协定下所作承诺的情况作出规定。这些规定应该包括即使有关国家实现了所规定的 ODS 淘汰量，执行委员会也无法提供在协定中商定的资金数额的情况。这些规定还应包括即使执行委员会已经履行了提供所商定资金的义务，有关国家仍无法达到商定的 ODS 削减目标的情况。

所涉问题：执行机构在以效绩为基础的淘汰计划中应承担什么责任？如果像下文第 43 段所述，在协定中说明执行机构的作用和职责，是否适当？或是否应该在有关国家与执行机构另外达成的一项协定中处理这个问题？

管理责任

42. 有关国家应该对协定的执行和管理担负全面责任，以保证实现协定中规定的各项目标。然而，该国应该选择一个执行机构来协助执行协定。如果有关国家的政府决定请一个以上的执行机构（包括双边机构）提供服务，应该指明主要执行机构和给予合作的实施机构。

43. 应该在协定中说明有关国家、主要机构和每个给予合作的实施机构的作用和责任。

关于行政费用的安排

44. 应该在协定中根据执行委员会关于行政费用的政策，为支付执行机构的行政费用作出安排。

第四部分—以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划的执行

45. 以效绩为基础的 ODS 淘汰计划的执行应该通过编制、提交以及核准年度执行方案来实现。

编制和提交年度执行方案和资金申请

46. 主要执行机构应该代表有关国家政府向执行委员会提交年度执行方案和资金申请，以供审批。核实已经在上一个年度实现了规定的目标是为计划所涉年度发放资金的先决条件，因此，在提交年度执行方案的同时还应提交效绩核查报告。如果由于在结束上一个年度的执行方案之后为完成核查所需要的时间，无法提交该核查报告，应该随同年度执行方案提交一份临时的执行情况审查报告。

年度执行方案的内容

47. 以下的建议是应该列入年度执行方案的主要项目，然而，下列每个项目下的细节只是为了举例，应该根据每个淘汰计划的具体情况予以调整。

- **ODS 淘汰目标：**应与协定中商定的目标相同。应该提供指标，其中可以包括上一个年度和方案年度的 ODS 供应、需求和库存数据。
- **工业界采取的行动：**应该包括在所涉制造业和制冷设备维修业计划淘汰的 ODS 数量。对于制造业，应在计划中开列每个行业/次级行业将完成的工业改造项目数目和将实现的 ODS 淘汰量。对于制冷设备维修行业，应在计划中说明将采取的行动，例如 ODS 的回收和再循环，并说明这些行动的预计影响，这种影响可以用将再循环的 ODP 吨数来表示。
- **技术援助：**应该说明计划举办的赋予能力的活动、这些活动的目标、所针对的目标群体以及活动的影响。
- **政府采取的行动：**应该说明计划采取的措施和执行时间表。这些措施可以是针对 ODS 的供应和需求颁布和实施政府政策以及举办宣传运动。
- **年度预算：**应当开列将在当年进行的各种活动将引起的计划开支。
- **执行机构的行政费用：**应该说明机构名称、所涉机构在计划年度的开支计划、商定的行政费率以及将支付的行政费用总额。

48. 附件一为举例说明的目的以列表形式开列了上述各个项目。

附件一
年度执行方案的格式

这个提议的格式是供第5条国家用于为执行以效绩为基础的ODS淘汰计划编制年度执行方案；但是，应该根据每项计划的具体需要对这个格式进行修订。

1. 数据

国家 _____

计划年度 _____

已完成年数 _____

计划之下的剩余年数 _____

上个年度的 ODS 消费量目标 _____

计划年度的 ODS 消费量目标 _____

申请经费数额 _____

主要执行机构 _____

合作机构 _____

2. 目标

目标:				
指标		上个年度	计划年度	削减数量
ODS 的供应	进口数量			
	产量*			
	共计 (1)			
ODS 的需求	制造业			
	维修业			
	库存			
	共计 (2)			

* 适用于 ODS 生产国。

3. 工业界采取的行动

行业	上个年度的消费量 (1)	计划年度的消费量 (2)	计划年度内的削减量 (1)-(2)	已完成项目数	与维修有关的活动数	ODS 淘汰量 (ODP 吨数)
制造业						
气雾剂						
泡沫塑料						
制冷						
清洗						
其他						
共计						
维修业						
制冷						
共计						
总计						

4. 技术援助

拟议的活动:

目的:

目标群体:

影响:

5. 政府采取的行动

规划的政策/活动	执行时间表
控制 ODS 进口的政策类型: <i>维修及其他</i>	
宣传教育	
其他	

6. 年度预算

活动	计划的开支(美元)
共计	

7. 行政费用

附件二

(立约国名称) 与多边基金执行委员会关于淘汰消耗臭氧层物质的协定草案

1. 本协定是[国名]（下称“立约国”）与执行委员会就根据《议定书》的时间规定，于[最后完成日期]之前彻底淘汰附录 1-A 所列行业对消耗臭氧层物质（下称“规定物质”）的受控使用所达成的谅解。
2. 立约国同意根据附录 2-A 第一行规定的年度淘汰目标（下称“目标”）和本协定逐步淘汰在[行业名称]中使用的所有规定物质。年度淘汰目标将至少符合《蒙特利尔议定书》规定的淘汰时间规定。立约国同意，该国一旦接受本协定，而且执行委员会履行了第 3 款所述供资义务，该国便不得申请或接受多边基金的与规定物质有关的进一步资助。
3. 如果在本协定中承担义务的立约国遵守了在以下各款中规定的义务，执行委员会在原则上同意向该国提供附录 2-A 第 9 行中开列的资金数额（下称“资金”）。执行委员会在原则上将于附录 3-A 具体指明的各次执委会会议上提供这些资金（下称“核准供资时间表”）。
4. 立约国将遵守附录 2-A 第*和*行为了每种规定物质开列的消费量限制。该国还将如本协定第 8 款所述，接受通过有关的执行机构对遵守这些消费量限制的情况进行的独立核查。
5. 除非立约国至少在付款时间表开列的所涉执行委员会会议之前[数字]天满足下列条件，否则执行委员会将不根据付款时间表提供资金：
 - (a) 立约国达到了为所涉年度规定的目标；
 - (b) 已经按第 8 款的规定独立核实，这些目标已经达到；
 - (c) 立约国基本上完成了上次年度执行方案规定的所有行动；
 - (d) 立约国使用附录 4-A（“年度执行方案”）中的表格提交了申请的经费所涉年度的年度执行方案，而且该方案已经得到执行委员会的批准。
6. 立约国将保证对在本协定之下进行的活动进行准确的监测。附录 5-A（“监测”）开列的机构将根据该附录所述作用和责任进行监测并提出监测报告。这项监测的结果也将经过第 8 款所述独立核查。
7. 尽管提供的资金数额取决于立约国为履行本协定所规定义务需要的资金的估计数，但执行委员会同意，立约国可以把资金派作其他用途，只要能够证明，这些用途有助于尽可能顺利地根据本协定实现淘汰，无论在决定本协定下的供资数额时是否曾把资金用途考虑在内。然而，必须把资金用途中的任何变化事先列入立约国的年度执行方案，并经执行委

员会批准，一如第 5(d)分款所述，而且，此种变化需经过第 8 款所述独立核查。

8. 立约国同意全面负责本协定的管理和执行，并全面负责该国为履行本协定为其规定的义务而举办的所有活动，或为此代表其举办的所有活动，的管理和进行。[主要执行机构的名称]（下称“主要执行机构”）同意担任主要执行机构，[[其他执行机构的名称]（下称“合作执行机构”）同意在主要执行机构的牵头下担任合作执行机构]，以进行立约国根据本协定进行的活动。主要执行机构将负责进行附录 6-A 开列的各项活动，其中包括，但并不仅限于，进行独立的核查。立约国还同意在多边基金的监测和评价方案之下进行定期的评价活动。[合作执行机构将负责进行附录 6-B 中开列的各项活动。] 执行委员会在原则上同意向主要执行机构[以及合作执行机构]提供附录 2-A 第 10 行中开列的费用。

9. 立约国同意，该国如果无论处于何种原因，没有达到为消除[行业]中的规定物质所确立的目标，或在其他方面没有遵守本协定，将无权根据付款时间表获得资金。执行委员会可酌情决定，在立约国表明，该国已经履行了所有应该在付款时间表规定的下一笔付款之前履行的义务之后，将根据执行委员会决定的经过修订的付款时间表恢复供资。立约国确认，执行委员会可以根据附录 7-A 规定的供资数额，扣除在任何一年未能减少的每一 ODP 吨消费量的资金。

10. 如果执行委员会今后的任何决定对立约国内的任何其他消费行业项目或任何其他相关活动的供资产生影响，均不得以此为根据对本协定中的供资规定进行改动。

11. 立约国将遵守执行委员会和主要执行机构提出的任何合理请求，以帮助本协定的执行。尤其重要的是，立约国将向主要执行机构[以及合作执行机构]提供渠道，以使其获得为核查对本协定的遵守情况所必需的信息。

12. 本协定所载全部协议均是在《蒙特利尔议定书》的范围达成的协议，其所涉义务不超出该议定书的范围。本协定使用的所有术语的含义均是《议定书》为其规定的含义，除非本协定另有定义。

附录 1-A

规定物质

应在此附录中开列根据本协定应该淘汰的消耗臭氧层物质的通用名称。

附件 A:	一类	CFC-11, CFC-12, CFC-113 CFC 114 and CFC-115
	二类	哈龙 1211、哈龙 1301 和哈龙 2402
附件 B:	一类	CFC-13
	二类	CTC
	三类	TCA
附件 E:		甲基溴

附录 2-A
目标和供资

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
《蒙特利尔议定书》淘汰时间表						CFC-50%			CFC-85%		
1. 第一个物质/行业的总消费量允许上限(ODP 吨)											
2. 执行中项目的淘汰量											
3. 本计划之下的新淘汰量											
4. 第一个物质的总年度淘汰量 (ODP 吨)											
5. 第二个物质/行业的总消费量允许上限(ODP 吨)											
6. 执行中项目的淘汰量											
7. 本计划之下的新淘汰量											
8. 第二个物质的总年度淘汰量 (ODP 吨)											
9. 为主要执行机构商定的资金											
10. 主要执行机构的支助费用											
11. 为合作执行机构商定的资金											
12. 合作执行机构的支助费用											
13. 商定资金总额(百万美元)											
14. 机构支助费用总额(百万美元)											

附录 3-A

核准供资时间表

1. 本附录将开列提交年度执行计划供资申请的时间，例如：
 - (a) 最迟应在年度计划所涉年度前一年的最后一次会议上审议供资申请。
 - 或
 - (b) 将在年度计划所涉年度的第一次会议上审议供资申请。

附录 4-A
年度执行计划表格

见《准则》附件一

附录 5-A

监测机构及其作用

(如项目文件所述)

附录 6-A

主要执行机构的作用

1. 主要执行机构将根据以下规定负责在项目文件中具体指明的一系列活动：
 - (a) 根据本协定、该机构具体的内部程序以及立约国的淘汰计划所载规定保证对效绩和财务进行核查；
 - (b) 向执行委员会核实，年度执行方案中规定的目标已经达到，相关的年度活动已经完成；
 - (c) 协助立约国编制年度执行方案；
 - (d) 保证在将来的年度执行方案中体现以前的年度执行方案取得的成就；
 - (e) 报告年度执行方案的执行情况，第一次报告应从第[]年的年度执行方案执行情况开始，在[年]内编写和提交。
 - (f) 保证由适当的独立技术专家进行由主要执行机构负责进行的技术审查；
 - (g) 进行规定的监督视察；
 - (h) 保证存在一个操作机制，以便能够有效和透明地实施年度执行方案以及准确地上报数据；
 - (i) 为执行委员会核查是否已经根据规定的目标消除了消费量；
 - (j) 协调任何协作执行机构进行的活动；
 - (k) 保证利用指标来向立约国付款；和
 - (l) 在接到请求时提供政策、管理和技术支助方面的协助。

附录 6-B

合作执行机构的作用

(将在项目文件中制订并列入本附录)

附录 7-A

在发生违约时削减供资的办法

1. 根据协定第 9 款,可以为在一年当中每一 ODP 吨没有实现的淘汰量减少*美元的供资。

Annex III

**COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND
IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES ON THE FIRST REVISION OF DOCUMENT
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/37/65**

CANADA

COLOMBIA

FINLAND

NETHERLANDS

POLAND

UNDP

UNEP

UNIDO

Guidelines for the Preparation, Implementation and Management of Performance-Based and National Phase-out Plans

Comments from Canada

Paragraphs 4, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 28

Agree with responses and text proposed by the Secretariat.

Paragraph 6, re: *The performance targets established in such plans should, at a minimum, conform with the phase-out schedules of the Montreal Protocol applicable to the countries concerned in relation to all of the controlled substances covered in the plans.*

Paragraph 33, re: *The performance targets should at a minimum meet the control schedules of the Montreal Protocol for each of the controlled substance.*

In response to ExCom Decision 37/20 (a), the 14th Meeting of the Parties may consider whether the ExCom should be given authority to approve projects for countries in non-compliance, when such projects would bring the country into compliance within a short time frame. Therefore, it is advisable to either delay inclusion of the above-mentioned sentences in the Guidelines or to qualify them, for example, with the following words: ***except to the extent that the performance targets conform to the response by the Parties to Decision 37/20(a).***

Paragraph 23

The data to be provided for the servicing sector should include the names of any training institutions to be involved in the training of technicians and responsible for incorporating the training program into their curriculum.

Paragraph 24

Agree with the statement that this paragraph should be deleted, as it is not realistic, for example, to apply one single cost-effectiveness value of US \$12.1/kg to all the different types of non-investment activities that could be considered for the refrigeration servicing sector within countries with greatly varying levels of consumption. Experience from approved Refrigerant Management Plans (RMPs) indicates that the cost-effectiveness of non-investment activities can vary greatly depending on the type of activity, size of the country, level of consumption and other factors. The statement that it is necessary to have some mechanism to cost these non-investment activities is valid, but since the adoption of Decision 31/48 on RMPs, some implementing agencies have actually been estimating the cost-effectiveness of non-investment activities, such as the training of technicians, based on project and country-specific factors, not on a single, theoretical cost-effectiveness value.

Paragraphs 28 and 40

Either one of these paragraphs on monitoring and evaluation should be revised to make them consistent with one another, as paragraph 40 refers to periodic evaluations by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, while paragraph 28 does not.

Paragraph 36

It appears that there should not be a “/” between “ODP” and “tonnes” in the table.

Paragraph 39

No objection to retaining the suggestion that major changes in the plans should be authorized by the ExCom, but it should be noted that ‘major changes’ may need to be elaborated or defined at some point by the ExCom.

Paragraph 40, re: *responsibility of implementing agency if found to be responsible for the inability of country to honour its commitments*

The ExCom has the authority to transfer a project from one agency to another if an agency does not perform its tasks adequately. In addition, delays in the progress of the implementation of national phase-out plans are monitored by the ExCom. If an agency is responsible for a serious delay, it would be expected to remove the reason for the delay as soon as possible and report on its progress at each ExCom meeting if required. Agencies are aware that their performance in implementing such projects would be taken into account by Article 5 countries and the ExCom when considering their involvement in future projects.

Paragraph 44

It seems overly prescriptive to require agreements for national phase-out plans to specify the duration and timing of disbursing of the administrative fees. In order to avoid unnecessary burden for the implementing and bilateral agencies, it should be sufficient to specify the level of administrative fees, together with an acknowledgement that ExCom guidelines regarding the return of balances from completed and cancelled projects, including support costs, will be followed.

COMMENTS FROM COLOMBIA

The following are the comments from Colombia regarding the Guidelines for the preparation, implementation and management of performance-based sector and national ODS phase-out plans:

- **Title:** Colombia agrees with the change proposed for the Title of the Guidelines.
- **Paragraph 4:** Colombia supports strongly the concept that Guidelines should be adopted as a guidance document to be adjusted through the time to incorporate experiences gained in the course of application.
- **Paragraph 10:** The new paragraph between square brackets is more accurate when suggest 14 weeks prior to an Executive Committee meeting in order to submit a national/sector phase-out plan. In this sense Colombia supports this text.
- **Paragraph 23:** The response of the Secretariat with regards to what is meant by “*a viable workshop*” is still unclear. Is important take into account that most of these workshops in Article 5 countries and particularly in Colombia, operate a small scale and that they are spread all over the country working in economic hard conditions. This sort of workshops as Secretariat describes in its response are rather uncommon and without important CFC consumption.

In this context, Colombia considers that the most appropriate way to proceed in this case is that each country, jointly with the implementing agency, develops some criteria to select those eligible workshops according to its national context. Such criteria must be agreed with the Executive Committee.

- **Paragraph 24:** Although incremental cost is considered in the light of investment activities, for Colombia remains a doubt about what should be the case whether current cost-effectiveness of US \$12.1/Kg for non-investment activities is modified in the near future. What mechanism should be applied to adjust approved funds?
- **Paragraph 35:** It is unclear how a schedule of fund disbursement should be in consonance with the Executive Committee guidance on the resource availability, and the following questions rise:
 - 1. Should country adjust its financial resources requirements according to a specific amount established by the Executive Committee?
 - 2. Do this imply that countries could not submit national/sectoral phase-out plans beyond to Montreal Protocol schedules?
- **Paragraph 39:** Colombia supports the criterion that the agreement *must* include a clause about the flexibility for the country concerned to reallocate the approved funds and also, that major changes should be authorized by the Executive Committee.

COMMENTS FROM FINLAND

2002-09-18

Some further comments submitted by Finland are inserted in the following document with track changes – underlined and in green, proposed additional deletions are in red.

Para. 10

10. ~~A national phase-out plan covering more than one industrial sector should be submitted four weeks after an Executive Committee meeting to allow for a thorough review by the Secretariat sector experts, hiring of consultants and possibly fielding missions by the relevant Secretariat staff and consultants to the country concerned, as appropriate. A sector plan should be submitted 14 weeks prior to an Executive Committee meeting.~~ [A national/sector phase-out plan including a Draft Agreement and a proposed first annual implementation programme should if not otherwise agreed with the Secretariat be submitted 14 weeks prior to an Executive Committee meeting to allow for a thorough review by the Secretariat sector experts, hiring of consultants and possibly fielding missions by the relevant Secretariat staff and consultants to the country concerned, as appropriate.]

Comments: The Agreement is proposed to be signed by the country/MLF during the ExCom meeting and will we believe be a Draft until signed.

Different policies on deadline for submitting projects are confusing and there should be a uniform policy of 12 weeks in consistence with Decision 20/7 on high cost projects.

Experiences accumulated over the years on project review should result in better efficiency and shorter not longer review period. The plans will be of variable size where a shorter review period can be motivated and needed for various reasons. With the objective to be time efficient during the compliance period, the Agencies should therefore be able to discuss the deadline date with the Secretariat.

Response of the Secretariat: Since the sector and national ODS phase out plans usually involve substantial financial commitment, and multiple sources of data and activities, review process could include data validation of different sources, and sometimes protracted consultation with the relevant implementing agencies and country concerned. This is the due diligence the Secretariat has to exercise in order to formulate responsible recommendations to the Executive Committee on such plans. This process requires time and 14 weeks is a reasonable length of time for such tasks.

Queries: What are the financial implications of the field missions to be undertaken by the Secretariat and its consultants?

Are these missions the same as the technical audits for the ODS production sector? If yes, is this a new policy?

Response of the Secretariat: For projects costing more than US \$5 million, the Executive Committee decided, inter alia (Decision 20/7) “the analysis and review process could involve a joint visit, if warranted, by the Fund Secretariat reviewer and the relevant implementing agency.” This is not the same as the mandatory technical audit for the ODS production sector and it is not intended as a new policy.

The cost of such missions by the Secretariat staff and its consultants would be charged to the travel (budget line 1,600) and the consultancy (budget line 1,200) allocations in the budget of the Secretariat, as appropriate.

Para. 17

17. The proposal should describe the strategy that will be followed to achieve the annual reductions proposed, in particular, the management of the supply and demand of ODS in the country to achieve the objectives of the proposal. This should include a discussion of policy instruments to reduce the supply of ODS, such as import quotas, price controls [*and the control of illegal trade in ODS*]. This should also include the steps to be taken to gradually curtail the ODS demand. (e.g. measures like completing the conversions of manufacturing industries in conjunction with first before taking on the demand in the refrigeration servicing).

Comment: Words in the bracket at the end of the paragraph should be deleted because the rendition could be misconstrued that the phase out in the manufacturing industries and the refrigeration servicing are separate and sequential steps while in reality they overlap, and phase out activities in refrigeration servicing should be planned and executed before the completion of conversion of industries in view of the time lag to enable such activities to produce the impact.

Response of the Secretariat: The comment would have more validity in the event of a country submitting plans covering servicing or manufacturing conversion separately. The paragraph addresses a different situation that is of an integrated sectoral plan, for example refrigeration.

Para. 18

18. The strategy should include a time frame of implementation based on the actual conditions in the country. This would entail an assessment of how much of the current consumption could be avoided with little investment with targeted awareness campaigns and evaluations carried out on the results of such campaigns in terms of actual reduction achieved.

Queries: Awareness campaigns are important but could they always bring about actual ODS consumption reductions?

Response of the Secretariat: The paragraph intends to emphasize the need for an integrated approach to the planning of the various activities to be included under the strategy of implementing the phase out plan. The non-investment activities such as the awareness campaigns should not be treated as individual separate activities, but a component of a

programme contributing to the achievement of the reductions of the ODS consumption. [\(We fully agree to this response\)](#)

Para. 23

23. For refrigeration servicing, data provided should include estimated number of viable workshops in the country, their typical baseline equipment, estimated number of technicians currently working in refrigeration servicing, estimated average consumption of CFCs per workshop per year, number of recovering and recycling equipment needed and justification, including an estimate of the amount of ODS to be recovered annually, and other details.

Queries: What is meant by “a viable workshop”?

Response of the Secretariat: A viable workshop in this context refers to a refrigeration servicing entity which has been operating for a number of years, maintains a sustainable level of business and expects to continue its service in the future.

[... “estimated number” is very important: Lengthy discussions on how to acquire detailed data on current and future consumption by individual service shops risk causing projects unnecessary delays and waste of time and money. Such detailed data are not necessary for the RMPs and are impossible to acquire, as most of those enterprises keep no records, many are unwilling to give away the information they might have and many of them work in the informal sector. The search for of almost exact data and number of viable service shops should not stop relevant measures since the measures can be designed to tackle the situation of good estimations of data and shops.](#)

Para. 24

24. *[For non-investment activities, the charge against the aggregate baseline ODP level should be calculated in accordance with Decision 35/57.]*

Comments and queries: The cost-effectiveness of US \$12.1/kg for non-investment activities in Decision 35/57 is an interim value, to be reviewed in the future. How would this affect the calculation of incremental costs of non-investment activities in the phase out plans?

This cost-effectiveness value is valid for stand-alone non-investment activities, and not applicable for the performance-based plans.

The provision from Decision 35/57 is new but it is necessary to have some mechanism to cost these non-investment activities.

[This paragraph should be deleted since this cost-effectiveness value is valid for stand-alone non-investment activities, and not applicable for the performance-based plans addressing the phase out of validated consumption.](#)

Annex I

5. Government Action

Policy/Activity Planned	Schedule of Implementation
Type of Policy Control on ODS Import, servicing etc	
Public Awareness	
Others	

[Policies to control ODS import should not be the only example on type of policy control. Policy control is an important supportive tool in reducing the demand in the servicing sector that should be considered by the governments in the countries concerned.](#)

Guidelines for the preparation, implementation and management of performance-based substance-wide and national ODS-phase-out plans (Decision 37/67)

Poland

Remarks with respect to definitions:

1. Point 2 doesn't include **bromochloromethane**, which is to be totally reduced for Article 5 countries by January 1, 2002 (with possible essential use exemptions).
Is lack this substance intentional or by mistake?
2. Point 3 includes only refrigeration without **air conditioning and heat pumps sector**. It is known that all TEAP reports include this differentiation because of some different use of ODS in both sectors (refrigerant + blowing agent and only refrigerant).
It would advisable to put air conditioning and heat pumps sector to definitions and accordingly in other places of the report.
3. Point 3 contains some exemptional uses of ODS e.g. MDIs and process agents. The question is what about other exemptions: **feedstock, laboratory and analytical uses**.
Is it intentional or by mistake?

COMMENTS FROM NETHERLANDS

Our delegation expressed at the previous ExCom that the draft on the table was fine for the moment, that we need to finalize the document so that it can be used, and that it should be a living document anyway. Indeed, it has already grown yet a bit more thanks to the comments of other members.

Based on the discussions during another agenda-item last time, I have one point that might be addressed in the guidelines as well. It concerns the regional coordination of phase-out plans, with a view to a more level playing field. This issue came up I think in the UNDP business plan, regarding Costa Rica. I would like to leave it entirely up to you whether you think including this issue might help the document to grow, or whether it would hold it back (in which case I withdraw the comment).

COMMENTS FROM UNDP

Definitions:

1. The definition of "Sectors" should be based on ease/convenience that the sector provides for monitoring and verification of phase-out targets. Also, a sector should be distinguished from another by the basic premise that phase-out in one sector is largely unaffected by the phase-out in another.

For example, there are distinct differences between Refrigeration (Manufacturing) and Refrigeration (Servicing) Sectors, in terms of consumption patterns, activities needed to effect phase-out, monitoring milestones and performance/verification indicators. For instance, as long as an operating CFC-based population of refrigeration equipment exists (and as long as CFC prices are not critically prohibitive), CFCs would continue to be consumed in the Refrigeration (Servicing) sector, even if they are phased out in Refrigeration (Manufacturing). Secondly, phase-out in Refrigeration (Servicing) is by definition, only indirect and can be only "facilitated" primarily through well-coordinated incentive, disincentive and regulatory measures, supported by required investments and technical support. The phase-out in Refrigeration (Servicing) is also far more challenging for purposes of independent confirmation/verification. In contrast, the phase-out in Refrigeration (Manufacturing) is primarily a result of investments/technical assistance and legal phase-out commitments can be obtained irrespective of regulations. The phase-out is also amenable to direct verification at enterprise level.

Thus, Refrigeration (Manufacturing) and Refrigeration (Servicing) should be treated as distinct sectors.

2. In the event that these two sectors cannot be treated independently for the purposes of these guidelines, then the requesting Article-5 governments should be urged to entrust preparation and implementation of a phase-out plan for the Refrigeration Sector as a whole, only to one agency, and not to split the work between agencies.

Incremental Costs and Cost-effectiveness:

1. The guidelines should categorically state which incremental costs are eligible and which are not. There has been a large variation in the categories of incremental capital and operating costs and their levels, approved so far for various countries, even for the same sectors.
2. The levels of incremental capital cost line items must be based on formal agreements between Secretariat and Implementing Agencies, as done before in case of individual projects.

3. The guidelines should also state clearly if (and when) incremental operating costs are eligible.

Verification of Phase-out:

1. It is necessary to elucidate in more detail and clarity, the criteria and methodology for independent verification of phase-out.
2. The independent verification agency can be truly "independent", only if it is not "indigenous", as after all, such an agency would be retained and paid for through the project funds, invariably by the government/implementing agency concerned.

COMMENTS FROM UNEP

General: The revised document is a good improvement over the first attempt and tries to take into account some of the comments received on the first draft.

Para 7: The words “high enough” do not adequately address the concerns expressed over the use of the words “Significant consumption” in the last draft. Consumption, above which, the sub-sector plan will be applicable will need to be defined more precisely, for e.g. in terms of ODP tonnes.

Para 8. Definition of sector/National ODS phaseout plan: We reiterate that such plans should also include the ineligible consumption of controlled ODS. Such plans should not only serve for the funding request, but also the practical action plan for the country to phaseout all consumption, not only eligible consumption. Ineligible consumption (along with eligible consumption) is part of the A7 data.

Para 9: It may be more appropriate to use the wordings “legal agreement” instead of “an agreement that will legalize formally ...”. If there is a need to again define what a legal agreement is following the explanation of the Secretariat, this should be included in the definitions.

Para 10: It will be worthwhile to consider that many of these projects don't get approved in one meeting because of complex issues involved and this gives the Secretariat enough time between two meetings to complete the review process. There may not be adequate time for IAs preparing a detailed performance based project after long data collection exercises and then the project going through another Multilateral Fund Secretariat review process.

In view of the above, we feel that MFS should devise, in consultation with the IAs, a more flexible and innovative way of doing business for such projects. For example, Multilateral Fund Secretariat experts and reviewers, could be involved in the project preparation exercise so that collective, coordinated and timely assistance can be given to the countries during the compliance period. Such approach could assist in strengthening the new proposed “contingency Fund” approach. In view of this, the duration of 14 or 12 weeks may not be a real issue.

Para 16: Article 7 data should be the most recent data, as it is official data that is accepted under the Montreal Protocol. Any other data collected either for the purposes of funding under the Multilateral Fund should start from this data as a basis. We should also encourage the countries to make sure that their Article 7 data is correct that can be broken down into sectors if needed, rather than encouraging collection of “new and more recent data” for every performance based agreement that may be developed. Multiplicity of data will only add to discrepancies rather than solve them. It has become evident from the past experience where there are data discrepancies in the data submitted to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat and the Ozone Secretariat by the same country.

Para 17: We reiterate that experience in China, the Bahamas, India, Malaysia, Mauritius and Thailand has shown that the servicing sector phase out needs extensive preparatory work and

since SMEs are involved, a much longer implementation time. So a reference to a sequential phase out after the manufacturing sector phase out may not be conducive in countries' efforts in meeting compliance.

Para. 18: UNEP agrees with the views of the Secretariat. Awareness campaigns are never treated as separate activities, but are always part of the package though the funding has to be separate in order for each activity and funding to be properly reflected.

Para. 18, 19 and 20: should be illustrated with examples following the Secretariat's understanding of these requirements. Reference to some specific cases as examples like the Malaysia/Thailand CFC phase out plan may be helpful to the stakeholders specifically Article 5 countries in understanding clearly these guidelines?

Para. 23: For some of the sectors, it might be difficult to provide the exact number of SMEs with ODS consumption and their production details. This will be difficult to get to the last number as has been very clear from the experiences in this sector.

Para 24: It is not clear whether the remark on page 9 in bold "This paragraph should be deleted" is Secretariat's recommendation. In any case, many countries have expressed concern over the implementation of this Decision 35/57 (relating to cost-effectiveness of US \$12.1/kg for non-investment activities) and the impact it may have on developing and implementing non-investment activities and consequently their compliance position. While the decision exempts LVCs, the remaining countries need more clarity on this issue/

It is useful that lessons learnt from the implementation of such agreements in the past have been considered through a dialogue with the Implementing Agencies. However, country consultations are critical to develop this crucial document and there may be a need to discuss this draft with all countries and not limit it to the Executive Committee members alone. Network meetings may be utilized for such dialogue to give the paper a practical perspective.

In this respect, UNEP would like to fully co-operate with Multilateral Fund Secretariat to outreach the spirit and substance of these guidelines through our CAP programme.

COMMENTS FROM UNIDO1. Para. 9, page 4:

It is suggested in the paragraph that the eventual agreements on the respective NPP or SPP are going to be established between the Executive Committee and the country concerned. We consider it essential to define a range of “the flexibility to apply the funds approved to achieve its goals”, as indicated in the response of the Secretariat. We believe that proper wording of this paragraph will avoid possible difficulties during the implementation process of the plans.

2. Para. 13, page 5:

We believe that the response of the Secretariat to the queries regarding the eligibility criterion of 25 July 1995 to address ODS phase-out according to decision 17/7 should be better elaborated including in particular the criteria to address the process agents in the plans.

3. Para. 16, page 6:

In light of our comments to para. 9 above, we suggest to modify the first sentence of para. 16 by incorporating clear definitions of the responsibilities of the relevant government bodies with respect to the consumption data to be included in the plans as starting points, as well as its validation.

4. Para. 28, page 10:

We believe that the relevant language regarding funding of “independent confirmation of the performance” should be incorporated in this para. to enable the implementing agencies or the implementation units in the respective countries to establish the required budget line in the budgeting of the plans.

5. Para. 44, page 13:

In our opinion the issue of “payment of administrative fees for implementing the agreement” is still pending depending upon the decision to be taken in this respect.

6. Para. 46, page 14:

Taking into consideration a significant level of responsibilities of countries involved in the joint implementing agencies/country implementation of the plans, it is important to have a certain guidance from the Executive Committee regarding the composition or format of “the performance verification report” summarizing the achievements of the target in the preceding year. We believe it will facilitate release of funding for the following year of plan.
