



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/48  
8 March 2005

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Forty-fifth Meeting  
Montreal, 4-8 April 2005

**REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
(FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 44/57)**

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to the meeting and not to request additional copies.

## **Background**

1. At its 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting in 2004, the Executive Committee had an extensive debate on a discussion paper prepared by the Secretariat on the operation of the Executive Committee without sub-committees and on the potential for an intersessional approval procedure (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69), and decided to continue discussing throughout 2005, the issues of reducing the number of Executive Committee meetings and establishing a procedure for intersessional approval. The discussion paper prepared for the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting could be made available upon request.
2. To facilitate its further discussion, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat (decision 44/57) to produce a document compiling the views of Executive Committee members and providing an estimate of the financial implications of various scenarios. At the same time, the Committee requested interested Parties and implementing agencies to submit comments in writing by 4 February 2005, for incorporation into the document to be prepared by the Secretariat.
3. Subsequent to the meeting, the Secretariat wrote on 12 January 2005 to all the members of the Executive Committee for 2004 and 2005 seeking written comments on this issue and attached the document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69 for the benefit of those members who joined the Committee in 2005.
4. The Secretariat is providing in this document an assessment of the financial implications of the alternatives proposed of reorganizing the work of the Executive Committee. Included in Annex I is a compilation of the interventions of members of the Executive Committee on the subject at the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting and the written comments received from members as of the end of February 2005.

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE ALTERNATIVES OF REORGANIZING THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

### **I. Introduction**

5. This short paper should be considered as a supplementary section to the document “Report on operation of the Executive Committee without Sub-Committees and potential for an inter-sessional approval procedure” (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69), which the Secretariat submitted to the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee in November 2004. It provides the cost implications of the alternatives that were proposed in the earlier paper, in response to the request of the Committee in decision 44/57. It may be helpful to recall that the earlier paper included two alternatives, that is, either to continue the current practice of holding three Executive Committee meetings a year, or reduce the frequency to two regular meetings a year but retain the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting as optional.

6. The discussions at the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting and the written comments provided by Committee members after the meeting added two more alternatives, namely, to continue holding three meetings a year but with 4 days for each session, and hold the two meetings every year in conjunction with the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) and the Meeting of the Parties.

7. The purpose of this short paper is to cost these alternatives as additional information for decision-making on reorganizing the future work of the Executive Committee.

### **II. Cost Breakdown of Executive Committee Meetings**

8. To facilitate comparison of different alternatives, costs are broken down into components, such as: travel of delegates; daily subsistence allowance (DSA); documentation and other items; and, as far as possible into standard units, such as daily cost of DSA; cost of documentation per meeting and so on. Please note that this is not an attempt to provide a complete list of cost components, but rather a list of the direct cost items of holding a meeting of the Executive Committee, therefore it does not include for instance fully cover the cost of participation of the non-Article 5 members or that of the implementing agencies and others. However, a cursory look is provided at the end of the paper with a broad estimation of the cost of participation of non-Article 5 countries and implementing agencies.

9. The cost-estimation is worked out by averaging actual cost data from 2003 and 2004, with zero inflation. The numbers quoted may therefore differ from the actual expenditures reported by the Treasurer and change in future years resulting from change of venue, timing of the meeting and other variables. The assumption is that holding the meetings in Montreal, unless it is specifically stated that the venue is away from Montreal in order to be with other ozone-related meetings.

## II.1 Standard cost components

*Travel:* Provides return-tickets for the participation of three delegates from each of the seven Article 5 country members although members may share the benefits with countries they co-opt. The total cost under this component may vary due to the variation of countries on the Executive Committee each year resulting in different travel routes. However, on average the travel expenditure per meeting of 21 participants held in Montreal is US \$64,000.

*DSA:* Provides a daily allowance to three delegates from each of the seven Article 5 country members for the entire duration of an Executive Committee meeting. The DSA rates are set by the United Nations in New York for countries and regions in the world and adjusted monthly. Using Montreal as the venue for the meeting, the DSA expenditure per day of 21 participants typically costs US \$5,500 and for a 7-day duration which includes the travel time, the total cost could be US \$40,000.

*Translation of documents:* Provides the translation of meeting documents both pre-session and during the meeting into any of the six official languages of the United Nations. For many years, the Secretariat has been using remote translation to save on the cost of travel and DSA of the translators although this means running a 24-hour schedule to manage the translators located in the four corners of the world to produce the meeting reports in all languages during the time of the meeting.

Based on the experience of the past two years, the average number of words to be translated per meeting per language is approximately 200,000, which cost about US \$33,000 to translate. The experience of the past two years shows that usually three languages are needed a year and the cost of translation per meeting for three languages is about US \$100,000. It is relevant to note that the cost of translation is not driven by the number of meetings but by the number of words to be translated and the number of languages involved. Therefore, the reduction of the number of meetings from three to two a year may not proportionately reduce the cost of translation if the number of words and the number of languages needed remain unchanged.

*Rental of facilities:* Makes provisions for the rental of meeting rooms, computers, photocopiers, and the hiring of meeting attendants. Assuming the use of the facilities at the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) in Montreal, the cost of rental per meeting is US \$30,000.

*Report writing:* Provides the needs for hiring professional report writers, who prepare the draft report of the meetings on-site in English. The expenditure includes the fees for the individuals and the return tickets plus DSA for those who are not recruited locally. A team of 5 people is required and costs approximately US \$13,000 on a per meeting basis.

*Interpretation:* Covers the cost of hiring interpreters in languages that are needed for conducting the meetings. This includes the fees for the individuals and the return-tickets plus DSA for those who are not recruited locally. Typically a team of three is needed for each language and costs approximately US \$14,000. If three languages are needed the cost per meeting comes to US \$42,000.

*Dispatch of documents:* Provides for the shipping of the meeting documents to all meeting participants, members and co-opted members of the Executive Committee, the implementing and bilateral agencies and the observers. Depending on the weight of the documents, an average of US \$3,500 has been spent on this component on a per meeting basis for the past two years.

## II.2 Back-to-back with other ozone-related meetings away from Montreal

10. Since in most cases convening the Executive Committee meeting back-to-back with the Meeting of the Parties and the OEWG results in holding the meeting away from Montreal, cost estimation under this scenario assumes just that. Convening the meeting elsewhere tends to reduce the cost of a few of the above components but incurs additional costs in a few other items. These are explained below.

*Savings:* These could be realized from cost sharing with the Ozone Secretariat on the travel of members and co-opted members of the Executive Committee, the report writers and interpreters, assuming that both Secretariats use the same teams. Based on previous experience, a 50 percent reduction could be achieved on travel.

*Travel and DSA of the Secretariat Staff:* This is an additional cost component which would not have been incurred if the meeting was held in Montreal. Using the two cases in 2004 as an illustration, this could cost between US \$65,000 (Geneva) to US \$100,000 (Prague), On average, US \$75,000 could be incurred under this item.

*Rental of facilities:* This tends to incur higher cost in venues away from Montreal. Again using the two cases in 2004, this could cost between US \$50,000 (Geneva) to US \$135,000(Prague), both of which are higher than the US \$30,000 in ICAO. An average of US \$70,000 could give a good approximation of the rental cost away from Montreal.

## **III. Cost of Alternatives**

### III.1 Continue the status quo of 3 meetings with 5 days at each session

| <b>Component</b>          | <b>Cost/Meeting (in US \$)</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Total (in US \$)</b> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Travel                    | 64,000                         | 3                | 192,000                 |
| DSA                       | 40,000                         | 3                | 120,000                 |
| Translation of documents* | 100,000                        | 3                | 300,000                 |
| Rental of facilities      | 30,000                         | 3                | 90,000                  |
| Report writing            | 13,000                         | 3                | 39,000                  |
| Interpretation*           | 42,000                         | 3                | 126,000                 |
| Dispatch                  | 3,500                          | 3                | 10,500                  |
| <b>Grand Total</b>        | <b>292,500</b>                 |                  | <b>877,500</b>          |

*Notes:*

It is assumed that 3 languages are needed for translation of documents and interpretation.

III.2 Three meetings with a 4-day duration each

| Component                 | Cost/Meeting (in US \$) | Frequency | Total (in US \$) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Travel                    | 64,000                  | 3         | 192,000          |
| DSA                       | 34,500                  | 3         | 103,500          |
| Translation of documents* | 100,000                 | 3         | 300,000          |
| Rental of facilities      | 27,000                  | 3         | 81,000           |
| Report writing            | 11,000                  | 3         | 33,000           |
| Interpretation*           | 36,800                  | 3         | 110,400          |
| Dispatch                  | 3,500                   | 3         | 10,500           |
| <b>Grand Total</b>        | <b>276,800</b>          |           | <b>830,400</b>   |

Notes:

It is assumed that 3 languages are needed for translation of documents and interpretation. For reducing the number of days from 5 to 4, this results in lowering cost of the rental of facilities by approximately US \$3,000; the cost of report writing by US \$2,000; and the cost of interpretation by US \$5,200. This also reduces the cost of DSA by one day, which is approximately US \$5,500.

III.3 Two meetings with 5 days at each session

| Component                 | Cost/Meeting (in US \$) | Frequency | Total (in US \$) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Travel                    | 64,000                  | 2         | 128,000          |
| DSA                       | 40,000                  | 2         | 80,000           |
| Translation of documents* | 150,000                 | 2         | 300,000          |
| Rental of facilities      | 30,000                  | 2         | 60,000           |
| Report writing            | 13,000                  | 2         | 26,000           |
| Interpretation*           | 42,000                  | 2         | 84,000           |
| Dispatch                  | 4,000                   | 2         | 8,000            |
| <b>Grand Total</b>        | <b>343,000</b>          |           | <b>686,000</b>   |

Notes:

It is assumed that 3 languages are needed for translation of documents and interpretation. It is also assumed that the number of words to be translated does not change with the reduction of number of meetings and as a result the annual cost remains the same but is distributed over two meetings.

III.4 Two meetings with 5 days per session back-to-back with other ozone-related meetings away from Montreal

| Component                         | Cost/Meeting (in US \$) | Frequency | Total (in US \$) |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Travel                            | 32,000                  | 2         | 64,000           |
| DSA                               | 40,000                  | 2         | 80,000           |
| Translation of documents*         | 150,000                 | 2         | 300,000          |
| Rental of facilities              | 70,000                  | 2         | 140,000          |
| Report writing                    | 8,000                   | 2         | 16,000           |
| Interpretation*                   | 30,000                  | 2         | 60,000           |
| Dispatch                          | 4,000                   | 2         | 8,000            |
| Travel and DSA of the Secretariat | 75,000                  | 2         | 150,000          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                | <b>409,000</b>          |           | <b>818,000</b>   |

Notes:

It is assumed:

- 3 languages are needed for translation of documents and interpretation.
- the number of words for translation does not change with the reduction of number of meetings and as a result the annual cost remains the same but is distributed over two meetings.
- The teams of report writers and interpreters are shared between the Ozone Secretariat and Fund Secretariat. As a result the travel cost of each member from the report writing team and the interpreter team is reduced by 50%, or US \$1,000, assuming the full cost per person is US \$2,000.

**IV. A cursory look at the cost of the participation of non-Article 5 countries and implementing agencies**

11. There are a number of limitations in estimating the cost of participation of non-Article 5 countries and implementing agencies at the Executive Committee meetings. Firstly, although there are 7 members from non-Article 5 countries, it is not possible to determine the number of participants from each Committee member and their constituents. Secondly, it is understood that some participants attend the Executive Committee meetings in the capacity of consultants and are paid fees in addition to expenses. These fees would form part of the cost of participation of the delegation concerned, however it would be hard for the Secretariat to place an estimate on such costs. Thirdly DSA is managed differently from country to country and is difficult to generalize and estimate.

12. The first two limitations also apply to the cost estimation of the four implementing agencies, although they apply the same UN system-wide DSA rates. The cost of participation of the bilateral agencies is not separately listed since their participation is often subsumed under the participation of the concerned non-Article 5 member.

13. In order to provide a broad estimation of the cost of participation of non-Article 5 countries and the four implementing agencies, a number of simplifying assumptions are made based for practicality on meetings taking place in Montreal:

- (a) Cost of participation includes only travel, and not DSA. This could range between US \$500 (North America) to US \$5,000 (Asia and Oceania) per person.
- (b) One participant only has been accounted for from each non-Article 5 country and each implementing agency and all are attending the meetings in the capacity of government or agency representatives. This number adds up to 11 participants.

IV.1 Cost of alternative

|  | <b>Cost/Meeting<br/>(in US \$)</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Total<br/>(is US \$)</b> |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Status quo of 3 meetings per year of 5 days each session | 37,000*                            | 3                | 111,000                     |
| 3 meetings of 4 days each session                        | 37,000                             | 3                | 111,000                     |
| 2 meetings of 5 days each session                        | 37,000                             | 2                | 74,000                      |
| 2 meetings back-to-back with other ozone meetings        | 37,000                             | 2                | 74,000                      |

\*Assuming 4 participants from North America (US \$500x4), and 7 from Asia and Europe (US \$5,000x7)

14. Admittedly, this is a very simplified analysis; however, since travel is the most expensive cost component in the cost of participation, it provides a relevant high degree of approximation to the real costs and could be used to extrapolate if the number of participants increases.





## Annex I

### INTERVENTIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT THE 44<sup>TH</sup> MEETING AND WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS AS OF THE END OF FEBRUARY 2005

1. This annex contains the transcriptions of the interventions of members of the Executive Committee on the subject at the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting. Minor language editing was done with due consideration for maintaining the integrity of the original statements. Written comments received from members are reproduced in a separate section after the transcriptions.

#### Transcriptions

##### Chair:

2. Thank you Secretariat for your comprehensive introduction. The United Kingdom has the floor.

##### United Kingdom:

3. Thank you Madam Chair. My delegation would like to thank the Secretariat very much for producing document 44/69, we feel it contains much food for thought on this extremely complex issue. My delegation is very keen that this topic be taken further forward, we think it's well worth looking at not least because, it, the idea was also included in the ICF evaluation, so therefore, we are needing to look at it anyway. However, before a decision can be taken on whether to continue with the present regime, or to remove one meeting from the present format, we think the ExCom needs to have a clearer picture of the challenges we are likely to face in the coming years. My delegation believes that at a minimum we would need to take at least three considerations into account. First, given that most larger volume consuming countries have now entered into agreements with the ExCom for sectoral or national phase-out plans, the costs of which have already been agreed in principle. We are envisaging that the focus of the work of the MLF would now be shifting to ensuring implementation of those agreements and ensuring that low volume consuming countries continue to be provided with the relevant assistance to enable them to comply with the control provisions of the Montreal Protocol. Second, as the Secretariat has highlighted, we envisage that in order to meet these new challenges the way in which tasks are distributed between the ExCom and the Secretariat might have to change. We might wish to give more responsibility for routine work to the Secretariat and as the Secretariat mentioned we may need to consider a procedure for intersessional approvals which would result in the delegation of new level of authority to the Secretariat under very specific conditions, and from the Secretariat's document it seems that this might take some time. Given that the third step would then be to adjust the organization of the work, and part of that decision might be on whether we need to keep the present frequency of meetings or reduce the number of meetings to two per year, or indeed even another option of cutting the length of the meetings but retaining three meetings. From what we understand from the Secretariat this does need to be approved by a MOP and clearly we have missed our chance this year. Therefore, the Secretariat's option B is not really an option, clearly again this is going to take time. To facilitate further discussion,

given that we are clearly not going to be able to move to a new system as of January 2005, we feel that it could be worth having more discussion and perhaps even more work done by the Secretariat on this issue. We don't feel there's any need to rush into a decision at this stage and that perhaps this could be an agenda item at our next meeting. We'd therefore like to propose, having heard, waited obviously until we've heard other Committee members commenting on this issue, that it may be necessary to have another policy paper from the Secretariat looking at, more closely at the future challenges that the ExCom's going to face. Thank you.

Chair:

4. I would like to thank the U.K. I give the floor to Cuba and afterwards Austria and then Argentina.

Cuba:

5. Thank you very much Madam Chair. I'd like to congratulate the Secretariat for presenting a very complete document which has all possible options in it and all possibilities as well. Of course, we are going to continue studying it in order to complete it but it is a very useful document which is going to help us in the analysis. This notwithstanding, in principle we will go to the substance of the problem which is getting rid of one of the meetings of the ExCom and also I'd like to talk about a practical and an economic problem. Everything that has been said is of course very important, has to do with rules and procedures that we have to study and develop. Therefore, in principle, I'd like to know how much we're going to save by this reduction because I don't know, perhaps we are going to have to increase the number of people in the Secretariat because we're giving it new tasks and in the end we're going to have to change our working methods. So I am not really sure because I haven't seen the economic repercussions of this. Apparently, this has to do with money, we have to figure out how much money we're going to save by getting rid of a meeting and how much money is going to be necessary in order to apply all this in terms of procedure. Secondly, until 2007 of course, no change can take place because we have to take into account procedures, measures, actions which have to be undertaken. However, there are still some things that are of great concerns to us because, for example, if something is not presented in one meeting we have to wait six more months. This can give rise to problems with compliance and we want to accelerate compliance, after all. There is another major decision that has to be taken. The ExCom works during these meetings and if we get rid of the meeting the Secretariat would be taking on responsibilities which normally are the Executive Committee's. We have to think thoroughly about this, we have to really study it. I agree with the U.K., that we have to study this in detail. We have to have full knowledge of all its implications, because in the end, we will have to take a decision, but what decision, why is it an economical decision, is it a political one? Are we going to divide the responsibilities of the functioning of the Fund, this is so important that I think that we have continue studying this topic and also I want to know what the other members of the ExCom think of this. Thank you.

Chair:

6. Thank you Cuba and now I give the floor to Austria.

Austria:

7. Thank you Madam Chair. Let me join the previous speakers in congratulating the Secretariat for this comprehensive analysis. It is a very difficult decision we have to take. We have to be clear that there are advantages and disadvantages, which they have been clearly analyzed. This delegation has got from the government the directive to reduce costs and if possible to reduce one meeting, so the prospective is to move towards two meetings, but of course, we know that it is not very simple to just cancel one meeting and move one half of the agenda to one meeting, to the first meeting maybe. If it's the second meeting then move it to the third meeting, so this could even result in an overload of work. With regards to the first part of the paper where the operation without sub-committees was shown, I think there is no doubt that this is a clear progress now that possibilities have been extended for members to participate in decision-making in the meeting. So I think the change we made last year was a change to the better and also to more transparency and I think this is also a first answer to the ICF analysis. Now going to a reduction from three to two meetings, well, besides the formal endorsement by the Meeting of the Parties, the crucial point in my view is the delegation of authority from this Committee to the Secretariat. Of course, if we prolong the time between meetings, we have to set up something to approve projects. It comes to my mind that we have a lot projects for countries at risk of non-compliance, here, I think this was already mentioned, then for those projects where all the contentious issues have been solved. Of course, the issue of implementation or project delays and also cancellation, these would be candidates for this automated or intersessional approval procedure. In my view, I think if we decided to go into this direction, we could build upon the existing procedure for bilateral projects simply to enlarge the scope that it covers all projects. As I mentioned before, it could also apply to the cancellation procedure, but I think the members of the Committee would have to be involved. So, as it is written in the document it should be on a no-objection basis. For example, a project A is submitted to the Secretariat, the Secretariat sends it out to the members with a comment and maybe sets a deadline. If there is agreement or no reaction then the project can move forward. So this would be a very simple procedure and I think this would be very useful for the future to have something like that in the Terms. Now looking at the time of implementation, if we decided to start in 2005, I think we already have planned for three meetings for next year and it's almost impossible to change now. As the Chair of next year, I think this could be a gigantic workload not only for the Chair but also for the Committee. So we might end up with, especially the second meeting of maybe six or seven days. That's something I also want to avoid, I think my colleagues also want to avoid. Especially if we think that we may have it back-to-back with a Meeting of the Parties and maybe also with Implementation Committee, so we should think of the timing. There is one advantage I would like to draw your attention to, and this is the time between the meetings. If we have a time interval of six months, there would be more time for the Secretariat to engage into negotiations with implementing agencies and also with countries and the same applies to the implementing agencies. So, I sometimes had the feeling from the implementing agencies and also from the Secretariat that there is certain rush from meeting to meeting and this could be a way out and make the process more relaxed. So, in summary, I think for next year we will still have three meetings, the earliest year to start with two meetings, in my opinion would be 2006 but of course on a trial basis. Maybe we would have also to consider 2007. I think we also have to endorse the current format of having the meeting in plenary and no sub-committees. Thank you.

Chair:

8. Thank you Austria for your contribution, I now give the floor to Argentina, afterwards, Japan, Belgium and Niger. Argentina, please go ahead.

Argentina:

9. Thank you Madam Chair. My delegation also would like to join others in thanking the Secretariat for the very detailed study it has undertaken of the different options for the Executive Committee in terms of its future work and the consequences of each of these options. We agree with the conclusions of the Secretariat as far as the advantages of the new system is concerned which has allowed for more participation of the members of the ExCom and also has avoided duplication of debate on the same subjects, however as we can all see, this has not decreased the volume of work that the ExCom has to undertake which is very high for the time being. Therefore, we think it is premature to decide at this moment to eliminate one of the annual meetings. Also, the need to change the mandate of the ExCom requires that we wait at least one more year in order to change the frequency of the meetings. We think that it would be wise to study this item during the first two meetings of 2005 in order to take a decision before the next Meeting of the Parties which could change the mandate if the ExCom considers it desirable. We think that if an amendment were to be proposed on this, it would have to give some sort of flexibility to the Executive Committee. We could do this by giving us the possibility of holding two or three meetings if necessary and an amendment in paragraph 8 of the mandate which would be in harmony with rule 4.1 of the rules of procedure of the ExCom which could be the following: "The ExCom shall hold at least two meetings a year." I think that with this proposal we can cover the U.K.'s proposal in terms of having three meetings of a shorter duration or two meetings per year. In terms of establishing an intersessional period procedure, we can start studying this possibility with a view to the future, however, this subject deserves much debate in future meetings. Independently of the solution, in future we have to guarantee equitable participation of all members of the ExCom in the decision-making process. This is the reason why my delegation prefers to extend the procedure of non-objection which had been suspended in '95 for other matters as well as bilateral ones. As far as what the Secretariat proposes in 3.4 of the document which is the delegation of authority, my delegation thinks that the Executive Committee should maintain the authority to approve. Therefore, the system which is to be adopted, independently of the form it takes, has to guarantee the fair participation of all members and the distribution of documentation in good time before the meeting in order to guarantee the translation into all UN languages. Also, we have to take into account that we have to consider the needs of countries which are at the risk of non-compliance which should be the main objective of our future work. Therefore, Madam Chair, the economical study, the financial study requested by Cuba is very useful for all of us, for example Austria. Austria said that all governments are asking for budgetary reductions and also I support what the U.K. has asked for, we should maintain this topic in the agenda of our next meeting. Thank you very much.

Chair:

10. Thank you very much Argentina, Japan you have the floor please (not translated, was in Spanish).

Japan:

11. Thank you Madam Chair and I don't think that an amendment to the Terms of Reference is necessary for us to meet only twice a year. We also would like to meet at least three times a year, and that is the mandate for us, so, there's no justification for making a change in the mandate. In view of the kind of the uncertainties expressed in the future we really have to retain our liberty to meet three times in the future if it is necessary. I wonder whether we can meet in extraordinary sessions, but I think the "at least three" means that we can meet more than three, but we can meet less than three. We do not need to change the Terms of Reference. We can just decide to meet twice and that's our decision and should we have any authorization or permission from the Meeting of the Parties, the answer is no. So, one problem is now resolved because there's no constraint on us to apply this starting from next year to having two meetings. Now I think it's possible to have two meetings but the most important thing is, we have to have business plans approved in the previous year for the year it is pertaining to. So, if we meet next year only twice, so this meeting has to agree on the business plan for year 2005. Our current pattern of approving or the considering business plan is quite awkward because we approve the business plan for the particular year as late as the end of the first quarter of the year. So we approved the 2004 business plan as late as March because of that we are already cutting into the operational period. Business plan is a planning document, so, we have to approve that, one year before, before we start implementing it. This is a real lacuna and also deficiency of our system. So, if we agree on the making some change in the pattern of the meeting, we really have to reform that part of the lacuna, that part of the deficiency.

12. I think, the arranging the Executive Committee meetings back-to-back with the OEWG would enormously contribute to the economy or savings. There's no doubt about that. Delegations coming from A5 as well as non-A5 countries are paying a lot of energies and time to attend meetings. So I think that obviously two times are enough and that would represent an enormous economy and of course those who are involved in the protection of atmosphere have to attend other meetings, and that is also the advantage to those who are working in similar areas. And, now, how we can we proceed to intersessional approval. I think Argentina is right and that the members of the Executive Committee have to be responsible of the decisions taken by the Executive Committee. We will never delegate that authority to the Secretariat, but we can always authorize the Secretariat to make a commitment up to a certain level at US \$X million. Under that level, the Chief Officer is authorized to take a decision to enter into commitment and of course we will review and approve that retroactively. If that ceiling is exceeded, the Chief Officer has to enter into intersessional consultation by sending letters and faxes. I hate to see that the teleconferencing would be organized in a very awkward time in Tokyo. But anyway, intersessionally and through the intersessional communication, we shall authorize the Chief Officer to exceed the kind of the cap she is given. I think that the existence of the pre-approved business plan would certainly facilitate that process. Since there are already concrete elements in the business plan, delegations can react to the Chief Officer's proposals. Using the business plan as guide we will ask agencies and Secretariat to inform at the end of each meeting members of the Executive Committee what are in the pipeline. I don't think that all of a sudden new projects could be proposed. Since the preparatory assistance is given and the planning is there, the agencies and the Secretariat should be in a position to brief us or indicate us what are in their pipelines. If we have such a list, that would constitute the basis for intersessional consultation. If

the ceiling given to the Secretariat on commitment authority is exceeded, then the delegations would be quick enough to give their answers.

13. So, I would like to mention that the work programmes might be subject to the approval within the commitment authority given to the Chief Officer and the amounts that are proposed under the work programme are relatively modest. It would not require any agreement for the Chief Officer to enter into commitment. Institutional strengthening projects are also possible. If there are any needs to deal quickly with compliance, with regard to countries at risk, we can authorize the Chief Officer to proceed with the commitment if these projects are submitted. So, we have ample possibility of implementing this system. I remember that in the past the Terms of Reference of our Committee gave the Secretariat the authority to process any project below US \$½ million. If there is any doubt about the aspect of the incrementality of the cost exceeding US \$500,000 it should be for discussion by the Executive Committee. That was the original decision taken when the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee were established by the contracting Parties. So, contracting Parties anticipated the flexible manner to work and do not micro manage the Secretariat work. That idea is still embodied in those who have participated to establish the Executive Committee. I think we have ample chance for agreeing on something and then we will apply this starting from next year. This delegation needs not insisting on having two meetings starting in 2005, but we shall take a decision to meet only twice, starting in year 2006, and in preparation for that we have to work out the mechanism of the intersessional approval. What is the authority we can give to the Chief Officer, what is the mechanism for agreeing among the Parties intersessionally and what is the basis, documentary basis or information basis for that. So, I hope that this could be well taken by the Secretariat and Mr. Lang will ponder on it. Thank you.

Chair:

14. I'd like to thank Japan and I now give the floor to Belgium.

Belgium:

15. Thank you Madam Chair and let me start also by thanking the Secretariat for its clear analysis. I find the document so clear that to my simple mind at least it's rather easy to take a decision and I'll explain a little bit of it as briefly as possible. Let me first say that yes, we should endorse the suggestion that we continue with the plenary ExCom without sub-committees. I think it is working alright, but it's very early to decide on that because we haven't finished yet our first year and this is the only meeting that I've heard the mention at least of night sessions. Scary. So, we have at least to continue a year and evaluate that. Now, I take the point of Argentina and this is not the change to a plenary ExCom without sub-committees. The new pattern is very interesting at least for me because I'm learning a lot about the project approval, and I've never been involved in that and I was able to stay awake. It has not diminished our workload, so, I'm really very hesitant to consider reducing meetings. I've expressed that before. First, it's not becoming, it's not clear at least to me that we have less work. We acted upon the development of the previous system with the sub-committees, and we have to give us a little more time and see how the workload evolves, develops, diminishes or whatever, and then come to a logical conclusion whether or not to change to two meetings and

not try to force this change upon us, because I have the impression that we are going too fast on this and I could envisage a sort of intermediate phase which would be, having three, still three ExCom meetings, but 4 days long or 3 days long. It should flow naturally out of the work and the decreasing in workload should give us that indication. Now, eventually we may reduce to two meetings. I'm not really opposed to it. I think this whole issue has to be viewed in the context of reaching the ultimate objectives of the Montreal Protocol and I think this is the overriding principle before we start discussing anything. I would not like to see the introduction of changes that are going to put at risk of reaching the objectives of the Montreal Protocol and we have said it over and over again that we are at a crucial point. We are geared towards compliance very clearly and I think that's the right way to go and it is very important. So I would really be very hesitant to take any measure that might jeopardize that. Let me be very clear on that. Having said that and if it so appears that we can change eventually to two meetings with all the provisos that I've said, well, then first of all let us get a clear legal advice whether we need an amendment or not, because that's not clear among people in the room. I subscribe to the intervention of Cuba, and if one of the reasons is also economic, then we should try to get to a system of two meetings that does not require the same amount of travel for ExCom members as it is now. Let's then move up the Open Ended Working Group to May, so that we can be back-to-back to MOP and OEWG both. So, let me support the U.K. suggestion and of all other speakers before me that we take this in a very serene way and that we continue thinking about it at next meeting. I don't think we need a clear decision now, but let's give us ourselves the time to think this over with, with prudence and not rush into things. Thank you.

Chair:

16. Thank you Belgium. Niger please and then the United Kingdom, Iran and Canada.

Niger:

17. Thank you Madam. We would join other speakers in expressing sincere thanks to the Secretariat for putting forward this document studying the practice of ExCom, it's full of useful information. Like the United Kingdom, Cuba and other delegations, we feel that it's very premature to move to two meetings if we compare the current regime which has only been in place for a year, and then it's already a very laborious regime compared to the previous one with two sub-committees. Like the delegate of Cuba, we feel that we need to think about increasing staff and if we have two meetings in 2006 and 2007, instead of talking about evening meetings, perhaps we should extend the number of days. That would take us through the weekends, for example, and that would make conference staff and personnel costs a lot more expensive. So, keeping the regime without the sub-committees is one which we feel has worked. For intersessional developments maybe a video conference might be possible as Japan has suggested, but we would tend to disagree with Japan on this system. We would prefer to work morning, afternoon, and night than start going down that road, but in any event we feel it's very premature to go this way and we think that at the 46<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee we could come back to discussing this again. Thank you.

Chair:

18. Thank you Niger. United Kingdom.

United Kingdom:

19. Thank you Madam Chair. I didn't actually ask for the floor, but I'm very happy that you offered it to me. We were actually very pleased to hear all the support around the room for my delegation's view that this topic definitely deserves consideration at the next meeting and possibly the one after. We do think however, that it should be possible for this group to reach a decision on this in time to present something to the next Meeting of the Parties and we think that this would time in very nicely with the report that we are going to need to provide on the ICF consulting evaluation and would hope that we could resolve the issue in time to do that. Thank you.

Chair:

20. Thank you United Kingdom. Iran to be followed by Canada, Iran please.

Iran:

21. Thank you Madam. I would like to thank the Secretariat for this paper. There are a number of issues we would like to bring up. As far the intersessional approvals are concerned, this delegation doesn't believe it is the level of funding associated with any particular project which is important, it is rather the nature of decision-making. In some instances the Committee has had lengthy discussion on proposals for a few thousand dollars, so what kind of ceiling to which the Secretariat can make approval. Plus the fact that in decision-making there are a number of people present in the ExCom. The number maybe 40, 50 or even more, so it is the collective wisdom which is applied to making decisions. Secondly, we'd like to say that we are quite happy with the present arrangement of the meeting without the sub-committees, and the benefit is that everybody has the chance to take part in the discussions. The third thing is that we have apparently missed one component or one benefit of the meetings which is the interaction between delegates and contact groups, informal meetings when we are considering to reduce the number of meetings to two. A lot of work has been done at the margin of the meeting with the implementing agency, with the Secretariat, with each other, this has helped to reach understanding on various issues. We think this is important and maybe Secretariat can take this into account to see how much of the problem is resolved informally. As to the economy and efficiency, I personally don't like to be travelling all the time, but we have been willing to do so because we make some achievement. As for the economy, we think the suggestion by the delegate of Japan is quite helpful, and that they could be arranged with other meetings related to Montreal Protocol. In summary we think that it is premature to make any decision with the amount of information we have before us now, we should give some more time to see whether it is feasible or not. Thank you.

Chair:

22. Thank you Iran, Canada please.



Canada:

23. Thank you Madam Chair. I'll try to be brief as well at this stage, because I think there seems to be some emerging consensus that we could continue to consider the issue of having two meetings next year but that we're not able to actually take a decision on this at this meeting. Let me first of all also thank the Secretariat for quite a thoughtful and comprehensive document. It made it easy for us to all understand the issues involved. We'd point out that the document argues that the main driver for the frequency of the meetings of the Executive Committee has been the burden and complexity of its work. Therefore, we agree with Belgium and other delegates that the main arguments for reducing the number of meetings from three to two would be that the workload or the complexity would somehow be reduced, or that somehow the work can be dealt with more efficiently through the application of standardized approaches. At this point it is not evident that we would be able to do this by 2006, it's possible, but we're really not sure, we know that there will be increasingly a diminishing number of projects to approve, so it is possible. As well, if the ExCom were to adopt an intersessional procedure for approving projects, the workload during meetings could be reduced somewhat further.

24. At this stage, we think that the Secretariat has provided quite comprehensive documentation and we're not sure what more the Secretariat can present to us, we'd have to see how things go. Cuba has mentioned the further information, financial information which perhaps the Secretariat could include a brief document on this by the next meeting as well as if there are any other important outstanding issues which were not reflected in the present document then perhaps the Secretariat could include those in a further document for the next meeting. But we think that the document we have before us basically gives us a pretty comprehensive view of the picture and we have to see whether there will be an actual reduction of work as time goes on. With respect to the intersessional procedure for approving projects, we will recall that the reason why we asked the Secretariat to present a paper on this at the last meeting was not principally related to having two meetings but was related to the issue of compliance and not delaying projects if there was an urgency for compliance of the recipient country. So we would support actually applying a non-objectional procedure for approving projects as described by the Secretariat to areas with, and without established policy and guidelines where there is compliance as an issue. This could be combined with a procedure delegating authority to the Secretariat to approve projects in areas where there are well established guidelines in place. So, this would be according to the Secretariat's paper in paragraph 45, we would support basically their option 4. We think this option may provide some additional work to ExCom members between sessions, but it has a low risk of compromising ExCom responsibility. Furthermore, it would provide some relief to the overall workload of the ExCom and a solution to compliance related urgent requests. With respect to the organization of work without the sub-committees, we think that this year has worked fairly well, so we support the current process of considering all issues during the plenary. Thank you.

Chair:

25. Thank you Canada, Hungary has the floor.

Hungary:

26. Thank you Madam Chairperson. First, I also thank the Secretariat for the very thorough analysis. There is only one point I would like to express my partial disagreement with one of the statements of the study and this is in paragraph 74(b), that lists the disadvantages of the possible two meeting format. It says that “since the new scheduling under the two meeting format may not provide the opportunity to hold meetings back-to-back with the Open-ended Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties”, it is the last bullet point, I think there is no special difficulty to hold the second meeting back-to-back with Meeting of the Parties, because it is usually held in November or sometimes in December and if the Ozone Secretariat can hear the suggestion of our distinguished Belgian colleague to bring forward the Open-ended Working Group in May, both meetings can be held back-to-back. So, my delegation has the opinion that the two meeting format might be introduced and Argentina suggested a very flexible way how to introduce and when. Concerning the working method, the plenary session without sub-committees proved to be appropriate, so, I would suggest to follow that method. Thank you very much.

Chair:

27. Thank you Hungary. Well if there are no further speakers, I’m going to try to sum up what’s been said about this item. On the whole, I think there are two points on which there is consensus, the first is the advantage of having done away with the sub-committees. No delegation has objected to this, no one’s calling for a reversion to the sub-committees. Belgium, I think suggested we keep things going as they are for a year then take another look at it, but I think we can adopt this procedure and endorse the way in which the Executive Committee operates at present for a further year. The other point where there is consensus is the need for more thorough consideration in the course of the next year of the possibility of reducing meetings from three to two a year. There are delegations which have pointed out that this could be done. Argentina for example, suggested a formula for amending the Terms of Reference of the Executive Committee, specifically paragraph 8 of the Terms of Reference, which says “the Executive Committee shall hold three meetings a year while retaining the flexibility to take advantage of the opportunity provided by other Montreal Protocol meetings to convene additional meetings where special circumstances make this desirable”. So it’s clear, the Executive Committee can, under the Terms of Reference have three meetings or more as they stand, but not fewer, so to reduce it to two, there would be a need to amend those Terms of Reference and only the Meeting of the Parties can do that. But anyway, Argentina’s proposal is on the table, it does provide for flexibility when it says two or more meetings, if necessary.

28. As regards the establishment of an intersessional procedure, some delegations pointed out that the authority for approval of projects should remain with the Executive Committee others suggested some delegation of authority in the Secretariat, or in Japan’s case, in the person of the Chief Officer of the Multilateral Fund. However, it seems clear that this matter needs to be studied further and Japan and Niger have established that some video conference system might be explored in this regard. Canada pointed out that the intersessional procedure is not necessarily tied to the question of reducing to two meetings, rather it’s just to facilitate approval of projects where there may have been difficulties with the regard to compliance by the country concerned and on the whole there is a fair measure of consensus that perhaps the non-objection

procedure currently used by bilateral agencies which has been used in the past by them could be extended to such cases and Austria, Canada and others took that view. There's also consensus that the two meeting should not involve an increase in the workload of these meetings, and there should be an attempt to find a way of holding them in conjunction with other meetings under the Montreal Protocol. Belgium suggested moving the Open-ended Working Group meeting to May which is something that would have to be agreed upon with the Ozone Secretariat. My proposal is that the Secretariat might perhaps compile all of these opinions in one document. There have been a lot of them and perhaps as Cuba requested, it might provide some information on the financial implications, or financial advantages of adopting one or other of the options before us, and the delegations which haven't spoken should have the chance to transmit their comments to the Secretariat on these matters and then a document would be submitted to the next meeting of the Executive Committee. Now is that an acceptable way of proceeding to delegates? Belgium please.

Belgium:

29. Yes, it is, for me it's completely acceptable. If I understood you well, we would still have some time to submit written comments on this issue after the meeting. I was going to suggest that, but you're quicker than me. I would also like to know the opinion of the implementing agencies on this because they are now working at a very clear structure of meetings and, and, as we know from this document and from experience, any change may relieve workload, and it may not. I think, I remain of the opinion that it is way too early to make the switch, I think that Canada has supported that. We have to give it more time and I mean, 2006 is too early in my mind, let me be very clear about that. We will have to see how the workload evolves for some time but my suggestion would be to also invite the implementing agencies to submit comments on this eventual two meeting innovation. Thank you.

Chair:

30. Thank you Belgium, Japan has the floor.

Japan:

31. Madam Chair. I wish to know whether there is any consensus on the desirability of having back-to-back meetings with the OEWG? I think nobody wanted to have two more meetings than the actual two meetings which are, you know, made in conjunction with the OEWG and MOP. In fact, you know, we have only one meeting which is not organized back-to-back to the Meeting of the Parties or the OEWG. So we are not increasing that number and because of the back-to-back arrangement we have been able to come only three times a year to the Executive Committee. I think there's a consensus on that. In order to enable the Secretariat to make further proposals on the intersessional consultation arrangement, I think the information on the projects in pipeline and the status of compliance record would be very useful. We mentioned that point and hope that that point, would need some more consideration in the future. Thank you.

Chair:

32. Thank you Japan. Well, it's clear that nobody wants to increase the number of meetings and of course what you said about projects in the pipeline is valid and so is your proposal for the business plan to be submitted to the last meeting of the previous year. All of that will be taken into account by the Secretariat when it prepares the document which collates everything that's been said by you at this meeting. Cuba has the floor.

Cuba:

33. Thank you Madam. I think the major conclusion we've drawn is that there's not a general consensus, yet we need to continue studying the question. The only thing that there is consensus on is that this should continue to be discussed and it's important for all the aspects to be taken into account. We can look at it again at the next meeting but that is the only consensus, thank you.

Chair:

34. Cuba, from your last statement, I understand that you disagree with continuing with the current procedure of continuing meetings without the sub-committees.

Cuba:

35. Madam Chairman. I was only referring to this idea of having two or three meetings, but as to whether the Executive Committee without the sub-committees has been a success, well, it's been a comprehensive success. We have the fullest understanding and support for this. It was not that aspect that I was commenting, it's on the other one, which needs to be studied further and checked.

Chair:

36. Well, all the delegations agree with continuing through 2005 discussing this matter and seeing how the workload evolves in the Executive Committee and to go on studying the matter. Well, the opinions will be compiled by the Secretariat in a document taking on board the opinions of delegations in the Executive Committee over the course of the next year. If there are no further opinions on this matter, then it may be so decided.

Chair:

37. Do any agencies wish to take the floor? The World Bank. UNDP.

UNDP:

38. No, we, we're fine with suggestion that we send written comments by the deadline, we definitely haven't had time to analyze the impact on the cash flow, especially on some of the national plans and things like that, so we would like to look more carefully on this before we send comments. Thank you.

Chair:

39. Thank you UNDP. Well, the deadline for written comments will be February 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Written Comments**Brazil

- In assisting the ExCom to decide on the convenience of holding two meetings a year instead of three, the Secretariat might want to identify commonalities and differences between Multilateral Fund (MLF) procedures and those of the GEF, which holds two meetings a year. This comparative analysis might include project approval, frequency of business plan and fund balance reviews, monitoring and evaluation procedures and other matters. We believe that the MLF and the GEF each has its own identity and purposes, which justify their mutual independence and their different proceedings. However, some lessons might be learned by the MLF from the GEF, **as far as meetings' dynamics is concerned**. In this sense, it is not the case of applying GEF's proceedings regarding budget, business plans and monitoring and evaluation to the MLF, but of assessing how these and other issues are presented before GEF Council members and analyzed by the GEF Council, **therefore impacting on the duration and frequency of meetings**.
- It is not clear to us why the reduction of ExCom meetings would prevent the Committee from holding sessions back-to-back with OEWG and MOP meetings (§ 228 of ExCom44 report). This explanation could be made more explicit in the new Secretariat's paper. We look forward, in this sense, to seeing the cost estimates to be produced by the Secretariat for the various scenarios.
- An intersessional approval procedure on a non-objection basis would be an important element if the ExCom is to hold two meetings a year. As stated in paragraph 230 of ExCom 44 report, the current interim procedure is a good basis for a new interim procedure. In crafting this procedure, we should avoid the risk of increasing instead of simplifying the workload of all participants in this process (ExCom members, Secretariat, agencies, interested Parties) or of rendering this workload highly unpredictable. We also believe ExCom meetings should remain the primary *locus* of decision-making within the Multilateral Fund. Intersessional review of projects should therefore respond to a compliance imperative of an interested Party and be guided by criteria regarding the relevance and urgency of projects submitted for intersessional approval. There might be a need for a cost ceiling to projects eligible for intersessional review, as well as a limit to the number of projects that can be presented for intersessional review (precedence to be determined by compliance needs, for instance). Exemption of the cost ceiling rule could be granted to projects already analyzed in a prior ExCom meeting, to which specific adjustments were sought and which are submitted to intersessional approval upon explicit recommendation by the ExCom.

- As regards the proposed text for a possible amendment to the Rules of Procedure of the Executive Committee (§226 of ExCom44's report), Brazil could go along with it. Alternatively, the text could read "at least two and no more than three" meetings a year.

### Mauritius

The comments for Mauritius are as below:

We would like to associate ourselves with all the various implications highlighted in the Secretariat document as well as points raised by members in the previous ExCom meeting on the review of the structure of the meeting. We wish to emphasize on a few points:

- Current transitional period of the Committee from a project-focused operating environment to one enabling compliance.

In this context, sufficient meetings have to be held to undertake future workload especially in terms policies and procedures to enable it to monitor the implementation of the national ODS phase-out programmes and assist Article 5 countries in meeting their Montreal protocol phase-out schedules in a timely manner.

In view of the above, Mauritius has two proposals for the immediate and medium term as follows:

- (a) Immediate term: Three meetings format continues for at least one year
- (b) Medium term: The holding of the number of meetings be left open and schedule as per the workload.

### United Kingdom

The report prepared by the Secretariat provided a good start for thinking about this issue and we thank the MLF for preparing it.

With regards to the operation of the ExCom without Sub-committees we agree that the new regime started in 2004 should continue.

With regards to continuing with the present regime (3 meeting/year) or to remove one meeting from the present format, we feel that the following considerations should be taken into account before making a final decision:

1. The future role of the MLF relating to supporting compliance: Most larger volume-consuming countries have now entered into agreements with the ExCom for sectoral or national-phase-out plans, the costs of which have been agreed in principle. The focus of the work of the MLF should now be on ensuring implementation of agreements and ensuring that the remaining low-volume consuming countries continue to be provided with relevant assistance to enable them to comply with the control provisions of the MP.

2. The need to eventually identify new tasks for ExCom and the Secretariat in order to meet the new challenge, which may result in adjusting the distribution of tasks between ExCom and the Secretariat .We might wish to give more responsibility concerning routine work to the Secretariat and consider a procedure for intersessional approvals resulting in the delegation of a new level of authority to the Secretariat under specific conditions.

After clarifying these points we could then adjust the organization of work accordingly. Part of this would be a decision on whether we would need to keep the present frequency of meetings or reduce the number of meetings to two per year.

To facilitate our discussion we believe it would be very helpful if we could have a new policy paper from the Secretariat covering the options we have, on the basis of a thorough analysis of all the possible changes we might be confronted with in the next 12 month or so, including those already contained in the Evaluation report presented to MOP last week.

We would also need to carefully consider whether any proposed change to the meeting regime actually resolves the issue of frequency of travel or simply reduces the number of days.

#### *France*

Here are a few comments to the document:

Point 2: We would prefer the wording "identify the CHANGE of tasks" rather than "identify new tasks", as it may be that some tasks will be reduced. If there are only two ExCom meetings per year, it would be interesting to count how many preparation (reading, preparing comments, attending) work days will be reduced all together, which can be shifted to other tasks.

Point 3: We agree to take the decision of reducing the number of meetings from three to two with intersessional approvals after analyzing the organization of the workload. We would suggest to include the other meetings, such as the inter-agency meetings in the analysis.

Considering such additional meetings is also linked to the last paragraph. Here we would like to add that it is not only the issue of the frequency of travel or the reduction of the number of days, but also a question of costs (travel costs + person/days of work): when we count the interagency meetings, we are talking of up to five trips/meetings for ExCom preparation.

#### UNDP

1. UNDP would definitely prefer a regimen with 2 rather than 3 meetings a year as it would reduce the number of deadlines for submission of documents. This in turn would allow more time to devote efforts to implementation/formulation of programmes, and assist

countries in these efforts, rather than running from one deadline to the next throughout the year.

2. The model proposed by the MLFS is definitely a good proposal, but as mentioned during the last Interagency Coordination meeting, UNDP would much prefer following scheduling throughout the year to avoid overloading most of the work at the last meeting of the year:

July meeting: Would deal with Progress Reports (including financial aspects) and submissions that were delayed a year earlier, plus a portion of the submissions of the year itself. This meeting would be back-to-back with the OEWG to save costs. The meeting would prepare the yearly report for consideration at the MOP which typically takes place in Oct-Nov of each year.

December meeting: Would deal with the next year's business plans and approve PRP funds needed to allow IA's to get on with their next year's work from early January on. Results from recommendations from the MOP and ImpCom meetings (typically held in Oct-Nov) which might affect the business plans would promptly be incorporated by the IA's in the business plans. This meeting would also deal with remaining submissions of the year concerned.

3. Observations:

- While the last ExCom would not be back-to-back with the MOP, this cost-saving aspect would be recuperated as the July-meeting would be back-to-back with the OEWG.
- The annoyance of splitting up the progress report between the two meetings would be avoided in our proposal.
- Allowing inter-sessional approvals such as is done in the GEF would reduce workloads at the 2 remaining ExComs to a level that is likely to be workable. This last proposal may only apply for projects for which mutual agreement is reached between the MLFS and the IAs and would anyway be in the list for blanket approval. Such projects would then be posted for 2 weeks on the intranet accessible for comments by ExCom Members.
- Submissions of tranche requests in Agreements must be adjusted accordingly as to avoid delays in implementation. The possibility of advancing tranches which are due in March to the year before need to be considered on a case by case basis.