



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
19 March 2010

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixtieth Meeting
Montreal, 12-15 April 2010

OVERVIEW OF ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING PROJECT REVIEW

Pre-session documents of the Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol are without prejudice to any decision that the Executive Committee might take following issuance of the document.

Introduction

1. This document consists of the following sections:
 - (a) An analysis of the number of projects and activities submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies to the 60th Meeting;
 - (b) Policy issues identified during the project review process (including projects submitted to the 60th Meeting not included in business plans or not required for compliance);
 - (c) Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval;
 - (d) Investment projects for individual consideration;

Projects and activities submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies

2. Bilateral and implementing agencies submitted 102 funding requests including new multi-year agreements, tranches of approved multi-year agreements, as well as projects and activities amounting to US \$55,684,552, including agency support costs where applicable, as submitted. Following the project review process by the Secretariat, 48 projects and activities totalling US \$8,129,123 are recommended for blanket approval; 40 projects and activities totalling US \$40,464,688 are being forwarded for consideration by the Executive Committee; and 14 projects and activities totalling US \$5,276,332 were withdrawn by the relevant agencies. The Secretariat is recommending not to approve three projects in UNEP's work programme totalling US \$791,000 (as submitted). At the time of preparing this document, four projects (two in China, and one each in Jordan and Mexico totalling US \$13,424,592 as submitted) were still under discussion with relevant implementing agencies. If no agreement on the funding level is reached two weeks in advance of the 60th Meeting, the projects would be deferred to a future Meeting as required under decision 20/15¹.

Policy issues identified during project review

3. During the project review process, the Secretariat identified the following policy issues:
 - (a) Projects submitted to the 60th Meeting not included in the business plans or not required for compliance;
 - (b) Funding of institutional strengthening renewals;
 - (c) Final tranches of ODS phase-out plans not submitted to the 60th Meeting;
 - (d) HCFC phase-out projects with a requested level of funding of over US \$5 million;
 - (e) HCFC phase-out projects in domestic and commercial refrigeration enterprises.

Projects submitted to the 60th Meeting not included in business plans or not required for compliance

4. Implementing agencies have submitted to the 60th Meeting, US \$2,249,550 in activities that were not included in the 2010 business plans. Projects amounting to US \$13,826,934 in values that exceed

¹ "That no project proposals should be submitted to the Executive Committee until agreement had been reached between the Implementing Agency and the Secretariat on the cost of items of capital equipment and the operating costs required to implement the project. Where no agreement had been achieved, the underlying basis of the disagreement should be presented to the Executive Committee for consideration prior to consideration of the project".

those in the business plans, and US \$1,713,400 in values below those in the business plans have also been submitted. In total, the Executive Committee has a net of US \$14,363,084 in values above the business plans submitted to the same meeting at which business plans are presented for consideration.

5. The higher portion of values of activities submitted to the 60th Meeting that were not included in the business plans results from the submission of France of a demonstration project for disposal of unwanted ODS in Mexico valued at US \$1.12 million. Other activities not included in business plans relate to the final tranches of a few NPPs/TPMPs planned for submission after 2010, as well as project preparation for ODS disposal activities and HPMP preparation (Table 1 below).

Table 1. Activities submitted to the 60th Meeting not included in business plans

Country	Agency	Sector / Sub-Sector	US\$ requested 60 th Meeting(*)	Notes
Bangladesh	UNEP	National ODS phase-out plan (sixth tranche)	25,425	2010 business plans included fund requested for fifth tranche only.
Bangladesh	UNDP	National ODS phase-out plan (sixth and seventh tranches)	118,250	2010 business plans included fund requested for fifth tranche only.
Ecuador	UNIDO	Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam manufacturing sector)	64,500	
Egypt	UNIDO	National CFC phase-out plan (fifth tranche)	107,500	2010 business plan included fund requested for fourth tranche only.
Egypt	UNIDO	Preparation for a pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	64,500	
India	UNDP	Preparation of a project for demonstration of a sustainable technological, financial and management model for disposal of ODS	86,000	
Jordan	IBRD	PRP for HCFC refrigeration sector plan (commercial)	32,250	
Maldives	UNDP	HCFC phase-out management plan	400,000	
Mexico	France	Demonstration project for disposal of unwanted ODS (phase I)	1,120,000	
Nigeria	UNIDO	Preparation for a pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	64,500	
Serbia	UNIDO	National CFC phase-out plan (fifth tranche)	75,250	2010 business plan included fund requested for fourth tranche only.
Somalia	UNIDO	Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan	91,375	

(*) Including agency support costs

6. Bilateral and implementing agencies also submitted in their business plans several activities not required for compliance as shown in Table 2. In its work programme, UNEP included several activities that were not required for compliance and that had not been considered previously by the Executive Committee. The Secretariat requested UNEP to withdraw those activities from the funding requests in its work programme to enable the Committee to first consider them in UNEP's business plan; however UNEP did not withdraw all of the activities requested by the Secretariat.

Table 2. Activities submitted to the 60th Meeting not required for compliance

Country	Agency	Project	US\$ in 2010 business plans (*)	US\$ requested 60th Meeting (*)
Mexico	UNIDO	ODS disposal demonstration project	1,064,250	1,852,225
Region: ASP	UNEP	Technical assistance to MDI producing countries in ASP region for CFC use for EUNs 2010-2012	150,000	169,500
Region: ASP	UNEP	Regional Enforcement networking to improve compliance with Multilateral Environmental Agreements that include trade restrictions (Montreal Protocol; Rotterdam, Stockholm and Basel Conventions) (Request funding for ozone component)	1,006,830	372,900
Region: ECA	UNEP	Initiating regional cooperation to enforce ODS trade controls in Europe and Central Asia network countries (second tranche)	32,000	31,075
Region: EUR	Czech Republic	Initiating regional cooperation to enforce ODS trade controls in ECA network countries (joint implementation with UNEP)	91,000	90,965
Global	Italy	HCFCs phase out + destruction of un wanted ODS	361,600	361,600
Global	UNEP	Techno- economic study on cost benefit of leapfrogging high GWP alternatives to HFCs to low GWP or zero GWP alternatives	226,000	226,000
Global	UNEP	Dates/Methyl Bromide Help Desk	395,000	395,500
Global	UNDP	Resource Mobilization to address climate co-benefits re HCFCs	269,000	268,750
Global	UNDP	Resource Mobilization to address climate co-benefits re HCFCs	269,000	268,750
Global	UNIDO	Funds mobilization for additional climate benefits	322,500	322,500
Global	UNIDO	Funds mobilization for additional climate benefits	322,500	322,500
Global	World Bank	Resource Mobilization for HCFC Phase-out Co-benefits	269,000	268,750
Global	World Bank	Resource Mobilization for HCFC Phaseout Co-benefits	269,000	268,750

(*) Including agency support costs

7. It should be noted that agencies were asked to submit their business plans only twice, once in advance of the Inter-agency coordination meeting and then at the submission date. Following the submission date, no further additions were accepted. However, one would not expect activities to have been left out of business plans or submitted at higher values than those in the business plans submitted to the same meeting.

8. Members may recall that agencies had submitted draft business plans when there had been a Subcommittee for Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance, but since the Subcommittee was dissolved, the Committee has considered only one business plan per year. Business plans exceed the remaining allocation for the triennium and therefore are monitored at every meeting following their approval, but not at the same meeting as their approval as it had been assumed that agencies would reflect their submissions in the business plans that are submitted to the same meeting. Without a draft business plan, the Committee is not in a position to opine on planned activities in advance of their request for funding.

9. To ensure that business plans reflect submissions to the same meeting and to provide the Committee with a first consideration of a new activity in the business plan before a funding request is made, the Executive Committee may wish to require that activities submitted at the same meeting as that at which the business plans are considered should be deferred from consideration at the same meeting if they are either: not included in the business plans, submitted at a higher value than those in the business plans, or represent activities not required for compliance that have not been previously considered by the Committee.

Funding of institutional strengthening renewals

10. In response to decision 53/39, the Secretariat presented an analysis in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63 on institutional strengthening (IS) projects and options for funding IS projects after 2010. At its 57th Meeting, the Committee decided to consider the document in the context of the outstanding policy issues related to HCFC phase-out. Although the Committee has not been able to have a substantial discussion on funding of IS projects, at its 59th Meeting it decided “(a) to extend financial support for institutional strengthening (IS) funding for Article 5 Parties beyond 2010 up to December 2011, and (b) to allow Article 5 Parties to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HCFC phase-out management plans” (decision 59/47).

11. Funding for the renewal of IS projects submitted to the 60th Meeting has been requested according to decision 59/47, except for the following three cases: the IS renewals for Mongolia and Nauru (submitted by UNEP) where a ten per cent increase in the funding levels was requested to account for additional work to address ozone and climate benefits. The third case relates to the submission of the IS renewal project for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as a component of its HPMP (submitted by UNIDO).

12. In the case of the IS renewal projects for Mongolia and Nauru, the Secretariat pointed out that an arbitrary increase of ten percent in the funding level was not within the current guidelines for funding such projects and that funding could be extended only up to December 2011. Subsequently, UNEP resubmitted both proposals according to decision 59/47. In the case of the renewal of the IS project for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, paragraphs (a) and (b) of decision 59/47 are mutually exclusive, taking into consideration that funding for the implementation of the proposed activities in the HPMP (including IS) is requested up to 2015. However, in light of decision 59/47(a), funding for the IS component could only be approved up to December 2011.

13. In its deliberation on the issues presented in this document, the Executive Committee may wish to note that the analysis contained in the document mentioned above on options for funding IS projects after 2010, concluded that funding IS projects needs to continue to ensure all phase-out goals are achieved in a sustainable manner (including HCFCs and possible future HFCs). The paper also addresses the need to include performance indicators in requests for the renewal of IS projects and develop new reporting formats.

14. Accordingly, the Executive Committee might wish to consider:

- (a) Extending the current date of up to December 2011 for funding renewals of institutional strengthening (IS) projects at current levels to the usual two-year period of renewal;
- (b) Requesting bilateral and implementing agencies as appropriate to include in the request for renewal of IS projects the following indicators:
 - (i) The achievement of effective measures to control HCFC imports, as a condition for full, two-year approval of requests for renewal of IS funding for all projects submitted after the end of 2011;
 - (ii) Specification as an objective for the development of measures to ensure the long term sustainability of monitoring, enforcement and reporting activities, without ongoing support from IS funding, together with indicators for progressive achievement of this objective;
- (c) Requesting the Secretariat to complete the work on objectives, indicators and formats so that the results can be applied to requests for renewal of institutional strengthening

projects submitted from the beginning of 2011 onwards;

- (d) Further requesting the Secretariat to place consideration of a possible further review of funding for renewal of IS projects on the agenda of the Executive Committee at a future meeting.

Final tranches of ODS phase-out plans not submitted to the 60th Meeting

15. The agreements between Article 5 countries and the Executive Committee for the phase-out of ODS include a phase-out schedule for each ODS covered under the agreement, with its corresponding funding level approved in principle by the Committee. In all the agreements, the total funding is distributed in various tranches throughout the phase-out period, with the last funding tranche being requested between 2007 and 2009 (excluding methyl bromide with a phase-out date of 1 January 2015).

16. Requests for approval of final tranches of NPPs or TPMPs, at a total value of US \$2,338,800 and US \$228,390 for agency support costs, have been submitted to the 60th Meeting by 15 Article 5 countries (i.e., Bangladesh, Botswana, Chile, Congo, Egypt, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kyrgyzstan, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Serbia, Thailand, Uruguay, Yemen and Zimbabwe). The main reasons provided for the delay in the submission of tranches were: a low rate of disbursement of the funding approved from previous tranches, although some activities, such as training programmes or awareness and information dissemination, were being implemented; internal circumstances prevailing in some Article 5 countries restricting travel of national and international experts and distribution of equipment; delays in updating ODS regulations; and delays in procurement of equipment and distribution among technicians or training centres.

17. In reviewing the requests for the last tranches of NPPs and TPMPs submitted to the 60th Meeting, it was proposed to bilateral and implementing agencies to consider revising the work programmes associated with the last tranches of the NPPs or TPMPs to include not only activities to sustain zero consumption of CFCs but also to facilitate the phase-out of HCFCs. This proposal was made considering the fact that as of 1 January 2010 no more CFCs can be imported, and taking into account the number of customs officers and technicians that have been trained, and the recovery/recycling network and incentive programmes for the conversion of CFC-based equipment in place. Furthermore, funding for the preparation of HPMPs has been approved for the majority of Article 5 countries. Responses received from bilateral and implementing agencies on this proposal have been summarized in the relevant country's project proposal document.

18. In addition to the requests submitted to the 60th Meeting, final tranches of NPPs or TPMPs in the 20 Article 5 countries listed in Table 3 below, with a total cost of US \$1,894,045 and US \$169,754 for agency support costs, had yet to be submitted.

Table 3. Last tranches of NPPs or TPMPs yet to be submitted

Country	Agency	Consumption (ODP tonnes)		Cost (US \$)	
		2007 (allowed)	2008	Project	Support
Antigua and Barbuda	World Bank	1.6	0.1	27,900	2,511
Burundi	UNEP/UNIDO	8.9	1.0	94,000	(47,670)
Central African Republic (the)	France/UNEP	1.7	-	90,000	11,700
Democratic Republic of the Congo (the)	UNDP/UNEP	99.9	8.6	143,750	14,735
Democratic People's Republic of Korea (the) (*)	UNEP	66.3	33.5	10,000	1,300
Dominica	UNDP/UNEP	0.2	-	19,000	2,230
Equatorial Guinea	UNEP	4.7	2.3	75,000	9,750
Eritrea	UNEP/UNIDO	6.2	2.8	145,000	15,850
Guatemala	UNEP	33.7	1.4	32,000	4,160
Haiti	UNEP	25.4	2.3	65,000	8,450
Kuwait	UNEP/UNIDO	72.1	33.0	105,000	13,250
Lao, People's Democratic Republic (the)	France	6.5	2.0	138,500	18,005
Peru	UNDP/UNEP	43.4	-	261,000	23,838
Saint Kitts and Nevis	UNDP/UNEP	0.6	-	17,000	2,090
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	UNEP	0.3	-	14,000	1,820
Saudi Arabia	UNEP/UNIDO	269.8	365.0	183,500	15,990
Sierra Leone	UNDP/UNEP	11.8	4.2	75,000	8,950
Suriname	UNEP	6.2	-	53,000	6,890
Tunisia	World Bank	130.5	12.2	345,395	25,905
Turkey (**)	World Bank	570.9	-	-	30,000
Total				1,894,045	169,754

(*) Funding was deferred by the Executive Committee to the 61st Meeting.

(**) Funding is only for the agency support cost.

19. From reviewing the data in the above table, the following observations seem relevant:
- Except for one country (Saudi Arabia) the 2008 CFC consumption reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol is below the maximum allowable consumption for that year;
 - Seven of the 20 Article 5 countries (Central African Republic, Dominica, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Turkey) reported zero consumption of CFCs in 2008;
 - Funding for the last tranche in one country (the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) was deferred by the Executive Committee to the 61st Meeting; and funding for another country (Turkey) is only for the agency support cost.
20. Noting the stipulations of the NPP or TPMP agreement between an Article 5 country and the Executive Committee that funding will be provided to the country if the annual consumption limits of the ODSs specified in the agreement are met, the Executive Committee may consider:
- Allowing the submission of outstanding funding tranches of national phase-out plans (NPPs) or terminal phase-out plans (TPMPs) in Article 5 countries to the 61st Meeting on the understanding that the Governments concerned, with the assistance from relevant bilateral and implementing agencies, will consider implementing activities to sustain zero consumption of CFCs, and other activities to facilitate the phase-out of HCFCs;
 - Funding tranches of NPPs or TPMPs not submitted to the 61st Meeting should be integrated into the relevant HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) of the countries concerned.

HCFC phase-out projects with a requested level of funding of over US \$5 million

21. On behalf of the Government of Pakistan, UNIDO submitted to the 60th Meeting an umbrella project proposal for the conversion from HCFCs to hydrocarbons in five enterprises manufacturing domestic and/or commercial refrigeration equipment in Pakistan at a total cost of over US \$6.25 million. Noting that the proposal was received only eight weeks in advance of the Meeting and not at the mandatory twelve weeks for projects over US \$5 million as decided by the Executive Committee (decision 20/7²), the Secretariat advised UNIDO that it will begin reviewing the project only after all documents for the 60th Meeting have been finalized, and requested UNIDO's deferral of the project to the 61st Meeting of the Executive Committee.

22. Subsequent to this request, UNIDO divided the original project proposal into two covering the same five enterprises, each proposal at a funding level below US \$5.0 million, and thus not subject to the requirements of decision 20/7. The Secretariat reviewed both project proposals, considering not only their costs, but most importantly the fact that through the conversion of these enterprises the Government of Pakistan might be able to meet the 2013 and 2015 HCFC compliance targets. Furthermore, cost reductions in some project items (such as training, technical assistance, trials and plant commissioning, and possibly in the unitary cost of similar equipment items when several units are required) could be realized when considering the five enterprises together instead of individually.

23. The review of the project proposals covering the five domestic and commercial refrigeration manufacturing plants in Pakistan was more complicated and required more time than other similar projects for the following reasons:

- (a) The overall HCFC consumption in the country had to be analyzed in order to assess whether the reductions in HCFC consumption associated with the projects will be sufficient to meet the 2013 and 2015 compliance targets (as per the requirements of (decision 54/39(d))³. This analysis was undertaken in the absence of a final HPMP for Pakistan, where the assumptions used for forecasting HCFC consumption will be fully described;
- (b) Three of the five enterprises covered under the projects submitted to the 60th Meeting received funding from the Multilateral Fund for phasing out CFC-11 (foam) and CFC-12 (refrigeration). For these enterprises, the previously approved projects had to be reviewed;
- (c) The introduction of hydrocarbon technologies, in particular in domestic refrigeration enterprises, is relatively complex as these companies have more than one production line for insulation of refrigerator components.

24. In order to allow for a thorough review of HCFC projects in the consumption sector with a requested level of funding of more than US \$5 million that might be submitted in 2010 by Article 5

² Projects in the consumption sector with a requested level of funding of more than US \$5 million should be submitted to the Fund Secretariat in full, 12 weeks in advance of the Executive Committee meeting at which they are to be considered. For projects other than umbrella projects: (i) that the submitting agency should, if requested, provide additional information, such as detailed baseline information beyond that normally provided, plant layouts, description, justification and costing of all significant items; (ii) that the analysis and review process could involve a joint visit, if warranted, by the Fund Secretariat's reviewer and the relevant implementing agency (decision 20/7).

³ For countries that chose to implement investment projects in advance of completion of the HPMP: (i) the approval of each project should result in a phase-out of HCFCs to count against the consumption identified in the HPMP, and no such projects could be approved after 2010 unless they were part of the HPMP; (ii) if the individual project approach was used, the submission of the first project should provide an indication of how the demonstration projects related to the HPMP and an indication of when the HPMP would be submitted (decision 54/39(d)).

countries in advance of completion of their HPMPs, the Executive Committee might wish to request bilateral and implementing agencies assisting those countries to submit only one project proposal covering all the enterprises in the relevant sector or subsector, 12 weeks in advance of the Meeting at which it is to be considered.

HCFC phase-out projects in domestic and commercial refrigeration enterprises

25. The majority of the project proposals that were approved for the conversion of domestic and commercial refrigeration manufacturing enterprises included funding for the phase-out of CFC-11 used for the production of rigid polyurethane insulation foam, and CFC-12 used as a refrigerant. The two replacement technologies chosen for CFC-11 were HCFC-141b and cyclopentane; for replacement of CFC-12, HFC-134a was the refrigerant chosen by the majority of the enterprises, except for some domestic refrigeration enterprises that chose isobutane. A summary of Multilateral Fund projects for the conversion of domestic and commercial refrigeration enterprises is presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Approved projects for conversion of domestic and commercial refrigeration enterprises

Number of projects	Cost (million US\$)		Consumption (ODP tonnes)		
			CFC-11 (foam)		CFC-12 (refrigerant)
	Project	Support	To HCFC-141b	To cyclopentane	
Domestic					
87	46.0	4.6	4,515		1,754
96	150.5	17.0		13,583	3,169
<i>Total: 183</i>	<i>196.5</i>	<i>21.6</i>	<i>4,515</i>	<i>13,583</i>	<i>4,923</i>
Commercial					
225	52.7	6.7	3,130		1,419
23	12.9	1.4		779	268
<i>Total: 248</i>	<i>65.6</i>	<i>8.1</i>	<i>3,130</i>	<i>779</i>	<i>1,687</i>

26. The conversion of domestic and commercial refrigeration enterprises to non-CFC alternatives was considered under the refrigeration sector, even though consumption of CFC-11 used as a foam blowing agent represented 79 per cent and 70 per cent of the total CFCs used in the domestic and commercial refrigeration subsectors, respectively. The cost-effectiveness thresholds for the refrigeration sector that have been used since they were adopted by the Executive Committee at its 16th Meeting are: US \$13.76/kg for domestic refrigeration and US \$15.21/kg for commercial refrigeration. In cases where hydrocarbon-based technologies were chosen to replace CFCs in domestic refrigeration projects, the numerator was discounted by up to 35 per cent when calculating the cost-effectiveness value, to take into account the higher cost of hydrocarbon technologies, primarily due to safety factors (decision 17/14). However, this did not apply to the commercial refrigeration sub-sector.⁴

27. The conversion to non-ODS alternatives of all HCFC-based domestic refrigeration enterprises and all the commercial refrigeration enterprises using HFC-134 as the refrigerant relates only to HCFC-141b used as a foam blowing agent. Therefore, these projects could be considered under the foam sector rather than the refrigeration sector. Considering that the introduction of hydrocarbon technologies, in particular in domestic refrigeration enterprises,⁵ is more complex than in other rigid foam applications,

⁴ After an analysis of commercial refrigeration projects undertaken by the Secretariat, the Executive Committee decided that there was no need for the introduction of a discounting factor to account for the additional safety costs needed for hydrocarbon technology because, on average, projects using hydrocarbon technologies were within one per cent of the cost effectiveness threshold for the sector and therefore would not be at a disadvantage when being considered for funding (Decision 20/45).

⁵ Hydrocarbon-based technologies (mainly cyclopentane for foam insulation) have been selected as the preferred ODS replacement by enterprises manufacturing domestic and commercial refrigerators, when the enterprise size allows for a competitive investment. Other technologies do not perform well on insulation value and density of the

as these enterprises usually have more than one production line for insulation of components (doors and cabinets) with several foam dispensers, and also require additional production equipment (new storage tanks and pre-mixers), modifications to a large number of fixtures and jigs, and installation of safety equipment throughout the enterprise, the cost-effectiveness threshold of the rigid foam sub-sector of US \$7.83/kg, might not be applicable. However, establishing a cost-effectiveness threshold would require additional information drawn from the experience gained through reviewing HCFC phase-out projects as stand-alone projects (in 2010) and/or as components of HPMPs.

28. The Executive Committee might wish to consider that projects for the conversion of domestic and/or commercial refrigeration enterprises where the total HCFC consumption is used as a foam blowing agent should be considered under the foam sector as rigid insulation refrigeration foam; and to establish the cost-effectiveness threshold at a future meeting once sufficient information has been gathered from the review of HCFC phase-out projects as stand-alone projects and/or as components of HPMPs.

Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval

29. Annex I to this document, lists 48 projects and activities totalling US \$8,129,123 which are recommended for blanket approval. The approval of these projects by the Executive Committee covers relevant conditions or provisions included in the corresponding project evaluation sheets, as well as the approval of implementation programmes associated with the relevant tranches of multi-year projects.

Investment projects for individual consideration

30. A total of 40 projects and activities totalling US \$40,464,688 as submitted, are proposed for individual consideration. The issues associated with non-investment projects are presented in the bilateral cooperation document (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/16) and in the relevant work programme amendments of the implementing agencies (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/17 for UNDP; UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/18 for UNEP; UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/19 for UNIDO and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/20 for the World Bank).

31. The list of 15 investment projects submitted for individual consideration, including a brief explanation of the issues to be addressed, is shown in Table 5 below:

foam produced (CO₂), are too expensive (operating costs) and have high global warming potential (GWP) values (HFC-based), or are not proven enough for this application (methyl formate, methylal).

Table 5. Investment projects for individual consideration

Country	Project	Agency	Issue	ExCom document
Foam				
Colombia	Demonstration project to validate the use of super-critical CO ₂ in the manufacture of sprayed polyurethane rigid foam	Japan	HCFC demonstration project. Cost agreed	60/25
Colombia	Conversion plan from HCFCs to hydrocarbons in the production of polyurethane rigid insulation foam in the domestic refrigeration subsector (Mabe Colombia, Industrias Haceb, Challenger and Indusel S.A.) (Challenger)	UNDP	HCFC investment project. Cost agreed	60/25
Croatia	Phase-out of HCFC-141b from the manufacturing of polyurethane rigid and integral skin foams at Poly-Mix	Italy	HCFC investment project. Two technologies proposed. Cost agreed	60/27
Pakistan	Phase-out of HCFC-141b from the manufacturing of insulation PU rigid foam at United Refrigeration, HNR (Haier), Varioline Intercool and Shadman Electronics companies	UNIDO	HCFC investment project. Cost agreed	60/36
Pakistan	Phase-out of HCFC-141b from the manufacturing of insulation PU rigid foam at Dawlance	UNIDO	HCFC investment project. Cost agreed	60/36
Turkey	Validation of the use of HFO-1234ze as blowing agent in the manufacture of extruded polystyrene foam boardstock (phase I)	UNDP	HCFC demonstration project. Cost agreed	60/41
Fumigant				
Chile	National phase-out of methyl bromide - terminal project (first tranche)	UNIDO/ UNEP	Multiyear agreement. No outstanding issues. Cost agree	60/23
Phase-out plan				
Bangladesh	National ODS phase-out plan (fifth, sixth and seventh tranches)	UNDP/ UNEP	CFC consumption over allowable level in agreement, due to high consumption for MDIs	60/21
Egypt	National CFC phase-out plan (fourth and fifth tranches)	UNIDO	CFC consumption over level in agreement, due to manufacturing of MDIs	60/28
HPMP				
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	HCFC phase-out management plan (phase I, first tranche)	UNIDO	HPMP (resubmitted from the 59th Meeting)	60/40
Maldives	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	UNDP/ UNEP	HPMP for complete HCFC phase-out	60/33
Refrigeration				
China*	Demonstration project for conversion from HCFC-22 technology to HFC-32 technology in the manufacture of commercial air-source chillers/heat pumps at Tsinghua Tong Fang Artificial Environment Co. Ltd.	UNDP	HCFC demonstration project. Cost not yet agreed	60/24
China*	Demonstration project for conversion from HCFC-22 technology to Ammonia/CO ₂ technology in the manufacture of two-stage refrigeration systems for cold storage and freezing applications at Yantai Moon Group Co. Ltd.	UNDP	HCFC demonstration project. Cost not yet agreed	60/24
Jordan*	Phase-out of HCFC-22 and HCFC-141b from the manufacture of unitary air-conditioning equipment at Petra Engineering Industries Co.	UNIDO	HCFC demonstration project. Cost not yet agreed	60/31
Destruction				
Mexico*	Demonstration project for disposal of unwanted ODS (phase I)	France/ UNIDO	ODS destruction project. Cost not yet agreed	60/34

(*) If no agreement on the funding level is reached two weeks in advance of the 60th Meeting, the project would be deferred to a future Meeting as required under decision 20/15.

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)			C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	Total	
BAHRAIN						
REFRIGERATION						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (air conditioning sector)	UNIDO		\$30,000	\$2,250	\$32,250	
SEVERAL						
Ozone unit support						
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VI)	UNEP		\$52,500	\$0	\$52,500	
Total for Bahrain			\$82,500	\$2,250	\$84,750	
BOTSWANA						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
HCFC phase out plan						
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan	Germany		\$150,000	\$19,500	\$169,500	
CFC phase out plan						
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	Germany		\$50,000	\$6,500	\$56,500	
Total for Botswana			\$200,000	\$26,000	\$226,000	
BRAZIL						
SEVERAL						
Ozone unit support						
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VI)	UNDP		\$307,125	\$23,034	\$330,159	
Total for Brazil			\$307,125	\$23,034	\$330,159	
CHILE						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
CFC phase out plan						
Servicing sector terminal CFC phase-out plan (second tranche)	Canada	32.9	\$261,500	\$33,995	\$295,495	
Total for Chile			32.9	\$261,500	\$33,995	\$295,495
CONGO						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
CFC phase out plan						
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNEP		\$42,000	\$5,460	\$47,460	
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNIDO	1.8	\$45,000	\$4,050	\$49,050	
Total for Congo			1.8	\$87,000	\$9,510	\$96,510
ECUADOR						
FOAM						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500	
Total for Ecuador			\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500	

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
GRENADA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase III)	UNEP		\$52,500	\$0	\$52,500
Total for Grenada			\$52,500		\$52,500
GUATEMALA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
Total for Guatemala			\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
GUINEA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNIDO	1.5	\$60,000	\$5,400	\$65,400
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNEP		\$58,000	\$7,540	\$65,540
Total for Guinea			1.5	\$118,000	\$12,940
GUINEA-BISSAU					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNEP	3.9	\$37,500	\$4,875	\$42,375
Total for Guinea-Bissau			3.9	\$37,500	\$4,875
INDIA					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VIII)	UNDP		\$326,576	\$24,493	\$351,069
Total for India			\$326,576	\$24,493	\$351,069
IRAQ					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan	UNEP		\$100,000	\$13,000	\$113,000
Total for Iraq			\$100,000	\$13,000	\$113,000
JORDAN					
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation of a HCFC refrigeration sector plan (commercial)	IBRD		\$30,000	\$2,250	\$32,250
Total for Jordan			\$30,000	\$2,250	\$32,250

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
KENYA					
FUMIGANT					
Preparation of project proposal					
Project preparation for the elimination of controlled uses of methyl bromide in post-harvest sector	UNIDO		\$40,000	\$3,000	\$43,000
Total for Kenya			\$40,000	\$3,000	\$43,000
KYRGYZSTAN					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
Terminal CFC phase-out management plan (third tranche)	UNDP	5.0	\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
Terminal CFC phase-out management plan (third tranche)	UNEP		\$25,300	\$3,289	\$28,589
Total for Kyrgyzstan			5.0	\$85,300	\$7,789
MEXICO					
FUMIGANT					
Methyl bromide					
National methyl bromide phase-out plan (second tranche)	Spain	50.0	\$800,000	\$93,000	\$893,000
National methyl bromide phase-out plan (second tranche)	Canada	50.0	\$500,000	\$58,527	\$558,527
National methyl bromide phase-out plan (second tranche)	UNIDO	250.0	\$2,000,000	\$150,000	\$2,150,000
Total for Mexico			350.0	\$3,300,000	\$301,527
MONGOLIA					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (XPS foam manufacturing sector)	Japan		\$60,000	\$7,800	\$67,800
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Renewal of the institutional strengthening project (phase VI)	UNEP		\$42,500	\$0	\$42,500
Total for Mongolia			\$102,500	\$7,800	\$110,300
MOROCCO					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
REFRIGERATION					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (refrigeration and air conditioning sectors)	UNIDO		\$40,000	\$3,000	\$43,000
Total for Morocco			\$100,000	\$7,500	\$107,500

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
MOZAMBIQUE					
FUMIGANT					
Technical assistance/support					
Technical assistance for the elimination of controlled uses of methyl bromide in soil fumigation	UNIDO		\$40,000	\$3,600	\$43,600
Total for Mozambique			\$40,000	\$3,600	\$43,600
NICARAGUA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
Terminal phase-out management plan for Annex A Group I substances (second tranche)	UNEP		\$70,000	\$9,100	\$79,100
Total for Nicaragua			\$70,000	\$9,100	\$79,100
PARAGUAY					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
Terminal phase-out management plan for Annex A Group I substances (fourth tranche)	UNEP		\$24,000	\$3,120	\$27,120
Terminal phase-out management plan for Annex A Group I substances (fourth tranche)	UNDP		\$21,000	\$1,575	\$22,575
Total for Paraguay			\$45,000	\$4,695	\$49,695
PHILIPPINES					
SEVERAL					
Ozone unit support					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VII)	IBRD		\$158,491	\$11,887	\$170,378
Total for Philippines			\$158,491	\$11,887	\$170,378
QATAR					
FOAM					
Preparation of project proposal					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$80,000	\$6,000	\$86,000
Total for Qatar			\$80,000	\$6,000	\$86,000
SERBIA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
CFC phase out plan					
National CFC phase-out plan (fourth and fifth tranches)	UNIDO	268.0	\$193,500	\$14,513	\$208,013
Total for Serbia		268.0	\$193,500	\$14,513	\$208,013
SOMALIA					
PHASE-OUT PLAN					
HCFC phase out plan					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan	UNIDO		\$85,000	\$6,375	\$91,375
Total for Somalia			\$85,000	\$6,375	\$91,375

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)			C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	Total	
THAILAND						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
CFC phase out plan						
National CFC phase-out plan: 2010-2012 annual implementation plan	IBRD	501.6	\$385,000	\$34,650	\$419,650	
Total for Thailand		501.6	\$385,000	\$34,650	\$419,650	
URUGUAY						
REFRIGERATION						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (refrigeration manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$50,000	\$3,750	\$53,750	
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
CFC phase out plan						
Terminal phase-out management plan for Annex A Group I Substances (third tranche)	Canada		\$30,000	\$3,900	\$33,900	
Terminal phase-out management plan for Annex A Group I Substances (third tranche)	UNDP	29.9	\$45,000	\$3,375	\$48,375	
Total for Uruguay		29.9	\$125,000	\$11,025	\$136,025	
VENEZUELA						
FOAM						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam sector)	UNIDO		\$100,000	\$7,500	\$107,500	
REFRIGERATION						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (refrigeration and air conditioning manufacturing sector)	UNIDO		\$100,000	\$7,500	\$107,500	
Total for Venezuela			\$200,000	\$15,000	\$215,000	
VIETNAM						
FOAM						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation of a HCFC foam sector plan	IBRD		\$100,000	\$7,500	\$107,500	
REFRIGERATION						
Preparation of project proposal						
Preparation of a HCFC refrigeration sector plan	IBRD		\$100,000	\$7,500	\$107,500	
Total for Vietnam			\$200,000	\$15,000	\$215,000	
YEMEN						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
ODS phase out plan						
National ODS phase-out plan (second tranche)	UNEP		\$140,000	\$18,200	\$158,200	
National ODS phase-out plan (second tranche)	UNIDO		\$233,000	\$17,475	\$250,475	
Total for Yemen			\$373,000	\$35,675	\$408,675	

List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)			C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	Total	
ZIMBABWE						
PHASE-OUT PLAN						
CFC phase out plan						
National phase-out of Annex A (Group I) substances (phase II, fourth tranche)	Germany		\$40,000	\$5,108	\$45,108	
Total for Zimbabwe			\$40,000	\$5,108	\$45,108	
REGION: EUR						
SEVERAL						
Technical assistance/support						
Initiating regional cooperation to enforce ODS trade controls in Europe and Central Asia network countries (second tranche)	UNEP		\$27,500	\$3,575	\$31,075	
Initiating regional cooperation to enforce ODS trade controls in Europe and Central Asia network countries (second tranche)	Czech Rep		\$80,500	\$10,465	\$90,965	
Total for Region: EUR			\$108,000	\$14,040	\$122,040	
GRAND TOTAL		1,194.6	\$7,453,492	\$675,631	\$8,129,123	