



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/55
4 June 2010



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Sixty-first Meeting
Montreal, 5-9 July 2010

OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (DECISION 57/39)

Introduction

1. This document is prepared as a follow-up to decision 57/39 which maintained the *status quo* of holding three meetings a year, requested the Secretariat to organize, within the next year, one meeting with a duration of four days, rather than five days and to monitor the time and workload at Meetings of the Executive Committee as compared to those of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP) and the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG). Furthermore the Executive Committee decided to place the issue of the operation of Executive Committee Meetings on the agenda for the 61st Meeting.
2. For the benefit of the Executive Committee, in particular members that joined the Committee in January 2010, the findings and conclusions from the previous papers prepared by the Secretariat on the operation of the Executive Committee can be found in Annex 1 to this document.
3. This document consists of the following sections:
 - (a) A report on the experience of the four-day meeting;
 - (b) A consideration of the workload at Executive Committee Meetings as compared to MOP and OEWG meetings based on consultations with the Ozone Secretariat;
 - (c) An analysis of the future workload of the Executive Committee;
 - (d) Conclusions; and,
 - (e) A recommendation for the Executive Committee's consideration.

A report on the experience of the four-day meeting

4. In accordance with decision 57/39(b), the 60th Meeting of the Executive Committee had a four-day duration instead of the customary five-day one. During a five-day meeting, the Executive Committee normally meets daily in morning and afternoon sessions from Monday to Thursday and again for a session on Friday afternoon to adopt the draft report; a total of nine sessions. There is usually no session on Friday morning to allow time for the Secretariat to prepare the draft report, however there is some flexibility for an additional session to be scheduled at that time if any issues remain to be discussed. The 60th Meeting consisted of nine sessions over four days: a morning and afternoon session each of the four days plus an additional evening session that was convened on the evening of day three.
5. With the same number of sessions for each meeting, the actual hours spent in session during the four-day meeting did not differ significantly from the customary five-day one. However, one consequence of holding the meeting over four days instead of five was that there were fewer time slots available to schedule meetings of contact groups and the sub-group on the production sector. The intensity of the contact group meeting schedule can also be similar in a five-day meeting, for example as it was during the 59th Meeting in Port Ghalib when the contact group on HCFC guidelines met several times.
6. The lack of a free session on the morning of the final day of the meeting resulted in less time for the preparation of the draft meeting report, which was issued on the afternoon of the final day. Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/L.1 was issued in English and translations into Arabic, French and Spanish, while document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/L.1/Add.1, which covered a significant number of other agenda items (see table 1), was issued in English only and contained solely draft decisions with no narrative text. Members were thus denied the opportunity to provide feedback on the narrative text and some could not review the draft report in their language of choice.

7. The main factors affecting the difference in costs of a four-day versus a five-day meeting in Montreal are interpretation, translation and report writing costs, the rental of equipment and premises and the number of days of daily subsistence allowance for sponsored delegates. Taking into account these factors the cost of a four-day meeting is in the order of US \$20,000 less than a five-day meeting. This amount of saving broadly concurs with the calculations of four-day meeting costs presented to the 45th Meeting in document UNEP/Oz.Pro/ExCom/45/48.

8. Due to the complexity of the policy issues on the agenda of the 60th Meeting and as noted above, an additional session was convened on the evening of day three. Despite the additional session there was not sufficient time to address a number of agenda items and these items were deferred to the 61st Meeting. Also since the implementing agencies were requested to submit revised business plans to the 61st Meeting (decision 60/5), the agenda items for individual agencies' business plans were brief with no presentations of individual business plans by the agencies. In the absence of a Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, there were no evaluation items on the agenda; these might normally occupy one whole session of a meeting.

9. The comparison of the five-day to the four-day meeting format is summarized in table 1 below.

Table 1: Comparison of 5 day to 4 day format of Executive Committee Meeting

	Customary meeting 5 days	60th Meeting 4 days
Days	Monday to Friday	Monday to Thursday
Sessions scheduled	Morning: 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. Afternoon: 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.	Morning: 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. Afternoon: 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Actual number of sessions	9	9
Actual sessions	2 sessions daily on day 1 to day 4 1 session - day 5 (afternoon)	2 sessions daily on days 1 and 2 3 session on day 3 (including one evening session) 2 sessions on day 4: first session in the morning with the second session from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m.
Session hours	27	27
Evening sessions	Seldom	One
Contact groups (handling of)	Typically early morning and evening and during the 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. breaks between sessions.	Early morning and evening and during the 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. breaks between sessions however fewer time slots in which to schedule meetings.
L.1 Report	L.1 draft report in English and translations issued in advance of final session	L.1 report in English and translations issued in advance of final session (Items: 1-5, 7, 8(a), 9(b)) L.1/Add 1 available at start of final session in English only containing solely draft decisions for the majority of the remaining items (Items, 6, 8(b)(c)(d), 9(d), and 10 to 14)
Cost	The savings of holding a four-day meeting instead of a five-day meeting are in the order of US \$20,000	
Remarks	Provides some flexibility to accommodate a heavy agenda	No flexibility to accommodate a heavy agenda Restricted time slots available for contact groups Heavier workload due to the shorter period of time

Workload at Executive Committee Meetings as compared to meetings of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP) and the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG)

10. The Fund Secretariat consulted with the Ozone Secretariat regarding the time and workload of the MOP and the OEWG meetings. The OEWG meeting normally takes place over four days, occasionally five days. The Ozone Secretariat, often in consultation with the Co-Chairs, determines the number of days required taking into account the issues on the agenda of each individual meeting, and the Ozone Secretariat's estimate of the time that the Parties are likely to spend on each agenda item. This assessment has enabled the Ozone Secretariat to ensure sufficient time for the Parties to address all of the issues before them. Over the last five years, the OEWG has been scheduled for four days with the exception of the 2008 meeting, which was scheduled for five days. The MOP is normally scheduled for five days.

11. The terms of reference and thus working practices of the MOP and OEWG are quite different to those of the Executive Committee. Unlike the MOP, the Executive Committee's work involves business planning and the review of a large number of projects and activities for individual countries. Furthermore, the Executive Committee has an average of 59 pre-session documents¹ per meeting while the OEWG and MOP have an average of seven to eight². The MOP and OEWG have a greater number of information and background documents, including documents from the Assessment Panels (Environmental Effects Assessment Panel, Scientific Assessment Panel and Technology and Economic Assessment Panel) that may contain in the order of 150 pages of technical assessments. The Executive Committee's information documents number 2 or 3 per meeting.

12. Fourteen Executive Committee members delegations attend the Executive Committee whereas up to 196 Parties could attend a meeting of the OEWG or MOP. This means that interventions per agenda item might occupy significantly more time than in an Executive Committee meeting.

13. Another difference is the actual mode of operation. MOP and OEWG rely much more heavily on contact groups and/or sub-groups, which draft a significant number of conference room papers (CRPs). Contact groups established by the OEWG or MOP generally meet sequentially and the Co-Chairs may suspend the plenary so that contact groups can meet. The MOP/OEWG plenary will then be reconvened at a later time. The Executive Committee discusses all issues in plenary with contact groups being formed only as needed for difficult or technical issues, for example the HCFC guidelines contact group, and with the exception of the production sector issues which are dealt with by the Sub-group on the Production Sector. While the Executive Committee suspended its plenary at the 59th Meeting of the Executive Committee to allow the contact group on HCFC guidelines to meet, this is seldom the practice.

14. The Ozone Secretariat generally presents issues to the OEWG and MOP for their sole deliberation. The OEWG deals with issues ahead of the MOP and prepares draft decisions for the MOP's consideration. A preparatory segment of the MOP addresses only outstanding issues from the OEWG or new issues raised by the Parties to facilitate the high level segment of the MOP. The Fund Secretariat, on the whole, presents the Executive Committee with recommendations that form the basis of draft decisions for the Committee.

15. A comparison of meetings of the Executive Committee and the OEWG/MOP is summarized in Table 2 below.

¹ An average of the number of pre-session documents for the last five meetings (56th to 60th Meetings)

² An average of the number of pre-session documents for the last five meetings of OEWG and the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.

Table 2 – Comparison of characteristics of meetings of the Executive Committee, Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) and Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP)

	Executive Committee	OEWG	MOP
Focus of work	Core focus is financial matters, business planning, monitoring, evaluation, project and work programme review plus policy issues	Policy issues and review of technical issues to consider if policy changes are needed.	Policy issues and review of technical issues to consider if policy changes are needed Consideration of non-compliance issues and negotiating final decision language
Attendance	7 Article 5 country members 7 non- Article 5 countries Co-opted members from approximately 20 countries Treasurer Implementing agencies Observers	Delegations from up to 196 Parties but normally fewer than the MOP Assessment panels Multilateral Fund Secretariat and implementing agencies Observers.	Delegations from up to 196 Parties. Assessment panels Multilateral Fund Secretariat and implementing agencies Observers
Decisions	Based on recommendations from the Fund Secretariat for consideration by Committee	Based on discussions of issues by contact groups	Based on draft from from OEWG or on issues discussed during the MOP preparatory segment
Days	5 days normally Monday to Friday	4 days <i>One five-day meeting took place in 2008</i>	5 days
Timetable of sessions	Morning: from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. Afternoon: from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.		
Night sessions	Seldom	May be organized if plenary is suspended for contact groups	
Contact groups or other meetings	Since the 42 nd Meeting ³ , the Executive Committee has discussed all issues in plenary with contact groups being formed only as needed for difficult or technical issues, for example: guidelines for the preparation of HPMPs; HCFC policy issues; ODS disposal. There are also informal groups on individual projects. Production sector issues are dealt with by the Sub-group on the Production Sector.	Contact and other groups part of the mode of operation of the two bodies.	

³ Following discussion at the 40th and 41st Meetings the Executive Committee abolished the two sub-committees, the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (MEF) and Sub-Committee on Project Review (PR), (decision 41/92).

	Executive Committee	OEWG	MOP
Average number of pre-session documents over last 5 meetings	59 plus an average of 2 to 3 information documents.	7 plus documents from Assessment panels	8 plus documents from Assessment Panels Additional documents issued when the joint MOP and Vienna Convention (COP) meets every three years. Higher number of information (11) and background documents (10) including voluminous Assessment Panel reports
Conference room papers	Average of 4 CRPs over last 5 meetings (range from 2 to 6)	<i>no data</i>	<i>no data</i>
Language of meeting documents	English and 3 or 4 other United Nations languages depending on Executive Committee membership	Documents are available in all United Nations official languages (6).	

Future workload of the Executive Committee

16. The main factor affecting the number of meetings per year has been the workload of the Executive Committee. As of 2010, sectoral and national plans to achieve the complete phase-out of CFCs, halons and CTC in all Article 5 countries have for the most part been completed. The phase-out plans to meet the 2015 methyl bromide control measure concern a relatively small number of countries and are in place. The focus of work has thus shifted to starting up and implementing the first stage of the HPMPs to meet the 2013 and 2015 Montreal Protocol HCFC control measures.

17. Following decision XIX/6 of the Parties, intense and complex negotiations on policies for the phase-out of HCFC consumption commenced and a major milestone was reached at the 60th Meeting with the agreement on the majority of the outstanding issues (decision 60/44). The first two HPMPs were approved at the 60th Meeting and following the probable approval of a small number at the 61st Meeting, the majority of the remaining 130 or so HPMPs are likely to be submitted at the end of 2010 and during 2011. Any new issues regarding HCFC consumption phase-out will be handled on a case by case basis as part of the HPMP project review process.

18. The Sub-group on the Production Sector that was reconvened at the 59th Meeting will continue meeting to discuss the remaining elements of a final decision with respect to the HCFC production sector during 2010 and 2011.

19. Additionally over the 2011 to 2015 period the Executive Committee will continue with the regular agenda items on status of contributions and disbursements, status of resources and planning including the report on balances and annual tranche delays, business plans, progress reports, monitoring and evaluation. The Committee will also consider the following projects:

- (a) Renewal of institutional strengthening projects;
- (b) Work programme activities of bilateral and implementing agencies such as project preparation;
- (c) Monitoring compliance and ongoing HCFC multi-year projects and agreements for all Article 5 countries;
- (d) Assessing project completion and financial closure;
- (e) Tranches of methyl bromide phase-out plans.

20. The Executive Committee should also note that the agenda of the 30th OEWG includes agenda items⁴ to amend the Montreal Protocol to include the phase-down of hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) and that this could have implications for the work of the Executive Committee during 2011 and 2012. There is also a proposed draft decision⁵ submitted to the OEWG by Canada, Mexico and the United States of America on the phase-out of HFC-23 by-product emissions resulting from the production of HCFC 22, which could, if adopted, place an additional burden on the Executive Committee.

Conclusions

21. Although a significant part of the policy work on the HCFC phase-out consumption sector has been completed, there will be a significant workload in 2011. In order to assist Article 5 countries to comply with the 2013 and 2015 Montreal Protocol HCFC control measures, the Executive Committee will consider approximately 130 HPMPs for Article 5 countries and should agree guidelines in order to initiate the process of approval of funding for the HCFC production sector. Any possible amendment to the Montreal Protocol to include HFCs might increase the workload of the Executive Committee in 2011 or for 2012.

22. If the Executive Committee decides to maintain the status quo of three meetings per year sufficient time should be allowed between meetings for the completion of a number of activities including project review, noting that HPMPs should be submitted to the Secretariat 14 weeks in advance of the meeting at which they will be considered. It would therefore be advisable that the three meetings in 2011 be scheduled to allow 15 or 16 weeks between meetings. Table 3 provides potential schedules for 2011 which would allow the maximum time possible between meetings to allow for review of HPMPs. Any meeting schedule would have to be planned with reference to meetings of other Montreal Protocol bodies for which final dates may not be known at the time of any planning exercise. For 2012 this is not likely to be an issue since it is expected that all HPMPs will be approved by the end of 2011.

Table 3 –Options for schedule of Executive Committee Meetings in 2011

	Possible dates	
Meeting 1	14 to 18 March	21 to 25 March
Meeting 2	11 to 15 July	18 to 22 July
Meeting 3	14 to 18 November	21 to 25 November

23. The Executive Committee might wish to note that the option of holding two meetings per year was re-visited a number of times since the 44th Meeting. The conclusion of discussions was not to reduce the frequency of meeting given the expected level of workload in the lead-up to HCFC phase-out but that the option of two meetings per year with the possibility of a third special meeting mid-year could be considered in the future. If the Committee considers changing to two meetings per year with fixed schedules⁶ it would result in the rearrangement of the annual business cycle as follows:

⁴ The OEWG will consider proposals for amendments to the Montreal Protocol one from the Federated States of Micronesia (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/30/4) and one from Canada, Mexico and the United States of America (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/30/5) both regarding HFCs.

⁵ “Proposed draft decision submitted by Canada, Mexico and the United States of America on the phase-out of HFC-23 as a by-product emission of HCFC-22 with high global-warming potential” (UNEP/OzL.Pro.WG.1/30/CRP.1)

⁶ The two-meeting a year scenario was discussed at the 44th Meeting when the Committee examined the option of scheduling the first meeting of the year in mid-May and a second meeting in early November. From a business cycle point of view, the analysis concluded that most of the activities currently on the agenda of the second meeting of the year could be rescheduled without too much disruption of the work of the Executive Committee.

- (a) The approval of the business plans for the following year should take place at the second meeting instead of the current first meeting (March/April), to enable the agencies to start implementing their business plans from the 1 January of the following year;
- (b) The approval of the work programmes would also need to take place at the same meeting since the majority of them are project preparations for developing the business plans;
- (c) Due to the unavailability of financial data in advance of the May meeting, the operational part of the progress reports could be dealt with at the first meeting while the financial part of the progress report would be submitted to the second meeting to be reviewed together with other finance related items such as the accounts of the Multilateral Fund.

24. For the 44th Meeting illustrative agendas were developed for the two meetings per year schedule and are attached as Annex II to this document. If the Executive Committee were to decide to adopt a two-meeting per year scenario, the schedule for meetings for 2011 could be as follows.

Table 4 –Two meeting per year schedule for Executive Committee meetings in 2011

	Possible dates	
Meeting 1	16 to 20 May	23 to 27 May
Meeting 2	7 to 11 November	14 to 18 November

25. With such a meeting schedule, project proposals submitted by Article 5 countries might have to wait up to six months for consideration by the Executive Committee. In order to avoid major delays in the approval of tranches of HPMPs that would be critical for compliance with the 2013 and 2015 HCFC control measures, an intersessional approval procedure may need to be put in place. A number of possibilities for such a procedure were presented to the 44th Meeting and these are outlined in Annex III.

26. Another alternative, as referred to in paragraph 23 above, for the Executive Committee to consider is the possibility of holding two meetings per year with the option of an intersessional special mid-year meeting, in the event of the need to discuss specific policy issues.

27. In some circumstances the Committee might be able to meet over 4 days if the agenda items for a meeting were judged not to be too complex. However, it would be difficult to make such an assessment of a meeting's agenda sufficiently in advance for timely scheduling of the dates for the meeting.

28. A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of a two and three meeting per year schedule is provided in Table 5:

Table 5 – Advantages and disadvantages of a two and three meetings per year

	Advantages	Disadvantages	Action required
Three meetings per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue with the established systems for project review and monitoring, evaluation, planning and financial matters • Meetings have usually accommodated the necessary discussions • Provides three opportunities per year for Executive Committee’s oversight of financial and monitoring matters • Policy issues can be addressed as they arise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relief in the number of Montreal Protocol-related meetings per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Two meetings per year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savings of approximately US \$260,000 per year if meetings take place in Montreal. • Could more easily accommodate the 14-week deadline for submission of new HPMPs however this is only relevant for 2011 • Provide the possibility for an intersessional special mid-year meeting on a needs basis to address significant policy issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and financial matters addressed at only two meetings per year instead of the customary three 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redesign the agendas for the two regular meetings with the progress reports being considered at both meetings, operational activities being reported at the first meeting and the financial data being reported at the second meeting

29. From the analysis of the meeting cycle and length of meetings, it does not appear that a comparison between MOP and OEWG meetings with those of the Executive Committee is relevant.

Recommendations

30. Based on the findings above, the Executive Committee may wish to consider the possibility of:
- (a) Maintaining the status quo of holding three meetings a year for at least 2011 and 2012; and,
 - (b) Reviewing the issue of the number of meetings per year at the first meeting of 2012 in view of the workload related to HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs) and any other issues at that stage;
- or
- (c) Holding two regular meetings with fixed schedules and maintaining the possibility of having a special third meeting in the middle of the year if needed.

Annex I

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FROM PREVIOUS PAPERS PREPARED BY THE FUND SECRETARIAT ON THE OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Background

1. The organization of the work of the Executive Committee has been discussed at a number of meetings since 2002, when the Multilateral Fund adopted a compliance-oriented strategic planning approach. At the Executive Committee's request, the Secretariat prepared documents dealing with the terms of reference of the Executive Committee, the organization of work of the two sub-committees, its workload, the re-organization of the annual business cycle into two meetings per year, the introduction of an intersessional project approval procedure, and the financial implications of changing the Committee's operations

2. Following discussion at its 40th and 41st Meetings the Executive Committee abolished the Sub Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance (MEF) and Sub-Committee on Project Review (PR), (decision 41/92) and thus since the 42nd Meeting, all work has taken place in the full Committee with contact groups being convened as necessary. At the same time the Committee also decided to examine whether the new regime would provide sufficient time-saving to permit reducing the number of meetings to two per year. Since 2004 the Committee has addressed the operation of the Executive Committee and specifically looked at the issue of reducing the number of meetings in relation to the workload of the Executive Committee at its 44th, 46th, 45th 50th, 53rd, 54th and 57th Meetings. The Committee examined the issue of the Committee's projected workload in relation to two meeting per year business cycle including agendas which illustrated how this could be possible. An examination of the financial implications of the different meeting cycles and lengths of meeting indicated that there was little financial incentive to reduce meetings to a four-day format; however, a reduction of three to two meetings per year could result in savings of around \$200,000 per year if meetings were held in Montreal.

3. Given that the Committee might wish to change the number of meetings per year, it requested the Parties to the Montreal Protocol to amend the terms of reference of the Executive Committee to allow the Committee to move to two meetings per year if it so decides and this was approved by the Parties (Decision XIX/11).

4. A summary of past deliberations and findings can be found in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/66 and a list of all documents dealing with the operation of the Executive Committee is listed in the table below. The conclusion of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/66 written in early 2009 was that the main limiting factor from three to two meetings per year was the workload of the Executive Committee and that the workload would remain heavy for the next few years as the Executive Committee due to considerations on decision XIX/6 of the Parties and the subsequent development of guidelines and review of HPMPs. The Executive Committee considered the option of three four-day meetings per year and two meetings per year and decided to revisit the issue at its 61st Meeting.

Document number	Title	Decision number
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69	Report on operation of the Executive Committee without sub-committees and potential for an intersessional approval procedure (follow-up to decisions 41/92 and 43/3 (c))	44/57
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/48	Report on the operation of the Executive Committee (follow-up to decision 44/57)	45/56 (b))

Document number	Title	Decision number
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/46/45	Report on the operation of the Executive Committee (decisions 44/57 and 45/56 (b))	46/40
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/50/56	Report on the operation of the Executive Committee (follow-up to decision 46/40): a supplement	50/41
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/63	Report on the operation of the Executive Committee (follow-up to decision 50/41)	53/40
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/54/57	Report on the operations of the Executive Committee (decision 53/40)	54/33
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/66	Operation of the Executive Committee (decision 54/43)	57/39

Annex II

ILLUSTRATIVE AGENDAS

Illustrative agenda (1st Meeting of the year)

No.	Item	Annotations (where necessary)
1.	Opening of the meeting	
2.	Organizational matters:	
	(a) Adoption of the agenda	
	(b) Organization of work	
3.	Secretariat activities.	
4.	Status of contributions and disbursements	
5.	Status of resources and planning:	
	(a) Report on balances returned from cancelled and completed projects	
	(b) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan and annual tranche submission delays	
	(c) Status of implementation of delayed projects and prospects of Article 5 countries in achieving compliance	
6.	Programme implementation:	
	(a) Evaluation reports from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (SMEO)	As per monitoring and evaluation annual work programme
	(b) Progress reports as at 31 December of previous year (operational part):	Due to the unavailability of finance data, reporting limited to operational activities
	(i) Consolidate progress report	
	(ii) Bilateral progress report	
	(iii) UNDP	
	(iv) UNEP	
	(v) UNIDO	
	(vi) World Bank	
	(c) Report on implementation of approved projects with specific reporting requirements	
7.	Project proposals:	
	(a) Overview of issues identified during project review	
	(b) Bilateral cooperation	Cannot predict number of projects
	(c) Work programmes:	Cannot predict number of projects. Most activities expected to be for renewals of institutional strengthening projects, and a few technical assistance activities
	(i) UNDP	
	(ii) UNEP	
	(iii) UNIDO	
	(iv) World Bank	
	(d) Investment projects: - MYAs on-going - Stand-alone projects (pilot, demonstration, investment) - HPMPs	Cannot predict number of projects. The majority of the projects are expected to be HPMPs
8.	Report of the production sector sub-group	
9.	Policy issues (papers)	Cannot predict
10.	Other matters	
11.	Adoption of the report	
12.	Closure of the meeting	

Illustrative agenda (2nd Meeting of the year)

No.	Item	Annotations (where necessary)
1.	Opening of the meeting	
2.	Organizational matters:	
	(a) Adoption of the agenda	
	(b) Organization of work	
3.	Secretariat activities.	
4.	Status of contributions and disbursements	
5.	Status of resources and planning for the current year business plans:	
	(a) Report on balances returned from cancelled and completed projects	
	(b) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan and annual tranche submission delays	Provide an update of the implementation of the current year business plans after the 1 st Meeting of the year
	(c) Status of implementation of delayed projects and prospects of Article 5 countries in achieving compliance	
6.	Programme implementation:	
	(a) Consolidated project completion reports	
	(b) Evaluation reports from SMEO	As per the annual work programme
	(c) Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme of following year	
	(d) Report on implementation of approved projects with specific reporting requirements	
	(e) Evaluation of the business plans of the previous year	
7.	Financial matters:	
	(a) Accounts of the Multilateral Fund for the previous year	
	(b) Reconciliation of accounts	
	(c) Financial part of the progress reports as at 31 December previous year	
	(d) Proposed Secretariat budget	
8.	Project proposals:	
	(a) Overview of issues identified during project review	
	(b) Bilateral cooperation	Cannot predict number of projects
	(c) Amendments to work programmes - current year	Cannot predict number of projects. Includes renewals of institutional strengthening project
	(d) Core unit costs	
	(e) CAP budget	
	(f) Investment projects: - MYAs on-going - Stand-alone projects (pilot, demonstration, investment) - HPMPs	Cannot predict number of projects.
9.	Report of the production sector sub-subgroup	
10.	Policy issues (papers)	Cannot predict
11.	Business planning for the following year:	
	(a) Financial planning for the triennium	
	(b) Updated model rolling three-year phase-out plan (rolling forward by one year)	
	(c) The Multilateral Fund business plan in the new year	
	(d) Business plans of the implementing agencies and associated work programme activities:	
	(i) Bilateral agencies	
	(ii) UNDP	
	(iii) UNEP	
	(iv) UNIDO	
	(v) World Bank	
12.	Report of the Executive Committee to the Meeting of the Parties	If the MOP takes place after the 2 nd Executive Committee Meeting of the year.
13.	Other matters	
14.	Adoption of the report	
15.	Closure of the meeting	

Annex III

POSSIBILITIES FOR AN INTERSESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE

(Extracted from document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69)

Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/69 includes a review of the intersessional approval procedure in place and outlines a number of possibilities with regard to the extending the procedure.

Possibility	Advantages	Disadvantages
1. Stay with existing intersessional approval procedure on a no-objection basis and extend it to non-bilateral activities. No new procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero risk on compromising Executive Committee responsibility • Applicable to all funding requests irrespective of availability of guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional work for Executive Committee members between sessions • Long processing time resulting from sending the documents to Executive Committee members and waiting for the end of the prescribed response period.
2. Apply a new procedure of full delegated authority only to activities with well established policies and guidelines	Limited relief on the workload at the meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low risk of compromising Executive Committee responsibility • No solution for compliance-related urgent requests
3. Set a funding ceiling for applying the new procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high ceiling could include refrigerant management plans and multi-year agreements and address compliance-related urgent requests • A low ceiling would cover institutional strengthening and project preparation and result in limited relief on workload at the meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High risk of compromising Executive Committee responsibility if high ceiling set • Low ceiling may not cover all urgent compliance-related requests
4. Apply the existing no-objection procedure to areas without established policies and guidelines where compliance is an issue; and Apply the new procedure to areas with well-established guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide solution to compliance-related urgent requests without risk of compromising Executive Committee responsibility • Limited relief on the workload at the meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional work for Executive Committee members between sessions • Low risk of compromising Executive Committee responsibility