



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/16  
16 March 2011

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH



---

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Sixty-third Meeting  
Montreal, 4-8 April 2011

**OVERVIEW OF ISSUES IDENTIFIED DURING PROJECT REVIEW**

## 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 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting;
  - (b) Issues identified during the project review process;
  - (c) Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval; and
  - (d) Investment projects for individual consideration.

## Projects and activities submitted by bilateral and implementing agencies

2. Bilateral and implementing agencies submitted 111 funding requests for new multi-year agreements, tranches of approved multi-year agreements and projects and activities, amounting to US \$688,157,691, including agency support costs where applicable. The submission included:
  - (a) Twenty-two HPMPs for low-volume-consuming (LVC) countries (including the HPMP for Bhutan which was initially submitted to the 62<sup>nd</sup> Meeting<sup>1</sup>, the HPMP for the Pacific Island Countries (PIC) covering 12 Article 5 Parties<sup>2</sup>; and 7 HPMPs for non-LVC countries, including HPMPs from Indonesia<sup>3</sup> and the Islamic Republic of Iran<sup>4</sup> which were initially submitted to the 62<sup>nd</sup> Meeting;
  - (b) Sectoral HCFC phase-out plans outside a complete HPMP, including demonstration projects in the foam, solvents and refrigeration servicing sectors from China, which were initially submitted to the 62<sup>nd</sup> Meeting<sup>5</sup>;
  - (c) One stand-alone investment project in the aerosol sector in Mexico, which was initially submitted to the 62<sup>nd</sup> Meeting<sup>6</sup>; and
  - (d) Pilot ODS destruction projects in 2 countries, and CFC phase-out activities for two countries;
  - (e) Ten renewal requests for institutional strengthening projects and 14 non-investment projects from relevant bilateral and implementing agencies.
3. Following the project review process, 17 projects and activities totalling US \$1,290,147 including support costs are recommended for blanket approval; 90 projects and activities totalling US \$644,154,233 including support costs (of which US \$165,745,063 is requested at the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting) are being forwarded

---

<sup>1</sup> The Executive Committee decided to defer consideration of the HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche) for Bhutan to its 63<sup>rd</sup> meeting (decision 62/52).

<sup>2</sup> The 12 Article 5 countries under the PIC strategy are Cook Islands, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

<sup>3</sup> The Executive Committee decided to defer consideration of the HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I) for Indonesia to its 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (decision 62/56).

<sup>4</sup> The Executive Committee decided to defer consideration of the HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I) for the Islamic Republic of Iran to its 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (decision 62/57).

<sup>5</sup> The Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*, to request the relevant bilateral and implementing agencies to submit the four sector plans and demonstration projects to the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (decision 62/60 (e)).

<sup>6</sup> The Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*, to request UNIDO to resubmit the project proposal for the phase-out of HCFC-22 and HCFC-141b in aerosol manufacturing at Silimex in Mexico to the 63<sup>rd</sup> meeting, on the understanding that all technical issues would have been resolved and the level of funding would have been agreed between the Fund Secretariat and UNIDO (decision 62/9 (b)).

for individual consideration by the Executive Committee; and 2 projects totalling US \$2,181,150 were withdrawn by the relevant agencies (due to the issues raised during the project review process, in particular major discrepancies in the HCFC consumption data, the relevant bilateral and implementing agencies requests for deferral of the HPMPs for Lesotho and Rwanda). The second tranche of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at a total value of US \$115,025 is not submitted for the consideration by the Executive Committee since it was submitted before the funding approved schedule contained in the Agreement with the Executive Committee.

4. As advised in the “Report on balances and availability of resources” (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/4), the total level of resources available for approvals by the Executive Committee at the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting is US \$139,253,870, as of 9 March 2011. This amount is lower than the US \$165,745,063 being requested for projects and activities at the same Meeting.

5. At the time of preparing this document, projects in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Viet Nam were still under discussion with the relevant implementing agencies. The outcomes of the discussions would be communicated to the Executive Committee prior to the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting.

#### **Issues identified during project review**

6. During the project review process, the Secretariat identified the following issues:
- (a) Discrepancies between data reported under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol and that reported under the HPMP;
  - (b) Additional funding requests for HCFC phase-out outside of approved HPMPs;
  - (c) Funding for conversion of eligible enterprises that currently have very low levels of HCFC consumption;
  - (d) Applicability of HCFC cost-effectiveness thresholds for LVC countries.

#### Discrepancies between data reported under Article 7 and in HPMPs

7. Article 5 countries undertook comprehensive surveys of HCFC consumption for the preparation of their HPMPs. In some cases, the data from those surveys differed from the official data reported by the countries under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol, even for the year 2009. Once the issues related to such data discrepancies were addressed with the relevant bilateral and/or implementing agencies, and after consultations with the Ozone Secretariat, the Fund Secretariat suggested to the agencies that they should encourage Article 5 countries to send the Ozone Secretariat an official request to review previously reported data. The Ozone Secretariat also explained that as HCFC consumption for 2009 is used to calculate the baseline for compliance for Article 5 parties, the methodology for revision of baseline data, adopted by the Parties to the Montreal Protocol at their 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting (decision XV/19), applies. This means that the requests from Article 5 countries should be submitted through the Ozone Secretariat for consideration by the Implementation Committee.

8. This issue is particularly relevant for Article 5 countries where most of the HCFC consumption is mainly used for servicing refrigeration equipment, as the level of funding for stage I of their HPMP is subject to the estimated baseline for compliance in line with decision 60/44. Pending the submission of an official request to the Implementation Committee for reviewing the reported HCFC consumption data, the Fund Secretariat estimated the baseline for compliance as the average of the actual reported consumption for 2009 (Article 7) and the forecasted consumption for 2010, which was also used to determine the starting point for aggregate reduction in HCFC consumption.

9. This issue was raised and discussed in the context of the HPMP for the Lao People's Democratic Republic (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/38). The HCFC-22 consumption for 2009 of 2.15 ODP tonnes (39.1 mt) based on the survey was 0.94 ODP tonnes higher than the consumption reported under Article 7 which was 1.21 ODP tonnes (22.0 mt). Given the fact that the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic had officially reported its HCFC consumption for 2009 and that any revision to the reported Article 7 data for any given year for calculating the baseline for compliance would have to be considered by the Implementation Committee, the Secretariat suggested that the level of funding to enable the country to meet all the compliance targets up to 2020 be either based on the average of their 2009 consumption reported under Article 7 and their estimated 2010 consumption, which would be US \$210,000, or at US \$280,000 as submitted based on the 2009 and 2010 consumption data from the survey (the Secretariat presented both options in its recommendation to the Executive Committee). The Secretariat also noted that the Executive Committee had already decided to adjust the agreed starting points for aggregate reductions in cases where calculated HCFC baselines based on reported Article 7 data differ from the calculated starting point based on the average consumption forecast for 2009-2010 (decision 60/44 (e)). However, the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic insisted on using the 2009 consumption survey data for calculating their estimated baseline and requested the Secretariat to bring this issue to the attention of the Executive Committee.

10. In view of the information given above, the Executive Committee might wish to consider that the calculation of the starting points for aggregate reductions in HCFC consumption for HPMPs should be based on the latest accepted HCFC consumption data that has been reported under Article 7.

#### Additional funding requests for HCFC phase-out outside approved HPMPs

11. Some Article 5 countries with reported HCFC consumption solely in the refrigeration servicing sector and with foam enterprises relying exclusively on imported HCFC-141b pre-blended polyol systems face major challenges in converting these enterprises. Low levels of foam production and corresponding low uses of HCFC-141b by these enterprises (from just a few metric tonnes to under 15 mt of HCFC-141b) dictate their continued reliance on imported alternative systems. Emerging technologies such as unsaturated HFC (or HFO), methylal, methyl formate, HBA-2 or FEA-1110, are becoming available as safety and performance issues are being addressed, and a subset of these appear to be viable for small-sized enterprises. However, systems based on these technologies are not yet on the market; furthermore, the final technology selection might not depend entirely on the enterprises themselves.

12. Based on the above, Article 5 countries with foam enterprises that rely completely on imported systems are therefore unable to determine the technical assistance needed for introducing an alternative technology and, thus include a funding proposal for the conversion of those enterprises in stage I of their HPMP. It is also to be noted that Article 5 countries that commit to achieve up to the 2020 control target through stage I of their HPMP would have substantial more funding to meet the 2013 and 2015 control targets as compared to countries that commit only to achieve up to the 2015 control target. Considering that 50 to 60 per cent of the total funding available for the implementation of stage I of the HPMP could be requested in the first two tranches, the funding level associated with the first two tranches would be about 70 per cent higher than the funding available to only achieve up to the 2015 control targets. On this basis, while it could be assumed that the majority of Article 5 countries will opt for achieving up to the 2020 control target through stage I of their HPMPs, decision 60/44 clearly requires that a choice between funding either targets require a strong justification based on the activities included in the HPMP. Since stand-alone projects outside an HPMP cannot be submitted after 2010 (as per decision 54/39 (d)), these countries have two options to address such foam manufacturing enterprises:

- (a) Submit stage I of their HPMP addressing only up to the 2015 control target focusing on activities in the servicing sector, and submit their stage II HPMP by 2015 to include a funding request for the conversion of the foam enterprises and address the 2020 control target; or

- (b) Submit stage I of their HPMP addressing up to the 2020 control target focusing on activities in the servicing sector, and submit their stage II HPMP by 2020 to include a funding request for the conversion of the foam enterprises.

13. This issue was discussed in the context of the HPMPs for Paraguay (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/48) and Lao People's Democratic Republic (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/38). However, it is also relevant for other Article 5 countries preparing their HPMPs. In the case of Paraguay, the Government explored the possibility of submitting an umbrella project covering all the foam enterprises during the implementation of stage I of the HPMP, when alternative systems become available from relevant systems houses. However, if submission of the project were not possible, the Government agreed that it would submit it as part of stage II of the HPMP. In the case of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Government requested that the phase-out of HCFC-141b contained in imported pre-blended polyol systems be included in stage I of the HPMP where the country would like to meet the 35 per cent reduction in 2020, with the possibility that associated funding for the foam sector be requested at a later Meeting (possibly in 2015) in addition to the funding request to the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting. The Secretariat informed UNEP that this proposed approach is not in line with decision 54/39(d). However, as requested by the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Secretariat has brought this issue to the attention of the Executive Committee.

14. The Executive Committee might wish to request that Article 5 countries with reported HCFC consumption solely in the refrigeration servicing sector and with foam enterprises relying exclusively on imported HCFC-141b pre-blended polyol systems could, on an exceptional and on a case-by-case basis, submit a funding request for the conversion of these enterprises during implementation of stage I of the HPMP, on the understanding that:

- (a) There are no systems houses in the country concerned, and funding for the conversion of any of the foam enterprises was not requested but fully described in the submission of stage I of the HPMP;
- (b) All foam enterprises and the annual amount of HCFC-141b contained in imported pre-blended polyol systems during the three years prior to the submission of stage I of the HPMP would be included therein;
- (c) The eligibility of the foam enterprises will be determined at the time of the submission of the project, and the funding level would be based on the amount of HCFC-141b contained in imported pre-blended polyol systems as defined under paragraph (b) above;
- (d) The project proposal would completely phase-out the use of HCFC-141b in imported pre-blended polyol systems and would include a commitment from the country to put in place, by the time the last foam manufacturing plant had been converted to a non-HCFC technology, regulations or policies banning the import and or the use of HCFC-141b pre-blended polyol systems in line with decision 61/47.

#### Funding for conversion of eligible enterprises with very little or no current consumption of HCFCs

15. On behalf of the Government of Mongolia, UNEP (lead agency) and the Government of Japan submitted stage I of the HPMP for Mongolia to meet up to the 35 per cent reduction of HCFC consumption by 2020 (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/43). HCFC-22 is the only HCFC used in Mongolia for the manufacturing of extruded polystyrene (XPS) foam and for servicing refrigeration systems. Accordingly, the activities proposed in the HPMP include the conversion of the only two XPS foam manufacturing enterprises and technical assistance for addressing the servicing sector.

16. During the project review process, it was noted that both XPS foam enterprises have had erratic production levels since their establishment: one enterprise used 15.0 and 24.0 mt of HCFC-22 in 2007 and 2008 respectively, with no reported production in 2009 or 2010; the other used 2.0 mt and 3.8 mt in 2008 and 2010 respectively, with no production in 2007 and 2009. As explained by UNEP and the Government of Japan, both enterprises are owned by construction companies that produce their own insulation foam rather than importing it. While the recent economic recession lowered the demand for insulation foam, activity in the construction sector is expected to increase within a year or two, with the corresponding increase in HCFC-based foam production.

17. The HCFC baseline for compliance has been estimated at 23.8 mt (1.31 ODP tonnes), which is almost entirely associated with HCFC-22 consumption in the refrigeration servicing sector (i.e., only 3.8 mt of HCFC-22 were consumed in the 2009 and 2010 baseline years for production of XPS foams). The total maximum HCFC consumption by both XPS foam enterprises (at their respective peak years of production) totalled 26.0 mt. This amount is 2.2 mt more than the HCFC baseline for compliance; therefore, any new foam production could put the country at risk of non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol.

18. Both enterprises are eligible for funding in line with decision 60/44 (a). However, given that one enterprise had no reported HCFC consumption in 2009 and 2010, its funding eligibility was in doubt (it is to be noted that at its 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that ODS consumption at the enterprise level should be calculated on the basis of either the year, or an average of the three years, immediately preceding project preparation). Considering the potential risk of non-compliance if production of XPS foam increases and production capacity of these two enterprises are not converted, guidance from the Executive Committee is being sought. As explained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/43, the level of funding for the conversion of the two enterprises has been agreed at US \$130,000 (from US \$302,500 as originally requested).

19. The Executive Committee may wish to consider whether enterprises with no reported consumption of HCFCs in the last two years prior to submission of a funding request could be considered eligible for funding on a case-by-case basis on condition that it was clearly demonstrated that an immediate return to foam production would put the country at potential risk of non-compliance with the impending control targets of the Montreal Protocol.

#### Applicability of HCFC cost-effectiveness thresholds for LVC countries

20. The HPMP for Swaziland (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/52) has been submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting. In 2009 the Government of Swaziland reported for the first time under Article 7 the amount of HCFC-141b contained in imported pre-blended polyols (i.e., 7.66 ODP tonnes (69.63 mt)), used by one enterprise for manufacturing insulation foam for domestic and commercial refrigeration equipment. During stage I of the HPMP, the Government is proposing to convert the manufacturing plant to hydrocarbon-based technology. Following the discussion on technical and cost issues, the total cost of the project was agreed as US \$932,176, with a cost-effectiveness value of US \$13.32/kg, which is US \$3.53/kg over the cost-effectiveness threshold of US \$9.79/kg. During the project review process, UNDP raised the issue of the applicability of the cost-effectiveness thresholds to project grants for enterprises of LVC countries. The Executive Committee may wish to note that, with HCFC-141b consumption of nearly 70 mt, the relevant enterprise cannot be considered as a small and medium-size enterprise (SME) although it is operating in an LVC country.

21. A number of decisions on this issue has been adopted by the Executive Committee itself and the Parties to the Montreal Protocol as follows:

- (a) At its 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting (March 1995), the Executive Committee adopted cost-effectiveness threshold values for different sub-sectors of the aerosol, foam, halon, refrigeration and

solvent sectors, which have been applied for all project submitted since the 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting<sup>7</sup>. The Executive Committee also agreed to reserve, *inter alia*, US \$6,630,000 exclusively for allocation to projects from low ODS-consuming (LVC) countries. This amount would be in addition to any funds received as a result of approval of projects from LVC countries that qualified under the cost effectiveness thresholds;

- (b) At its 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting (July 1995), the Executive Committee decided that there should not be a separate set of cost-effectiveness thresholds to be applied to projects from LVC countries that did not meet the general threshold values agreed at the 16<sup>th</sup> Meeting (decision 17/11).
- (c) At their 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting (December 1995), the Parties to the Montreal Protocol requested the Executive Committee to provide specific support to LVC countries indicating, *inter alia*, that approval of projects in LVC and very-LVC countries should be based upon a more appropriate project-appraisal approach reflecting the particular circumstances encountered by these countries (decision VII/25);
- (d) At its 53<sup>rd</sup> Meeting (November 2007), the Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*, that the current classifications of LVC countries and SMEs should be maintained until the cost effectiveness thresholds of HCFC phase-out had been developed and the potential impact of those thresholds on LVC countries and SMEs had become better known. It would then be possible to review those classifications including a classification for very-LVC countries, and current policies and funding arrangements targeting those countries and enterprises (decision 53/37);
- (e) At its 54<sup>th</sup> Meeting (April 2008), the Executive Committee adopted guidelines for the preparation of HPMPs (decision 54/39). Guidelines were developed for countries with HCFC consumption in the servicing sector only, and countries with manufacturing sectors using HCFCs, rather than for LVC and non-LVC countries;
- (f) At its 60<sup>th</sup> Meeting (April 2010), the Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*, that the current cost-effectiveness threshold values used for CFC phase-out projects in paragraph 32 of the final report of the 16th Meeting of the Executive Committee (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/16/20), to be measured in metric kilogramme, shall be used as guidelines during the development and implementation of the first stage of HPMPs (decision 60/44 (f) (ii)).

22. The Executive Committee may wish to consider the issue of conversion of the manufacturing enterprise in light of the above comments and decisions.

### **Projects and activities submitted for blanket approval**

23. Annex I to this document, lists 17 projects and activities totalling US \$1,290,147 including support costs 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.

---

<sup>7</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/16/20 (paragraphs. 32c, 32d)

### Investment projects for individual consideration

24. A total of 90 projects and activities totalling US \$644,154,233 including support costs (of which US \$165,745,063 is requested at the 63<sup>rd</sup> Meeting) after the review by the Secretariat, are proposed for individual consideration. The issues associated with non-investment projects are presented in the relevant work programme of the bilateral (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/17) and implementing agencies (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/18 for UNDP; UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/19 for UNEP; UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/20 for UNIDO, and UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/21 for the World Bank.

25. To facilitate the consideration by the Executive Committee of the projects submitted for individual consideration, the Secretariat has classified the projects by sector, and has grouped projects according to the issues, as shown in Tables 2 to 6 below.

**Table 2. Non-HCFC investment projects submitted for individual consideration**

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
<b>CFC phase-out plans</b>				
Eritrea	Terminal phase-out management plan (second tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/29	Lack of progress in implementation
Iraq	National phase-out plan (second tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/36	Submission of the verification report
<b>Pilot ODS disposal projects</b>				
Ghana	Pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	UNDP	63/31	Technical and cost-related issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Mexico	Pilot demonstration project on ODS waste management and disposal	UNIDO	63/42	Technical and cost-related issues have been satisfactorily addressed

**Table 3. HCFC stand-alone projects submitted for individual consideration**

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
<b>Aerosol sector</b>				
Mexico	Phase-out of HCFC-22 and HCFC-141b in aerosol manufacturing at Silimex in Mexico	UNIDO	63/42	Technical and cost-related issues have been satisfactorily addressed

**Table 4. HPMPs for LVC countries submitted for individual consideration**

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
<b>HPMPs with no outstanding issues</b>				
Benin	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/23	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Congo	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/27	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Georgia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNDP	63/30	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Guyana	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNDP UNEP	63/32	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Honduras	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/33	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Kyrgyzstan	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNDP UNEP	63/37	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Liberia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	Germany	63/39	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Mali	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNDP UNEP	63/40	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Montenegro	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNIDO	63/44	All issues have been

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
	first tranche)			satisfactorily addressed
Pacific Island Countries	HCFC phase-out management plan for PIC countries through regional approach (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP	63/46	Regional approach covering 12 Article 5 countries
Paraguay	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNDP	63/48	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Republic of Moldova	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNDP	63/49	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Sao Tome and Principe	HCFC phase-out management plan	UNEP	63/50	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Timor-Leste	HCFC phase-out management plan	UNEP UNDP	63/53	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
<b>HPMPs for accelerated HCFC phase-out in advanced of the Montreal Protocol</b>				
Bhutan	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	UNDP UNEP	63/24	Accelerated HCFC phase-out
Mauritius	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	Germany	63/41	Accelerated HCFC phase-out
Namibia	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	Germany	63/45	Accelerated HCFC phase-out
Papua New Guinea	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	Germany	63/47	Accelerated HCFC phase-out
Seychelles	HCFC phase-out management plan (first tranche)	Germany	63/51	Accelerated HCFC phase-out
<b>HPMPs with other policy issues</b>				
Lao People's Democratic Republic	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	France UNEP	63/38	Calculation of baseline. Additional funding to be requested for foam enterprises using imported systems
Mongolia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP Japan	63/43	Funding for enterprises with low levels of consumption
Swaziland	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNDP	63/52	Applicability of cost-effectiveness threshold

**Table 5. HPMPs for non-LVC countries submitted for individual consideration**

Country	Project	Agency	ExCom	Issue
<b>HPMPs with no outstanding issues</b>				
Afghanistan	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	Germany UNEP	63/22	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Chile	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNDP	63/25	Phase-out of the servicing sector only
Democratic Republic of Congo	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNDP	63/28	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Indonesia	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	Australia UNDP UNIDO World Bank	63/34	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Islamic Republic of Iran	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	Germany UNDP UNEP UNIDO	63/35	All issues have been satisfactorily addressed
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	UNEP UNIDO	63/54	Technical and cost issues under discussion
Viet Nam	HCFC phase-out management plan (stage I, first tranche)	World Bank	63/55	Technical and cost issues under discussion

**Table 6. HCFC phase-out activities in China (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/26)**

<b>Phase-out activity</b>	<b>Agency</b>
HCFC phase-out management plan (HPMP) for China: Overarching strategy summary	UNDP
Sector plan for phase-out of HCFC-141b in the foam sector (phase I)	World Bank
Sector plan for phase-out of HCFCs in the extruded polystyrene (XPS) foam sector (phase I)	Germany/UNIDO
Demonstration project for conversion from HCFC-22/HCFC-142b technology to CO <sub>2</sub> with methyl formate co-blowing technology in the manufacture of XPS foam at Feininger (Nanjing) Energy Saving Technology Co. Ltd.	UNDP
Demonstration project for conversion from HCFC-22 to butane blowing technology in the manufacture of XPS foam at Shanghai Xinzhao Plastic Enterprises Co. Ltd.	UNIDO/Japan
Sector plan for HCFC phase-out in the industrial and commercial refrigeration and air conditioning sectors (stage I)	UNDP
HCFC-22 phase-out management plan for the room air-conditioner manufacturing sector	UNIDO
Demonstration project on HCFC management and phase-out in the refrigeration servicing sector	UNEP/Japan
Demonstration project for conversion from HCFC-141b-based technology to iso-paraffin and siloxane (KC-6) technology for cleaning in the manufacture of medical devices at Zhejiang Kindly Medical Devices Co. Ltd.	UNDP/Japan

-----

# List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/16  
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
<b>BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA</b>					
<b>FOAM</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (rigid polyurethane foam applications)	UNIDO		\$30,000	\$2,250	\$32,250
<b>Total for Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>			<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$2,250</b>	<b>\$32,250</b>
<b>CHILE</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase IX)	UNDP		\$186,550	\$13,991	\$200,541
<b>Total for Chile</b>			<b>\$186,550</b>	<b>\$13,991</b>	<b>\$200,541</b>
<b>CROATIA</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase VII)	UNEP		\$87,707	\$0	\$87,707
<b>Total for Croatia</b>			<b>\$87,707</b>		<b>\$87,707</b>
<b>ECUADOR</b>					
<b>FUMIGANT</b>					
<b>Methyl bromide</b>					
Preparation of investment activities in cut-flowers production	UNIDO		\$45,000	\$3,375	\$48,375
<i>Approved on the understanding that the resulting investment project constituted the final phase-out for methyl bromide in Ecuador, and that no additional project preparation funding would be provided for methyl bromide activities in future for the country.</i>					
<b>Total for Ecuador</b>			<b>\$45,000</b>	<b>\$3,375</b>	<b>\$48,375</b>
<b>GEORGIA</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VII)	UNDP		\$60,667	\$4,550	\$65,217
<b>Total for Georgia</b>			<b>\$60,667</b>	<b>\$4,550</b>	<b>\$65,217</b>
<b>GUINEA</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VII)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
<b>Total for Guinea</b>			<b>\$60,000</b>		<b>\$60,000</b>

# List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/16  
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
<b>JORDAN</b>					
<b>REFRIGERATION</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (refrigeration air-conditioning sector)	IBRD		\$30,000	\$2,250	\$32,250
	<b>Total for Jordan</b>		<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$2,250</b>	<b>\$32,250</b>
<b>KUWAIT</b>					
<b>FOAM</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (polyurethane foam component)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
	<b>Total for Kuwait</b>		<b>\$60,000</b>	<b>\$4,500</b>	<b>\$64,500</b>
<b>LIBERIA</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase IV)	UNEP		\$85,213	\$0	\$85,213
	<b>Total for Liberia</b>		<b>\$85,213</b>		<b>\$85,213</b>
<b>LIBYA</b>					
<b>FOAM</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (polyurethane foam component)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
<b>PHASE-OUT PLAN</b>					
<b>HCFC phase out plan</b>					
Preparation of a HCFC phase-out management plan (additional funding)	UNIDO		\$65,000	\$4,875	\$69,875
	<b>Total for Libya</b>		<b>\$125,000</b>	<b>\$9,375</b>	<b>\$134,375</b>
<b>MALI</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VI)	UNEP		\$60,677	\$0	\$60,677
	<b>Total for Mali</b>		<b>\$60,677</b>		<b>\$60,677</b>
<b>SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase III)	UNEP		\$60,666	\$0	\$60,666
	<b>Total for Sao Tome and Principe</b>		<b>\$60,666</b>		<b>\$60,666</b>

# List of projects and activities recommended for blanket approval

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/63/16  
Annex I

Project Title	Agency	ODP (tonnes)	Funds recommended (US\$)		C.E. (US\$/kg)
			Project	Support	
<b>SEYCHELLES</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of institutional strengthening project (phase V)	UNEP		\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
<b>Total for Seychelles</b>			<b>\$60,000</b>		<b>\$60,000</b>
<b>VIETNAM</b>					
<b>SEVERAL</b>					
<b>Ozone unit support</b>					
Extension of the institutional strengthening project (phase VIII)	UNEP		\$118,976	\$0	\$118,976
<b>Total for Vietnam</b>			<b>\$118,976</b>		<b>\$118,976</b>
<b>YEMEN</b>					
<b>FOAM</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (rigid polyurethane foam component)	UNIDO		\$60,000	\$4,500	\$64,500
<b>Total for Yemen</b>			<b>\$60,000</b>	<b>\$4,500</b>	<b>\$64,500</b>
<b>ZIMBABWE</b>					
<b>FOAM</b>					
<b>Preparation of project proposal</b>					
Preparation for HCFC phase-out investment activities (foam sector)	Germany		\$30,000	\$3,900	\$33,900
<b>Total for Zimbabwe</b>			<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$3,900</b>	<b>\$33,900</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,160,456</b>	<b>\$48,691</b>	<b>\$1,209,147</b>