



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/71/13
6 November 2013



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Seventy-first Meeting
Montreal, 2-6 December 2013

2013 CONSOLIDATED PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

1. This report provides an overview of the project completion reports (PCRs) received since the 68th meeting. UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank did not follow fully the agreed delivery schedule for the first three quarters of 2013 as shown in the Annex I attached to this document.

I. Overview of PCRs received and due

In total 18 PCRs were received for investment projects and 64 PCRs for non-investment projects in 2013. Tables 1 (investment) and 2 (non-investment) below present a detailed analysis of the submission of PCRs by bilateral and implementing agencies.

Table 1
PCR SUBMITTED FOR INVESTMENT PROJECTS
(Except multi-year projects)

Agency	Completed projects up to December 2012	Total PCRs received for projects completed up to December 2012	PCRs still due	PCRs received in the reporting period		
				2011	2012	2013 ¹
France	15	11 ²	4	0	1	0
Germany	19	19 ³	0	N/A	N/A	0
Italy	10	9 ⁴	1	2	2	0
Japan	6	6	0	N/A	N/A	0
Spain	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
UNDP	892	891 ⁵	1	1	5	4
UNIDO	440	440 ⁶	0	9	1	10
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
United States of America	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
World Bank	455	450 ⁷	5	0	9	4
Total	1,841	1,830	11	12	18	18

¹ After the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee (8 December 2012 to 30 September 2013).

² In addition, France submitted 1 PCR for multi-year project.

³ Germany submitted 1 PCR for multi-year project.

⁴ In addition, Italy submitted 1 PCR for multi-year project.

⁵ In addition, UNDP submitted 2 PCRs on cancelled projects and 3 PCRs for multi-year projects.

⁶ In addition, UNIDO submitted 2 PCRs for cancelled projects, 9 cancellation reports and 22 PCRs for multi-year projects.

⁷ In addition, the World Bank submitted 2 PCRs on cancelled projects.

Table 2
PCRs SUBMITTED FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS
 (Except project preparations, country programmes, multi-year projects, and on-going projects like networking and clearing-house activities as well as institutional strengthening projects)

Agency	Completed projects up to December 2012	Total PCRs received for projects completed up to December 2012	PCRs still due	PCRs received in the reporting period		
				2011	2012	2013 ¹
Australia	25	25 ²	0	17	N/A	N/A
Austria	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Canada	57	55	2	2	0	1
Czech Republic	2	2	0	N/A	N/A	2
Denmark	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Finland	5	5	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
France	28	14	14	0	0	0
Germany	54	51	3	0	0	0
Israel	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Japan	13	8	5	0	0	0
Poland	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Portugal	1	0	1	N/A	0	0
Singapore	2	0	2	0	0	0
South Africa	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spain	3	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sweden	5	5 ³	0	3	0	1
Switzerland	3	3	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
UNDP	259	258 ⁴	1	15	8	6
UNEP	425	405 ⁵	20	33	6	51
UNIDO	109	109 ⁶	0	3	N/A	1
United States of America	40	40	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
World Bank	36	32	4	0	2	2
Total	1,072	1,020	52	73	16	64

¹ After the 68th meeting of the Executive Committee (8 December 2012 to 30 September 2013).

² In addition, Australia submitted 1 project cancellation report.

³ In addition, Sweden submitted 3 PCRs for multi-year projects and 3 PCRs on transferred projects.

⁴ In addition, UNDP submitted 2 PCRs on transferred projects and 1 PCR for multi-year project.

⁵ In addition, UNEP submitted 12 PCRs for multi-year projects.

⁶ In addition, UNIDO submitted 3 PCRs for multi-year projects.

II. Analysis of PCRs for investment projects

2. The 18 PCRs received in the reporting period represent projects completed in 8 countries. In most cases the ODS phase-out in the projects covered by the 18 PCRs was as planned except for the total phase-out reported being slightly less than the planned amount. This also results in a different amount of the ODS phase-out data reported in the PCRs in the 2012 progress report, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
ODS PHASED OUT BY PROJECTS WITH PCRS SUBMITTED

Agency	Number of projects	PCRs		2012 progress report	
		ODP phase-out planned	ODP phased out	ODP phase-out planned	ODP phased out
UNDP	4	285.6	285.6	285.6	271.6
UNIDO	10	2,007.2	1,777.3	2,007.2	1,777.3
World Bank	4	193.2	188.4	193.2	188.4
Total	18	2,486.0	2,251.3	2,486.0	2,237.3

3. Out of 18 projects, 14 showed delays ranging from 5 months to 77 months, one PCR was completed on time and three PCRs were completed before the scheduled date as shown in Table 4. The limited number of PCRs covered in the analysis does not allow for a discussion of any trend. Delays are most frequently attributed to the supplier (6), enterprise (5), external factors (3), followed by Government (2).

Table 4
IMPLEMENTATION DELAYS
(Total figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Agency	Number of projects	Average delays as per PCRs (months)	Average delays as per 2012 progress reports (months)	Average duration as per PCRs (months)	Average duration as per 2012 progress reports (months)
UNDP	4	22.58	28.41	54.81	63.26
UNIDO	10	28.32	28.32	49.93	49.93
World Bank	4	26.91	26.91	54.83	54.83
Total	18 (18)	26.73 (24.52)	28.01 (25.56)	52.10 (52.88)	53.43 (53.91)

4. Key information on PCRs is still not frequently complete, in particular with regard to the list of equipment (11.1 per cent of the PCRs compared to 0 per cent in 2012), as shown in Table 5.

Table 5
KEY INFORMATION PROVIDED IN PCRs of INVESTMENT PROJECTS
(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

	Provided		Incomplete		Not applicable*		Not provided	
	Number of projects	Percentage %	Number of projects	Percentage %	Number of projects	Percentage %	Number of projects	Percentage %
List of annual consumption of ODS and substitutes	11	61.1 (77.8)	3	16.7 (22.2)	4	22.2 (0.0)	0	0.0 (0.0)
List of equipment	14	77.8 (94.4)	2	11.1 (0.0)	2	11.1 (5.6)	0	0.0 (0.0)
Operating cost details	1	5.6 (27.8)	2	11.1 (38.9)	15	83.3 (27.8)	0	0.0 (5.6)
List of destroyed equipment	4	22.2 (55.6)	1	5.6 (11.1)	12	66.7 (22.2)	1	5.6 (11.1)

* According to indications of implementing agencies (IAs)

5. IAs rated 33.3 per cent of projects as highly satisfactory; 50 per cent were rated as satisfactory and 16.7 per cent as less satisfactory as shown in Table 6.

Table 6
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION BY THE IAs
(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Assessment	World Bank	UNDP	UNIDO	Total	Percentage of total %
Highly satisfactory	1	2	3	6	33.3 (33.3)
Satisfactory	2	2	5	9	50.0 (55.6)
Less satisfactory	1		2	3	16.7 (11.1)
Total	4	4	10	18	100.0

III. Analysis of PCRs for non-investment projects

6. Sixty-four PCRs were received for non-investment projects, the majority of which are for technical assistance projects¹. Total expenditures for all completed non-investment projects with PCRs were reported to be 92 per cent of the planned expenditures indicating some overall savings, as shown in Table 7. This data needs to be reconfirmed once the final financial figures become available. Comments on 64 PCRs received have been provided by National Ozone Units (40) and by the implementing agencies (55).

Table 7

BUDGETS, PHASE-OUT AND DELAYS REPORTED IN PCRS RECEIVED FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS

(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Agency	Number of projects	Approved funds	Funds disbursed (US \$)	ODP to be phased out (ODP tonnes)	ODP phased out	Average delays (months)
Bilateral	4	653,000	607,619	166.2	166.2	36.80 (0.00)
UNDP	6	1,470,397	1,451,511	62.7	62.7	53.61 (54.40)
UNEP	51	3,068,725	2,873,201	771.6	719.0	34.01 (25.72)
UNIDO	1	40,000	39,012	0.2	0.2	28.43 (0.00)
World Bank	2	464,994	276,300	150.9	150.9	62.90 (35.52)
Total	64	5,697,116	5,247,643	1,151.5	1,098.9	36.84 (41.28)

7. The delays experienced in project implementation continue to show a great deal of variance. Out of 64 non-investment projects, two were completed before the scheduled date. Delays were experienced in 62 projects ranging from 6 months to 93 months (in 59 cases, delays of more than 12 months occurred). The overall average delay for non-investment projects is 36.84 months beyond the planned completion date.

8. The difference in ODP phase-out planned and reported as achieved is almost entirely due to seven projects implemented by UNEP for which the actual ODS phase-out was reported to be less than planned.

9. Implementing agencies rated 12.5 per cent of the projects “highly satisfactory”; 18.8 per cent as “satisfactory as planned”; 62.5 per cent as “satisfactory though not as planned”; and 1.6 per cent as “unsatisfactory”, as shown in Table 8. The validity of such assessments can only be verified during evaluations. The assessment was not provided in three of 64 non-investment projects.

¹ This review does not include country programmes, project preparation, or UNEP’s recurrent activities (including networking), which do not require PCRs as per decision 29/4.

Table 8
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS BY THE IAs
(Figures in brackets show last year for comparison)

Assessment	Bilateral	World Bank	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Total	Percentage of total %
Highly Satisfactory	2		3	3		8	12.5 (12.5)
Satisfactory or satisfactory and as planned	1	1	2	7	1	12	18.8 (25.0)
Satisfactory though not as planned	1	1	1	37		40	62.5 (50.0)
Unsatisfactory				1		1	1.6 (0.0)
Not Provided				3		3	4.7 (0.0)
Total	4	2	6	51	1	64	100.0

10. Most PCRs for non-investment projects contain substantial information and analysis. However, the sections on causes of delays and corrective actions taken are not always provided. Usually enterprise, Government, agency, external factors and design are given as reasons for delays.

IV. Schedule for submission of PCRs in 2014

11. The IAs submitted schedules for submission of PCRs due. Table IV in Annex I shows the schedule for submission of PCRs for projects completed as of 31 December 2012 and takes into account the number of outstanding PCRs as of 30 September 2013. The IAs will, in addition to the above schedule, submit PCRs in 2014 for projects completed during 2013.

V. Improve consistency of data reported in PCRs and in annual progress reports

12. Decision 68/5(b)(i) requested IAs, in cooperation with the Fund Secretariat, to establish full consistency of data reported in the PCRs, in the inventory and the annual progress reports by end of January 2013. The Fund Secretariat provided all agencies with detailed information on data completeness and inconsistencies of PCRs received in comparison to the inventory and the progress reports. All cases of incomplete information and data inconsistencies in PCRs received in 2003, 2004 and 2009 have now been resolved, while this process still continues for several other years as shown in Annex I. During the reporting period, 12 PCRs were received with incomplete information and 18 with data inconsistencies as shown in table XII in Annex I.

13. In order to improve consistency of data and facilitate the preparation of PCRs, since July 2004 implementing agencies can download key project data from the website of the Fund Secretariat (when indicating the project number or title, the first page of the PCR forms will be automatically filled in with data from the Fund Secretariat's project Inventory database, including actual data and remarks from the last progress reports). However, the continued high number of reports with inconsistencies appears to indicate that this facility is still not used.

VI. Causes of delays

14. Causes of delays in submission of PCRs have been analyzed according to the type of projects (technical assistance, training, demonstration, investment projects). Within each category, the information is further separated according to what caused the delay: Government, implementing agency, external factors, enterprises, suppliers or other. A table with all the information is available upon request.

Technical assistance projects

Government-related delays

15. According to the reports received some delays were caused by the late signing of the agreement by the Government. Frequent changes in the NOU personnel also led to interruption on project implementation as well as changes in procedures for approval of various activities planned by the project. Delays in appointment of relevant representatives led to interruptions in the approval process. Delays in recruiting experts and consultants meant that activities were implemented later than planned. Changes at the high level of authority in the relevant Ministry prevented continuity in the project implementation and caused delays in the issuing of the financial and progress reports.

16. Delays occurred also because of the new organizational structure of the lead Ministry; the procedures for appointment and empowerment of the national project director; late signing of project document; change in policies; rotation of personnel; and Government's unavailability during the electoral process. In one case natural catastrophes paired with weak Government structures further delayed the project implementation.

17. To address these delays the relevant implementing agency led discussions with the authorities, either to solve a misunderstanding, to speed the signature of the agreement or to inform the new incumbents about the particulars of the project. Identification of and further coordination with local authorities was needed in order to create synergies and foster institutional capabilities to address the issues at stake.

Agencies-related delays

18. These delays are caused by the procurement process (different interpretations on the procurement rules for subcontracts; procurement of equipment took more time than expected) and by the absence of or changes in the country offices. Often-mentioned was the transfer of the UNEP regional office from Mexico to Panama as well as problems in cooperation and coordination with other UN agencies. To avoid and/or solve the delays, agencies increased the follow-up and communication activities.

External factors- related delays

19. Various external factors are quoted as causes of delay, such as the adherence to a new regional system of licenses and delays in finding consultants. The lack of proper planning for training during summer when there is a higher demand for MAC services, resulted in many technicians not being available for training. To address this issue awareness became a priority.

20. In one case physical factors are also mentioned. When the customs headquarters collapsed during an earthquake the activities of the customs institutions were limited as Montreal Protocol implementation was considered less important at the time of national crisis.

Project design-related delays

21. Some reasons are related to the inclusion of new elements in the initial project design or to the conversion of a previous project approved as investment into a technical assistance programme. In such cases, objectives and milestones had to be modified. In another case, the establishment of the ozone unit in the Customs Department was rejected because customs provisions did not allow the creation of specialized offices.

Other factors

22. The most frequent reason for delay under this category is the difficulty in finding consultants for the project. Another factor quoted is related to a Meeting of the Parties decision linked to a specific circumstance.

Training Projects

Agency-related delays

23. Agency-related delays are caused by the change of location of regional offices or by the decentralization of an agency through the creation of UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) in 2003. Temporary delays were offset by greater direct support and in particular building national capacities. Government-related delays

24. An important factor is the lack of national capacity for the organization of workshops. Understaffing of the National Ozone Offices and changes in the Governments at high levels prevent continuity of project monitoring.

Demonstration projects

25. Causes for delays of demonstration projects are mostly external factors of technical nature. An example is when laboratory testing was made by a third party (external) that had problems with its facility, the test had to be moved to another site.

Investment projects

Government related delays

26. Government-related causes are rare and relate to the economic and political situation of the country as well as to the recruitment of the National Ozone Officer.

Enterprises

27. Delays took place because of the resistance to change of enterprises which doubted the quality of new alternatives. The implementing agency provided closer technical assistance to these companies. Delays also occurred because of the late delivery of materials and equipment to the training site. Various meetings and consultations were organized by the implementing agency to address those issues.

Delays due to suppliers/contractors

28. The most often quoted delays occurred because of the late organization of bids and of equipment delivery. Inappropriate infrastructure led to delays in installation and commissioning of equipment which was solved after the implementing agency held consultations with the enterprises. Another cause was due to the lack of availability of technicians during the production schedule. It was therefore needed to reschedule the production.

External factors

29. External factors include severe environmental conditions (for a MB project), political and economic situations and, in one case, the bidding process as the bid offers were higher than initially planned. For this last factor discussions were held with the company to increase its counterpart funding.

VII. Lessons learned

Technical assistance projects

30. A metered-dose inhaler (MDI) project in Bangladesh reported that awareness activities are important for faster market adoption of non-CFC alternatives and phase-out of CFC MDIs; and Workshops for sensitizing stakeholders and adoption of CFC-free alternatives were important in reaching the objectives of the project. Appropriate awareness materials are helpful in awareness campaigns such as stickers for use at pharmaceutical outlets and clinics, and posters for use at pharmaceutical outlets, selected medical centers treating respiratory diseases, hospitals etc.

31. For automobile air-conditioners (MAC) and refrigerant recovery and recycling R&R units, it is important to deliver equipment that can be retrofitted in future to work with HFC-134a, assuring the sustainability of the project. Also, MAC servicing shops operate differently from A/C servicing shops since many technicians are specialized in mechanics rather than in refrigeration; therefore, they need more intensive training.

32. In order to avoid delays in the implementation of R&R projects, it is important that the NOU undertakes certain steps before procuring equipment. These include ensuring that administrative issues concerning the customs clearance, storage, transport and transfer of ownership of the equipment are fully discussed with and addressed by the appropriate authorities, and that criteria and procedures for the distribution of equipment are agreed upon;

33. Organizational restructuring within a Government institution may help achieve satisfaction of corporate goals through a structure and coordinated human effort, complying at the same time with aims and objectives at the national and international level.

34. The servicing sector phase-out plan should be developed and implemented before the conversion of manufacturing sector to achieve the maximum benefit. There was a general lack of knowledge amongst the refrigeration technicians. Most of them only had theoretical knowledge about good practices while only a minority had proper training. As such, the initial training sessions had to cover some basic topics. Hence, the project strengthened the training centers to support the long term training strategy. Periodic monitoring and evaluation of results allowed NOU to identify lessons learned, improve performance and assess the success of the planned activities under each module and sub-modules, as well as the whole of the Refrigerant Management Plan (RMP).

Recommendation

35. The Executive Committee might wish to consider:

- (a) Taking note of the 2013 consolidated project completion report contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/71/13 including the schedule for submission of project completion reports (PCRs) due and the lessons learned;
- (b) Requesting bilateral and implementing agencies concerned:
 - (i) To establish by the end of January 2014 in cooperation with the Secretariat, full consistency of data reported in the PCRs in the Inventory and in the annual progress reports;
 - (ii) To provide to the Secretariat by the end of January 2014 the information still missing in a number of PCRs;

- (iii) To clear by the end of January 2014 the backlog of PCRs on projects completed before the end of 2006; and
- (c) Inviting all those involved in the preparation and implementation of projects to take into consideration the lessons learned drawn from PCRs when preparing and implementing future projects.

- - -

Annex I
STATISTICS

Table I
SCHEDULE FOR PLANNED SUBMISSION OF PCRS IN 2013 AND ACTUAL DELIVERY

	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNDP	July 2013					1TAS	
	August 2013			1REF			
	September 2013	ARS	2	1PHA, 1REF			
		REF		1FOA	6	4TAS, 1DEM	
	Total		2	4	6	6	
Status at September 30, 2013				+2		0	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNEP	November 2012					9REF, 1HAL	
	January 2013	REF			15	5REF, 5SEV,	
		SEV			3	2PHA, 1ARS	
	February-March 2013					18TAS, 4TRA	
	April 2013	PHA			1		
		REF			15		
		SEV			4		
		HAL			1		
	June 2013					2TAS	
	July 2013	REF			18		
		SEV			3		
		ARS			5		
		PHA			1		
August-September 2013					2TAS, 2TRA		
Total				66	51		
Status at September 30, 2013						-15	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
UNIDO	December 2012			1FUM			
	January 2013	SOL			1		
	March-May 2013			5PHA, 1FUM			
	June 2013	REF	1	1REF			
	August 2013			1PHA			
	September 2013	REF	1	1PHA		1TAS	
	Total		2	10	1	1	
Status at September 30, 2013				+8		0	
	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs		Non-Investment PCRs		
			Schedule	Received	Schedule	Received	
World Bank	December 2012					1TAS	
	January 2013			2ARS, 1REF, 1SOL		1TAS	
	February 2013	Methyl bromide			1		
	July 2013	Halon	1				
		Foam				1	
	Total		1	4	2	2	
Status at September 30, 2013				+3		0	

Table II

**PCRS FOR INVESTMENT PROJECTS RECEIVED AND DUE BY IMPLEMENTING AGENCY, SECTOR AND YEAR
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL THE END OF 2012)**

Agency	Sector	PCR(s) Received in:																PCR(s) Due in ¹										
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total	2004	2005	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
UNDP	Aerosol	1	-	9	4	11	-	-	4	3	5	2	-	-	-	2	-	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Foam	20	34	79	83	117	87	82	77	7	21	7	3	-	1	1	-	619	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Halon	-	-	3	13	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Refrigeration	1	22	2	33	9	22	39	42	1	4	3	1	-	-	-	2	181	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Solvent	3	-	-	19	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Sterilant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	25	56	93	152	137	110	122	126	11	31	13	6	1	1	5	2	891	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	
UNIDO	Aerosol	6	6	10	6	4	2	-	7	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Foam	8	22	3	22	11	15	11	14	8	2	1	1	-	-	-	118	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1	-	6	1	6	3	2	-	1	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Halon	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	4	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Refrigeration	12	25	11	32	14	22	24	34	7	4	-	1	-	-	-	1	187	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Solvent	5	13	5	3	3	5	5	4	9	-	1	-	1	-	-	54	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total	32	66	29	63	35	48	42	64	24	13	3	10	5	3	1	2	440	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
World Bank	Aerosol	4	6	6	-	1	-	2	5	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Foam	18	25	38	20	20	18	8	26	12	6	6	-	-	3	-	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Halon	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	
	Multiple Sectors	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Others	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	
	Process Agent	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Production	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Refrigeration	18	24	22	26	15	16	12	21	9	7	1	-	1	1	-	1	174	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Solvent	15	4	3	1	-	-	-	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Sterilant	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Total	59	60	73	48	36	34	23	56	24	16	7	-	1	9	-	4	450	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	5	
Bilateral	Aerosol	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Foam	-	-	3	2	2	2	-	5	6	6	1	1	-	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Fumigant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	2	
	Halon	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Phase-Out Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Refrigeration	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	2	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	11	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	
	Solvent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	2	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	-	1	5	2	3	2	-	7	11	7	5	3	1	-	2	-	49	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	1	5		
Grand Total	116	183	200	265	211	194	187	253	70	67	28	19	8	13	8	8	1830	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	11	

¹ 6 months after projects completion according to the Progress Report

Table III

**PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT RECEIVED AND DUE FOR NON-INVESTMENT PROJECTS
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL THE END OF 2012)**

Agency	Sector	See PCR(s) Received so far for Year Due																	PCR(s) Due in ¹										
		1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total	Before 1997	2002	2003	2005	2007	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
UNDP	Demonstration	-	-	5	-	-	6	1	2	-	-	-	-	3	4	1	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	
	Technical Assistance	-	6	39	17	7	5	1	15	8	21	29	27	12	12	4	5	208	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Training	-	18	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	24	50	17	7	11	2	17	8	21	33	27	12	15	8	6	258	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
UNEP	Technical Assistance	9	53	3	18	22	18	5	6	1	7	7	8	9	17	2	39	224	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	7	1	-	14
	Training	8	34	1	2	21	15	20	10	5	4	7	25	5	9	4	11	181	-	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	2	-	6
	Total	17	87	4	20	43	33	25	16	6	11	14	33	14	26	6	50	405	-	1	-	2	1	1	5	7	3	-	20
UNIDO	Demonstration	-	-	-	6	7	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Technical Assistance	-	6	8	-	4	1	3	4	3	15	9	6	2	3	-	1	65	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Training	-	1	1	-	5	6	7	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	22	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	7	9	6	16	10	13	8	3	16	9	6	2	3	-	1	109	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
World Bank	Demonstration	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
	Technical Assistance	5	4	6	-	1	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	-	-	2	2	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
	Training	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	6	7	6	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	2	-	-	-	2	2	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	4
Bilateral	Demonstration	5	5	12	-	3	1	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	
	Technical Assistance	-	-	13	1	1	9	14	15	8	5	15	7	13	19	-	4	124	1	1	-	2	-	1	2	9	4	-	20
	Training	1	3	19	1	9	6	5	6	6	2	2	-	2	-	-	62	1	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	6	
	Total	6	8	44	2	13	16	20	21	16	7	17	8	15	19	-	4	216	2	1	1	3	-	2	3	11	4	-	27
Grand Total	29	133	113	45	80	70	62	63	34	57	75	74	43	63	16	63	1020	2	2	1	5	1	3	8	22	7	1	52	

¹ 6 months after projects completion according to the Progress Report

Table IV

**SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF OUTSTANDING PCRS IN 2014
(FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED UNTIL 31 DECEMBER 2012)**

UNDP	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
UNDP	August	Demonstration		1
		Aerosol	1	
	Total UNDP		1	1
Total PCRs due as of 30 September 2013			1	1
UNEP	December 2013	Technical Assistance		2
		Training		1
	March 2014	Technical Assistance		3
		Training		2
	May 2014	Technical Assistance		2
		Training		2
	July 2014	Technical Assistance		1
		Training		1
	September 2014	Technical Assistance		4
		Training		0
Total UNEP			18	
Total PCRs due as of 30 September 2013			N/A	20
UNIDO	February	FUM	1	
	March	FOA	1	
	April	FOA	1	
	August	FUM	1	
	October	REF	1	
	Total UNIDO		5	0
Total PCRs due as of 30 September 2013			0	0
World Bank	April	Foam (1)	1	0
	July	Halon (1)	1	1
		Aerosol (1)		
	October	Halon (1) One-off phaseout plan (1) Refrigeration (1)	3	0
Total World Bank		5	1	
Total PCRs due as of 30 September 2013			5	4

Table V

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2005 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)**

	Canada		Germany		Japan		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1	1	1	33	33			32	32	11	10	79	78
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		100%				100%		91%		99%
Data Inconsistencies																
Date Approved	3	3					3	3							6	6
Planned Date of Completion			1	1			15	15			2	2	2	1	20	19
Revised Planned Date of Completion	3	3			2	2	23	23	3	3			27	26	58	57
Date Completed	2	2	1	1	2	2	22	22	1	1	1	1	6	6	35	35
Funds Approved	1	1	1	1									6	6	8	8
Funds Disbursed	1	1					4	4			1	1	5	5	11	11
ODP To Be Phased Out							2	2					3	3	5	5
ODP Phased Out							4	4			1	1	3	3	8	8
Total	10	10	3	3	4	4	73	73	4	4	5	5	52	50	151	149
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		96%		99%

Table VI

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2006 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)**

	Australia		Canada		France		Germany		Japan		Poland		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1	2		8	8					5	5	1	1	9	9	35	16	62	41
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		0%		100%		N/A		N/A		100%		100%		100%		46%		66%
Data Inconsistencies																						
Date Approved	1	1			1		1	1											3	2	6	4
Planned Date of Completion	1	1	2	2	1										1	1			17	4	22	8
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1	5	5	1		4	4							3	3	1	1	43	8	58	22
Date Completed	2	2			2		3	3	1	1	1						1	1	5	3	15	10
Funds Approved			2	2	1		1	1											4	0	8	3
Funds Disbursed			4	4	1										1	1			4	0	10	5
ODP To Be Phased Out							2	2									1	1	5	2	8	5
ODP Phased Out			1	1	1		8	8	1	1							1	1	5	2	17	13
Total	5	5	14	14	8	0	19	19	2	2	1	0			5	5	4	4	86	21	144	70
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		0%		100%		100%		0%		N/A		100%		100%		24%		49%

Table VII

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2007 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)**

	Canada		France		Germany		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	2	2			7	7	26	26			3	3	10		48	38
Solved as % of Total		100%				100%		100%				100%		0%		79%
Data Inconsistencies																
Date Approved									1	1			1		2	1
Planned Date of Completion									1	1			1		2	1
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1					1	1			5	5	15		22	7
Date Completed			1	1	6	6	9	9	1	1	1	1	5		23	18
Funds Approved											1	1	3		4	1
Funds Disbursed									1	1			4		5	1
ODP To Be Phased Out			1	1	2	2	12	12	2	2	1	1	2		20	18
ODP Phased Out			1	1	7	7	12	12			1	1	1		22	21
Total	1	1	3	3	15	15	34	34	6	6	9	9	32	0	100	68
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		0%		68%

Table VIII

**SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2008 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)**

	Australia		Canada		France		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1	1	1	1					17	17	1	1	4	4	3		27	24
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%						100%		100%		100%		0%		89%
Data Inconsistencies																		
Date Approved									1	1			1	1	1		3	2
Planned Date of Completion	1	1	1	1			1	1	2	2			2	2	1		8	7
Revised Planned Date of Completion									6	6	3	3	1	1			10	10
Date Completed	1	1			1				14	14					1		18	15
ODP To Be Phased Out			1	1					12	12	2	2			1		16	15
ODP Phased Out			1	1					14	14	2	2			1		18	17
Total	2	2	3	3	1		1	1	49	49	7	7	4	4	5		73	66
Solved as % of Total		100%		100%		0%		100%		100%		100%		100%		0%		90%

Table IX

SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2010 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)

	Canada		Finland		France		Germany		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information			1				3	3			5	5			3	3	12	11
Solved as % of Total				0%				100%				100%				100%		92%
Data Inconsistencies																		
Date Approved							1	1			1	1					2	2
Planned Date of Completion											3	3					3	3
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1	1					3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	11	11
Date Completed							1	1			4	4					5	5
ODP To Be Phased Out					1		7	7			2	2					10	9
ODP Phased Out							4	4			4	4	1	1	3	3	12	12
Funds Approved													1	1			1	1
Funds Disbursed													5	5			5	5
	1	1			1	0	16	16	1	1	17	17	8	8	5	5	49	48
Solved as % of Total		100%				0%		100%				100%		100%		100%		98%

Table X

SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2011 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)

	Australia		Canada		Sweden		UNDP		UNEP		UNIDO		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1						7	7	2	2	1	1	11	10
Solved as % of Total								100%		100%		100%		91%
Data Inconsistencies														
Date Approved									1	1	1	1	2	2
Planned Date of Completion	1												1	0
Revised Planned Date of Completion	1		1		3		10	10	4	4	1	1	20	15
Date Completed	1				2		3	3			3	3	9	6
ODP To Be Phased Out	1				1		2	2	1	1			5	3
ODP Phased Out							5	5	1	1			6	6
Funds Approved	1				1								2	0
Funds Disbursed					2						1	1	3	1
	5	0	1	0	9	0	20	20	7	7	6	6	48	33
Solved as % of Total		0%		0%		0%		100%		100%		100%		69%

Table XI

SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2012 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)

	France		Italy		UNDP		World Bank		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	1				7	7	5		13	7
Solved as % of Total		0%				100%		0%		54%
Data Inconsistencies										
Revised Planned Date of Completion			1		4	4	2		7	4
Date Completed	1		2		3	3	1		7	3
ODP To Be Phased Out	1				1	1	3		5	1
ODP Phased Out	1				2	2	1		4	2
	3	0	3	0	10	10	7	0	23	10
Solved as % of Total		0%		0%		100%		0%		43%

Table XII

SUMMARY OF PCRs RECEIVED IN 2013 WITH DATA PROBLEMS
(As of 25 October 2013)

	World Bank		UNDP		UNEP		Total	
	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved	Problems with PCRs	Problems with PCRs Solved
Incomplete Information	4		6	6	2		12	6
Solved as % of Total				100%		0%		50%
Data Inconsistencies								
Revised Planned Date of Completion	6				1		7	0
Date Completed			1	1	2		3	1
ODP To Be Phased Out	1		1	1			2	1
ODP Phased Out	1		2	2	2		5	2
Funds Disbursed			1	1			1	1
	8	0	5	5	5	0	18	5
Solved as % of Total		0%		100%		0%		28%