



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/51\*  
15 October 2014



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Seventy-third Meeting  
Paris, 9-13 November 2014

**REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME FOR THE 2015-2017 TRIENNIUM  
(DECISION 71/45)**

1. Since administrative cost regimes have been reviewed for each new triennium, at its 62<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee was asked if it wished an independent assessment or an assessment by the Secretariat. The Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to review administrative costs for the 2012-2014 triennium (decision 62/25(c))<sup>1</sup> based on the core unit report and again for the 2015-2017 triennium (decision 71/45(b))<sup>2</sup>. This document is intended to provide basic information on the regime's functioning, rather than a detailed review.

2. The current administrative cost regime has largely three aspects: agency fees and core unit costs for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank; different rates for UNEP and the bilateral agencies; and the compliance assistance programme (CAP) budget. Annex I presents the current administrative cost regime for bilateral and implementing agencies. Administrative costs were defined in the last independent assessment of administrative costs prepared by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) (attached to document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/55/48).

\*Reissued for technical reasons on 16 October 2014.

<sup>1</sup> The Executive Committee decided "that the extension of the administrative cost regime for the 2012-2014 triennium could be based on the report on 2012 core unit costs to be prepared by the Fund Secretariat by the 65<sup>th</sup> meeting" (decision 62/25(c)).

<sup>2</sup> At its 71<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee requested the Secretariat to submit to the last meeting in 2014 a document reviewing the current administrative cost regime, in consideration of the administrative cost regime for the 2015-2017 triennium (decision 71/45(b)).

### **Core unit costs**

3. The core unit costs are annually reviewed by the Secretariat and are presented with six core unit budget line items along with three to four budget line items for other administrative costs. An increase rate of 0.7 per cent per year is allowed for core unit costs per decision 67/15. The functioning of the regime is characterized with a core unit budget where funds are returned as a budget in the case of the World Bank that has a cost accounting system to determine the extent to which the core unit budget is utilized; in the case of UNDP funds from agency fees are used increasingly to support core unit staff and expenses with no funds having ever been returned; and in the case of UNIDO funds from agency fees are increasingly used to support core unit staff and related expenses, and funds have never been returned. UNIDO's funds for agency fees and core unit budgets are pooled into its General Fund as it does not have a separate Trust Fund for the Multilateral Fund as is the case with UNDP and the World Bank. UNDP uses cost accrual accounting to account for costs to its core unit whereas UNIDO is still in the trial stages of a cost accounting system until the end of 2014, and did not indicate when such system would be implemented.

4. UNDP and UNIDO have indicated that core unit funds are used for both administrative and project implementation purposes. Cost accounting could be applied to core unit budgets to calculate actual costs of approved core unit as is the case with the World Bank. Alternatively, the reporting format for core unit and administrative costs could be revised. The revision could include staff and travel costs for non-core unit activities. UNIDO currently uses an estimation system to separate project execution costs from project implementation costs that has been agreed with the Secretariat and noted by the Executive Committee.

5. The Executive Committee may wish to request the Secretariat, in cooperation with the implementing agencies, to further consider reporting for core unit and administrative cost and possible format changes, in a document to be presented to the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting for application in future annual reviews of such costs.

### **Overall administrative costs**

6. This section addresses additional income and use of administrative costs, and provides a comparison between the current and the previous regimes and historical administrative costs.

#### Additional income and use of administrative costs

7. UNDP and the World Bank do not receive additional support for administrative costs. UNIDO indicated that an estimation of additional resources provided can be obtained from its Organization by a comparison between the totality of support cost reimbursement provided by the Multilateral Fund and the total support requirements, as reported annually. Although UNIDO had a surplus of income for administrative costs as at the end of 2008, since 2009 through 2013 administrative costs have exceeded income by US \$5,960,390 amounting to a subsidy of US \$1,192,078 per year<sup>3</sup>.

8. UNIDO also provides support to the Foreign Economic Cooperation Office/Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO/MEP) of China for project execution. It indicates in its core unit submission that over US \$2.8 million in administrative costs was estimated for this budget category in 2014 and US \$3.2 million is expected in 2015. UNDP had previously used UNOPS services but now dedicates teams at regional locations and does not transfer fees to FECO/MEP or other entities. The World Bank does not transfer agency fees to FECO/MEP or other entities either.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/31, Table 4.

## Comparison between administrative cost regimes, and impact on historical average

9. Table 1 shows a comparison of the overall administrative costs between the 2009-2011 triennium and the 2012-2014 triennium, and the impact on the historical average. The current regime would have had the same percentage of administrative costs as the 2009-2011 regime had core unit and UNEP CAP costs been reduced by US \$394,811 per year. However, it would have been less if all projects would have been submitted to the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting (11.3 per cent for 1991-2014 and 11.9 per cent for 2012-2014).

**Table 1: Administrative cost income against approvals (US \$)**

Agency	Average annual administrative costs under previous regime (2009-2011)	Average annual administrative costs under current regime (2012-2014)*	Historical annual average 1991-2010	Historical annual average 1991-2014
<b>Income</b>				
UNDP	4,324,130	4,238,202	3,656,236	3,849,749
UNEP	1,285,038	1,261,743	789,117	876,777
UNIDO	5,459,708	4,267,249	3,866,521	4,098,225
World Bank	3,233,016	3,574,499	4,466,932	4,382,775
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>14,830,871</b>	<b>13,778,985</b>	<b>12,926,110</b>	<b>13,400,407</b>
<b>Approvals</b>				
UNDP	31,400,644	30,663,084	26,372,829	28,340,533
UNEP	16,782,779	16,983,918	8,754,954	10,170,816
UNIDO	46,525,204	31,584,269	29,776,357	32,159,015
World Bank	24,495,488	28,592,313	46,329,716	44,064,996
<b>TOTAL (including bilateral)</b>	<b>123,485,742</b>	<b>111,534,777</b>	<b>114,317,905</b>	<b>117,857,524</b>
<b>Percentage of income to approvals</b>				
UNDP	13.8%	13.8%	13.9%	13.6%
UNEP	7.7%	7.4%	9.0%	8.6%
UNIDO	11.7%	13.5%	13.0%	12.7%
World Bank	13.2%	12.5%	9.6%	9.9%
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>

\* Based on submissions after review as at 2 October 2014. If all the projects that were in the 2014 business plan had been submitted, the average rate would have been less than the previous triennium.

## Assessing administrative costs on the basis of expenditures against project delivery (disbursements)

10. The World Bank proposed, in response to a document presented by the Secretariat at the Inter-agency coordination meeting in September 2014, that an alternative means of assessing administrative costs should be based on disbursement of support costs (fee income and core unit budget) against project funding disbursed. Table 2 provides the analysis. This method also shows an increase from the historical average under the current regime.

**Table 2: Administrative cost expenditures against disbursements\***

Agency	Historical annual average		Actual	
	2002 to 2010	2002 to 2013	2012	2013
<b>Expenditures</b>				
UNDP	3,515,113	4,052,717	4,909,004	5,723,531
UNIDO	4,433,516	4,879,336	5,181,590	6,821,000
World Bank	5,733,080	4,974,375	3,671,821	2,932,534
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>13,681,710</b>	<b>13,906,428</b>	<b>13,762,415</b>	<b>15,477,065</b>
<b>Disbursement against approvals</b>				
UNDP	27,694,697	29,314,891	30,437,946	38,551,004

Agency	Historical annual average		Actual	
	2002 to 2010	2002 to 2013	2012	2013
UNIDO	30,278,104	34,025,368	47,975,931	68,115,585
World Bank	61,823,227	50,756,703	5,957,855	37,600,393
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>119,796,028</b>	<b>114,096,962</b>	<b>84,371,733</b>	<b>144,266,982</b>
<b>Percentage of expenditure to disbursement against approvals</b>				
UNDP	12.7%	13.8%	16.1%	14.8%
UNIDO	14.6%	14.3%	10.8%	10.0%
World Bank	9.3%	9.8%	61.6% **	7.8%
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>

\* Does not include UNEP and bilateral agencies because expenditure reports on total administrative costs are not provided.

\*\* The World Bank had limited disbursements against projects in 2012 but received core unit costs and had other administrative costs comparable to previous year.

### Assessing administrative costs on the basis of expenditures against number of projects under implementation

11. UNDP indicated that the rate of delivery should be taken into account on the basis of the number of projects under implementation. It proposed an alternative means of assessing administrative costs based on expenditures against the number of projects under implementation. Table 3 provides the analysis. This method also shows an increase in the historical average based on the current regime.

**Table 3: Administrative cost expenditures against number of ongoing projects\***

Agency	Historical annual average		Actual	
	2002 to 2010	2002 to 2013	2012	2013
<b>Expenditures</b>				
UNDP	3,515,113	4,052,717	4,909,004	5,723,531
UNIDO	4,433,516	4,879,336	5,181,590	6,821,000
World Bank	5,733,080	4,974,375	3,671,821	2,932,534
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>13,681,710</b>	<b>13,906,428</b>	<b>13,762,415</b>	<b>15,477,065</b>
<b>Number of ongoing projects</b>				
UNDP	223	207	154	141
UNIDO	175	183	215	199
World Bank	79	68	37	29
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>369</b>
<b>Expenditure against ongoing projects</b>				
UNDP	15,747	19,586	31,877	40,592
UNIDO	25,383	26,663	24,100	34,276
World Bank	72,571	73,153	99,238	101,122
<b>Total (excluding UNEP and bilateral)</b>	<b>28,716</b>	<b>30,369</b>	<b>33,898</b>	<b>41,943</b>

\* Does not include UNEP and bilateral agencies because expenditure reports on total administrative costs are not provided.

### UNEP administrative costs taking into account CAP administrative cost activities

12. UNEP's CAP budget is annually reviewed and is presented with 105 line items in the budget, while there is no accounting for the disposition of the agency fees that UNEP collects. UNEP's CAP includes activities that might be considered administrative in nature. For this reason, among others, and since CAP has staff to address institutional strengthening, UNEP is the only agency that does not receive an agency fee for administrative costs. The PWC administrative cost study (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/55/48) assessed the costs of CAP by line item. UNEP also made an assessment of those line items to estimate an overall administrative overhead for CAP. Annex II contains the assumptions for the different assessments.

13. Table 4<sup>4</sup> presents the results of that assessment using the PWC methodology and shows decreasing administrative costs for UNEP and the resulting impact on the overall administrative costs of the Multilateral Fund if these assessments are used.

**Table 4: Administrative costs using the PWC methodology for CAP administrative costs**

Agency	Average annual administrative costs under previous regime (2009-2011)	Average annual administrative costs under current regime (2012-2014)	Historical annual average 1991-2010	Historical annual average 1991-2014
<b>Income</b>				
UNDP	4,324,130	4,238,202	3,656,236	3,849,749
UNEP	3,280,251	3,779,510	3,243,869	3,307,185
UNIDO	5,459,708	4,267,249	3,866,521	4,098,225
World Bank	3,233,016	3,574,499	4,466,932	4,382,775
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>16,297,106</b>	<b>15,859,460</b>	<b>15,233,557</b>	<b>15,637,934</b>
<b>Approvals</b>				
UNDP	31,400,644	30,663,084	26,372,829	28,340,533
UNEP	12,375,184	15,512,563	11,842,888	12,325,284
UNIDO	46,525,204	31,584,269	29,776,357	32,159,015
World Bank	24,495,488	28,592,313	46,329,716	44,064,996
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>123,485,742</b>	<b>111,534,777</b>	<b>114,317,905</b>	<b>117,857,524</b>
<b>Percentage of income to approvals</b>				
UNDP	13.8%	13.8%	13.9%	13.6%
UNEP	26.5%	24.4%	27.4%	26.8%
UNIDO	11.7%	13.5%	13.0%	12.7%
World Bank	13.2%	12.5%	9.6%	9.9%
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>13.3%</b>

14. Table 5<sup>5</sup> presents the results of that assessment using UNEP's methodology where it assigns an estimated administrative cost percentage to the costs of its CAP. It also shows decreasing administrative costs for UNEP and the resulting impact on the overall administrative costs of the Multilateral Fund if these assessments are used.

**Table 5: Administrative costs using UNEP's methodology for CAP administrative costs**

Agency	Average annual administrative costs under previous regime (2009-2011)	Average annual administrative costs under current regime (2012-2014)	Historical annual average 1991-2010	Historical annual average 1991-2014
<b>Income</b>				
UNDP	4,324,130	4,238,202	3,656,236	3,849,749
UNEP	2,556,384	2,961,643	2,537,098	2,582,520
UNIDO	5,459,708	4,267,249	3,866,521	4,098,225
World Bank	3,233,016	3,574,499	4,466,932	4,382,775
<b>Total (including bilateral)</b>	<b>15,573,239</b>	<b>15,041,593</b>	<b>14,526,787</b>	<b>14,913,270</b>
<b>Approvals</b>				
UNDP	31,400,644	30,663,084	26,372,829	28,340,533
UNEP	13,099,051	16,330,429	12,549,658	13,049,948

<sup>4</sup>Data provided for the other implementing agencies are the same as in Table 1.

<sup>5</sup>Data provided for the other implementing agencies are the same as in Table 1.

Agency	Average annual administrative costs under previous regime (2009-2011)	Average annual administrative costs under current regime (2012-2014)	Historical annual average 1991-2010	Historical annual average 1991-2014
UNIDO	46,525,204	31,584,269	29,776,357	32,159,015
World Bank	24,495,488	28,592,313	46,329,716	44,064,996
<b>TOTAL (including bilateral)</b>	<b>123,485,742</b>	<b>111,534,777</b>	<b>114,317,905</b>	<b>117,857,524</b>
<b>Percentage of income to approvals</b>				
UNDP	13.8%	13.8%	13.9%	13.6%
UNEP	19.5%	18.1%	20.2%	19.8%
UNIDO	11.7%	13.5%	13.0%	12.7%
World Bank	13.2%	12.5%	9.6%	9.9%
<b>TOTAL (including bilateral)</b>	<b>12.6%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>12.7%</b>

### Review of the administrative cost regime for the 2018-2020 triennium

15. The Executive Committee has historically reviewed administrative costs at the last meeting prior to the following triennium. The reviews have been performed optionally by independent consultants, consulting accounting firms, or the Secretariat. The present review was limited to the functioning of the current administrative cost regime. As a detailed analysis of the current administrative cost regime was not foreseen in decision 71/45(b), the following issues were not considered: change to the current regime with a core unit and agency fee to a budget-based system without agency fees; introductions of compliance assistance to other implementing agencies; elimination of the core units; impact of programme management unit (PMU) funding on administrative costs; assessment of a change in structure of core units/CAP to reflect any changes in requirements for stage II of HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs), additional fees for administrative costs associated with being a lead agency and/or fees for arranging co-financing; or the need for budgetary controls of core unit costs. In deciding the administrative cost regime, the Executive Committee may also wish to consider how the review for the 2018-2020 would be conducted.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

16. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Noting the document on the review of the administrative cost regime for the 2015-2017 triennium (decision 71/45) as presented in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/51;
- (b) Requesting the Secretariat, in cooperation with the implementing agencies, to further consider reporting for core unit and administrative costs and possible format changes, in a paper to be presented to the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting, for application in future annual reviews of such costs;
- (c) Whether to continue to apply the existing administrative cost regime for the bilateral and implementing agencies during the 2015–2017 triennium; and
- (d) Requesting a review of the administrative cost regime and its core unit funding budget at the last meeting of the 2015–2017 triennium according to one of the options mention in paragraph 15.

-----

## Annex I

### CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE COST REGIME

1. At its 67<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee decided:
  - (a) To continue to apply the existing administrative cost regime to UNEP and the bilateral agencies during the 2012–2014 triennium;
  - (b) To apply a new administrative cost regime for the 2012–2014 triennium to UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank, consisting of annual core unit funding for which an annual increase of up to 0.7 per cent could be considered subject to annual review, and to apply the following agency fees on the basis of funding per agency:
    - (i) An agency fee of 7 per cent for projects with a project cost above US \$250,000, as well as institutional strengthening projects and project preparation;
    - (ii) An agency fee of 9 per cent for projects with a project cost at or below US \$250,000;
    - (iii) An agency fee no greater than 6.5 per cent, to be determined on a case-by-case basis for projects in the production sector; and
  - (c) To review the administrative cost regime and its core unit funding budget at the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee, i.e. the last meeting of the 2012–2014 triennium.

**(Decision 67/15)**

2. For UNEP and bilateral agencies, at its 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee decided:
  - (a) To apply an agency fee of 13 per cent on projects up to a value of \$500,000;
  - (b) That for projects with a value exceeding \$500,000 but up to and including \$5,000,000, an agency fee of 13 per cent should be applied on the first \$500,000 and 11 per cent on the balance;
  - (c) To assess projects with a value exceeding \$5 million on a case-by-case basis;
  - (d) That the agency fee for projects submitted under the SME window (Decision 25/56) should be 13 per cent;
  - (e) That agencies implementing projects under the SME window should report back to the Executive Committee on the actual administrative costs of such projects;
  - (f) To request the Secretariat and the Implementing Agencies to develop standardized cost items for future reporting on administrative costs;
  - (g) To review the results of implementation of this decision at the second meeting of the Executive Committee in 1999 and to report to the Eleventh Meeting of the Parties in 1999, in line with decision VIII/4 of the Meeting of the Parties;

- (h) To apply this decision to projects approved beginning with the current meeting.

**(Decision 26/41)**

- 3. UNEP agreed to an 8 per cent agency fee and zero agency fees for institutional strengthening in its request for CAP funding.

-----



Annex II

ASSUMPTIONS FOR ASSESSMENTS OF UNEP'S ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMPONENTS OF CAP

			Code 2013/ 2014	Component	Location			PWC % Admin	UNEP % Admin
<b>10</b>	<b>PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>								
	<i>1100 Project personnel*</i>								
	<b>Past Code</b>			<b>Title/Description (2013/2014)</b>		<b>Grade</b>	<b>w/m</b>		
	1101	1101	1101	Head of Branch	Paris	D1	12	100%	20%
	1102	1102	1102	Senior Environment Officer - Network & Policy	Paris	P5	12	50%	10%
	1103	1103	1103	Programme Officer - Capacity Building	Paris	P4/P5	12	50%	10%
	1104	1104	1104	Information Manager	Paris	P4	12	10%	10%
	1105	1105	1105	Monitoring & Administration Officer	Paris	P4	0	100%	100%
	1106	1106	1106	Programme Officer - Policy & Tech Support	Paris	P4	12	10%	10%
	1107	1107	1107	Programme Officer - HCFC	Paris	P3	12	10%	10%
	1108	1108	1108	Programme Officer - ECA / Paris	Paris	P3	12	50%	10%
	1109							10%	10%
	1110	1145	1145	ROA Programme Officer - HPMP / Methyl Bromide	Nairobi	P3	12	10%	10%
	1111	1142	1142	ROA Regional Network Coordinator - Francophone	Nairobi	P4	12	10%	10%
	1112	1143	1143	ROA Regional Network Coordinator - Anglophone	Nairobi	P4	12	10%	10%
	1113	1144	1144	ROA Programme Officer - HPMP	Nairobi	P3	12	10%	10%
	1114	1151	1151	ROLAC Regional Network Coordinator	Panama	P4	12	10%	10%
	1115	1152	1152	ROLAC Regional Network - Caribbean	Panama	P4	12	10%	10%
	1116	1153	1153	ROLAC Programme Officer - HPMP	Panama	P3	12	10%	10%
	1117	1154	1154	ROLAC Programme Officer - HPMP / Methyl Bromide	Panama	P3	12	10%	10%
	1118	1121	1121	ROAP Senior Regional Network Coordinator - SA	Bangkok	P5	12	10%	10%
	1119	1122	1122	ROAP Regional Network Coordinator - SEA	Bangkok	P4	12	10%	10%
	1120	1123	1123	ROAP Regional Network Coordinator - PIC	Bangkok	P4	12	10%	10%
	1121	1124	1124	ROAP Programme Officer - HPMP	Bangkok	P4	12	10%	10%
	1122	1131	1131	ROWA Regional Network Coordinator	Manama	P4	12	10%	10%
	1123	1132	1132	ROWA Programme Officer - HPMP	Manama	P4	12	10%	10%
	1124	1133	1133	ROWA Programme Officer - HPMP	Manama	P3	12	10%	10%
	1125	1141	1141	ROA Senior Regional Network Coordinator	Nairobi	P5	12	10%	10%
	1126	1111	1111	ECA Regional Network Coordinator	ECA	P4	12	10%	10%
	1127	1125	1125	ROAP Programme Officer - HPMP	Bangkok	P3	12	10%	10%
	1199	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	1200	<i>Consultants (Description of activity/service)</i>							
	1201								
	1299	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	1300	<i>Programme Assistance (General Service staff)</i>							
				<b>Title/Description</b>		<b>Grade</b>	<b>w/m</b>		
	1301	1301	1301	Principal Assistant - Head of Branch	Paris	G6	12	100%	10%
	1302	1302	1302	Programme Assistant - Regional Networks	Paris	G6	12	10%	10%
	1303	1303	1303	Programme Assistant - Clearinghouse	Paris	G6	12	10%	10%
	1304	1304	1304	Administration Assistant	Paris	G6	0	100%	100%
	1305	1305	1305	Programme Assistant - ECA / Paris	Paris	G5	12	50%	10%
	1306	1306	1306	Programme Assistant - Capacity Building	Paris	G5	12	10%	10%
	1307	1307	1307	Programme Assistant - Information	Paris	G5	12	10%	10%
	1309	1311	1311	Programme Assistant - ECA / Paris	ECA	G5	12	10%	10%
	1310	1317	1317	Temporary assistance CAP				10%	10%
	1311	1321	1321	ROAP Programme Assistant - SA	Bangkok	G6	12	10%	10%
	1312	1322	1322	ROAP Programme Assistant - SEA	Bangkok	G5	12	10%	10%
	1313	1323	1323	ROAP Programme Assistant - PIC	Bangkok	G5	12	10%	10%
	1314	1324	1324	ROAP Regional Outreach Assistant - HPMP	Bangkok	G6	12	10%	10%
	1315	1331	1331	ROWA Programme Assistant	Manama	G6	12	10%	10%
	1316	1332	1332	ROWA Programme Assistant	Manama	G6	12	10%	10%
	1317	1333	1333	ROWA Regional Outreach Assistant-HPMP	Manama	G6	6	10%	10%
	1318	1341	1341	ROA Programme Assistant	Nairobi	G6	12	10%	10%

			Code 2013/ 2014	Component	Location			PWC % Admin	UNEP % Admin
		1319	1342	ROA Programme Assistant	Nairobi	G5	12	10%	10%
		1320	1343	ROA Regional Outreach Assistant - HPMP	Nairobi	G6	12	10%	10%
		1321	1351	ROLAC Programme Assistant	Panama	G4	12	10%	10%
		1322	1352	ROLAC Regional Outreach Assistant-HPMP	Panama	G6	12	10%	10%
		1323	1353	ROLAC Programme Assistant	Panama	G5	12	10%	10%
		1324	1354	ROLAC - Programme Assistant	Panama	G3	12	10%	10%
	1399	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	1600	<i>Travel on official business (UNEP staff)</i>							
		1601	1601	Paris staff travel	Paris			50%	10%
		1602	1610	ECA staff travel	ECA			10%	10%
		1603	1620	ROAP staff travel	Bangkok			10%	10%
		1604	1630	ROWA staff travel	Manama			10%	10%
		1605	1640	ROA staff travel	Nairobi			10%	10%
		1606	1650	ROLAC staff travel	Panama			10%	10%
	1699	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	<b>1999</b>	<b>COMPO- NENT TOTAL</b>							
	<b>1999</b>								
	<b>1999</b>								
<b>20</b>	<b>SUB CONTRACT COMPONENT</b>								
	2200	<i>Sub-contracts (MOUs/LAs for supporting organizations)</i>							
		2202	2110	ECA Sub-contracts with supporting organizations	ECA			10%	10%
		2203	2120	ROAP Sub-contracts with supporting organizations	Bangkok			10%	10%
		2204	2130	ROWA Sub-contracts with supporting organizations	Manama			10%	10%
		2205	2140	ROA Sub-contracts with supporting organizations	Nairobi			10%	10%
		2206	2150	ROLAC Sub-contracts with supporting organizations	Panama			10%	10%
		2212	2210	ECA Regional awareness raising	ECA			10%	10%
		2213	2220	ROAP Regional awareness raising	Bangkok			10%	10%
		2214	2230	ROWA Regional awareness raising	Manama			10%	10%
		2215	2240	ROA Regional awareness raising	Nairobi			10%	10%
		2216	2250	ROLAC Regional awareness raising	Panama			10%	10%
								10%	10%
								10%	10%
	2299	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	2300	<i>Sub-contracts (for commercial purposes)</i>							
		2301	2301	Technical and policy information materials	Paris			10%	10%
		2302	2302	Clearing House	Paris			10%	10%
		2303	2303	Capacity Building on HCFC phase-out	Paris			10%	10%
		2304						10%	10%
		2305						10%	10%
		2306						10%	10%
	2399	<i>Sub-total</i>							
	<b>2999</b>	<b>COMPO- NENT TOTAL</b>							
	<b>2999</b>								
	<b>2999</b>								
<b>30</b>	<b>TRAINING COMPONENT</b>								
	3300	<i>Meetings/conferences</i>							
		3301	3210	ECA South-South cooperation	ECA			50%	10%
		3302	3220	ROAP South-South cooperation	Bangkok			10%	10%
		3303	3230	ROWA South-South cooperation	Manama			10%	10%
		3304	3240	ROA South-South cooperation	Nairobi			10%	10%

			<b>Code 2013/ 2014</b>	<b>Component</b>	<b>Location</b>			<b>PWC % Admin</b>	<b>UNEP % Admin</b>
		3305	3250	ROLAC South-South cooperation	Panama			10%	10%
		3306	3301	Advisory and Consultative Meetings - Paris	Paris			10%	10%
		3307	3310	ECA network meetings/thematic workshops	ECA			10%	10%
		3308	3321	ROAP network meetings/thematic workshops - SA	Bangkok			10%	10%
		3309						10%	10%
		3310						10%	10%
		3312	3322	ROAP network meetings/thematic workshops - SEA	Bangkok			10%	10%
		3313	3323	ROAP network meetings/thematic workshops - PIC	Bangkok			10%	10%
		3314	3330	ROWA network meetings/thematic workshops	Manama			10%	10%
		3315	3340	ROA network meetings/thematic workshops	Nairobi			10%	10%
		3316	3350	ROLAC network meetings/thematic workshops	Panama			10%	10%
		3319						10%	10%
		3320						10%	10%
		3399		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		<b>3999</b>		<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>					
		<b>3999</b>							
		<b>3999</b>							
<b>40</b>				<b>EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT</b>					
		4100		<i>Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500 each)</i>					
		4101	4101	Office supplies - Paris and ECA	Paris / ECA			50%	10%
		4102	4110	Office supplies - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		4199		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		4200		<i>Non-expendable equipment</i>					
		4201	4201	Office equipment / computer - Paris and ECA	Paris / ECA			50%	10%
		4202	4210	Office equipment / computer - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		4299		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		4300		<i>Rental of premises</i>					
		4301	4301	Office rental - Paris and ECA	Paris / ECA			50%	10%
		4302	4310	Office rental - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		4399		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		<b>4999</b>		<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>					
		<b>4999</b>							
		<b>4999</b>							
<b>50</b>				<b>MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>					
		5100		<i>Operation and maintenance of equipment</i>					
		5101	5101	Rental and maintenance of office equipment - Paris and ECA	Paris			50%	10%
		5102	5110	Rental and maintenance of office equipment - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		5199		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		5200		<i>Reporting cost</i>					
		5201	5201	Reporting/reproduction costs	Paris			50%	10%
		5202	5210	Translations - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		5299		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		5300		<i>Sundry</i>					
		5301	5301	Communication & dissemination - Paris and ECA	Paris / ECA			10%	10%
		5302	5310	Communication - Regions	Regional			10%	10%
		5399		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		5400		<i>Hospitality</i>					
		5401						10%	10%
		5499		<i>Sub-total</i>					
		<b>5999</b>		<b>COMPONENT TOTAL</b>					
		<b>5999</b>							
		<b>5999</b>							
		<b>99</b>		<b>TOTAL DIRECT PROJECT COST</b>					

-----