



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/59  
17 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 OPERATION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (DECISION 70/23(d))**

## **Background**

1. At its 70<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered an analysis of how the two meetings per year scenario could be held without an intersessional approval procedure while still enabling the Executive Committee to fulfil its tasks. Following its deliberations the Executive Committee took decision 70/23 by which it decided to convene two Executive Committee meetings in 2014 on a trial basis, preferably in mid-April/early May for the first meeting, and prior to the 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Parties (MOP) for the last meeting. If needed, an intersessional meeting would be organized to discuss any urgent policy issues or project proposals that would need to be addressed between the two meetings. The two meetings per year scenario would be reviewed at the last meeting of 2014 (decision 70/23(d)).

2. The Secretariat has prepared the present document pursuant to decision 70/23(d) based on the experience of the first meeting of 2014 (72<sup>nd</sup> meeting) and the preparations for the last meeting in 2014 (73<sup>rd</sup> meeting). The Secretariat discussed the main findings of the analysis of the trial with the bilateral and implementing agencies at the Inter-agency coordination (IAC) meeting held from 2-3 September 2014. Agencies' feedback received is reflected in the present document.

## **Summary of the experience of the two meetings per year scenario in 2014**

3. The most significant issues relating to the summary of the experience of the two meetings per year scenario in 2014 are presented below. Additional information on the analysis can be found in Annex I.

### Annual schedule and venue of Executive Committee meetings

4. In accordance with decision 70/23(b) the first Executive Committee meeting was held from 12 to 16 May 2014 (72<sup>nd</sup> meeting), and the last meeting will be held from 9 to 13 November (73<sup>rd</sup> meeting) back-to-back with the 26<sup>th</sup> MOP.

### *Intersessional meetings*

5. The Secretariat considers that the logistics of organizing an intersessional meeting would always be problematic since there would not be sufficient time to book conference service staff and premises. In addition there would be additional costs related to last minute travel arrangements<sup>1</sup>.

### *Composition of the Sub-group on the production sector*

6. Since the composition of the Sub-group was not agreed until the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting in May 2014 as part of the work under the agenda item on the organization of work, it was not possible to convey restricted distribution documents directly to members of the Sub-group in advance of the first meeting of the year<sup>2</sup>. For the same reason it would not have been possible to organize a sub-group meeting in advance of the first meeting of the year should one have been required. In order to avoid any potential impediments to the work on the production sector, the Executive Committee may wish to agree the

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting did not request the Secretariat to organize an intersessional meeting of the Executive Committee between the first and last meetings, the Secretariat noted that there would not have been sufficient time to organize a back-to-back intersessional meeting with the 34<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the Parties (OEWG) in July 2014, since the two-month interval between the 72<sup>nd</sup> and OEWG meeting would have been too short to make the necessary logistic and travel arrangements, and prepare documents. One option would be for the Executive Committee to decide on the need for an intersessional meeting based on an assessment of the following year's workload at the last meeting of the year. However, agencies and the Secretariat believe that varying the number of meetings per year could disrupt their activities and negate the benefits of having more time for project implementation. The World Bank suggested the possibility of a "virtual" intersessional meeting for consideration of straightforward issues, though the Executive Committee had not supported this idea in the past.

<sup>2</sup> Limited distribution documents for the meeting of the Sub-group on the production sector are always posted in a password protected area on the Multilateral Fund website for access by Executive Committee members only. With the consent of ODS producing countries restricted distribution documents were sent by email to all 14 Executive Committee members prior to the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

composition of the Sub-group by an exchange of letters between the Chair and members of the Executive Committee earlier than the first meeting of the year<sup>3</sup>.

#### *Back-to-back meetings*

7. Bilateral and implementing agencies opined that holding Executive Committee meetings back-to-back with Montreal Protocol meetings was not constructive. Some of the reasons put forward were that it could be difficult for countries with small delegations to handle the large workload of back-to-back meetings; and, there could be negative effects on the quality of discussions due to the high number of meeting days.

#### Effect on the work of the Secretariat and implementing agencies

##### *IAC meetings*

8. The period between the two meetings allowed the Secretariat to organize two IAC meetings in advance of each Executive Committee meeting<sup>4</sup>. These provided an opportunity for Secretariat staff, bilateral and implementing agencies, and the UNEP Treasurer, to discuss issues on the agendas of the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meetings and agree on a number of follow-up actions to facilitate their work in preparation for the meetings<sup>5</sup>. In particular agencies were able to provide feedback on policy/discussion papers including the cost guidelines for stage II of HPMPs, issues related to the climate impact of HCFC phase-out, and the operation of the Executive Committee. The IAC meetings greatly facilitated interactions between the agencies and the Secretariat by reason of the additional time for face-to-face communication and the opportunity for the Secretariat to share its rationale on the development of policy papers.

9. One specific example was the development of the present document. Feedback from bilateral and implementing agencies during the IAC meeting in September 2014 indicated that the two meetings per year scenario allowed them more time to address project implementation, rather than having to meet the multiple deadlines in a three meetings per year scenario. UNEP commented that the two meeting schedule made it easier to plan the submission of the large number of small projects in its portfolio, and to schedule network meetings in a way to allow for increased participation by other agencies.

##### *Additional guidance material prepared by the Secretariat*

10. In 2014 the Secretariat has prepared approximately 107 documents for consideration by the Executive Committee. This number was lower than previous years (173, 146, and 163 documents in 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively) as a result of fewer standard documents<sup>6</sup> being prepared on an annual basis. Thus the Secretariat had more time available to develop and update other documents and guides<sup>7</sup> with a view to facilitating the work of the bilateral and implementing agencies when preparing and submitting progress reports, and new HPMPs or tranches of HPMPs or HCFC production phase-out management plans (HPPMPs).

<sup>3</sup> Note that at the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting the Executive Committee decided that members of the group should be selected as soon as the new membership of the Executive Committee was determined by the Seventh Meeting of the Parties (decision 18/24(c)).

<sup>4</sup> The full reports of both meetings are available to Executive Committee members: documents MLF/IACM.2014/1/19 and MLF/IACM.2014/2/20.

<sup>5</sup> For examples discussion on the submissions of project proposals; business and financial planning matters; the return of balances from projects; final reports on HCFC demonstration projects and so on.

<sup>6</sup> For example: Provisional agenda; Provisional annotated agenda; Status of the Fund; Secretariat activities; Report on balances and so on.

<sup>7</sup> Guides prepared by the Secretariat include: Guide for the presentation of tranches of HCFC production sector phase-out plans (Currently under consideration by the Sub-group on the production sector as UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/SGP/6); Updated guide for the preparation of HCFC phase-out management plans (January 2014 - MLF/IACM.2014/1/8); Updated guide for the preparation of tranches of HCFC phase-out management plans (January 2014 - MLF/IACM.2014/1/9); Guidelines for the verification of national consumption targets of multi-year agreements (January 2014 MLF/IACM.2014/1/9); Guide for funding the preparation of stage II of HCFC phase-out management (MLF/IACM.2014/1/10); Annual Progress and Financial Report operational guidelines (MLF/IACM.2014/1/11).

Main issues related to the meeting calendar

*Verification report on the achievement of ODS reduction targets*

11. While the issue of the submission of verification reports of national consumption targets had been resolved by decision 72/19<sup>8</sup>, agencies had commented that Article 5 countries would prefer to submit HPMP tranches together with verification reports to avoid multiple submissions and an increased workload. Agencies pointed out that if the first meeting of the year were in April or May a higher number of HPMP tranches would inevitably be submitted to the last meeting of the year causing a substantially heavier workload for that meeting.

*Submission deadlines*

12. In view of the two meetings per year scenario in 2014, the Chief Officer had encouraged agencies to submit project proposals 10 weeks before the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meetings due to the higher number of projects per meeting. Agencies responded positively submitting a significant percentage of submissions due by the eight weeks in advance of that deadline. This informal arrangement worked well in 2014 and the Secretariat would prefer to continue this arrangement in 2015.

Main issues related to agenda items of the two meetings

*Progress reporting*

13. All agencies pointed out that the schedule of meetings was critical to the success of the new mode of operation, and it was also important to ensure that the second meeting of the year did not become overloaded with agenda items. Agencies felt strongly that the progress report should be submitted to the first meeting of the year and the two meeting per year scenario adjusted accordingly<sup>9</sup>. While the Secretariat had in the past suggested the submission of progress reports to both meetings of the year, it was agreed in the framework of discussions related to the IAC meeting, that the best approach would be to hold the first meeting of the year later than May so that the full progress report, including financial reporting, could be submitted to the first meeting of the year. The Secretariat proposed the date of 15 April as the deadline for the submission of the progress report which would allow it to prepare the relevant documents for a first meeting of the year in mid-June. Given the proposed timing of the first meeting it was suggested that the second meeting be in early December. The proposed schedule would have the advantage that would facilitate the scheduling of submissions.

14. It should also be noted that the inclusion of status reports in the progress report reduced duplication of information and/or the risk of inconsistency in other documents and should be continued. For the second meeting of the year status reports and specific reports could be included in a separate document.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Executive Committee decided: (a) To encourage lead bilateral and implementing agencies submitting HCFC phase-out management plan tranche requests to the first meeting of the year to include a verification report of national consumption targets for the year immediately preceding the year during which the tranche was submitted; and, (b) That, should the verification reports mentioned in sub paragraph (a) above not be ready in time for the first meeting of the year, transfer of any approved funds for tranches to the bilateral and implementing agencies would occur only after receipt by the Secretariat of the verification reports confirming that, in the year immediately preceding the tranche request, the country had been in compliance with the Montreal Protocol and the Agreement between its Government and the Executive Committee (decision 72/19).

<sup>9</sup> With regard to progress and financial reports, decision 70/23(b)(viii) requested bilateral and implementing agencies requested to continue submitting their annual progress and financial reports to the Secretariat by 1 May each year, and requested the Secretariat to finalize the consolidated progress report and the relevant progress reports of the bilateral and implementing agencies and to post those documents on the Secretariat's intranet, once finalized, for consideration to the last meeting of the year. The Secretariat was also authorized to request relevant bilateral and implementing agencies to provide status reports on issues identified during the review of the annual progress and financial reports. Whilst the finalization of the progress report documents for the Executive Committee were delayed mainly due to the time to collect information pursuant to decision 70/7(b)(i) the additional time available allowed the Secretariat to update the progress report documents with information from the status and specific reports that were due to the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting, thus avoiding duplications and/or inconsistencies between the progress reports, and the status reports and compliance document.

## Discussion

15. On the whole the two meeting per year scenario worked well but the second meeting of the year had a heavier agenda due to the fact that it also included the progress report. In addition there was a possible issue in that countries might be discouraged from submitting tranches of HPMPs to a first meeting in May if the required verification report was not ready in time. Placing the progress report on the first meeting of the year and scheduling that meeting for mid-June would address both issues.

16. The two meetings per year scenario did not result in any compliance issues for Article 5 countries, and funding was available for all projects and activities approved at the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting or submitted for consideration at the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting

17. Based on its analysis the Secretariat proposes that Executive Committee meetings could be scheduled in mid-June and December. Meeting should be scheduled to avoid back-to-back arrangements with Montreal Protocol meetings, which would also allow all Executive Committee meetings to be held at the seat of the Secretariat in Montreal and avoid additional costs related to travel. Scheduling Executive Committee meetings for Montreal would also have the advantage that it would reduce the number of variable that affect the costs of meetings, e.g. rental of premises and equipment, travel and DSA costs and facilitate budgeting.

18. The Secretariat further concludes that:

- (a) There should be no inter-sessional meeting of the Executive Committee;
- (b) The Executive Committee could consider agreeing the composition of the Sub-group on the production sector in advance of the first meeting of the year. If required, a meeting of the Sub-group could be scheduled early in the year or immediately in advance of an Executive Committee meeting;
- (c) The agencies' progress report, including financial reports, should be submitted only to the first meeting to avoid over-burdening the second meeting of the year. As a consequence bilateral and implementing agencies should submit their progress and financial reports to the Secretariat by 15 April each year.
- (d) A document entitled "Country programme data and prospects for compliance" could be submitted to both meetings and to the Implementation Committee in lieu of the document "Status reports and compliance document". Any status reports for the second meeting could be submitted in a separate document together with reports on projects with specific reporting requirements;
- (e) Other submission deadlines for project proposals and reports could remain, however, agencies should continue, when possible, to submit projects and other items in advance of the prescribed deadlines for submission whenever possible.

### Meeting agendas

19. As a result of the analysis above illustrative agendas were developed for a two-meeting per year scenario from 2015 onwards and are contained in Annex II.

### Potential dates of the meetings

20. Based on all above considerations the most convenient dates for holding Executive Committee meetings in a two meeting per year schedule are in mid-June for the first meeting and early December for the last meeting. Potential dates for the first and last meetings of 2015 are proposed in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/Inf.2.

Review of the two-meeting per year arrangement

21. The Executive Committee may wish to consider reviewing two-meeting per year scenario at the first meeting of 2017 in order to discuss the matter in advance of the 2018-2020 replenishment of the Multilateral Fund and to avoid adding and additional agenda item to the last meeting of the triennium

**Recommendation**

22. The Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Noting the review of the operation of the Executive Committee prepared pursuant to decision 70/23(d) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/59;
- (b) Agreeing to continue convening two meetings of the Executive Committee from 2015 onwards, preferably in mid-June for the first meeting, and early December for the last meeting, in line with decision 70/23 amended as follows:
  - (i) The three-year business plan of the Multilateral Fund would be submitted to the last meeting of the year;
  - (ii) A document entitled “Country programme data and prospects for compliance” would be submitted to the first and last meetings of the year;
  - (iii) With regard to progress and financial reports;
    - a. Bilateral and implementing agencies would be requested to submit their annual progress and financial reports to the Secretariat by 15 April of each year;
    - b. The Executive Committee would consider the consolidated progress report and the relevant progress reports of the bilateral and implementing agencies at the first meeting of the year;
  - (iv) The Executive Committee would agree the composition of the Sub-group on the production sector no later than 6 weeks prior to the first meeting of the year by means of an exchange of letters between the Chair and members of the Executive Committee.
- (c) Inviting bilateral and implementing agencies to submit projects proposals in advance of the prescribed deadlines wherever possible in order to facilitate their timely review by the Secretariat; and
- (d) Reviewing the two meetings per year scenario for Executive Committee meetings at the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2017.

## **Annex 1**

### **Analysis of the two meetings per year schedule in 2014**

#### **Workload and agendas of the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meetings**

##### *Overall workload compared to previous meetings and years*

1. The agendas for the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meetings included a number of standard agenda items for each meeting, agenda items specific to the first or last meeting of the years as per decision 70/23, and those related to specific decisions of the Executive Committee.
2. The Secretariat analyzed the number of agenda items, documents, funding requests, policy issues and side meetings, and the total funding approved since the 63<sup>rd</sup> meeting to assess the workload of each meeting and the overall annual workload. While the 2014 workload is within the range of previous years it should be noted that no single indicator is directly proportional to or representative of the total workload in terms of the time required by the Executive Committee to address it. For example a high number of projects and activities does indicate the project review workload of the Secretariat, but not necessarily the amount of time that the Executive Committee has to spend on approving them since the availability of existing policies and guidelines often results in agreements between the Secretariat and the implementing agencies resulting in recommendations for blanket approval of the project and activities. A higher number of projects for individual consideration may not necessarily result a proportional increase in the time required for their consideration, since only a single policy issue may need to be addressed. Furthermore a policy issue could be relatively simple for the Executive Committee to resolve or, at the other extreme, may require in-depth consultation in contact groups over a number of Executive Committee meetings. The most significant factor was that there were 107 documents for consideration by the Executive Committee in 2014 which was significantly lower than previous years; for example there were 173, 146, and 163 documents in the years 2011, 2012 and 2013 respectively.

##### Conduct of the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting

3. The Secretariat prepared a total of 47 meeting documents, including the final report, and four production sector documents for the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting. The agenda of the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting was completed successfully within the five day time frame and the meeting closed at 4.50 p.m. on Friday, 16 May 2014.
4. The agenda of the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting included *inter alia* the implementation of the 2014 business plan and tranche submission delays, the 2014 consolidated project completion report of multi-year agreements, and consideration of five policy papers. It also included three additional items that required further consideration following the 71<sup>st</sup> meeting.
5. The Sub-group on the Production sector and 16 other contact or informal groups met in the margins of the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Approximately 23 separate side meetings were scheduled either prior to the morning plenary sessions, over lunch breaks, following afternoon plenary sessions, or on Thursday afternoon when the Executive Committee did not meet in plenary.
6. The Executive Committee convened in plenary for eight of the possible 10 morning/afternoon sessions with no evening plenary sessions. The plenary did not convene on Thursday afternoon to allow the production sector, contact and informal groups to complete their business, or on Friday morning to allow the Secretariat to prepare the draft meeting report.

##### Conduct of the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting

7. The Secretariat expects to prepare a total of 59 meeting documents, including the final report, and six production sector documents for the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

8. The 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting includes standard agenda items; the update on the implementation of the 2014-2016 business plan and tranche submission delays as mandated by decision 70/23; the consolidated business plan and agencies' business plans for 2015-2017; the draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 2015; the consolidated progress report and agencies' progress reports; the evaluation of the 2013 business plan; UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP) budget; core unit costs for UNDP, UNIDO and the World Bank; the accounts of the Multilateral Fund; the reconciliation of the accounts of the Multilateral Fund; the budget of the Fund Secretariat; the draft report to the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. The agenda will also include consideration of six policy papers including the continuation of the consideration of the guidelines for HCFC phase-out for stage II of HPMPs.

9. The Sub-group on the Production sector will meet in the margins of the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting to continue discussion on the HCFC production sector guidelines. Contact groups and/or informal discussion groups were convened as needed.

#### Financial resources available

10. At the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting the balance of the Multilateral Fund was reported as US \$70.2 million and thus sufficient resources were available to allocate the US \$40.9 million for the 124 projects and activities approved at the meeting. While the funds available for new allocations at the 72<sup>nd</sup> meeting were within the range for a first meeting of the year, the balance of funds that remained after the deduction of the amount for approvals (US \$70.2 million) was relatively low at US \$35.3 million. At the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting the balance of fund is expected to be about US \$80 million<sup>10</sup> while US \$69.8 million<sup>11</sup> worth of projects are being submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee.

#### Business plans

11. Pursuant to decision 70/23(b), the Secretariat submitted:

- (a) The documents on the evaluation of the 2014 business plan and tranche submission delays to the 72<sup>nd</sup><sup>12</sup> and the 73<sup>rd</sup><sup>13</sup> (first and last) meetings in 2014;
- (b) The 2014-2016 business plan of the Multilateral Fund<sup>14</sup> to the 71<sup>st</sup> meeting (last meeting) in 2013, and the 2015-2017 business plan<sup>15</sup> to the 73<sup>rd</sup> (last) meeting in 2014;
- (c) The document on the evaluation of the 2013 business plan<sup>16</sup> to the 73<sup>rd</sup> (last) meeting in 2014.

12. From the Secretariat's perspective this process worked satisfactorily. Decision 70/23 allows for a revised business plan to the first meeting of 2015 for adjustments in view of financial planning for the 2015-2017 triennium as a result of the replenishment of the Multilateral Fund. However, on an exceptional basis, the Secretariat proposed in its 2015-2017 consolidated business plan that a financial planning document be submitted to the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting to address the decision adopted by the 26<sup>th</sup> MOP.

---

<sup>10</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/4

<sup>11</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/24

<sup>12</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/72/5 & Add.1 (Update on the implementation of the 2014-2016 business plan and cash flow availability (decision 66/3))

<sup>13</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/5 (2014-2016 business plans and cash flow availability)

<sup>14</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/71/7

<sup>15</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/18

<sup>16</sup> Document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/16

Rearrangement of other agenda items

13. Other than the progress reporting the arrangement of agenda items pursuant to decision 70/23 worked well and no further adjustments are foreseen, i.e. agenda items on the implementation and the evaluation of the business plan, tranche submission delays.

Costs of meetings in 2014

14. Information on the budget for the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meetings can be found in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/73/58. The table below presents the actual costs per meeting from 2010 to 2013 and estimates for 2014. The costs per meeting include a number of items (rental of premises, report writers, equipment rental, translation, and interpretation and miscellaneous) that may vary according to the location of the meeting and the number of translated languages for meeting documents. Estimated costs for 2014 include the additional costs of holding the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting in Paris and an additional two languages for translation.

**Table: 1 Actual /Estimated costs per Executive Committee meeting**

Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	
Meetings per year	3	3	3	3	2	
Number of translated languages	3	4	4	4	5	
Number of meetings away from Montreal	0	1	1	1	1	
Costs per meeting (US \$)	First meeting	226,240	346,242	292,765	220,032	348,399
	Second meeting	227,860	317,428	342,385	299,651	
	Last meeting	250,160	384,986	355,664	258,478	*404,135
Total	704,260	1,048,656	990,814	778,161	752,534	

\*Estimate

15. Implementing agencies declared the two year schedule was cost neutral since they would travel to one additional IAC meeting each year, in lieu of a third Executive Committee meeting. Despite the cost, implementing agencies expressed support for holding two inter-agency coordination meetings per year in order to facilitate preparations for Executive Committee meetings.

Future workload of the Executive Committee

16. The 2015-2017 business plan indicates an increasing number of projects and activities from 2015<sup>17</sup> onwards. It should be noted that number of activities per year for 2015 onwards is comparable to previous years, and as discussed above, the number of activities for consideration is not directly proportional to the workload of the Executive Committee. In addition the policies and guidelines for HCFC phase-out projects are well established. It should be noted that the approval of stage I of HPMPs could only proceed after the approval of the cost guidelines at the 60<sup>th</sup> meeting. At that time the Executive Committee had to address HPMPs or stage I of HPMPs for all Article 5 countries. Not only are the criteria for funding stage II of HPMPs being presented for consideration to the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting, but Article 5 countries that wished to do so can submit stage II of their HPMPs based on the stage I guidelines<sup>18</sup>. The

<sup>17</sup> Projects and activities in the 2015-2017 business plans include: the renewal of institutional strengthening projects, tranches of approved MYAs, stage I of HPMPs for 5 remaining countries; preparation of stage II of HPMPs; stage II HPMPs; preparation of stage I or stage II of HCFC production sector for three countries; preparation and implementation of demonstration projects for low GWP alternatives; technical assistance; and methyl bromide technical assistance project.

<sup>18</sup> For those Article 5 countries that wished to do so, to allow the submission of stage II HPMPs in the absence of agreement on guidelines and provisions on funding for preparation of stage II, and prior to a decision by the Executive Committee on criteria for funding HCFC phase-out in the consumption sector for stage II, on the understanding that: (i) Any such proposals for stage II HPMPs would be considered on the basis of the

development of guidelines for stage II together with the experience gained in approving stage I of HPMPs may facilitate the work of approving stage II of HPMPs. In addition there are well established processes for monitoring MYAs, and the compliance of Article 5 countries. For example the document on tranche submissions delays submitted to the 72<sup>nd</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting provides and analysis of the reasons for the delay of each tranche and a letter is sent to each of the relevant countries following the meeting to advise them of the Executive Committee's concerns and encourage them to move forward.

17. The future workload of the Executive Committee may also depend on any decision taken by the Meeting of the Parties.

---

existing guidelines for stage I HPMPs; and (ii) The funding level approved for stage II would not be modified on the basis of the criteria to be adopted for funding HCFC phase-out in the consumption sector for stage II HPMPs (decision 70/21(e)).

## Annex II

### ILLUSTRATIVE AGENDAS

#### Illustrative agenda of the First meeting

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
  - (b) Organization of work.
3. Secretariat activities.
4. Status of contributions and disbursements.
5. Status of resources and planning:
  - (a) Report on balances and availability of resources;
  - (b) Financial planning [first meeting of triennium]
  - (c) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan;
  - (d) Tranche submission delays.
6. Programme implementation: Monitoring and evaluation:
  - (a) Evaluation reports from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (e.g., consolidated project completion reports (PCR) of multi-year agreements (MYA), MYA database report, desk studies and final evaluation reports that request field visits);
  - (b) Progress reports as at 31 December of the previous year (includes status reports and specific reports):
    - (i) Consolidated progress report;
    - (ii) Bilateral agencies;
    - (iii) UNDP;
    - (iv) UNEP;
    - (v) UNIDO;
    - (vi) World Bank;
  - (c) Country programme data and prospects for compliance.
7. Project proposals:
  - (a) Overview of issues identified during project review;
  - (b) Bilateral cooperation;

- (c) Work programmes (e.g., institutional strengthening; preparation for stage II HPMPs):
    - (i) UNDP;
    - (ii) UNEP;
    - (iii) UNIDO;
    - (iv) World Bank;
  - (d) Investment projects (e.g., tranches of stage I HPMPs; a few stage II HPMPs).
8. Policy issues (documents).
  9. Draft Report of the Executive Committee to the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.<sup>19</sup>
  10. Report of the Sub-group on the Production Sector.
  11. Other matters.
  12. Adoption of the report.
  13. Closure of the meeting.

---

<sup>19</sup> This agenda item would be included if that year's Meeting of the Parties is scheduled to take place before the Last Executive Committee meeting of the year.

### **Illustrative agenda of the Last meeting**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
  - (b) Organization of work.
3. Secretariat activities.
4. Status of contributions and disbursements.
5. Status of resources and planning:
  - (a) Report on balances and availability of resources;
  - (b) Update on the implementation of the current year business plan;
  - (c) Tranche submission delays.
6. Programme implementation: Monitoring and evaluation.
  - (a) Evaluation reports from the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (e.g., consolidated project completion reports (PCR), desk studies and final evaluation reports that request field visits);
  - (b) Draft monitoring and evaluation work programme for the year 201#;
  - (c) Evaluation of the implementation of the previous year's business plans;
  - (d) Status reports emanating from progress reporting and projects with specific reporting requirements;
  - (e) Country programme data and prospects for compliance.
7. 201#-201# business plans:
  - (a) Consolidated business plan of the Multilateral Fund;
  - (b) Business plans of the implementing agencies:
    - (i) Bilateral agencies;
    - (ii) UNDP;
    - (iii) UNEP;
    - (iv) UNIDO;
    - (v) World Bank.
8. Project proposals:

Annex II

- (a) Overview of issues identified during project review;
  - (b) Bilateral cooperation;
  - (c) Amendments to work programmes (e.g., IS; project preparation; UNEP CAP; core unit costs):
    - (i) UNDP;
    - (ii) UNEP;
    - (iii) UNIDO;
    - (iv) World Bank;
  - (d) Investment projects (e.g., tranches of stage I HPMPs; a few stage II HPMPs).
9. Policy issues (documents).
10. Accounts of the Multilateral Fund:
  - (a) Final 201# accounts;
  - (b) Reconciliation of the accounts.
11. Revised 201#, 201# and 201# budgets of the Fund Secretariat.
12. Draft Report of the Executive Committee to the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol.<sup>20</sup>
13. Report of the Sub-group on the Production Sector.
14. Other matters.
15. Adoption of the report.
16. Closure of the meeting.

---

<sup>20</sup> This agenda item will be included if that year's Meeting of the Parties is scheduled to take place following the last Executive Committee meeting of the year.