



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.
Limited

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/19
9 November 2000

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL
Thirty-second Meeting
Ouagadougou, 6-8 December 2000

**REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION
WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE YEAR 2000**

Table of Contents

	Introduction.....	Page 2
I	Desk Study on Recovery and Recycling Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/15.....	Page 2
II	Draft Formats for Terminal Reports and Extension Requests relating to Institutional Strengthening (IS) Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/16.....	Page 3
III	Consolidated Project Completion Report: Follow-up to Decision 29/4(b).....	Page 3
IV	Report on the Evaluation of Training Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/17.....	Page 16
V	Status Report on the Evaluation of Foam Projects.....	Page 18
VI	Desk Study on the Evaluation of Solvent Projects.....	Page 19

Annexes

Annex I	Draft Questionnaires Concerning the Status Quo of Recovery and Recycling Projects
Annex IIa	Final Report for Institutional Strengthening Projects
Annex IIb	Extension Requests Format for Institutional Strengthening Projects
Annex III	Revised PCR Format for Investment Projects including New Overall Assessment Scheme

Introduction

1. The purpose of this report is to give the Executive Committee an overview of the results of the implementation of the first part of the 2000 work programme for Monitoring and Evaluation, which was approved at the 29th meeting of the Executive Committee (Dec. 27/11).
2. The report consists of the following main sections:
 - (i) Draft Desk Study on Recovery and Recycling Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/15
 - (ii) Draft Format for Terminal Reports and Extension Requests relating to Institutional Strengthening (IS) Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/16
 - (iii) Consolidated Project Completion Report: Follow-up to Decision 29/4(b)
 - (iv) Report on the Evaluation of Training Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/17
 - (v) Status Report on the Evaluation of Foam Projects
 - (vi) Desk Study on the Evaluation of Solvents Projects
3. The consolidated report on project completion reports received since the last consolidated report submitted to the 29th meeting in November 1999 is presented in Section III. It includes also an explanation of the proposed overall assessment scheme for investment projects, schedules for future submission of PCRs due and information about the practicalities and the legal aspects of withholding a part of the administrative costs for a project until such time as the project completion report, including the final financial data, has been submitted.
4. The full desk study on solvent projects is available on request. A summary describing main findings, evaluation issues and the methodological approach chosen for the main phase of this evaluation is presented in Section VI. It can also be consulted on the web site of the Secretariat (www.unmfs.org) under the 'Executive Committee' section.

I Desk Study on Recovery and Recycling Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/15

5. At its 31st Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that:

"the implementing agencies should seek information from governments and/or national ozone units on the status of all the recovery and recycling projects they have implemented so as to ascertain whether they are in operation. The reports should be based on a standardized format for data collection, both at the individual equipment user level and as summarized information at the project level." (Decision 31/15, para a)

6. Draft standardized questionnaire formats were developed as requested in consultation with the implementing agencies and interested national ozone units and are presented in Annex I.

II Draft Formats for Terminal Reports and Extension Requests relating to Institutional Strengthening (IS) Projects: Follow-up to Decision 31/16

7. The Executive Committee decided at its 31st meeting to approve, for the time being, a revised format for terminal reports and extension requests for institutional strengthening projects, while inviting members of the Sub-Committee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance to offer their suggestions for improvement, for discussion at the next Sub-Committee meeting.

8. The following countries sent comments or proposals: Australia, India, Sweden and Japan. While Australia supported the formats as adopted in the last meeting of the Executive Committee, Sweden provided several proposals for improvements, and India and Japan proposed two amendments each.

9. All the proposals have been incorporated in the revised formats presented in Annexes IIa and IIb of this report; the changes are shown in bold italic letters.

10. It is also interesting to note that the Secretariat received several terminal reports and extension requests, using the new formats. Uruguay and Mexico had already used them prior to the last meeting of the Executive Committee, and 22 countries presented extension requests to the 32nd Meeting, while using in the majority of cases the new formats for the final report on the previous phase as well as for the extension request. The information is much richer and more structured than with the old formats and no difficulties were reported in using the new formats.

Recommendation on Terminal Reports and Extension Requests (IS Projects)

It is recommended:

11. that the Executive Committee might approve the revised formats with the changes proposed by the countries mentioned above.

III Consolidated Project Completion Report including Follow-up to Decision 29/4(b)

a) Overview

12. Implementing and bilateral agencies have submitted as of 31 October 2000 a total of 455 project completion reports (PCRs) for investment projects and 273 PCRs for non-investment projects, representing 61.6% and 60.8% of PCRs due for investment and non-investment projects completed as of 31 December 1999 (without considering project preparations and country programmes, for which, per Decision 29/4, PCRs are no longer requested).

13. The total number of PCRs received in the year 2000 increased substantially for both investment and non-investment projects. Nevertheless, due to the large numbers of investment projects completed in 1999, the total number of PCRs still outstanding for these projects has slightly increased. For non-investment projects, however, the total number of outstanding PCRs was substantially reduced. Tables 1 and 2 present more detailed data by agency and provide also comparative figures for the previous reporting period.

Table 1:
Investment Projects Overview

Agency	Completed Projects up to December 1999	Total PCR(s) Received for Projects Completed up to December 1999	PCR(s) Received in the Reporting Period ¹ (and in last year)	PCR(s) still due (and last year)
France	4	3	3 (0)	1 (0)
Germany	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0)
IBRD	253	179 ²	62 (51)	72 (71)
UNDP	321	148 ⁶	101 ⁵ (23)	173 (156)
UNIDO	161	123 ³	34 ⁴ (47)	38 (50)
USA	1	1	1 (0)	0 (1)
Total	739	455	194 (122)	284 (277)

¹ After the 29th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1 December 1999 to 31 October 2000).

² In addition, the World Bank already submitted 3 PCRs for projects completed in 2000 (not included in Table 1).

³ In addition, UNIDO already submitted 2 PCRs for project completed in 2000 (not included in Table 1).

⁴ In addition, UNIDO submitted 5 PCRs for subprojects (not included in Table 1).

⁵ In addition, UNDP submitted 2 PCRs for subprojects (not included in Table 1).

⁶ In addition, UNDP submitted 1 PCR for a cancelled project (not included in Table 1).

Table 2

Non-Investment Projects Overview (except Project Preparations and Country Programmes)

Agency	Completed Projects up to December 1999	Total PCR Received for Projects Completed up to December 1999	PCR Received in the Reporting Period ⁸ (and in last year)	PCR(s) still due (and last year)
Australia	6	0	0 (0)	6 (5)
Canada	12	12	12 (0)	0 (10)
Denmark	1	0	0 (0)	1 (1)
France	11	5	2 (1)	1 ⁹ (3)
Germany	4	0	0 (0)	4 (3)
IBRD	36	23	4 (11)	5 ¹⁰ (16)
Singapore	2	0	0 (0)	2 (2)
South Africa	1	1	0 (0)	0 (0)
Switzerland	2	2	2 (2)	0 (2)
UNDP	132	63 ¹¹	38 (25)	69 (90)
UNEP	185	118 ¹²	67 (44)	50 ¹³ (87)
UNIDO	24	17 ¹⁴	10 (8)	7 (9)
USA	33	32 ¹⁵	27 (3)	1 (28)
Total	449	273	162 (92)	146 (257)

⁸ From the 29th Meeting of the Executive Committee (1 December 1999 to 24 October 2000).

⁹ Excluding 5 Projects where PCRs are not required for Project Preparation activities.

¹⁰ Excluding 8 Projects where PCRs are not required for Project Preparation activities.

¹¹ In addition, UNDP submitted two PCRs for two Transferred projects (not included in Table 6a).

¹² Excluding two PCRs where UNEP submitted for two bilateral projects (South Africa and France.)

¹³ Excluding 17 Projects where PCRs are not required for Ongoing activities

¹⁴ In addition, UNIDO submitted 1 PCR for Austria project which was not completed yet in 1999.

¹⁵ In addition, USA already submitted 6 PCRs for projects completed in 2000.

14. Since the 29th Meeting of the Executive Committee, all Implementing Agencies made efforts to comply with the PCR delivery schedule agreed upon, which focussed in particular on the sectors under evaluation. UNDP delivered until 31 October 141 of 224 PCRs scheduled for submission until the end of this year. The World Bank provided 47 of 54 outstanding PCRs, UNIDO 9 out of 18, and UNEP sent significantly more than scheduled. There are, however, still some PCRs due, in particular, from UNDP, which supplied the largest number of PCRs, but had also the largest backlog as illustrated in Table 3. UNDP, in a fax dated 7 November 2000, declared its firm intention to fully comply with the schedule agreed upon in Beijing, and to deliver further 54 PCRs for investment projects and 29 for non-investment projects until 31 December 2000.

TABLE 3: SCHEDULE AGREED AT 29th EXCOM MEETING TO ELIMINATE PCR BACKLOG
UNDP PCR COMPLETION SCHEDULE

	Investment		Non-Investment		Total		Balance up to 30 September 2000
	PCR Schedule	PCR Received	PCR Schedule	PCR Received	PCR Schedule	PCR Received	
31 Dec 1999	30 (foam)	33 (foam)	0	0	30	33	+3
15 Jan 2000	10 (foam)	8 (foam)	6 (training)	6 (training)	16	14	-2
31 Mar 2000	16 (foam)	16 (foam)	14	15 (R&R)	30	31	+1
30 Jun 2000	30	20	18	11	48	31	-17
30 Sept 2000*	35	25	15	7 TAS	50	32	-18
31 Dec 2000	35		15		50		N/A.
Total	156	102	68	39	224	141	-33

*Including PCRs submitted until 31 October 2000.

UNEP PCR COMPLETION SCHEDULE

	PCR Schedule	PCR Received	Balance
December 1999	2 (training)	3 training (Nov. 1999)	+1
January 2000	25 (technical assistance)	57 (Nov. 1999)	+32

WORLD BANK PCR COMPLETION SCHEDULE

	PCR Schedule	Comment	PCR Received	Balance up to 31 October 2000
Jan	4 Compressor (incl. MACs)		4 (Comp. MAC)	0
Feb	10 foam (before 1999)		10 foam	0
Mar	7 foam (before 1999)		7 foam	0
Jun	16 technical assistance, 18 foam (1999)	Only 6 TAS are due	4TAS, 14 Foam	-6
Jul	3 solvents		3 SOL	0
Aug	1 halon		1 HAL	0
Sept	5 aerosols		4 ARS	-1
Total	64	54	47	-7

*The Bank submitted in addition: 3 PCRs in January, 6 PCRs in March and 6 PCRs in June and 9 PCRs in October 2000 which do not fall under this schedule for PCR submission for January, March, June, July, August or September.

UNIDO PCR COMPLETION SCHEDULE

	PCR Schedule	Comment	PCR Received	Balance up to July 2000
Mid-Jan 2000	5 (recovery and recycling)	5 R&R are due	5 R&R	0
Feb 2000	10 foam	Only 9 are due	2 received in May	-7
Mar 2000	10 foam and 2 (compressor)	2 compressors are due and No more PCR due for foam	1 compressor	-1
Jul 2000	3 solvents	Only 2 are due	1 SOL	-1
Total*	30	18 PCRs due	9	-9

*UNIDO submitted in addition: 1 PCR in January, 5 PCRs in May, 8 PCRs in June and 1 PCR in July, 4 PCRs in August, 6 PCRs in September and 2 PCRs in October 2000 which do not fall under this schedule for PCR submission for May, June or July.

b) Analysis of project completion reports received and due for investment projects

15. Until the end of 1999, UNDP completed 321 investment projects for which it submitted 148 PCRs (46.1 per cent of total) as at 31 October 2000, UNIDO completed 161 projects for which it submitted 123 PCRs (76.4 per cent), the World Bank completed 253 projects and submitted 179 PCRs (70.8 per cent), Germany and the U.S.A. each completed one project and submitted one PCR (100 per cent), and France completed four projects and submitted three PCRs (75 percent of PCRs due).

Table 4
PCRs for Investment Projects Received and Due by Implementing Agency,
Sector and Year

Agency	Sector	PCR(s) Received				PCR(s) Due					
		1998	1999	2000	Total	Before 1997	In 1997	In 1998	In 1999	In 2000	Total
UNDP	Aerosol	1	-	9	10	2	-	-	-	1	3
	Foam	20	32	55	107	1	2	22	22	73	120
	Halon	-	-	3	3	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Refrigeration	1	22	2	25	1		4	6	24	35
	Solvent	3	-	-	3	2	2	6	-	4	14
	Total	25	54	69	148	6	5	32	28	102	173
UNIDO	Aerosol	6	6	8	20	-	-	2	-	3	5
	Foam	7	23	2	32	-	-	-	6	1	7
	Halon	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Refrigeration	10	27	10	47	-	-	-	10	15	25
	Solvent	4	14	5	23	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Total	28	70	25	123	-	-	3	16	19	38
World Bank	Aerosol	4	6	4	14	-	-	1	2	-	3
	Foam	12	31	29	72	1	1	2	8	13	25
	Halon	2	1	1	4	-	-	-	1	1	2
	Multiple Sectors	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Others	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Production	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Refrigeration	13	29	21	63	-	1	4	21	11	37
	Solvent	13	6	3	22	1	-	1	-	1	3
	Total	45	74	60	179	2	3	8	32	27	72
Bilateral	Foam	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Halon	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Refrigeration	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Total	-	1	4	5	-	-	-	-	1	1
Grand Total	98	199	158	455	8	8	43	76	149	284	

16. The largest number of PCRs received were for completed foam projects, followed by refrigeration projects, but the number of PCRs still outstanding for these two sectors is still high, particularly for UNDP foam projects. The second largest number was received and is also still due for the refrigeration sector. The backlog of PCRs for early investment projects completed until the end of 1996 has been reduced to 16 (from 67 last year).

17. In the following paragraphs of section b, the figures differ slightly from those given in the analysis above because only 188 PCRs received until 24 October 2000 were taken into account, while in the overview above in section a, 194 PCRs received as of 31 October, were counted.

18. The 188 PCRs received as of 24 October 2000 represent completed projects in 26 countries. A large part of the completion reports (64.3 per cent) are for projects implemented in five countries (People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand).

19. ODS phase out in the projects reported upon in the project completion reports is found to be as planned in most investment projects, the total phase out reported being slightly more than the planned amount. However, information in the PCRs is often neither completed nor coherent. In many cases, unit production and ODS consumption data before and after the conversion are not complete. Also, the ODS data reported in the PCRs are slightly different from the ODS data reported in the 1999 Progress Report. (See Table 5 below).

Table 5
ODS Phased Out

Agency	Number of Projects	PCR		1999 Progress Report		Difference between PCR and/or Progress Report	
		ODP to be Phased Out	ODP Phased Out	ODP to be Phased Out	ODP Phased Out	ODP to be Phased Out	ODP Phased Out
France	3	93.00	51.00	93.00	-	0.00%	100%
IBRD	55	4,330.04	4,332.60	4,363.92	4,391.95	-0.78%	-1.35%
UNDP	95	4,434.68	4,449.78	4,445.00	4,445.00	-0.23%	0.11%
UNIDO	35	2,483.00	2,480.00	2,269.50	2,201.35	9.41%	12.66%
Total	188	11,340.72	11,313.38	11,171.42	11,038.30	1.52%	2.49%

20. Delays for project implementation show a great deal of variance in the project completion reports. Out of 188 projects, 43 projects were completed before the planned date, five projects were completed on time, 135 projects showed delays ranging from one month to 84 months and five PCRs did not indicate the date of completion. In 100 projects, delays of more than 12 months occurred. Delays cannot be attributed to particular sectors or implementing agencies. They tended to be longer than average for large projects. Average delays reported in the PCRs which refer to the originally approved planned completion dates were longer than the delays reported in the 1999 Progress Reports which use the planned dates of completion per proposal or revised dates of completion as per the 22nd and 28th Meetings of the Executive Committee (see Table 6).

Table 6
Implementation Delays

Agency	Number of Projects	PCR Average Delays (Months)	1999 Progress Report Average Delays (Months)	
			Based on Revised Planned Date of Completion	Based on Planned Date of Completion Per Proposal
France	3	30.67	21.97	21.97
IBRD	55	17.28	5.93	16.80
UNDP	95	10.70	11.22	11.22
UNIDO	35	8.68	7.15	7.15
Total	188	12.61	9.14	12.28

21. For the incremental operating cost (IOC) reported in the PCRs, actual expenditures were on average higher than planned expenditures. The World Bank reported actual IOC, including counterpart funding, of about 400 per cent higher than planned expenditures for a number of projects for which either no or limited IOC had been found eligible and approved; actual expenditures paid for by the companies concerned are reported as significant though, particularly for four refrigeration projects in China, which account for 95% of the large difference in the approved and the reported actual IOC for World Bank projects. UNIDO reported about one per cent higher than planned expenditures. Only 47 PCRs (25%) of the 188 PCRs received provided lists of operating costs, 67 PCRs (35.6%) did not provide such details and 74 PCRs (39.4%) responded to this question with "not applicable". Out of 47 PCRs which provided detailed lists, 41 PCRs (87%) reported details on actual per unit costs and actual number of units. However, 13 of the 47 PCRs received (30%) showed data inconsistencies between tables (see Table 7).

Table 7
Incremental Operating Costs

Agency	Number of Projects	Approved Operating Cost (US \$)	Actual Operating Costs (US \$)	Detailed Lists on Operating Costs		
				Provided	Not Provided	"Not Applicable"
France	3	25,500	25,500	-	1	2
IBRD	55	1,966,506	7,866,069	29	6	20
UNDP	95	2,228,212	2,225,115	2	49	44
UNIDO	35	1,529,370	1,636,501	16	11	8
Total	188	5,749,588	11,753,185	47	67	74

22. Equipment destruction or disposal is required to be reported in the PCRs for investment projects. Out of the 188 PCRs received, only 126 (67%) provided information, although not always complete, 30 (16%) did not report and 32 (17%) reported "not applicable" (see Table 8).

Table 8
Equipment Destruction

Agency	Number of Projects	Details on Equipment Destroyed			Type of information provided in the 126 PCRs which contain details					
		Provided	Not Provided	"Not Applicable"	Name of Equipment Destroyed	Description of Equipment Destroyed	Method of Disposal	Date of Disposal	Indicated by whom implemented	Destruction certified by
France	3		1	2						
IBRD	55	43	6	6	43	37	43	42	39	39
UNDP	95	75	3	17	72	75	75	74	72	69
UNIDO	35	8	20	7	8	5	8	8	7	5
Total	188	126	30	32	123	117	126	124	118	113

23. PCRs provide for an overall assessment of project implementation by the implementing agencies. 46% of investment projects were marked either satisfactory or highly satisfactory, 52% as satisfactory though not as planned, and only 1% each indicated as unsatisfactory and unacceptable (see Table 9). The categories need clearer and quantitative definitions in order to be employed in an objective and unambiguous way, which is proposed with the new overall assessment scheme in the revised PCR format presented in Section 2 of Annex III of this document.

Table 9
Overall Assessment of Project Implementation by the Agencies in the PCR

Assessment	France	IBRD	UNDP	UNIDO	Total	% of Total
Highly satisfactory, more than planned	-	2	22	6	30	16%
Satisfactory, as planned	-	22	21	14	57	30%
Satisfactory, though not as planned	3	28	52	15	98	52%
Unsatisfactory, less than planned	-	2	-	-	2	1%
Unacceptable	-	1	-	-	1	1%
Total	3	55	95	35	188	100%

c) Non-investment project completion reports

24. The largest number of PCRs received and also those outstanding concern technical assistance projects, implemented mainly by UNDP and UNEP. The backlog in PCRs for training projects, implemented mostly by UNEP, has almost been eliminated; for bilateral training projects there are still seven PCRs due, although significantly more PCRs than last year have been received, particularly from the U.S.A.

25. According to Decision 29/4, country programmes, project preparation, as well as UNEP's recurrent activities including networking, no longer require PCRs. According to the same decision, institutional strengthening projects are now jointly reported upon with the extension requests; such reports will be counted as PCRs in the future.

Table 10
Project Completion Report Received and Due for Non-Investment Projects

Agency	Sector	PCR(s) Received for Year Due				PCR(s) Still Due					
		1998	1999	2000	Total	Before 1997	In 1997	In 1998	In 1999	In 2000	Total
UNDP	Demonstration	-	-	5	5					1	1
	Institutional Strengthening ¹⁷	1	-	-	1	1	8	5	10	2	26
	Technical Assistance	-	6	27	33	14	4	6	12	6	42
	Training	-	18	6	24	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	1	24	38	63	15	12	11	22	9	69
UNEP	Institutional Strengthening ¹⁷	-	10	-	10			1	2	6	9
	Technical Assistance	1	61	3	65	7	4	5	9	11	36
	Training	8	34	1	43				1	1	2
	Total	9	105	4	118	7	4	6	12	18	47
UNIDO	Demonstration	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	Institutional Strengthening ¹⁷	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Technical Assistance	-	6	7	13	3	-	1	-	1	5
	Training	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	-	9	8	17	3	-	1	-	3	7
World Bank	Demonstration	1		-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Institutional Strengthening ¹⁷	1	5	-	6	-	-	-	1	-	1
	Technical Assistance	4	5	4	13	3	-	-	1	-	4
	Training	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	6	13	4	23	3	-	-	2	-	5
Bilateral	Demonstration	5	5	6	16	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Institutional Strengthening ¹⁷	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Technical Assistance	-	-	13	13	4	-	1	1	-	6
	Training	1	3	18	22	5	1	1	-	-	7
	Total	6	8	38	52	10	1	2	1	-	14
Grand Total		22	159	91	273	38	17	20	37	30	142 ¹⁶

¹⁶Plus four projects which implementing agencies declared as completed in their progress reports without indicating date of completion, (UNEP [3] and Bilateral [1]).

¹⁷Institutional strengthening reports will be recalculated to take into account the terminal reports received jointly with extension requests.

26. For the analysis of their content, only the 142 PCRs for non-investment projects received as of 24 October 2000 were taken into account in this section, while in the overview in Table 2 above, 20 more PCRs, received as of 31 October 2000, were counted.

27. Total actual expenditures were reported to be 98.3% of the planned expenditures which indicates slight overall savings. ODS phased out reported for technical assistance and demonstration projects was 12% higher than planned (see Table 11).

Table 11
Budgets and ODS phase out reported in PCRs received for Non-Investment Projects

Agency	Number of Projects	Approved Funds (US\$)	Actual Funds (US\$)	Average Delays (Months)	ODS Phased Out for TAS and DEM Projects (ODP Tonnes) ¹⁸	
					Approved	Actual
Bilateral	24	4,854,609	4,713,689	5.47	52.6	127.2
IBRD	3	1,789,300	1,761,876	14.21	130	316
UNDP	35	3,144,985	3,060,545	15.05	163.2	106.9
UNEP	67	7,842,500	7,787,109	4.96	-	-
UNIDO	13	1,497,775	1,483,861	3.91	145.16	-
Total	142	19,129,169	18,807,080	8.72	490.96	550.1

¹⁸Several technical assistance and demonstration projects have reported ODS phase out (World Bank (2), UNDP (4), UNIDO (6 with actual ODS phased out not yet known) and Bilaterals (6).

28. The delays realized for project implementation show a great deal of variance. Out of 142 non-investment projects, 19 were completed before the schedule date, 42 projects were completed on time and there were delays in 76 projects ranging from one month to 55 months. Five PCRs were received without a date of project completion or scheduled date of completion. In 31 projects, delays of more than 12 months occurred. No particular patterns with regard to delays are observable. The average delay for non-investment projects is 8.72 months beyond the planned completion date.

29. Eight PCRs did not report an overall assessment. 66% of the projects were marked as either satisfactory or highly satisfactory, 24% as satisfactory though not as planned, only 4% as unsatisfactory and none as unacceptable (see Table 12).

Table 12
Overall Assessment of Non-Investment Projects by Agencies

Assessment	IBRD	UNDP	UNEP	UNIDO	Bilateral	Total	% of Total
Highly satisfactory, more than planned	1	2	-	1	8	12	8%
Satisfactory, as planned	1	10	60	7	5	83	58%
Satisfactory, though not as planned	1	20	6	4	3	34	24%
Unsatisfactory, less than planned	-	3	-	1	1	5	4%
Unacceptable	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%
Not Provided	-	-	1	-	7	8	6%
Total	3	35	67	13	24	142	100%

d) Quality of PCRs received for investment projects

30. Some progress has been made with regard to the completeness of PCRs. Key elements are missing less frequently than during the previous reporting period. Problems persist particularly with regard to information about incremental operating costs and the destruction or disposal of equipment (see Table 13).

Table 13
Information provided in Investment Project Completion Reports Received During this
(and last) Reporting Period

	Provided		Not Provided		"Not Applicable" ¹⁹	
	Number of Projects	Percentage %	Number of Projects	Percentage %	Number of Projects	Percentage %
List of Annual Consumption Provided	163 (90)	86 (74)	25 (30)	14 (24)	0 (2)	0 (2)
List Of Capital Equipment Provided	174 (105)	93 (86)	14 (17)	7 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Operating Cost Details Provided	47 (47)	25 (38)	67 (47)	36 (39)	74 (28)	39 (23)
List of Destroyed Equipment Provided	126 (70)	67 (57)	30 (31)	16 (26)	32 (21)	17 (17)

¹⁹According to indications of Implementing Agencies

31. The quality of the PCRs received in terms of explanations about delays and problems encountered, overall assessment and lessons learnt has to some extent improved. In a number of cases, particularly in PCRs received from the World Bank, the analysis provided was consistent and thorough. The U.S.A. prepared useful lessons learnt on MAC projects, commercial refrigeration and halon projects, which are interesting for the review of new projects. UNDP PCRs, while improving recently, still vary in terms of completeness and quality, and UNIDO's PCRs are too often completed in a rather formal way (similar assessments and lessons learnt for several projects, figures correspond often mechanically to the project document and little discussion of problems encountered).

32. The increased transparency in some recent PCRs allowed to shed light on some problems, for example, in two refrigeration projects in China, which resulted in constructive follow-up discussions between the Secretariat, the Implementing Agencies, SEPA and the companies concerned.

33. In the context of desk studies of 18 compressor and 48 solvent projects, as well as during the on-going evaluation of foam projects, external consultants were rather critical with regard to the PCRs received. They found wide variations of the quality of PCRs in terms of completeness, clarity and consistency. In many cases, the PCRs did not give sufficient data for obtaining a clear picture of the results achieved, problems encountered and lessons learnt during project implementation (see also the relevant section in the Summary of the Desk Study for Completed

Solvent Projects in Chapter VI of this document). The desk studies were sent to the Implementing Agencies and extensive comments were received, and efforts to complete the missing information continue.

34. The participation of companies in the preparation of PCRs seems still to be rather the exception than the rule, except for the World Bank which requires from all enterprises to provide a first draft of the PCR, and withholds a portion of remaining funding until this is done. Comments by the governments are rarely received by the implementing agencies, in spite of regular requests. Even active and well-organized National Ozone Units do not maintain any documentation of PCRs for projects completed in their country.

e) Revised PCR format for investment projects and new overall assessment scheme

35. The revised PCR format for investment projects has already been presented to and taken note of by the 30th Meeting of the Executive Committee. Some further refining and testing had still to be undertaken with regard to the section on overall assessment (Decision 30/8). This has been done and consultations were held with the Implementing Agencies during an inter-agency coordination meeting in Montreal early in September of this year. The results of these developments and consultations have been incorporated into the revised format. The proposed Section 2 "Criteria and Rating Scheme for Overall Assessment" responds also to Decision 23/8(g) which had requested that the Secretariat should develop, in cooperation with the Implementing Agencies, criteria for project success rating, and submit them for approval to the Executive Committee.

36. In discussions with Financial Agents of the World Bank during their meeting in Washington in May 2000, the practicality of the incremental operating cost table was questioned and a number of improvements proposed which were again discussed and finalized during the inter-agency coordination meeting mentioned above.

37. A number of editorial improvements were made during the preparation of the PCR format for its use as a database file. In the future, the PCRs received by the Secretariat will be entered automatically from a user-friendly enhanced word document that the Secretariat will provide to all Implementing Agencies, jointly with user guidelines that were drafted by the World Bank.

f) Schedule of submission of project completion reports in the year 2001

38. In order to improve the timeliness of submission of PCRs, in line with the requirements of desk studies and field evaluations planned for 2001, as well as to eliminate the remaining backlog of outstanding PCRs, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer prepared in consultation with the Implementing Agencies a schedule for the submission of PCRs, which is shown in Table 14 below:

Table 14
Schedule for Submission of Outstanding PCRs in 2001*

	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
UNDP	31 Mar 01	UNDP will concentrate on foam PCRs until 15 th February 2001, and will deliver the outstanding solvent PCRs until 31 st January 2001 and the three aerosol PCRs and one halon PCR by end-February 2001. After that, the remaining PCRs would be primarily in the foam and refrigeration sectors.	30	10
	30 Jun 01		30	10
	30 Sept 01		30	10
	31 Dec 01		29	10
	Total		119	40
UNEP	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	31 Jan 01	TAS		20
	31 Jan 01	Training		2
Total			22	
UNIDO	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	31 Jan 01	Foam	7	
	31 Mar 01	Aerosol*	2	
	31 Mar 01	Refrigeration	22	
	31 Jul 01	Refrigeration	2	
Total		33		
IBRD	Schedule	Sector	Investment PCRs	Non-Investment PCRs
	31 Jan 01	Foam (13)*** Solvent (2) Compressor (3)	18	
	31 Feb 01	Halon (0) Refrigeration (5) All Sectors (5)	10	
	31 Mar 01	All Sectors	10	
	31 Apr 01	Aerosol (3) All Sectors (10)	13	
	31 May 01	All Sectors	6	
	31 Jun 01	TAS (2) INS (2)		4
	31 Jul 01	Foam (1) All Sectors (7) TAS (1)	8	1
	Total		67	5

*The table shows expected PCRs for projects completed as of 31 December 1999 and takes into account the number of outstanding PCRs as of 31 October 2000. The Implementing Agencies will, in addition to the above schedule, submit PCRs in 2001 for projects completed through 2000 and up to June 30, 2001.

**The completion reports on two other aerosol projects in Kenya are pending until warehouse issues are cleared.

***Some of these foam projects will have PCRs ready for submission before January 2000.

39. In view of the improvements realized in reducing the backlog of PCRs during this reporting period (see Table 3 above), and considering the commitments made by the Implementing Agencies to further reduce and finally eliminate the backlog during next year (see Table 14), the proposal made at the 29th Meeting of the Executive Committee to withhold part of the support costs, until such time as the PCR has been submitted, is not repeated here. However, if the schedule for the rest of 2000 and for 2001 will not be respected, such a proposal might need to be considered again at the last meeting of the Executive Committee in 2001. In that case, the legal and practical reservations expressed by UNDP against such a step would need to be discussed as well.

40. Instead, it is proposed that the Executive Committee might authorize the Implementing Agencies to withhold part of project funding, until such time as proof of equipment destruction according to the guidelines prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the implementing agencies has been provided and the company has also submitted to the implementing agency the necessary data to prepare a PCR of good quality. This could be part of the incremental operating costs if they are not fully used for covering capital cost. Such a measure would provide an incentive to the companies and leverage to the Implementing Agencies to speed up project completion which, according to Decision 28/2, includes the destruction or disposal of ODS-based equipment. At completion time, also the data required from the company for the preparation of a good PCR should be made available to the Implementing Agency. Experiences made by the World Bank in withholding part of project funding until a draft PCR is provided by the enterprise should be used in this respect.

g) Recommendations

41. The Executive Committee might:

- (a) take note of the revised PCR format for investment projects and the new overall assessment scheme contained in its Section 2. The new format will be used from 1 January 2001 onwards.
- (b) take note of the schedule for submission of outstanding PCRs in 2001.
- (c) authorize the Implementing Agencies to withhold part of funding for incremental operating costs if they are not fully used for covering capital costs, until such time as proof of equipment destruction according to the guidelines prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the implementing agencies has been provided and the company has also submitted to the implementing agency the necessary data to prepare a PCR of good quality.

IV Report on the Evaluation of Training Projects: Follow up to Decision 31/17

42. Decision 31/17, para 36(d) of the Executive Committee requested that the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer prepare a recommendation on the evaluation of training projects for the 32nd Meeting, taking into account comments received by members of the

Executive Committee, the countries covered by the evaluations and any further observations by the Implementing Agencies.

43. Comments concerning the country case studies were received from the National Ozone Units of Ghana, Uruguay and Argentina. The corrections proposed in the case of Ghana and Uruguay were incorporated in the final versions, while Argentina had no changes to propose. All ten case studies (Argentina, Ghana, Kenya, Malaysia, Namibia, Senegal, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Uruguay and Zimbabwe) are available on request and can also be consulted on the web site of the Secretariat (www.unmfs.org) under the 'Executive Committee' section.

44. Comments on the recommendations made in the synthesis report, document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/31/20, were received from the People's Republic of China, Australia, Japan and UNEP. These comments, as well as proposals made during the 11th Meeting of the Subcommittee on Monitoring, Evaluation and Finance, were incorporated in the recommendations presented below.¹

Main Recommendations on Training Projects Evaluated

It is recommended:

45. that all future non-investment activities related to the refrigeration servicing sector in low-volume countries (such as training of technicians in good services practices and customs training) should continue to be part of the Refrigerant Management Plan in order to place them in the context of a comprehensive plan for sector phase-out. *For non low-volume countries, projects such as training of technicians and training of customs officers would be prepared in the framework of a national long-term strategy for the refrigeration sector and considered in accordance with Decision 31/48, part C.* When preparing new RMPs, as well as during implementation of approved RMPs, training activities related to the refrigeration servicing sector and customs officers should build on the results of any earlier training activities. Consideration should be also given to strengthen the relevant industry associations and to involve them more closely in project preparation and implementation.

46. *that during the compliance period, the capacity of NOUs for development of national policies and regulations regarding monitoring and controlling consumption and trade of ODS and ODS-based equipment should continue to be enhanced.*

47. that countries are encouraged to develop a certification system to recognize those trainees who have successfully participated in training programmes through appropriate regulations or other policies. *Such regulations are most effective when they are developed with active industry participation and create common certification requirements across the country, either through national legislation or regulations consistent across states/provinces.*

¹New recommendations based on comments from members of the Executive Committee and UNEP are shown in italic letters, while the main recommendations made by the consultants, including modifications and additions, are presented in normal letters.

48. that national and regional activities should be planned and implemented in a complementary way. Regional workshops/seminars should focus on issues of common interest and should address priority requests in the region. National training programmes should respond to the specific requirements of countries concerned.

49. *that a list of relevant past and planned training events, bilateral and multilateral, should be made available by UNEP as part of its information exchange activities to all Parties. It would enable the Parties to consult such information on a timely basis and eliminate the possible duplication of similar events worldwide.*

50. that project proposals should include baseline data and indicators by which the results of the project could be assessed. Adequate monitoring systems should be developed to facilitate subsequent reporting on the results of training activities, and each project should foresee a budget line and adequate time for monitoring and reporting.

51. that the PCR format for non-investment projects used for reporting on training projects should be revised. The PCR should correspond to the related indicators defined for the approved project and should include information on the results and follow-up of training projects.

52. that the model of charging participants' fees for training of technicians, as included in the relevant German (GTZ) bilateral projects, in order to make training programmes sustainable should be closely monitored. If successful, countries should be encouraged to adopt it for future projects.

53. that national training handbooks, similar to the ones prepared for 10 African countries by GTZ, should be produced as part of the training materials for other countries as well, taking into account previous training materials developed.

54. that innovative solutions should be developed to reach out with training to the informal sector.

V Status Report on the Evaluation of Foam Projects

55. The final report on the evaluation of foam projects had been foreseen for presentation to the 32nd Meeting of the Executive Committee. However, due to several factors outlined below, a delay has occurred with the consequence that for this meeting only a status report will be presented, while the final report is now foreseen to be submitted to the 33rd Meeting of the Executive Committee in Spring 2001.

56. The factors contributing to the delay are the following:

- (a) Difficulty to find appropriate consultants who are, at the same time, sufficiently qualified and independent, i.e. not working for any particular implementing agency or supplier company;

- (b) Unforeseen work taken up on request of the Executive Committee concerning a desk study on recovery and recycling projects which was originally not planned in the Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme 2000;
- (c) Focussing on the implementation of the evaluation of Regional Networks in the first half of the Year 2000;
- (d) Continued work for improving the format for Project Completion Reports on investment projects and the related database.

57. Evaluation missions to selected countries in Asia and Latin America have taken place in November 2000, and further missions are planned until the end of the year, resulting in case studies on each of the enterprises visited. The draft case studies will be circulated to the countries visited and to the implementing agencies for their comments. This will be followed by the elaboration of a synthesis paper for presentation to the 34th Meeting of the Executive Committee. The sample of enterprises selected will comprise about 30 companies of different sizes, using various technologies, covering the main foam sub-sectors and being implemented by the World Bank, UNDP, UNIDO, as well as being approved in different years.

VI Desk Study on the Evaluation of Solvent Projects

a) Background

58. As foreseen in the 2000 Monitoring and Evaluation Work Programme, a desk study has been prepared by a consultant on completed solvent projects. A hard copy of this study is available on request and it can also be consulted on the web site of the Multilateral Fund Secretariat (in the section 'Executive Committee').

59. A brief overview of solvent projects from the beginning of the Fund's operations until today is followed by a presentation of the main findings of the desk study, evaluation issues identified and an outline of the evaluation methodology to be used in the main phase of the evaluation. As usual, for desk studies, the findings are preliminary, except for the assessment of the quality of project documents and completion reports. The problems found in project preparation and implementation need further analysis and corroboration during field visits and discussions with stakeholders concerned, primarily the companies and the implementing agencies.

b) Overview of the solvents sector

60. Since the beginning of the Fund's operations, 92 solvent projects were approved, 29 projects are implemented by the World Bank, 26 by UNDP and 26 by UNIDO which started relatively late. There is only one bilateral project approved in this sector (France). Total funding approved for these projects amounted to US \$35,889,994 with peaks in 1993 for individual investment projects and in 2000 for China's solvent sector strategy. This amount represents 4.4% of the total funding approved so far for all investment projects. The largest number of projects has been approved for phasing out CFC-113, (34 or 37%) followed by TCA projects

(32 or 35%). The most frequent substitute process was aqueous cleaning (47), followed by semi-aqueous cleaning (23), and a large variety of other processes.

61. 66 projects or 72% of the approved projects were completed by the end of 1999, of these projects 25 were completed by the World Bank, 17 by UNDP, and 24 by UNIDO. Total expenditure for the 48 projects for which PCRs were received by the Secretariat (including counterpart funding whose purpose is not specified in detail in the PCRs) amounted to US \$17,381,888, 5% more than the approved funding of US \$16,489,159. Expenditures for incremental capital costs were US \$17,048,028, 1% less than US \$17,268,740 approved, including non-specified counterpart funding. With regard to incremental operating cost, the PCRs for projects implemented by the World Bank show approved costs of US \$117,046 for the projects reported upon which, according to the PCRs received, were bypassed by more than 13 times, including non-specified counterpart funding. UNIDO projects on the other hand realized more savings than foreseen (almost US \$2,000,000) and UNDP reported very minor IOC. These figures merit a closer look during field visits.

Table 1: SOLVENT PROJECTS BY REGION

(According to 1999 Progress Reports)

Agency	Africa		Asia and the Pacific		Europe		Latin America and the Caribbean		Total*	
	Approved	Completed	Approved	Completed	Approved	Completed	Approved	Completed	Approved	Completed
France	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
IBRD	0	0	22	22	2	1	5	2	29	25
UNDP	0	0	22	13	0	0	4	4	26	17
UNIDO	9	7	19	9	1	1	7	7	36	24
Total	9	7	64	44	3	2	16	13	92	66

*This table excludes 12 Cancelled Projects: World Bank(6), UNIDO(2), UNDP(3), France(1)

62. In terms of geographical distribution, the World Bank focused on the larger countries mainly in Asia (22 completed projects), followed by Latin America (two projects) and Europe (one project). UNDP completed four projects in Latin America and 12 projects in Asia and UNIDO completed nine in Asia, seven in Latin America, seven in Africa and one in Europe (see Table 1).

63. In terms of funds approved per project, one of 66 completed solvent projects received funding of more than US \$2,000,000, while two projects had a level of funding of between US \$750,001 and one million. The other projects had budgets of less than US \$750,000 and in their majority (40) less than US \$250,000. The World Bank, followed by UNDP, had a relatively larger portion of large-scale projects.

c) Main findings

ODS phase out planned and achieved

64. The projects achieved the successful phase-out of about 1,005 ODP tonnes of solvents. The ODS phase out planned and achieved as reported in the PCRs corresponded in most cases to quantities planned for in the project documents. In a few projects, minor differences were reported while three projects, one in India, one in Mexico and one in Thailand, reported major differences that need further clarification.

Implementation delays

65. Only a minority of solvent sector projects were implemented within the project duration planned, while substantial delays occurred for the majority. According to the 48 PCRs received, six projects were completed ahead of schedule, eight on time, five with up to six-month delays, ten with seven to twelve-month delays, ten with 13-24 month delays, and nine with delays of 25 months or more.

Change of technology

66. The phase-out technologies have frequently changed from the ones approved in the project documents, for a variety of reasons. This has sometimes altered the approved capital and operating costs substantially, in either direction. It seems to be that in view of the large variety of technological choices in the solvent sector, it is sometimes difficult to make an exact assessment of the best alternatives during project preparation. Field visits may assist in considering whether more work on technology selection is required during project preparation.

Cost estimates

67. There are cases where incremental capital costs have been either over- or underestimated. It would seem that the project documents are frequently written without a very clear idea of what the costs are likely to be. In some cases, the incremental capital costs might have been exaggerated by either choosing new equipment where a retrofit may be possible, at a much lower cost, or by specifying machinery which offers an increase of production capacity or apparent improvements. In a very few cases, the incremental capital cost has included accessories without any real justification.

68. In some cases, IOCs seem to be exaggerated. As one example, the man-hours to operate new, more automated equipment were doubled where they should, if anything, have been reduced. In a number of cases, the high cost of substitutes are difficult to justify, for example, soldering fluxes, which were very expensive, where lower-cost ones were available, capable of doing the same work.

69. A number of projects approved prior to the 16th Executive Committee Meeting exceeded cost effectiveness thresholds, sometimes by a large margin. This would have been greater in number if the cost effectiveness had been calculated to include counterpart funding, which was sometimes considerable.

Viability of projects

70. In all cases, a viable solution was found, but this was not always entirely satisfactory, and various difficulties remained. The solution found, in some cases, would not appear – from the documentation – to have been the best choice, although this is difficult to assess with certainty without visiting the factory.

Fate of old equipment

71. In many cases, particularly in earlier projects, satisfactory proof of the destruction of old equipment was not furnished. Moreover, in the case of retrofitted machines, it can never be proved that ODS solvents cannot be used in the modified equipment. In a few cases, the old equipment was donated to e.g. universities; in at least one such case, there was no reason why it could not have been used with the same ODS solvent.

Learning curve

72. Although the documentation improved in recent years, the age of a project was not necessarily related to the quality of project preparation and implementation. It would seem that the lessons learnt from difficulties encountered during implementation of earlier projects were slow to be applied to later ones.

Quality of project documents

73. A number of requirements for a complete project document and frequent deficiencies in the project documents analyzed were identified and are summarized as follows:

- (a) A description of the existing equipment including its capacity (rarely given in any detail);
- (b) A contextual discussion of replacement technologies (sometimes given, but frequently out-of-context for the application and often incomplete);
- (c) A reason for the technology chosen (usually, after listing some possibilities, the choice was stated without a reason);
- (d) A discussion of choice and suitability of equipment for the chosen technology (almost never given);
- (e) A description of the installation with services (rarely mentioned);
- (f) Assessment of environmental, health and safety baseline, as well as likely effects and risks of conversion technologies (usually skimmed over and incomplete);
- (g) Description of how the used equipment should be disposed of (sometimes indicated, but not always).

74. In the case where a project contains two or more sub-projects, these should be treated totally separately with consolidation made only at the end. This would allow a much better transparency, particularly when sub-projects are also from different sub-sectors, as illustrated in several documents.

Project completion reports

75. The quality of the project completion reports varies from bad to very good. However, there are a number of common features requiring improvements. These are summarized as follows:

- (a) The figures in the approved and actual columns are too often rigorously identical; in some cases the overall assessment of the project is cut and pasted from the project document, even where there are manifestly variations;
- (b) The "before and after" production table frequently gives identical production figures over a period of four or five years and an identical consumption of solvents: this is not plausible in most cases;
- (c) More emphasis should be given to environmental and health and safety impacts before and after the conversion;
- (d) More details should be given where a change has occurred in the technology, after project approval, including whether Decision 22/69 of the Executive Committee had been followed;
- (e) Safety issues are not dealt with thoroughly;
- (f) Equipment Destruction/Disposal has not adequately been described.

d) Evaluation issues identified

- (a) Analyze cases where the ODS phase out does not appear to be transparent, inconsistent or less than approved, assess the viability of technology chosen and the risk of returning to the use of ODS and describe remaining tasks for phase out in cases where no final solution have been achieved so far.
- (b) Identify the reasons for the frequent implementation delays, systematize them and propose solutions to overcome repeated bottlenecks.
- (c) Review the reasons for the frequent changes of technology during project implementation. Related to changes of technology, frequent changes of incremental capital costs occur. The evaluation will try to analyze whether and how it will be possible to estimate cost of equipment more precisely during project preparation.

- (d) Identify ways to cope with difficulties encountered during project preparation leading to insufficient evaluation of all possible technological alternatives, which in turn may result in changes of technology during implementation.
- (e) Review cases where the conversion has led to significant increases of production capacity, procurement of additional equipment like testing instruments or automatization which had not been part of the original equipment, and might therefore not have been eligible for funding.
- (f) Establish actual incremental operating cost or savings for which information provided in the PCRs to the Multilateral Fund Secretariat is generally poor.
- (g) Examine safety and environment issues, including baseline conditions, in project preparation, implementation as well as in reporting.
- (h) Analyze experiences made with small projects in order to generate lessons of how to deal in future with such projects that might become more frequent.
- (i) Trace the fate of the old equipment, which is supposed to be destroyed or dismantled, and discuss possible and cost effective ways of rendering such equipment unusable.
- (j) Identify successful management approaches to organize the conversion efficiently within the company and in cooperation with the relevant Government authorities, the Implementing Agencies and the suppliers of equipment and materials.
- (k) Assess the role of training activities and policy regulations for successful completion of projects.
- (l) Test the project completion report in its new format and identify difficulties for improving the quality of project documents as well as project completion reports.

e) Evaluation approach

76. In 22 out of the 48 projects reviewed, it is suggested that some further information should be supplied by the implementing agencies, so that a greater transparency can be achieved. A further seven projects have been selected as possible candidates for field visits. This list, however, has not been finalised and a few more projects will be added in order to achieve a geographical, sub-sectorial and chronological balance.

77. The general objective of these visits would be to establish lessons learnt that will help future projects to be prepared and implemented in the most efficient manner. A few projects have been selected to find out what went wrong so that the same mistakes can be avoided in the future. Three additional projects have been indicated for possible site visits because they are in geographical proximity to other ones, and a visit would therefore not imply substantial extra costs.

78. During the field visits, an evaluation report format similar to the revised PCR format for investment projects will be used. Moreover, technical questions will be specifically formulated for each project, and some questions with regard to the linkages to non-investment projects and policy regulations as well as to the remaining tasks in the sector to achieve full ODS phase out will be added. Common features of projects and policies in a country will be summarized in a country report.

79. The draft case studies will be circulated to the countries visited and to the implementing agencies for their comments. This will be followed by the elaboration of a synthesis paper for presentation to the 34th Meeting of the Executive Committee.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR NOU ON HOW TO USE THE RECOVERY AND RECYCLING DATA FORMS

The Multilateral Fund of the Montreal Protocol has funded a recovery and recycling project in your country. For the recovery and recycling project to be successful, the beneficiary enterprises need to know whether the project is of benefit to them, and the NOU needs to know whether the equipment is being used appropriately, and to report the data back to the implementing agency.

The forms enclosed are the following:

1. For Enterprises that have received equipment from the project:

Tables E1 and E2 should be filled in by all users of the equipment, while the forms E3, E4 and E5 are for a selected sample of larger enterprises.

Table E1 Recovery Data Form: This form can be used by enterprises that do refrigeration and air-conditioning service, or MAC servicing, or both.

This form is a simple recording of the quantity of CFC-12 recovered by the enterprise. It requires that the enterprise weighs the cylinder before and after recovery, and record the quantity of CFC-12 recovered.

Enterprises that received recovery cum recycling equipment or MAC equipment often recover refrigerant during the day and recycle once the cylinder is full. They should use this form for the recovery portion only, and use Table E2 for the recycling operation.

The NOU should decide on the frequency of reporting by the enterprise. At the beginning, once a month should be encouraged.

Table E2 Recycling Data Form: This form should be used by enterprises that have received recovery cum recycling machines and/or MAC recovery/recycling machines.

Table E3 Use of Recovered CFC-12 Form: This form should be maintained by the enterprise. It will allow the NOU to understand whether recovered refrigerant is being recycled – if not, the enterprise should be urged to do so, and it will also allow for cross linking of information received from the recycling centres.

Table E4 Use of Recycled CFC-12 Form: This form is to be used if the enterprise has recovery cum recycling machines and/or MAC equipment.

Table E5 New CFC-12 Use Form: This information may be difficult to obtain, but if provided, will give the NOU an idea of refrigerant consumption.

The costing information to be recorded is for the enterprise's benefit, to understand the economic benefits of recovery and recycling.

2. For Use by Recycling Centres that have been set up under the project:

Table R1 A simple recording of the amount of refrigerant recycled. It requires that recovered refrigerant brought to the centre be tested with the Refrigerant Analyser and noted whether it passes or fails “minimum 98% CFC-12” purity.

Table R2 This is basically a register to be maintained by the recycling centre.

The costing information is for the recycling centre’s benefit, to understand the economic benefits of recycling.

3. For Use by NOU to Monitor Recovery and Recycling Project:

Table N1 A register to record the details of the beneficiaries of the project.

Table N2 A summary of Tables E1, E3, E4 and E5 received from the enterprises.

Table N3 A summary of Table R2 received from Recycling Centres and Tables E2, and E4 from Enterprises that have recovery cum recycling machines and/or MAC machines. Data from this Table can be used to report to the implementing agency/donor agency/Multilateral Fund.

Important Note:

Recovery and Recycling Projects funded by the Multilateral Fund are for CFC-12 recovery and recycling only. However, it has been observed that the equipment is also used for HCFC-22 recovery and recycling. This should be discouraged.

Should the enterprise want to carry out HCFC-22 recovery and recycling also, machines should be dedicated for each refrigerant. Otherwise, the small quantities of refrigerant remaining in the hoses and the system contaminate the next batch being recovered and/or recycled.

If enterprises persist on using the same equipment, they should be made to understand the dangers of contamination and be urged to practice purging of the equipment before using it for another refrigerant.

Forms E3, E4 and E5 to be filled in by a selected sample of larger enterprises:

TABLE E3 (Recovery): USE OF RECOVERED CFC-12 DURING THE WEEK

Opening Stock	Reused for Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning	Reused for MAC	Sent for Recycling (in house or outside)	Sold Or Returned to Owner	Closing Stock
Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg

TABLE E4 (Recycled): USE OF RECYCLED CFC-12 DURING THE WEEK

Opening Stock	Used for Refrigeration & Air-Conditioning	Used for MAC	Returned to Installation Owner	Sold	Closing Stock
Kg	Kg	Kg		Kg	Kg

TABLE E5 (New): USE OF NEW CFC-12 DURING THE WEEK

Opening Stock	Purchased	Used for Refrigeration and Air-Conditioning	Used for MAC	Sold	Closing Stock
Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg	Kg

Costing:

Man-hours spent recovering:

Man-hours spent recycling:

Labour cost:

Estimate of electricity used for recovery and recycling:

Cost of electricity:

Cost of filters replaced:

Cost of repairs to equipment:

Total quantity recycled:

Cost of Recovery and Recycling per kg:

Revised Terminal Report for Institutional-Strengthening Projects
(Sections 1-20 to be completed by the country concerned prior to sending it to the implementing agency for comments in Section 21)

1. Country:
2. National Implementing Agency / Ozone Unit:
3. Implementing Agency:
4. List of previous project phases:

Phase	Duration	MLF Funding (Approved)	MLF Funding (Disbursed)

5. Indicate the main project objective and the detailed objectives as defined in the action plan for the phase reported upon:

6. Describe the results achieved by category and compare them with the results foreseen in the Action Plan:

Year	Activities	Results Expected	Results Achieved
1 st Year			
2 nd Year			

Describe additional results unforeseen in the Action Plan:

9. Were resources (staff, budget, equipment) used for activities in addition to the approved action plan? If so, please specify:

10. ***Describe the role and position of the NOU within the national administration, the way its work was supervised and its access to senior decision-makers. Give name and title of the government officer who had the overall responsibility of supervising the work of the NOU and ensured that action taken was adequate to meet the commitments under the Protocol, and include the cooperation with steering committees, advisory groups or inter-ministerial bodies as well as the government entities who dealt with import/export licensing and customs:***

11. Describe how the action plan for the IS project has been integrated in the national authorities' planning process, ***in particular, the country programme:***

12. Title and date of reports submitted:

To Whom:	Title of Report	Submission (Year/Quarter)	
		Planned	Actual
1. Government Departments			
2. Reports to Multilateral Fund Secretariat			
3. Reports to Ozone Secretariat			
4. Implementing Agency			
5. Other Implementing Agency(ies)			
6. Bilateral Donor(s)			
7. Others			

13. Were adequate advice and/or technical support received from:

	Yes	No	Please specify
a) Implementing Agency			
b) Other Implementing Agency(ies)			
c) Bilateral Donor(s)			
d) Government Departments			
e) National Steering Committee			
f) Others (please specify)			

14. Support received from Regional Network (Network Coordinator/Manager and Network members) and input provided to the Network:

Support Received from Regional Network	Input Provided to Network

15. Was the NOU subject to an audit by the beneficiary Government or by the Implementing Agency? If yes, what were the results?

16. Lessons learnt (what were the main successes and difficulties and what can be learnt from them for improving effectiveness and impact during the next phase):

17. Terminal Report prepared by:

Name and signature of Officer responsible for preparing the Terminal Report:	
Title:	
Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	

18. Government Authority with oversight responsibility for the IS Project/NOU:

Name and signature of Officer responsible:	
Title:	
Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	
Comments:	

19. Implementing Agency:

Name and signature of Officer responsible:	
Title:	
Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	
Comments:	

**Extension of Institutional Strengthening Projects
Revised Plan of Action**

(Sections 1-16 to be completed by the country concerned prior to sending it to the implementing agency for comments in Section 17)

1. Country:
2. National Implementing Agency / Ozone Unit
3. Implementing Agency:
4. Period of Extension: From (month/year) to (month/year)
(Based on the approved guidelines)
5. Amount of MLF funding requested:
6. Status of ratification:

Amendment	Ratification Date	or projected date
London Amendment		
Copenhagen Amendment		
Montreal Amendment		

7. Consumption by group of substances and by sector. This is identical to the annual report the Ozone Units submit to the Fund Secretariat on the progress of implementation of Country Programmes. Please attach form with data for the most recent year, ***and describe sources/methods of collecting data on imports, exports and production as well as distribution by sector:***
8. Indicate the main project objective for the next phase in relation to the country's compliance with the provisions of the Montreal Protocol:

9. Objectives, planned activities per year and expected results:

Year	Objectives	Planned Activities	<i>Work Months</i>	Results expected
1 st Year				
2 nd Year				

10. *Describe the role and position of the NOU within the national administration, the way its work is supervised and its access to senior decision-makers. Give name and title of the government officer who has the overall responsibility for supervising the work of the NOU and for ensuring that action taken is adequate to meet the commitments under the Protocol, and include the cooperation with steering committees, advisory groups or inter-ministerial bodies as well as the government entities dealing with import/export licensing and customs:*

11. Describe how the action plan for the IS project will be integrated in the national authorities' planning process, *in particular, the country programme:*

12. Planned Project Cost:

	Planned Project Cost	MLF Funding	<i>Government Funding</i>	Other Sources
a) Equipment component				
b) Professional Staff				
c) Support staff				
d) Consultants				
e) Operational cost				
f) Funds for public awareness				
g) Contingency				
h) Others including in-kind (specify)				
Total Amount				

13. Personnel required:

Category and Numbers	Functional Titles/Expertise	Main Tasks	Time Period
Professional Staff ¹			
Support Staff			
Consultants			

¹*Please attach job description of the Head of the National Ozone Unit*

14. Title and schedule of reports to be submitted:

To Whom:	Title of Report	Planned Submission (Year/Quarter)
1. Government Departments		
2. Reports to Multilateral Fund Secretariat		
3. Reports to Ozone Secretariat		
4. Implementing Agency		
5. Other Implementing Agency(ies)		
6. Bilateral Donor(s)		
7. Others		

15. Action Plan prepared by:

Name <i>and signature</i> of Officer responsible for preparing the Action Plan:	
Title:	
Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	

16. Government endorsement:

Action Plan authorized by (<i>name</i>):	<i>(to be signed on hard copy)</i>
Title:	
Supervising Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	

17. Submission of Action Plan:

Name of Implementing Agency:	
Name <i>and signature</i> of Project Officer:	
Date:	
Comments of Implementing Agency:	

SECTION 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1	COUNTRY:		
1.2	PROJECT NUMBER (AS PER INVENTORY):	PROJECT NUMBER	
1.3	PROJECT TITLE		
1.4	ADDRESS(ES) OF ENTERPRISE AND PROJECT SITE(S):		
1.5	DATE OF APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT (AS PER INVENTORY):		
		APPROVED	ACTUAL
1.6	DATE OF COMPLETION:	Original:	
		Latest Revised:	
1.7	CONVERSION/ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGY USED ¹ :	From: To: Other	To:
		From: To: Other	To:
		From (other): To (other)	To (other):
1.8	ODP PHASE-OUT:	0.00	0.00
1.9	TOTAL MLF FUNDING:	\$ 0	\$ 0
1.10	TOTAL COUNTERPART FUNDING (AS PER PROJECT DOCUMENT):	\$ 0	\$ 0
1.11	TOTAL PROJECT COST:	\$ 0	\$ 0
1.12	COST-EFFECTIVENESS:		
1.13	PERCENTAGE OF ART. 5 COUNTRY OWNERSHIP:	0.0 %	0.0 %
1.14	PERCENTAGE OF EXPORTS TO NON-ART. 5 COUNTRIES:	0.0 %	0.0 %
	DISCUSSION HELD WITH:	AGENCY	NAME/DATE
1.15	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY:		
1.16	EXECUTING AGENCY/FINANCIAL INTERMEDIARY:		
1.17	NATIONAL COORDINATING AGENCY/NOU:		
1.18	BENEFICIARY COMPANY		
<p>¹If the actual technology used is different from the approved one, indicate procedures followed with regard to informing the Executive Committee and seeking approval in accordance with the guidelines established by Decision 22/70:</p> <p>Other explanations, if needed:</p>			

*Indicate whether this report is provisional or final .

SECTION 2: CRITERIA AND RATING SCHEME FOR OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Part A: Assessment of Quantitative Project Performance Data		
	CRITERIA	RATING
Pre-conditions for Completion*	ODS phase out as approved	20
	Conversion completed (no more CFC in use, ODS-free production has started)	20
	Certified equipment destruction	20
Delays	On time	15
	6 to 12 months delay	0
	More than 12 months delay	-15
Cost Effectiveness of MLF Funding	Cost effectiveness more than 5% better than approved	5
	Cost effectiveness as approved or less than 5% better	0
	Cost effectiveness less than approved	-5
Sub-total A		
Part B: Qualitative Rating of Project Performance**		
Project Preparation	Quality of project design	5, 3 or 1
Technology Choice	Conversion technology	5, 3 or 1
	Type of equipment	5, 3 or 1
	Supplier	5, 3 or 1
Management of Risks	Safety / health protection	5, 3 or 1
	Maintenance of equipment	5, 3 or 1
	Maintaining product quality	5, 3 or 1
	Preventing return to ODS use	5, 3 or 1
Sub-total B		
TOTAL SCORE	Highly satisfactory: 100 to 120 Satisfactory: 75 to 99 Less satisfactory: 48 to 74	

*The overall rating will be calculated only if the pre-conditions for completion as defined by the Executive Committee in Decision 28/2 are met and documented (applicable for projects completed after July 1999).

**Please rate the project performance with regard to quality/appropriateness using the following scale for each category: Highly satisfactory: (5); Satisfactory: (3); Less satisfactory: (1)

SECTION 3: DESCRIPTIVE ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

The following questions are to summarize actual performance as compared to what was approved in the project document.

3.1 Comments on ODS phase out approved and achieved (explain differences, report on remaining consumption of ODS and the risk of the beneficiary returning to the use of ODS):

3.2 Explain reasons if conversion technology was changed after approval (in cases other than approved by the Executive Committee):

3.3 Describe any major (technical, financial, political or other) problems encountered in project preparation, causes of delays and actions taken to overcome them:

3.4 Describe main post-conversion safety and environmental risks and measures taken to cope with them; attach copies of appropriate certificates:

3.5 Report on implementation of Executive Committee approval conditions (in cases of approval with specified conditions):

3.6 Comments on differences between approved and actual figures for capital, operational and contingency costs and actions taken to cope with cost overruns:

3.7 Report on reasons for changes in counterpart funding for eligible incremental costs:

3.8 Categorize and describe causes of implementation delays and actions taken to overcome them:

Categories	Causes of Delay	Actions taken to Overcome Delay(s)
a) due to Implementing Agency delays		
b) due to enterprise delays		
c) due to equipment / chemical supplier delays		
d) due to Governmental delays		
e) due to external (regional/global) factors		
f) due to delays in funding following project approval		

3.9 Provide an overall assessment of the fate of the baseline equipment (refer to Section 7):

3.10 Lessons learned for future action:

3.11 Comments of the beneficiary enterprise:

3.12 Government's / NOU's comments:

SECTION 4: ODS PHASE-OUT**Pre-conversion (as reported in project document)**

4.1 Products manufactured/services provided:

4.2 Annual level of production / services:

4.3 ODS consumed in baseline year:

Substance	Amount in Tonnes	ODP of the Substance	Total ODP Tonnes
ODS(1)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ODS(2)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ODS(3)	0.00	0.00	0.00
ODS(4)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL:	0.00		0.00
Explanations, if needed:			

4.4 Project Preparation

Budget Approved:	\$ 0
Actual Expenditures:	\$ 0
Describe briefly the role of the enterprise in project preparation:	
In what way was the NOU involved in project preparation:	
Were any changes made as a consequence of the external technical review? If yes, please specify:	
Did the ExCom approve the project in its original version? If not, please specify:	
Explanations, if needed:	

Transition from ODS-based to non-ODS-based production/services

4.5 Evolution of the amount of ODS consumed

Schedule	Actual Year	Units produced/ serviced using ODS	Amount of ODS consumed (Tonnes)			
			ODS(1)	ODS(2)	ODS(3)	ODS(4)
199X*						
199X**						
199X+1						
199X+2						
199X+3						
199Y***						
200Y+1****						
Explanations, if needed:						

4.6 Evolution of the amount of substitutes consumed

Schedule	Actual Year	Units produced/ serviced using substitutes	Amount of substitutes consumed (Tonnes)			
			SUB(1)	SUB(2)	SUB(3)	SUB(4)
199X*						
199X**						
199X+1						
199X+2						
199X+3						
199Y***						
200Y+1****						
Explanations, if needed:						

*Baseline year (per project document).

**Year of project approval. Please adjust accordingly if baseline year = approval year

***Year of successful commencement of new projection.

****Most recent year.

Post-conversion

4.7 Amount of substitutes consumed in final year of report, and remaining Ozone Depleting Potential

Substitute	Amount in Tonnes	ODP of the Substitute	Total ODP Tonnes
SUB(1)	0.00	0.00	0.00
SUB(2)	0.00	0.00	0.00
SUB(3)	0.00	0.00	0.00
SUB(4)	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL:	0.00		0.00
Explanations, if needed:			

SECTION 5: BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES

In case this PCR is still provisional (as indicated in Section 1), this may serve as a status report on project expenditures at the time of preparing the Project Completion Report with the understanding that a full financial completion report will be prepared as a supplement once the accounts of the project are closed.

5.1 Total budget and expenditure on incremental cost:

Project Budget	Approved Costs	Actual Total Costs	Actual Total Funding Disbursed	
			Grant Funds	Counterpart Funds
Incremental Capital Costs	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Contingency	\$ 0		\$ 0	
IOC*	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
TOTAL	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total MLF Grant**	\$ 0			
Total MLF Grant Not Utilized	\$ 0			
Indicate date(s) and amount(s) of IOC disbursement(s) by Implementing Agency:				
Other explanations, if needed:				

*If IOC funds were used to finance incremental capital costs, in accordance with ExCom Decision 20/6, the amount should be specified in Section 3.6 above.

**Differences between total approved costs and total MLF grant may be due to non-Art. 5 country ownership and/or exports to Art. 2 countries (see Sections 1.11 and 1.12 above).

5.2 Detailed list of incremental capital cost and contingency by item:

Project Budget	Approved Costs	Actual Costs	Actual Funding	
			Grant Funds	Counterpart Funds
Incremental Capital Costs*				
Subtotal				
Contingency				
Explanations, if needed:				

*List of equipment capital cost, including cost for international consultants, by item as approved in the project document (additional equipment should be so indicated). If the company insists on purchasing equipment for more than the limits established through international bidding, please provide detailed explanation in Section 3.6 above.

5.3 Incremental Operating Costs by Item and Disbursement(s)

Cost Items	As per project document approved		Based on information from company
	Before	After	Actual
CFC/ODS prices US\$/kg (per substance)	\$ 0.00		
Substitute prices US\$/kg (per substance)		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
Compressor prices US\$/unit*	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
Average foam density kg/m ³ *	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other (please specify)			
Explanations, if needed:			

*Where applicable

5.4 Approved and actual incremental operating costs:
(To be filled only upon specific request by the Multilateral Fund Secretariat)

Item	As per project document approved		Based on information from company
	Before	After	Actual
Number of units produced (annually)	0.00		0.00
Incremental unit costs US\$/unit*	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
IOC/Year	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Duration (years)	0		0
Total IOC, NPV	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Explanations, if needed:			

*Present the calculation of the actual incremental unit cost in the box below or attach it.

5.5 Counterpart funding of additional items not included in the project document (based on information provided by the company/beneficiary):

	ITEMS	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES
1.		
2.		
3.		
TOTAL		
Explanations, if needed:		

SECTION 6: IMPLEMENTATION EFFICIENCY

Project Milestones	Planned Dates	Planned Duration in Months**	Actual Date	Actual Duration in Months**	Delay in Months
ExCom approval date					
Start-up of project activities at country level as stated by Article 5 Party concerned					
Grant agreement submitted to beneficiary					
Grant agreement signature					
Bids prepared and requested					
Contracts awarded					
Equipment delivered					
Commissioning and trial runs					
Start of ODS-free production					
Decommissioning and/or destruction of redundant baseline equipment					
Total duration until project completion*					
Submission of project completion report					
Explanations, if needed:					

*Completion of project refers to when ODS-free production starts and equipment has been destroyed per ExCom Decision 28/2(a)

**The number of months taken to complete item by item

SECTION 7: FATE OF ODS-BASED PRODUCTION EQUIPMENT

LIST OF EQUIPMENT RENDERED UNUSABLE (the baseline)*		IMPLEMENTED			
Type of equipment	Description/ Specification**	Disposal Type***	Date of Disposal	Implemented by:	Certified by****:
<p>Explanations, if needed, particularly in case funds approved for retrofitting have subsequently been used to replace equipment rather than to retrofit it:</p>					

*List of equipment to be rendered unusable or to be modified according to the project document
 **Description/specification should include model and serial numbers
 ***Type of equipment disposal
 ****Attach copy of certificate