



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/43/49  
18 June 2004

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Forty-third Meeting  
Geneva, 5-9 July 2004

**POTENTIAL IMPLICATIONS OF SUBSEQUENTLY INCREASING  
THE AMOUNTS APPROVED FOR INSTITUTIONAL  
STRENGTHENING PROJECTS (DECISION 42/22 (B))**

## Introduction

1. At its 42<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee considered, inter alia, proposals for renewal of institutional strengthening (IS) projects submitted by UNEP. The countries concerned were in actual or potential non-compliance with the Montreal Protocol because they had failed to report under Article 7 any data in one or more of the reporting categories or years. During the discussion on the proposals, several representatives pointed out that, in some countries, the amounts of money being requested were not sufficient to fund even a half-time national ozone officer. It was also noted that there was a high turnover of ozone officers in some geographic regions/sub-regions, with the incoming ones needing time to master the task.

2. Subsequently, the Executive Committee recommended approval of the proposals for renewal of IS projects, without prejudice to the operation of the Montreal Protocol's mechanisms for non-compliance. The Committee also requested the Secretariat, in consultation with relevant bilateral and implementing agencies, to prepare a document for consideration at its 43<sup>rd</sup> Meeting on the potential implications of subsequently increasing the amounts approved for IS projects, paying particular attention to the question of how many similar cases might be involved, indicating the problems faced by ozone units in very-low-volume-consuming (VLVC) countries and the options for ensuring adequate capacity, including increased funding (Decision 42/22(b)).

3. The Secretariat has prepared this document pursuant to Decision 42/22(b) of the Executive Committee.

## Structure of the paper

4. The paper consists of a desk study based on a range of information available to the Secretariat, including:

- (a) Relevant decisions taken by the Executive Committee on IS projects;
- (b) The final report on the 1999 evaluation of IS projects and draft follow-up action plan submitted by the Secretariat to the 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Committee (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/06 and Corr.1); and
- (c) A review of progress reports and plans of action of IS projects submitted by eight VLVC countries, focussing on the funding level approved and the responsibilities of the Ozone Officers in achieving the phase-out of ODSs in their countries.

5. The paper presents an examination of the basis for the funding of IS projects in LVC or VLVC countries and a discussion of "adequate capacity" in relation to allocation of approved funds for salaries. It also indicates the financial implications for the Multilateral Fund of proposals for an increase in the level of institutional support, and indicates options for progressing the issue.

6. The paper takes as its starting point 68 LVC or VLVC countries where the level of funding for their IS projects is below US \$50,000 per year (listed in Annex I). The eight countries included in the Pacific Island Country (PIC) strategy are not included since special

arrangements were adopted in the PIC strategy. The paper does not consider the issue of across-the-board changes to the level of Multilateral Fund support for IS activities in Article 5 countries.

IS history: relevant decisions

7. At its 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee recognized the need to provide limited funding or assistance from the Fund for IS, since it "might, in exceptional cases, be an essential element in achieving the objectives of the Fund and the Montreal Protocol". The level of such funding was to be decided upon by the Executive Committee on the basis of a recommendation from the Secretariat taking into consideration the amount of controlled substances consumed in that country and the linkage between the IS and implementation of projects.

8. At the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting the Secretariat presented a paper that proposed areas of capital and recurrent expenditure that could qualify for support for IS (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20). These included basic office equipment (computers, printer, fax, photocopier); recurrent expenditure to cover incentives for skilled staff, and; critical areas of operational costs (communications, travel, recurrent awareness raising). Provision for staff was proposed to be commensurate with the level of consumption.

9. At the same meeting the Executive Committee decided, inter alia, "that requests for IS should be considered as special projects subject to approval by the Executive Committee on the basis of a written request submitted by the interested Party". Furthermore, "requests for IS should be included in the country programme of the Party requesting such assistance. However, the requests for institutional support may be submitted separately as a free-standing project ahead of the country programme where circumstances demand" (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/30, para. 74).

10. Subsequent to the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee approved requests for IS submitted by Article 5 countries (both within their country programmes or as stand-alone projects) for a three-year period.

11. Upon submission of the requests for renewal of the first three-year projects, at its 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting the Executive Committee "recommended extension of IS activities that have been completed for an interim period of six months pro rata on the basis of the first three-year allocation on the understanding that guidelines for second round IS should be developed by the Secretariat, and an evaluation and monitoring exercise would be carried out by the implementing agencies during the period and that, if necessary, the extensions could be renewed for a further six months pending completion of a full evaluation" (Decision 17/16).

12. At its 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee considered a paper on guidelines for renewal of IS projects prepared by the Secretariat (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52). In Decision 19/29, the Committee decided:

- (a) In the case of countries requesting institutional-strengthening projects for the first time, approval would be for three years;

- (b) Initial renewals would be at the same level of funding as the first approval; would be for two years; and would be conditional upon a report of progress and an articulated plan of future actions, this report to be submitted six months before the end of the three-year approval period; and
- (c) Any subsequent renewal would also be for two years; and would also be conditional upon a report of progress and an articulated plan of future actions.

13. In the lead up to the operation of the Fund during the compliance period of the Montreal Protocol, at the request of the Executive Committee, the Secretariat prepared a document that addressed the need to review the effectiveness of existing IS arrangements and the functioning of Ozone Units (Decision 27/10).

14. In the context of the report subsequently prepared by the Secretariat on the evaluation of IS projects (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/6 and Corr.1), at its 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting the Committee recognized, inter alia, the importance of an adequate mandate and position for ozone units and their full involvement in the planning of actual phase-out actions, bearing in mind their important role in designing and implementing strategies to enable their governments to meet their Montreal Protocol commitments and acknowledging the resources which the Multilateral Fund had assigned and would continue to assign in order to support and train the ozone units. In Decision 30/7(b), the Executive Committee urged all Article 5 countries with IS projects to ensure that:

- (a) The ozone unit is given a clear mandate and responsibility to carry out the day-to-day work in order to prepare, coordinate and, where relevant, implement the government's activities to meet its commitments under the Montreal Protocol; this also requires access to decision-makers and enforcement agencies;
- (b) The National Ozone Unit's position, capacities, and continuity of officers, resources and lines of command within the authority in charge of ozone issues are such that the National Ozone Unit can carry out its task satisfactorily;
- (c) A specified high-level officer or a post within the authority is given overall responsibility for supervising the work of the National Ozone Unit and ensuring that action taken is adequate to meet commitments under the Protocol;
- (d) Necessary support structures, such as steering committees or advisory groups are established, involving other appropriate authorities, the private sector and non-governmental organizations, etc.;
- (e) Personnel and financial resources and equipment provided by the Multilateral Fund are fully allocated to the task of eliminating ODS consumption and production and are made available to the National Ozone Unit;
- (f) Annual work plans for the National Ozone Unit are prepared and integrated in the authorities' internal planning processes;

- (g) A reliable system to collect and monitor data on ozone depleting substances imports, exports and production is established; and
- (h) Measures taken and problems encountered are reported to the Secretariat and/or the implementing agency in charge of the IS project when required by the Executive Committee.

15. In the context of the Strategic Planning Framework of the Multilateral Fund, and in order to help countries carry out the new strategic framework agreed, and provide increased support for critical areas such as public awareness, the Executive Committee agreed:

- (a) To increase the level of funding of IS projects (both new and renewals) by 30 per cent of the historically agreed level. This funding increment should prevail until 2005 when it should again be reviewed (Decision 35/57). The proposal by the Committee also included a clear commitment that this level of IS should prevail for all Article 5 Parties until at least 2010, even if they should phase-out early;
- (b) In addition to the direct increase in IS funding, UNEP will be provided with US \$200,000 per year to support public awareness, and countries will receive enhanced direct support on policy and substantive issues through UNEP's Compliance Assistance Programme; and
- (c) Countries undertaking national phase-out plans are likely to receive IS funding at an even higher level than that anticipated above to facilitate national project implementation, as explicitly agreed in related phase-out agreements.

#### Evolving role of IS

16. The above decisions were taken in the context of, and to support, the evolution of the role of IS as indicated below.

17. At its 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee established as the objective of IS provision of the necessary resources to an Article 5 country to facilitate implementation of projects for speedy and effective phase-out of ODSs, as well as to assist liaison with the Executive Committee, the Fund and Ozone Secretariats and the implementing agencies to facilitate, inter alia, the reporting of data.

18. During the grace period, the phase-out of ODSs in the majority of Article 5 countries was associated with conversion of ODS-based manufacturing facilities. While NOUs played an important role in the overall coordination of phase-out activities, ODS reductions were driven by the project-level achievements of the beneficiary enterprises assisted by the bilateral and/or implementing agencies. For lower-consuming Article 5 countries where the majority of the ODSs were CFCs used for servicing refrigeration systems, the Ozone Unit was required to undertake a coordinating role to facilitate implementation of refrigerant recovery and recycling programme and training programmes for refrigeration servicing technicians.

19. In the compliance period, and with the gradual completion of projects in the manufacturing sectors, the requirement for effective interventions by NOUs has increased. Additional phase-out to meet Montreal Protocol commitments had to come from a reduction in the use of CFCs for servicing refrigeration systems (a sector characterized by a large number of small users scattered throughout the countries with a large number of stakeholders). The country-driven approach adopted in strategic planning for the Multilateral Fund ultimately relies on the ozone units and the government concerned.

#### Level of funding for IS projects

20. The decisions of the Executive Committee have not established quantitative guidelines for the level of funding for IS projects or the constituent parts thereof. The Secretariat, in its review of IS proposals, has reached agreement with agencies on common elements of project costs, such as levels of funding for computing or other office equipment, and an understanding of what elements may not be eligible for financial support (such as motor vehicles, rental of office space, furniture). However the level of IS support is influenced significantly by the circumstances prevailing in the country, and the consequent nature and magnitude of the funding request submitted by the relevant agency. Relevant factors include: the amount of ODSs consumed (and produced where applicable) and its sectoral distribution; the size of the country in terms of population and surface area; the size and complexity of the industrial processes using ODS; the number of major cities with major commercial and industrial activities.

21. Since the approval of the first IS project at the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, the Executive Committee has approved funding for the establishment of Ozone Units in 131 Article 5 countries and disbursed a total amount of US \$44,291,954, representing 2.65 per cent of the total funds so far approved.

22. Of the total amount approved for IS, US \$16,099,174 is for the establishment of 91 Ozone Units in LVC countries, with a total CFC baseline consumption of 7,775 ODP tonnes and US \$28,192,780 for 38 Ozone Units in non-LVC countries, with total CFC baselines of 152,854 ODP tonnes of consumption and 108,541 ODP tonnes of production.

23. In terms of relative funding levels, LVC countries have received IS funding, on average, at the rate of US \$2,070 for every ODP tonne of CFC consumption. Non-LVC countries have received funding at the rate of US \$110 for every tonne of CFC consumption and production, or US \$184 for every ODP tonne of consumption only. Considering that in many cases the consumption of non-LVC countries rose significantly above their baselines before decreasing to meet Montreal Protocol commitments, the actual per-tonne value of IS funding for non-LVCs will have been lower than US \$184 per tonne.

24. In addition to financial assistance through the IS project, the Executive Committee has also approved funding for enhancing institutional capabilities through:

- (a) Regional networks for Ozone Officers: two meetings a year, plus some additional thematic meetings (i.e., meetings for customs officers in the region, workshops for refrigeration technicians on retrofits) organized back-to-back with network meetings;

- (b) National training programmes for customs officers and refrigeration technicians in the context of sectoral or national phase-out plans (for non-LVC countries) and RMPs (for LVC countries);
- (c) Funding through sectoral and/or national ODS phase-out plans for management and monitoring by the country, in addition to NOU activities (Decision 35/57);
- (d) Funding through RMP project proposals for LVC countries for the monitoring of RMP activities (Decision 31/48);
- (e) Funding of representatives of the Governments of Article 5 countries to attend the meetings of the Executive Committee and the Parties: in many cases, Ozone Officers are assigned as the representative or resource persons of their Governments.

### Analysis

25. The Secretariat commenced its analysis by examining IS funding in countries with annual funding levels of less than US \$50,000 per year. Seventy-six countries receive annual IS funding of up to US \$50,000 of which five are non-LVC countries. The range of IS funding for the 71 LVC countries is indicated in the table in Annex I. It can be seen that ten countries receive funding of between US \$40,000 and US \$50,000 per year and 19 countries receive between US \$30,000 and US \$40,000. The remaining 42 countries receive less than US \$30,000 per year. Of these countries, 17 receive funding of less than US \$20,000 per year.

26. As it is now more than two years since the Executive Committee decided to supplement IS funding by 30 percent (at the 35<sup>th</sup> Meeting), these funding levels generally include the 30 percent addition.

27. The corresponding ODS consumption baselines for each country considered in the analysis are also indicated in Annex I. While there are increases in median CFC consumption for each range of IS funding, there is not a clear correlation between consumption and IS funding. This occurs because of the range of other factors that influence the funding level indicated in paragraph 20 above. At the country by country level, the deviations from a proportionality between consumption and IS funding become more pronounced.

28. The Secretariat has also reviewed the progress reports on the implementation of IS projects and the plan of action for the renewal of IS projects recently approved for the Governments of the Bahamas, Comoros, Dominica, Guinea, Mauritania, Mongolia, Niger and Saint Kitts and Nevis (all VLVC countries) specifically in relation to the allocation of funding.

29. The review of these specific countries indicates the following:

- (a) The annual level of IS funding in the renewed projects ranges from US \$12,097 (for Comoros) to US \$34,667 (for Mongolia);

- (b) The proportion of IS resources dedicated to personnel funding, ranges from 20 percent to 69 percent. The lowest financial provision is US \$8,000 and the highest is US \$32,000;
- (c) The proportion of funding sought for office equipment generally decreases in the renewal requests (because it has already been funded); and
- (d) The proportion of funding for awareness activities generally increases, but has a wide range, from 8 percent to 48 percent; the lowest provision is US \$1,700 and the highest is US \$28,000.

30. While the renewal requests indicate proposed funding for salaries, these can include both fulltime positions and short term or support staff. It is not possible to gain from the reports alone an indication of the total annual cost for a single ozone officer, part of which may be met from Government contributions.

31. It has also been reported that in some cases the funding approved for ozone officers' remuneration is above the salaries paid to their immediate-supervisors. In these circumstances, the funding over and above the prevailing salary level may be re-directed to other IS activities.

32. The evaluation of IS projects conducted by the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and presented to the Executive Committee at its 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting indicated in its findings that the extension phases of IS projects "contained 70 percent or more for financing the current cost of ozone unit staff."

### *Compliance*

33. Of the 68 LVC countries with current IS project funding of less than US\$50,000 per year, a total of twenty countries are, or appear to be, in non-compliance with the control provisions of the Montreal Protocol, fifteen in regard to CFCs and eight in regard to methyl bromide. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Uganda and Saint Kitts and Nevis are, or appear to be, in non-compliance with both sets of control measures. The CFC baselines of the non-compliant or potentially non-compliant countries range from 1.5 to 101 ODP tonnes. Their current annual IS funding levels range from US \$13,000 to US \$47,667, as indicated in Table 1 below.

Table 1

<b>Country</b>	<b>Current annual IS funding</b>
1. Bosnia and Herzegovina – CFC and MB	47,667
2. Mozambique - MB	40,040
3. Bolivia – CFC	39,433
4. Botswana – MB	39,087
5. Sierra Leone - CFC	37,267
6. Suriname - CFC	36,667
7. Albania – CFC	32,200
8. Guinea-Bissau - CFC	30,000
9. Qatar – CFC	29,662



<b>Country</b>	<b>Current annual IS funding</b>
10. Swaziland - MB	29,172
11. Paraguay - MB	28,730
12. Honduras – MB	28,600
13. Uganda – CFC and MB	27,957
14. Nepal – CFC	26,867
15. Namibia – CFC	26,765
16. Papua New Guinea – CFC	19,847
17. Maldives – CFC	17,875
18. Saint Vincent and Grenadines – CFC	13,130
19. Dominica - CFC*	13,000
20. Saint Kitts and Nevis – CFC* and MB*	13,000

\* according to 2003 data submitted to the Fund Secretariat, the country is likely to be in compliance

### *Data reporting*

34. Of the 68 countries, a total of 34 have not yet reported to the Fund Secretariat on progress with implementation of their country programmes together with data for the year 2003. The current annual IS funding levels of the countries that have not reported range from US \$42,607 to US \$12,087 as indicated in Table 2 below.

Table 2

<b>Country</b>	<b>IS annual level</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>IS annual level</b>
1. Liberia	42,607	18. Trinidad and Tobago	28,600
2. Mozambique	40,040	19. Fiji	28,552
3. Bolivia	39,433	20. Uganda	27,957
4. Botswana	39,087	21. Nepal	26,867
5. Sierra Leone	37,267	22. Ethiopia	26,217
6. Burkina Faso	36,183	23. Chad	26,000
7. Oman	34,233	24. Bahamas	21,667
8. Myanmar	32,933	25. Mauritius	21,667
9. Zambia	32,760	26. Papua New Guinea	19,847
10. Niger	32,413	27. Central African Republic	19,760
11. Albania	32,200	28. Gambia	18,287
12. Mali	30,333	29. Maldives	17,875
13. Djibouti	30,000	30. Seychelles	13,823
14. Qatar	29,662	31. Grenada	13,000
15. Swaziland	29,172	32. Lesotho	13,000
16. Rwanda	28,867	33. Western Samoa	13,000
17. Paraguay	28,730	34. Comoros	12,047

*2005 CFC control measure*

35. The Secretariat also analysed the situation of the 71 countries in regard to compliance with the 2005 CFC control measure under the Protocol. Twenty-four countries have CFC consumption for 2002 already below the 2005 limit. Conversely, 12 countries have 2002 CFC consumption similar to or greater than their CFC baselines. In each case, there is no direct relationship between the level of IS funding and the situation of the countries concerned. It was also found that on the basis of the inventory of approved projects, the total level of funding for phase-out activities approved for each country cannot be correlated with the situation of the countries in regard to CFC compliance.

36. The above analysis of the circumstances of countries indicates no clear correlation between the level of funding of IS projects and compliance.

Financial implications for the Multilateral Fund

37. Without prejudging the Executive Committee's view on supplementing IS funding for some VLVC countries, the implications for the Fund of increasing the level of IS funding can be estimated by considering a series of alternative thresholds which would represent the minimum level of IS funding for any LVC country regardless of its circumstances. That is, all countries with levels of annual IS funding below the relevant threshold would receive additional funding to bring the annual total up to the level of the threshold. Table 4 below indicates the total funding implications of four different minimum threshold funding levels for IS projects in LVC countries. In the four cases illustrated, the minimum ranges from US \$20,000 to US \$50,000.

Table 4

Minimum annual IS funding US \$	Required annual supplementary funding US \$	Number of countries that would receive supplementary funding
20,000	73,108	17
30,000	321,032	43
40,000	855,472	62
50,000	1,503,422	68

Conclusions

38. While higher volume consuming countries have large national ozone offices, there has been an implicit assumption that for VLVC countries the Fund might assist with the provision of funding for one national ozone officer. This assumption has not as yet been discussed with stakeholders. The analysis carried out by the Secretariat of IS project proposals and all other relevant information currently available did not provide any estimate of the range of salary costs of a national ozone officer, with and without additional funding from national governments. To determine such salary costs, further work will be required, possible involving a survey of relevant countries.

39. Noting the financial implications indicated above, the Executive Committee could consider now supplementing the lower ranges of IS annual funding levels and whether to establish a minimum funding threshold. Alternatively the Committee could request further information on the outstanding issues. In particular, if the needs of countries and the role of IS support to meet those needs was to be examined in detail as a basis for considering further supplementing IS funding for VLVC countries, the Committee might wish to consider the requirement for a further evaluation of the effectiveness of IS support. This could be considered in the context of the review of IS funding levels due to be considered in 2005 in accordance with Decision 35/57, and the review of the requirement for further assistance for countries post-2007 also foreshadowed in 2005 under Decision 31/48.

#### Co-ordination

40. Consistent with Decision 42/22, the draft paper was provided to five bilateral partners and the four implementing agencies. Prior to completion of this document, responses had been received from the Government of Germany, the Government of Japan and from UNDP.

41. The Government of Germany indicated its view that:

- it favoured considering the establishment of a minimum funding threshold
- the current policy should, with the exception of VLVC countries, be continued with no further adjustments necessary at this time
- collecting further information on the range of salary costs of NOUs is unnecessary
- the efficiency of IS support is a personnel related issue and is not related to the level of funding: a further study of this phenomenon will not yield any correlations and should not be undertaken

42. The Government of Japan provided the following comments:

“We understand that the study by the Secretariat pursuant to Decision 42/22(b) should provide the Executive Committee with the financial implications of the possible increase in the resources for Institutional Strengthening taking into account various factors affecting compliance with control measures under the Montreal Protocol such as the capacity of the national ozone units, data collecting capacity and any other problems faced by them. Although the study indicated a range of the financial requirements along with alternative levels of minimum IS funding, the basis for these alternatives still remain unclear. We understand that most of the increase in the IS funding was in the personnel cost (See Para.32 of the draft ExCom/43/49). But we have no evidence that this increase in resources has effectively enhanced the compliance capacity of the LVCs.

“We should remind ourselves that the origin of the request by the Executive Committee for this study is to obtain information which will indicate how we can strengthen IS in order to enhance compliance capacity of Article 5 countries. In the course of the study, we may need to identify specific types of problems faced by these countries in achieving compliance before we determine a realistic range of financial requirements.

“Such factors may relate to: the lack of availability of accurate data in production and consumption which bring the countries into data non-compliance; state of effective use of IS resources including the use and turn-over of ozone unit staff; effectiveness of coordination by the NOU regarding national consultation among stakeholders, and: increased workload of the NOU in undertaking national phase-out plans and increasing public awareness as well as institutional building for ensuring strategic compliance with the Protocol. Some of these factors were mentioned in the draft (paragraphs 15 (a)to(c)).

“We should further identify and investigate such factors through a survey of relevant countries as the Secretariat suggests in paragraph 38 on the understanding that such a survey should not be limited to the salary costs of a national ozone officer, any other "outstanding issues" as mentioned in paragraph 39 of the draft.”

43. UNDP suggested that it would be unrealistic to conduct a survey to assess the IS project needs of each country on the basis of national circumstances and that standardised minimum IS funding categories might be assessed using baseline consumption levels. UNDP also indicated its agreement with the views of the Government of Germany concerning personnel related issues. A number of UNDP’s detailed comments were incorporated into this document as appropriate.

## Annex I

List of LVC countries with IS projects with an annual funding level below US \$50,000

Country	Meeting	Annual IS funding US \$	Total IS funding US \$	Baselines					
				Total	CFC	CTC	Halon	MB	TCA
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Comoros	23	12,047	271,426	2.5	2.5	-	-	-	-
Dominica	26	13,000	102,000	1.5	1.5	-	-	-	-
Saint Kitts and Nevis	21	13,000	219,800	4.0	3.7	-	-	0.3	-
Western Samoa	22	13,000	212,586	4.5	4.5	-	-	-	-
Lesotho	20	13,000	278,391	5.4	5.1	-	0.2	0.1	-
Grenada	30	13,000	192,100	6.0	6.0	-	-	-	-
St. Vincent/Grenadines	25	13,130	148,430	1.8	1.8	-	-	-	-
Seychelles	13	13,823	198,921	2.8	2.8	-	-	-	-
Antigua and Barbuda	26	15,600	260,631	11.0	10.7	-	0.3	-	-
Saint Lucia	21	15,851	364,030	8.3	8.3	-	-	-	-
Mauritania	14	16,845	651,511	15.7	15.7	-	-	-	-
Maldives	12	17,875	324,654	4.6	4.6	-	-	-	-
Gambia	19	18,287	466,956	23.8	23.8	-	-	-	-
Jamaica	29	19,067	1,770,218	103.3	93.2	2.8	1.0	4.9	1.4
Gabon	22	19,760	627,666	10.3	10.3	-	-	-	-
Central African Republic	18	19,760	477,591	11.3	11.3	-	-	-	-
Papua New Guinea	19	19,847	665,493	36.6	36.3	-	-	0.3	-
Mauritius	10	21,667	1,015,767	29.3	29.1	-	-	0.1	0.1
Guinea	18	21,667	453,779	51.0	42.4	-	8.6	-	-
Benin	18	21,667	767,829	63.8	59.9	-	3.9	-	-
Bahamas	19	21,667	626,065	65.0	64.9	-	-	0.1	-
Nicaragua	39	22,000	663,003	83.2	82.8	-	-	0.4	-
Chad	25	26,000	654,488	34.6	34.6	-	-	-	-
Ethiopia	20	26,217	358,641	51.0	33.8	-	1.1	15.6	0.5
Namibia	18	26,765	594,562	31.0	21.9	-	8.3	0.8	-
Nepal	26	26,867	388,604	29.9	27.0	0.9	2.0	-	-
Congo	17	27,265	620,199	18.4	11.9	0.6	5.0	0.9	-
Uganda	13	27,957	491,191	19.5	12.8	0.4	-	6.3	-
Guyana	23	28,167	849,619	54.8	53.2	-	0.2	1.4	-
Fiji	12	28,552	429,410	34.1	33.4	-	-	0.7	-
Mongolia	28	28,600	449,970	10.6	10.6	-	-	-	-
Lao, PDR	34	28,600	585,435	43.3	43.3	-	-	-	-
Burundi	26	28,600	721,786	59.1	59.0	-	-	-	0.1
Trinidad and Tobago	20	28,600	1,040,927	169.0	120.0	-	46.6	1.7	0.7
Bahrain	20	28,600	994,664	197.7	135.4	0.7	38.9	-	22.7
Tanzania	20	28,600	1,695,711	254.3	253.9	0.1	0.3	-	-
Honduras	20	28,600	2,639,556	591.0	331.6	-	-	259.4	-
Paraguay	21	28,730	1,482,831	212.1	210.6	0.6	-	0.9	-
Rwanda	36	28,867	395,358	30.4	30.4	-	-	-	-

## Annex I

Country	Meeting	Annual IS funding US \$	Total IS funding US \$	Baselines					
				Total	CFC	CTC	Halon	MB	TCA
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
El Salvador	22	28,990	1,385,347	308.7	306.6	-	0.7	1.4	-
Swaziland	15	29,172	387,007	25.2	24.6	-	-	0.6	-
Qatar	27	29,662	662,949	112.1	101.4	-	10.7	-	-
Djibouti	37	30,000	433,763	21.0	21.0	-	-	-	-
Georgia	23	30,333	846,972	36.2	22.5	-	-	13.7	-
Togo	23	30,333	618,167	39.8	39.8	-	-	-	-
Madagascar	29	30,333	264,900	50.5	47.9	-	-	2.6	-
Mali	24	30,333	614,760	108.1	108.1	-	-	-	-
Albania	38	32,200	495,793	43.9	40.8	3.1	-	-	-
Niger	15	32,413	630,847	32.0	32.0	-	-	-	-
Zambia	9	32,760	580,175	57.5	27.4	0.7	-	29.3	0.1
Myanmar	29	32,933	176,000	57.7	54.3	-	-	3.4	-
Malawi	12	33,367	2,844,150	170.4	57.7	-	-	112.7	-
Oman	32	34,233	719,021	263.2	248.4	0.1	13.7	1.0	-
Moldova	25	34,667	620,730	80.7	73.3	-	0.4	7.0	-
Brunei Darussalam	26	34,667	175,000	78.2	78.2	-	-	-	-
Burkina Faso	11	36,183	791,577	41.6	36.3	-	5.3	-	-
Suriname	41	36,667	319,000	41.3	41.3	-	-	-	-
Sierra Leone	36	37,267	590,163	99.8	78.6	2.6	16.0	2.6	-
Belize	29	38,350	401,825	24.4	24.4	-	-	-	-
Botswana	13	39,087	474,181	12.1	6.8	-	5.2	0.1	-
Bolivia	18	39,433	1,757,025	76.6	75.7	0.3	-	0.6	-
Mozambique	15	40,040	703,904	22.5	18.2	-	0.9	3.4	-
Liberia	41	42,607	614,383	75.8	56.1	0.2	19.5	-	-
Cambodia	36	43,333	1,102,500	94.7	94.2	-	-	-	0.5
Croatia	20	43,853	2,134,045	269.0	219.3	3.9	30.1	15.7	-
Kyrgyzstan	37	44,550	995,377	87.0	72.8	-	-	14.2	-
Bosnia and Herzegovina	27	47,667	2,257,166	33.3	24.2	-	4.1	3.5	1.5
Haiti	38	50,000	481,956	170.7	169.0	-	1.5	-	0.2
Yemen	25	52,000	3,342,487	353.8	349.1	-	2.8	1.1	0.8
Cote D'Ivoire	13	53,218	2,137,620	302.3	294.2	-	-	8.1	-
Barbados	15	58,933	541,137	21.6	21.5	-	-	0.1	-

- (1) Article 5 country.  
(2) Meeting at which the first IS project was approved by the Executive Committee.  
(3) Annual level of funds approved for IS, including the increased provided under Decision 35/57.  
(4) Total level of funding so far approved by the Executive Committee.  
(5) Sum of all ODS baselines for compliance.  
(6-10) Baselines for compliance.

----