



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51  
17 April 2015



ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF  
THE MULTILATERAL FUND FOR THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL  
Seventy-fourth Meeting  
Montreal, 18-22 May 2015

**REVIEW OF FUNDING OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS  
(DECISION 61/43(b))**

**Introduction**

1. At its 61<sup>st</sup> meeting (July 2010), the Executive Committee decided to maintain funding for institutional strengthening (IS) support at current levels, and to renew IS projects for the full two-year period from the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting, taking into account decisions 59/17 and 59/47(b) that allowed Article 5 Parties to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs), and to review continued IS funding at those levels at the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2015 (decision 61/43(b)).

2. Pursuant to decision 61/43(b), the Secretariat has prepared this document. The present document briefly reviews the history of IS funding, its linkage with other forms of institutional support and capacity building provided through project management units (PMUs) in multi-year phase-out plans (currently HCFC phase-out management plans in the consumption (HPMP) and production (HPPMP) sectors), and the UNEP Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP); assesses the relevance of IS support in contributing to the achievement of Article 5 countries' compliance with the Montreal Protocol's control measures; and, sets out the range of activities that national ozone units (NOUs) in Article 5 countries will have to undertake post 2015. During the preparation of this document a number of issues on IS not directly related to funding were identified, such as delays in submission, the quality of reports, and reporting format. A brief analysis of these issues and recommendations to address them, have been included in the document.

3. In preparing this document the Secretariat took into consideration Executive Committee's rules and policies for the funding of the IS as contained in Annex I to the present document; previous documents on IS listed in Annex II; discussions with implementing agencies regarding issues that were identified when reviewing requests for the renewal of IS projects submitted by Article 5 countries<sup>1</sup>; and

<sup>1</sup> These issues included, *inter alia*, the quality of the IS renewal requests, delays in submitting IS renewal requests, modalities of implementation and sustainability of IS activities, financial matters and reporting format.

bilateral consultations with individual agencies dealing with IS projects including several UNEP regional network coordinators. The financial status of IS projects by Article 5 country is contained in Annex III.

### **Overview and assessment of IS and funding**

4. At its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 1991) the Executive Committee recognized that providing support for IS to an Article 5 country might, in some cases, be an essential element in achieving the objectives of the Multilateral Fund and the Montreal Protocol<sup>2</sup>. At its 7<sup>th</sup> meeting (July 1992), the Executive Committee considered that the main objective of IS was to provide necessary resources to enable Article 5 countries to strengthen a mechanism within their countries to facilitate expeditious and effective implementation of ODS phase-out projects, ensuring liaison between the country concerned, the Executive Committee, the Fund Secretariat and the implementing agencies<sup>3</sup>. At the same meeting, funding for IS was approved for the first time<sup>4</sup> on the basis of a document on IS, which gave indicative ceilings and categories of funding, and elements of the financial support<sup>5</sup>.

5. At its 19<sup>th</sup> meeting (May 1996), the Executive Committee discussed funding levels for the renewal of IS projects and decided *inter alia*, that initial renewals would be at the same level of funding per year as the first approval for two years and would be conditional on a report on progress and an articulated plan of future action. Any subsequent renewal would also be for two years<sup>6</sup>.

6. In order to assist Article 5 countries in implementing the Multilateral Fund strategic framework, at its 35<sup>th</sup> meeting (December 2001) the Executive Committee agreed to increase IS funding by 30 per cent for all countries (decision 35/57). Subsequently, at the 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting (July 2004), the Executive Committee agreed to a minimum annual funding level for IS projects of US \$30,000 for low- and very-low-volume-consuming (LVCs, VLVCs) countries, provided that the country concerned had legislation in place and had appointed a full time national ozone officer (NOO) (decision 43/37).

7. At its 61<sup>st</sup> meeting (July 2010), the Executive Committee decided to maintain funding for IS support at current levels, and to renew IS projects for the full two-year period from the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting, taking into account decisions 59/17 and 59/47(b) that allowed Article 5 Parties to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HCFC phase-out management plans (HPMPs), and to review continued IS funding at those levels at the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2015 (decision 61/43(b)).

### **Institutional support through PMU and CAP**

8. The Executive Committee has also approved funding for the establishment and maintenance of PMUs<sup>7</sup> under national or sector phase-out plans. The responsibilities of PMUs include liaison with stakeholders, assistance in the development of legislation and regulations, project implementation, management and monitoring, reporting activities, and in some cases awareness-raising and information dissemination. In terms of the linkage between IS support to the NOU and the PMU with project

---

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 28(d) of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/5/16

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 74 of UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/30

<sup>4</sup> IS projects were approved for Chile, Jordan and Mexico.

<sup>5</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20. The document presented the following funding categories: Category 1: Large consuming countries (above 10,000 ODP tonnes - Up to US \$400,000); Category 2: Medium consuming countries (5,000-10,000 ODP tonnes - Up to US \$300,000); Category 3: Small consuming countries (less than 5,000 ODP tonnes - Up to US \$170,000). The elements for IS funding were office equipment, personnel and operational costs.

<sup>6</sup> Guidelines for renewal of institutional strengthening proposals in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52 and Corr.1 (decision 19/29).

<sup>7</sup> Annex V of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/46 includes a description of the roles and responsibilities of the project management unit.

management functions, three models have been observed<sup>8</sup>: a PMU is not established, particularly in some LVC countries; the NOU and PMU are constituted by the same team, with some staff paid by the phase-out plan; and PMUs are charged with implementing the phase-out plan under the supervision of or sometimes parallel to the NOU, particularly in countries with significant ODS consumption.

9. Approximately up to 5 to 10 per cent (for non-LVC countries) and up to 20 per cent (for LVC countries) of the total funding requested for an HPMP may be allocated to the establishment of the PMU, and must be justified in the project proposal as per the guidelines for national phase-out plans<sup>9</sup>. PMU funding could be considered as an addition to the overall level of institutional support. However, unlike IS funding, the funding allocation for the PMU is not fixed as the country has the flexibility to re-allocate PMU funds to substantive activities if required

10. In the context of supporting the country driven approach for the phase-out of ODS, the Executive Committee has provided support for capacity building at the regional and global levels. UNEP was provided with US \$200,000 per year to support public awareness, and from 2002 onwards countries have received direct support on policy and substantive issues through the formalization of its capacity development role as the CAP. The location of CAP staff in the regions aids delivery of advice to countries and as a result CAP has facilitated information exchange and cooperation among NOUs through regional network meetings, workshops, and South-South cooperation activities. The support provided by CAP to assist countries to develop ODS legislation, establish licensing and quota systems, and prevent illegal trade are viewed as some of the most effective contributions of the CAP<sup>10</sup>.

#### Relevance of IS support

11. Since the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee has approved US \$108,701,521 plus support costs of US \$6,731,511 for IS projects, which represents less than 4 per cent of the total funds approved under the Multilateral Fund of US \$3.17 billion<sup>11</sup>. The relevance of this funding for IS support as a major contribution to the achievement of Article 5 countries' compliance with the Montreal Protocol's control measures, can be summarized as follows:

- (a) Assisting relevant authorities in the ratification of the amendments to the Montreal Protocol. As of 4 December 2014 all the amendments to the Montreal Protocol have been universally ratified;
- (b) Assisting relevant authorities to put in place and enforce legislation and regulations for control and monitoring of ODS consumption (and production where applicable): In line with decision 63/17<sup>12</sup>, operational licensing and quota systems for HCFC imports and, where applicable, production and exports are in place and are capable of ensuring the

<sup>8</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8.

<sup>9</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/38/57/Rev.1.

<sup>10</sup> Section 3.7 on effectiveness of capacity-building provided, including IS and compliance assistance contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/4.

<sup>11</sup> At the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting the estimated funding requirement for a 3-year period for IS amounted to \$8.84 million, which was 4.42 per cent of the current size of the Fund, i.e., US \$200 million (paragraph 7, UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20). At the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting, the total amount of IS funding approved to date represented less than 4 per cent of the total funds approved under the Fund of US \$2.5 billion (paragraph 5, document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49).

<sup>12</sup> The Executive Committee decided to add the following paragraph both to the template for draft agreements approved in decision 61/46 and to the draft agreements submitted to the Committee for consideration at its 63<sup>rd</sup> meeting: "That, for all submissions from the 68<sup>th</sup> meeting onwards, confirmation has been received from the Government that an enforceable national system of licensing and quotas for HCFC imports and, where applicable, production and exports is in place and that the system is capable of ensuring the country's compliance with the Montreal Protocol HCFC phase-out schedule for the duration of this agreement."

countries' compliance with the Montreal Protocol targets in all but a few<sup>13</sup> Article 5 countries;

- (c) Coordinating the collection, analysis and submission of data on ODS consumption and production under Article 7 of the Montreal Protocol and progress reports on the implementation of country programmes. At the time of issuance of this document only one Article 5 country (Central African Republic) has not complied with the requirement to submit Article 7 data. Although some issues still remain regarding the submission of country programme reports (see paragraphs 19 and 20), the number of countries submitting their reports on time has increased year by year;
- (d) Coordinating key stakeholders, namely Government institutions (including customs authorities); ODS importers/exporters and traders; industry and industry/trade associations; training centres; and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and linking government authorities with the Executive Committee, the Fund Secretariat, and bilateral and implementing agencies;
- (e) Planning, organizing, directing and coordinating all activities required for the implementation of national phase-out plans. All Article 5 countries achieved the phase-out of CFC, halons and CTC by 1 January 2010; and all but seven countries have achieved the freeze in their consumption and production of HCFC by 1 January 2013;
- (f) Integrating ozone protection issues into national plans. All Article 5 countries requesting IS funding have provided details on the role and position of the NOU within the national administration and its reporting lines, and how the ozone protection programmes are anchored within the country's government structure;
- (g) Awareness-raising for stakeholders. All Article 5 countries have developed and implemented numerous events, radio and television emissions, and information products which target specific key stakeholders or the general public. Almost all countries celebrate the international ozone day and use the occasion to engage high level government officials and reach out to the general public.

12. The relevance of IS support has also been recognized both within and outside the Montreal Protocol:

- (a) The final report on the evaluation of IS projects<sup>14</sup> submitted to the 56<sup>th</sup> meeting (October 2008), concluded that there was sufficient evidence to indicate that achievement of the ODS phase-out as scheduled could not have been attained without the IS projects;
- (b) The Final report on the 2012 Evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol<sup>15</sup>, stated that "capacity building has played an important role in helping Article 5 countries to achieve and maintain compliance..."; and that "many stakeholders regard IS

---

<sup>13</sup> South Sudan does not have a licensing system, and that for Libya is not yet operational. Dominica and Mauritania have not included the accelerated HCFC control measures in their licensing and quota system (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/11).

<sup>14</sup> In decision 53/39, the Executive Committee requested an evaluation of past results and achievements of the IS programme as part of the 2008 monitoring and evaluation work programme. The evaluation was to be followed by a review of possible funding arrangements and levels for capacity building beyond 2010 to be presented to the 57<sup>th</sup> meeting. In response to decision 53/39, the Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Officer prepared document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8.

<sup>15</sup> Section 3.7 on effectiveness of capacity-building provided, including IS and compliance assistance contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/4.

activities as the most cost-effective of the non-investment project types and a fundamental component contributing to the overall success of the Montreal Protocol”. One of the lessons listed in the report in view of future challenges to the Montreal Protocol and the Multilateral Fund was that “Some of the key features of how the MLF operates have been instrumental to its success, including ... continued support for institutional strengthening and capacity building efforts ...”;

- (c) The 2008 report of the United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on environmental governance in the United Nations system<sup>16</sup> referred to the capacity building provided by the Multilateral Fund as “an exceptional but tangible example of a model of a financial mechanism to fully meet incremental costs for normative activities as distinct from developmental funding while successfully mainstreaming environmental activities in the broader framework for sustainable development in the field”. It pointed out that “the current framework of international environmental governance is undermined by the absence of a holistic approach to environmental issues and lack of clear operational linkages between development assistance on the one hand, and compliance and capacity-building assistance for environmental protection in developing countries, on the other”;
- (d) The 2014 report of the JIU<sup>17</sup>, regarding the Post-Rio+20 review of environmental governance within the United Nations system, noted that “the current framework of international environmental governance is undermined by the absence of a holistic approach to environmental issues and lack of clear operational linkages between development assistance on the one hand, and compliance and capacity-building assistance for environmental protection in developing countries, on the other”... and that “in the field of operationalization of their objectives, [MEAs operating within the United Nations] have few dedicated resources for capacity-building; the exception is the Montreal Protocol, which is assisted by the Multilateral Fund for its implementation”; and
- (e) The research paper on the global response to HFCs<sup>18</sup>, prepared by Chatham House<sup>19</sup> stated that “critical to the Montreal Protocol’s success was the Multilateral Fund’s early decision to support ‘institutional strengthening’ in Article 5 parties, allowing the establishment and maintenance of national ozone units (NOUs) and associated regional networks. This has helped to provide a continuous effort and momentum in phasing out ODS, including acting as the bridge to the thousands of companies that must make investments in new technology, sharing information on suppliers and on the important details of training, infrastructure development and public awareness.”

13. Though not a specific objective of IS projects, it is also of note that IS funding has allowed countries to strengthen their role as full partners in the Montreal Protocol, as evidenced by the former NOOs now in the ranks of Executive Committee members, government representatives at meetings of the Parties to the Protocol, and regional network coordinators.

---

<sup>16</sup> JIU/REP/2008/3.

<sup>17</sup> JIU/REP/2014/4

<sup>18</sup> A Global Response to HFCs through Fair and Effective Ozone and Climate Policies. July 2014. Available at [http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field\\_document/201407HFC.pdf](http://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field_document/201407HFC.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> Chatham House, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is an independent policy institute based in London (<http://www.chathamhouse.org/about#sthash.rEkDHSnL.dpuf>).

## Funding of IS beyond 2015

14. The need for IS funding has been expressed in reports of the Montreal Protocol including *inter alia* the 2012 evaluation of the financial mechanism of the Montreal Protocol<sup>20</sup>, and the 2008 evaluation of IS where it was found that the adequacy of funding levels ranged from more than enough in some situations; to others where NOUs believe current levels are less than sufficient. The document on IS presented at the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting<sup>21</sup>, concluded that it was necessary to maintain funding for IS projects in consideration of the 2013 and 2015 HCFC control measures and the responsibilities of the NOU to coordinate the associated HCFC phase-out.

15. At 61<sup>st</sup> meeting, only the HPMPs from the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Maldives were already approved. Since then 138 additional HPMPs had been approved and relevant HCFC phase-out policy decisions<sup>22</sup> associated with their implementation have been adopted. Based on the experience gained so far with the implementation of the 140 approved HPMPs, the concerted effort by all Article 5 countries to continue the orderly move from HCFC-based technologies to climate friendly energy-efficient alternatives, and achieve at least the 35 per cent reduction in HCFCs by 1 January 2020 is better understood. In this regard, Article 5 countries will have to:

- (a) Complete the preparation and submission of stage I of the HPMP for five Article 5 countries<sup>23</sup>, which includes a national survey of HCFC consumption, the overarching strategy to phase-out HCFC consumption according to the schedule of the Montreal Protocol, and the plan of action and phase-out activities to meet at least the 35 per cent reduction in HCFC consumption by 2020;
- (b) Complete stage I of the HPMPs from 86 LVC countries and 54 non-LVC countries and stage II for one non-LVC countries, and commencing the preparation of stage II of the HPMPs<sup>24</sup> for 101 countries;
- (c) Coordinate with all ODS-based manufacturing enterprises, and industry associations and trades (including refrigeration associations) to contribute to the HCFC phase-out;
- (d) Work closely with customs departments on issues including the application any revision of the harmonized system nomenclature for HCFCs and other non-ODS substances phase-in<sup>25</sup>, to ensure their correct classification, especially for refrigerant blends;
- (e) Develop regulations and codes of practice, and the adoption of standards for the safe introduction of flammable and toxic refrigerants including refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment charged with those substances;

---

<sup>20</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro.24/INF/4.

<sup>21</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49.

<sup>22</sup> Criteria for funding HCFC phase-out in the consumption sector adopted by decision 60/44 (decision 70/21); Guidelines for the preparation of stage II of HPMPs (decision 71/42); Retrofit of existing HCFC-based refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment to flammable or toxic refrigerants (decisions 72/17 and 73/34); Priorities regarding the preparation of stage II of HPMPs (decision 72/18); and, Minimizing adverse climate impact of HCFC phase-out in the refrigeration servicing sector (decision 72/41).

<sup>23</sup> The countries that do not have an approved stage I of the HPMP are: Botswana, Libya, Mauritania and South Sudan, and Syrian Arab Republic.

<sup>24</sup> As at the 73<sup>rd</sup> meeting, funding for preparation of stage II of an HPMP has been approved for 31 Article 5 countries. An additional request for three countries has been submitted to the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting.

<sup>25</sup> In the context of the discussion of the 2012 Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) progress report on information on alternatives to ozone-depleting substances, in response to decisions XXIII/9, XXIV/7 and XXV/5, the Parties *inter alia* requested the Executive Committee to consider providing additional funding to conduct inventories or surveys on alternatives to ODS in interested Article 5 parties" (paragraph 4 of decision XXVI/9).

- (f) Further develop and implement policies to support the selection of alternative technologies taking into consideration enterprises and national requirements and potential impacts to the environment including climate, noting that there are still a limited number of alternative technologies available for some applications<sup>26</sup>;
- (g) Further develop and implement specific regulations to support reductions in levels of HCFC consumption, including bans on HCFC-141b in bulk or contained in imported pre-blended polyols; bans on import of HCFC-based refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment and favouring the introduction of energy-efficient and climate-friendly equipment; mandatory certification programmes for refrigeration technicians, particularly as related to the use of flammable and/or toxic refrigerants;
- (h) Develop comprehensive training and certification programmes for refrigeration service technicians to address the safe handling of different types of refrigerants including flammable and toxic refrigerants<sup>27</sup>, and promote containment, recovery and recycling and reuse of recovered refrigerants rather than retrofitting HCFC-based equipment;
- (i) Prepare and implement activities for achieving the 2020 control measure taking into considering the need to minimize adverse climate impact of HCFC phase-out through the phase-in of environmental friendly technologies in the manufacturing sector (where applicable) and the servicing sector (in all Article 5 countries); and
- (j) Awareness-raising and dissemination of information products on HCFC phase-out and climate friendly HCFC alternatives to stakeholders and decision-makers.

16. Accordingly, sufficient funding support for IS projects should continue to be provided for implementing the above-mentioned activities so that Article 5 countries are able to achieve 35 per cent reduction in HCFCs required by 1 January 2020 and the 67.5 per cent reduction by 1 January 2025.

### **Overview of issues examined during the review of IS project proposals**

17. During the preparation of this document and the review of requests for the renewal of IS projects submitted by relevant implementing agencies on behalf of Article 5 countries, the Secretariat identified the following issues for consideration by the Executive Committee.

#### Submission of country programme data

18. The NOU plays a key role in coordinating of ODS phase-out activities in a country and is the focal point for the collecting and reviewing country programme (CP) data for submission to the Fund Secretariat by 1 May each year. CP data reports enable the Secretariat to track the status and progress made in phasing out ODS in order to confirm the extent to which compliance has been observed or where potential non-compliance has occurred well in advanced of the submission of Article 7 data reports, and to facilitate the review of project proposals submitted by Article 5 countries.

---

<sup>26</sup> Tranche requests submitted by the Governments of Dominican Republic (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/27) and El Salvador (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/29) reported on the use of HFC-245fa as an interim foam blowing agent as methyl formate foam formulations are not yet available.

<sup>27</sup> In case where an Article 5 country decides to proceed with retrofits and associated servicing to flammable and toxic refrigerants in refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment originally designed for non-flammable substances, the country concerned would do so assuming all associated responsibilities and risks and only in accordance with the relevant standards and protocols (decisions 72/17 and 73/34).

19. The CP data provided to the Executive Committee at the 74<sup>th</sup> meeting in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/11 on country programme data and prospects for compliance<sup>28</sup> is based on the CP data for 2013 and not for 2014, since the submission date for the 2014 CP reports is 1 May 2015. Thus the analysis in the document is of limited relevance to either the Executive Committee or the Implementation Committee Under the Non-Compliance Procedure of the Montreal Protocol. In view of this issue, document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/11 includes a recommendation requesting Article 5 countries to submit CP data reports no later than eight weeks prior to the first Executive Committee meeting of the year.

20. In view of the importance of prompt submission of CP data and the fact that less than 30 per cent of Article 5 countries are reporting CP data by the due date, the Secretariat recommends that the exact date of CP data submission is recorded in the IS report format so that performance against the submission deadline indicator is clear. In the case of poor performance against this indicator appropriate action could be taken, such as a remark in the “Views of the Executive Committee on the IS project”, which are transmitted to Article 5 countries through the Secretariat’s letters to governments following Executive Committee meetings.

#### Quality of IS terminal reports and renewal requests

21. The current format for IS reporting and renewal requests has been in use since the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting. In reviewing IS requests, the Secretariat noted that several of the IS reports do not contain sufficient information to allow a thorough review of the project. Some countries appeared to regard the IS reporting format, in particular the section on objectives and activities, as set in stone while others recognized it as a flexible format that could be used to provide the detail necessary.

22. To address this issue the Secretariat has amended the reporting format that builds on the simplified format approved at the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting is proposed, by including additional data elements. This format, as contained in Annex IV to the present report, could be used to reporting on the IS components of HPMPs at the time of a tranche request.

#### Failure to submit IS renewal requests

23. While countries can request funding for an extension of IS project every two years, currently 22 countries have not submitted a request for the renewal of their IS project despite being eligible for a renewal (see Annex V)<sup>29</sup>. According to information provided in the implementing agencies’ progress reports, implementation of the previous phase of IS projects may be delayed by administrative delays such as the signing of agreements, low disbursement, difficult circumstances prevailing in at the country level, or change of Government authorities including the NOO. In some cases the country has an active NOU and effective project implementation despite the delay which may suggest that the NOU is adequately funded from either IS funding or other sources.

24. To address the non-submission of IS renewal requests, the Executive Committee may wish to consider sending a letter to the Government concerned encouraging the country to work with the relevant implementing agency to address any issues and submit the IS renewal request.

#### IS funding as a component of an HPMP

---

<sup>28</sup> The Executive Committee decided that a document entitled “Country programme data and prospects for compliance” would be submitted to the first and last meetings of the year (decision 73/70(c)(ii)).

<sup>29</sup> The 2008 evaluation of IS projects noted that a significant number of IS projects had missed opportunities to renew IS projects resulting in late approval of the following phase and an overall loss to Article 5 countries of approximately US \$21.7 million representing 33 percent of total approved IS funding at that time.



25. Decisions 59/17 and 59/47(b) allowed Article 5 countries to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HPMPs. In the case where IS funding is included in an HPMP, a fixed amount for the IS component is approved in principle together with the funding for the country's HPMP for the period of the HPMP agreement. The approval of the funding is subject to the performance-based targets under the multi-year agreement covering the HPMP including all the conditions required for future tranche funding, in line with decisions 59/17 and 62/15. If the submission of an HPMP tranche is delayed the country could experience difficulties in terms of its IS support, as was the case for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>30</sup>. Unlike countries with stand-alone IS projects, which can lose potential funding if they do not submit a renewal request every two years, a country with an IS component in its HPMP can receive its full complement of IS funding despite any delay provided it meets the performance obligations of the HPMP.

26. The information included in the progress reports presented with tranche requests for an integrated IS-HPMP differs from that in the IS renewal report format approved by decision 61/43 (e.g., the reports do not indicate clearly whether the amounts approved for IS activities are allocated according to the approved IS components, or whether the amount budgeted for IS activities in the tranche corresponds, or not, to the notional annual IS funding level).

27. The Secretariat considers there is a need to record accurately the amounts of funding approved for IS components and to ensure the collection of appropriate information on IS related activities. In order to address this issue, the Executive Committee may wish to request that Article 5 countries with the IS project integrated into the HPMP use the IS report format used by countries with stand-alone IS projects.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

28. With respect to review of institutional strengthening funding and issues examined by the Secretariat, the Executive Committee may wish to consider:

- (a) Noting the review of funding of institutional strengthening (IS) projects prepared in line with decision 61/43(b) contained in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/74/51;
- (b) The level of funding for IS support taking into account the activities that Article 5 countries would need to undertake to enable them to achieve 35 per cent reduction in HCFCs required by 1 January 2020 and the 67.5 per cent reduction by 1 January 2025;
- (c) Approving the amended format for IS renewals with the identified objectives and indicators attached as Annex IV to the present document, and requesting the bilateral and implementing agencies to use the amended format from the 75<sup>th</sup> meeting and onwards;
- (d) With respect to countries with IS components included in the HPMP:
  - (i) Requesting bilateral and implementing agencies to provide reports on IS activities in those countries using the amended format referred to in sub-paragraph (c) when submitting a tranche request for an HPMP;
  - (ii) Requesting the Secretariat to include in the relevant pre-session documents of project proposals for stage I and stage II of HPMPs, information including the amount of IS funding for the entire stage of the HPMP, an explanation of the

<sup>30</sup> Owing to the lengthy discussions leading up to the approval of the HPMP for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 60<sup>th</sup> meeting, by the time of approval of the HPMP, the funding remaining under the previously approved stand-alone IS funding had been depleted. At the 63<sup>rd</sup> meeting the Executive Committee provided, on an exceptional basis, advance funding for the purpose of IS which would be deducted from the funding for the second tranche of the HPMP (decision 63/64).

rationale for the distribution of the IS funding among the individual tranches, and a terminal report and action plan for the IS component;

- (e) With regard to expediting the submission of requests for stand-alone IS projects:
  - (i) Requesting bilateral and implementing agencies to submit a comprehensive progress report describing the status of implementation of the IS project, the reasons for the delays and actions taken, or to be taken, to address them, for those IS projects renewals not submitted within six months of the end of its existing current phase;
  - (ii) Sending a letter to the government of Article 5 countries that have not submitted an IS project renewal request despite being eligible for one, encouraging the country to work with the relevant implementing agency to address any issues and submit the IS renewal request as soon as possible.

## Annex I

### SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF RULES AND POLICIES FOR THE FUNDING OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING PROJECTS

1. At its 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 1991), the Executive Committee agreed that “Support for institutional strengthening (IS) within an Article 5 Party, though not explicitly contained in the guidelines on incremental costs adopted by the Parties, might, in exceptional cases, be an essential element in achieving the objectives of the Fund and the Montreal Protocol. As such, limited funding or assistance should be provided by the Fund for IS. The level of such funding should 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 specific implementation projects”<sup>1</sup>.

2. At its 7<sup>th</sup> meeting (June 1992), the Executive Committee considered the document on IS<sup>2</sup>, which included some indicative figures for institutional support, that would serve as guidelines for the implementing agencies, Article 5 and donor countries. The document set out three elements of institutional support for funding, namely office equipment, personnel cost and operational cost. During the discussion, some members felt that a case-by-case analysis of the IS needs in each country was required. Although maximum amounts could be set, each country should be able to decide on the way the funds would be allocated in the light of the specific circumstances prevailing in the country. They also felt that in some countries the amounts might need to be higher than those proposed in the document. Subsequently, the Executive Committee adopted *inter alia* the following recommendations<sup>3</sup> and approved the first funding for IS projects:

- (a) Article 5 countries who request it be considered for support for IS and that such considerations be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the peculiar circumstances influencing ODS phase-out in the country together with the funding level;
- (b) The main objective is to provide necessary resources to enable strengthen a mechanism within the country to facilitate expeditious implementation of projects for phase-out of the controlled substances, as well as ensuring liaison between the country on the one hand, and the Executive Committee, the Secretariat, and the implementing agencies on the other;
- (c) 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 Party. However, in order to avoid delays in providing support, the implementing agencies may review and implement such requests within their work programmes, except where the funding requested exceeds US \$500,000, and report to the Executive Committee as and when such requests are approved for implementation; and
- (d) Requests for IS should be included in the country programme of the Party requesting such assistance. However, the requests may be submitted as a free standing project ahead of the country programme where circumstances demand.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/5/5/Rev.2 and paragraph 28(d) of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/5/16

<sup>2</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20

<sup>3</sup> Paragraph 74 of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20

3. At its 19<sup>th</sup> meeting (May 1996), the Executive Committee adopted guidelines for renewal of institutional strengthening proposals<sup>4</sup> (decision 19/29). The guidelines indicated that for new IS projects approval would be for a period of three years, while initial renewals would be at the same level of funding per year as the first approval for two years and would be conditional on a report on progress and an articulated plan of future action. Any subsequent renewal would also be for two years.

4. At its 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee considered the final report of the 1999 evaluation of institutional strengthening projects<sup>5</sup> and draft follow-up action plan. In decision 30/7, the Executive Committee decided, *inter alia*:

- (b) To urge all Article 5 countries with IS projects to ensure that:
  - (i) The National Ozone Unit (NOU) 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;
  - (ii) The NOU's position, capacities, and continuity of officers, resources and lines of command within the authority in charge of ozone issues are such that the NOU can carry out its task satisfactorily;
  - (iii) A specified high-level officer or a post within the authority is given overall responsibility for supervising the work of the NOU and ensuring that action taken is adequate to meet commitments under the Protocol;
  - (iv) Necessary support structures, such as steering committees or advisory groups are established, involving other appropriate authorities, the private sector and non-governmental organizations;
  - (v) 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 NOU;
  - (vi) Annual work plans for the NOU are prepared and integrated in the authorities' internal planning processes;
  - (vii) A reliable system to collect and monitor data on ozone-depleting substances imports, exports and production is established; and
  - (viii) 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.
- (c) To request the Secretariat, in collaboration with interested Article 5 and non-Article 5 countries and the implementing agencies, to prepare general principles for agreements between governments and the implementing agencies on new and renewed IS projects which incorporate the elements under (b), while recognizing that the agreements should

---

<sup>4</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52 and Corr.1.

<sup>5</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/6 and Corr.1.

be appropriate and adaptable to the specific situation in different countries. These principles should emphasize that action to be undertaken should be stated in general terms only in the IS agreement;

- (d) To instruct the implementing agency in charge of the IS project to follow up the phase-out status and problems encountered by the NOU and discuss and propose possible solutions with them;
- (e) To instruct all implementing agencies to ensure that their project proposals are based on the current strategic planning of the Article 5 country government and ensure that the NOU is fully involved in the planning and preparation of projects, regularly provide National Ozone Units with information on the progress of project implementation and assist them in improving their capacity to monitor and evaluate projects implemented and their impact at the country level;
- (f) To request the implementing agencies to define a procedure to justify reallocation of funds among the budget lines of institutional strengthening projects and report to the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee; and
- (g) To request UNEP and UNIDO to review whether quarterly progress reporting can be extended to six-month intervals and to report thereon to the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee.

5. In response to decision 30/7, the Executive Committee considered at its 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting (December 2000) a document on general principles for agreements between governments and the implementing agencies on new and renewed IS projects<sup>6</sup>. The document incorporated the elements referred to in decision 30/7 in the relevant sections of the UNEP and UNIDO agreements. Based on this document, the Executive Committee *inter alia* requested UNEP and UNIDO to move some of the elements of paragraph (b) of decision 30/7 from section 3.3, "Assumptions" to section 6.4.1, "General terms and conditions" of the revised model agreement; and the World Bank to revise the proposed amendment letter in order to ensure consistency with decision 30/7 (decision 32/15).

6. Subsequently, at its 33<sup>rd</sup> meeting (March 2001), the Executive Committee noted the proposed amendments by implementing agencies to their agreements for IS projects, as contained in the document on general principles for agreements between governments and implementing agencies on new and renewed IS projects (follow-up to decision 32/15)<sup>7</sup>. Through decision 33/12, the Executive Committee noted with appreciation the proposals of UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank to comply with the requirements of decisions 30/7 and 32/15, and *inter alia* requested the implementing agencies to apply those new requirements in all future agreements in this area.

7. At the 35<sup>th</sup> meeting (December 2001), during the discussion on the study on defining a starting point for determining the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding by the Multilateral Fund (follow-up to decision 34/66 (a))<sup>8</sup>, the Government of the United States of America submitted a proposal for implementing the first phase of the strategic framework adopted by the Executive Committee at its 32<sup>nd</sup> meeting<sup>9</sup>. The proposal included a section on IS projects, proposing *inter alia* that those projects and

---

<sup>6</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/18.

<sup>7</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/16.

<sup>8</sup> Agenda item 7 a, based on document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/61.

<sup>9</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/CRP.1.

their renewals shall be approved at a level that is 30 per cent higher than the historically agreed level. This will assist countries to carry out the new strategic framework agreed, and provide increased support for critical areas such as public awareness. In addition to this direct increase in 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 new Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP). It also noted that countries undertaking national phase-out plans were 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.

8. Subsequently, in decision 35/57, the Executive Committee decided that all IS projects and renewals shall be approved at a level that is 30 percent higher than the historically agreed level. The Executive Committee also indicated in the same decision that the 30 percent increase in the level of IS funding "should prevail until 2005 when it should again be reviewed. This proposal would also include a clear commitment that this level of IS [funding] or a level close to it should prevail for all Article 5 Parties until at least 2010, even if they should phase out early". Because IS and other non-investment activities contribute to reductions in the use of ODS, decision 35/57 also assigned to these projects a phase-out value of US \$12.10/kg. Subsequently in decision 36/7 the Executive Committee agreed that this value would not be applied to IS activities funded in low-volume consuming (LVC) countries.

9. Decision 35/57 also noted that "in addition to this direct assistance in IS funding, UNEP will, as agreed in 2000, be provided with US \$200,000/year to support public awareness, and countries will receive enhanced direct support on policy and substantive issues through UNEP's new Compliance Assistance Programme. Finally it should be noted that countries undertaking national phase-out plans are likely to receive IS funding at an even higher level than anticipated above to facilitate national project implementation, as explicitly agreed in related phase-out agreements."

10. At its 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting (July 2004), the Executive Committee addressed the situation of very-low-volume-consuming countries<sup>10</sup> and decided to increase the minimum level of IS funding to US \$30,000 per year provided that the country concerned had duly assigned a full-time ozone officer to manage the ozone unit and that a national licensing system controlling ODS imports was in place (decision 43/37).

11. At the 44<sup>th</sup> meeting (November-December 2004), the Government of China submitted an informal paper on enhancing the NOU capacity building in Article 5 countries in the final stages of the compliance period<sup>11</sup>. The paper suggested, *inter alia*, that the Fund should increase input in non investment activities and capacity building of Article 5 countries in the final stage of compliance period, especially in striking the illegal trade, policy formulation and enforcement, substitution technology promotion, and information management; to include in the Committee's agenda NOUs capacity building (i.e., work of the NOU, management problems faced and ways to resolve them); and strengthening UNEP's networks, especially its South-South cooperation activities for improving NOUs capacity.

12. The Executive Committee decided (decision 44/64) that some representatives would work on the issue intersessionally and submit a revised paper to the 45<sup>th</sup> meeting. In response to decision 44/64, the Government of China submitted a supplementary paper expanding on the proposal for enhancing Article 5 countries' NOU capacity-building in the final stages of the Protocol compliance period<sup>12</sup>. With regard to institutional capacity, the paper suggested that the Committee should review upcoming compliance

---

<sup>10</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/43/49.

<sup>11</sup> Annex XX of document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/73.

<sup>12</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/47.

requirements, orientation and tasks and the adaptability of existing working procedures and operational mechanisms. Issues such as NOU capacity-building and status of work should be on the agenda of each meeting of the Executive Committee. Article 5 countries should be supported and facilitated as they further strengthen their policies and laws and regulations for compliance, so as to strengthen the capacity of their governments on compliance monitoring and management.

13. The Executive Committee, through decision 45/55, requested the Secretariat to expand on the paper from China and to present to the 47<sup>th</sup> meeting the preliminary results of an analysis of possible further action and policies required to assist compliance with the phase-out requirements for all the ODS covered by the Montreal Protocol, including the review of IS projects envisaged under decision 35/57.

14. At the 47<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 2005), the Executive Committee considered the document on the preliminary results of an analysis of possible further action and policies required to assist compliance with all ODS phase-out requirements, including the review of IS projects envisaged under decision 35/57<sup>13</sup>. The issues presented in the document fell into three categories, namely, the adequacy of current IS and capacity-building activities to support phase-out and compliance with the Protocol control measures up to and including 2010; the potential need for institutional support to Article 5 countries after 2010; and an initial assessment of the opportunities for more efficient and effective administration of IS project renewals. The paper provided some conclusions, including the suggestion that the institutional support measures already in place constituted an appropriate response to meeting the needs of Article 5 countries in regard to their compliance obligations under the Protocol up to and including 1 January 2010.

15. In its decision 47/49, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note that in the compliance period specific measures had been taken to provide additional, and guaranteed institutional support and to re-focus the work of the Executive Committee on facilitating compliance;
- (b) To agree that the measures already taken constituted an appropriate response to meeting the needs of Article 5 countries in regard to their compliance obligations under the Montreal Protocol up to and including 1 January 2010;
- (c) To note that the anticipated actions required by Article 5 countries to meet compliance obligations after 2010 provided an indication that funding support for IS might need to be continued after 2010;
- (d) That possible funding arrangements and levels for IS support beyond 2010 should be examined at the end of 2007;
- (e) To explore the extent, nature and eligibility of any additional measures that might be considered for funding by the Executive Committee to address surveys, institutional measures and/or other preparatory activities for HCFC phase-out in the light of the results of the China policy study and the surveys carried out by UNDP;
- (f) To acknowledge that IS support might need to be revised in accordance with the Executive Committee's guidelines when a country formally revised its baseline with the Parties to the Protocol; and

---

<sup>13</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/47/53.

- (g) To request the Secretariat, in consultation with the implementing agencies, to prepare for the 49<sup>th</sup> meeting a paper examining the relative merits of replacing the current requirements for submission of requests for renewal of an IS project with a simplified arrangement that would make use of the report on progress on implementation of country programmes, which is now provided annually by all Article 5 countries receiving support from the Multilateral Fund, together with an annual cycle of funding renewals, but with no change to the annual levels of funding provided.

16. At the 49<sup>th</sup> meeting (July 2006), the Executive Committee considered the merits of replacing the current requirements for submissions of requests for renewal of an IS project with a simplified arrangement<sup>14</sup>. The document concluded that some of the key features of the current arrangements, especially those associated with financial management and accountability, might need to be retained. If those features were to remain, the existing system would need to be maintained. The Secretariat, however, would continue to look closely at the renewal process for IS projects and might be in a position to propose some detailed improvements as part of the next review, which was due at the end of 2007. The document also proposed fine-tuning the existing arrangements for conveying the views of the Executive Committee to governments of countries whose IS projects had been renewed.

17. In its decision 49/32, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To maintain for the time being the current arrangements for submission and consideration of requests for renewal of IS projects;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to continue to examine opportunities to fine-tune the IS renewal process and to address any additional findings in the context of the review of IS funding post-2010, to be presented to the Executive Committee at the end of 2007 in accordance with decision 47/49; and
- (c) To request the Secretariat to draft remarks to be addressed to the governments of those countries for which there were issues that might require urgent attention in order to maintain progress with phase-out and/or compliance or, alternatively, commenting favourably on exceptional successes or specific phase-out achievements.

18. At the 53<sup>rd</sup> meeting (November 2007), the Executive Committee considered options for possible funding arrangements and levels for IS support beyond 2010, and on opportunities to fine-tune the IS renewal process<sup>15</sup>. It provided a brief review of the current funding arrangements for IS projects, explored opportunities for streamlining IS renewal requests and proposed possible future levels of funding to support IS projects. It concluded that support from the Multilateral Fund for IS projects should be maintained at levels similar to current ones because the remaining activities in NOUs needed to support phase-out objectives after 2010 would be similar to those required to meet CFC phase-out goals.

19. In its decision 53/39, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To note that the anticipated actions required by Article 5 countries to meet compliance obligations after 2010 provided an indication that funding support for IS would likely be needed after 2010 and that possible funding arrangements and levels for IS support beyond 2010 should be examined taking into account paragraph (b) below, especially in light of decision XIX/6 of the Nineteenth Meeting of the Parties, which imposed new

---

<sup>14</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/38.

<sup>15</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/61.



obligations with respect to an accelerated HCFC phase-out;

- (b) To request the Secretariat to review possible funding arrangements and levels for capacity building, to explore the extent, nature and eligibility of any additional measures that might be considered for funding by the Executive Committee to address activities for HCFC phase-out consistent with guidelines pertaining to IS activities to be agreed by the Executive Committee and to report to the Executive Committee by the first meeting of 2009.

20. The Executive Committee, at its 56<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 2008), considered the final report on the evaluation of IS projects<sup>16</sup>, explained that the evaluation was part of the 2008 monitoring and evaluation work programme approved by the Executive Committee at its 53<sup>rd</sup> meeting (decision 53/7). The desk study on the evaluation of IS projects that had been presented to the 54<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee<sup>17</sup> had identified important issues for more detailed investigation during the results of which were summarized in this report.

21. In decision 56/6, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To take note of the final report on the evaluation of IS projects as presented in document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8;
- (b) To request:
  - (i) The Fund Secretariat to take into account the findings of the evaluation in its review of the funding for IS pursuant to Executive Committee decision 53/39;
  - (ii) The implementing agencies to review procedures for fund disbursement and reporting and administrative requirements with a view to minimizing project implementation delays for IS projects while ensuring that accountability for IS funds disbursed was maintained;
  - (iii) The Fund Secretariat, implementing agencies and the bilateral agencies, in consultation with Article 5 countries, to agree on a set of objectives, expected results and indicators, which would be incorporated into future IS extension requests;
  - (iv) The implementing agencies to monitor implementation of IS projects and to submit any requests for renewal up to six months in advance of expiry of the existing project in line with Executive Committee decision 19/29;
  - (v) The Fund Secretariat to review the formats for terminal reports and extension requests for IS projects with the aim of rationalizing reporting and project review;
  - (vi) UNEP, through the Compliance Assistance Programme (CAP), to allocate time during network meetings to discuss IS reporting and the importance of requesting renewals on time; and

---

<sup>16</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8.

<sup>17</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/54/13.

- (vii) UNEP to develop a training module on policy and technical issues related to the reduction of HCFCs, with technical inputs from the other implementing agencies, for briefings of national ozone units during network meetings.

22. At its 57<sup>th</sup> meeting (March-April 2009), the Executive Committee considered a review of the current funding arrangements for IS<sup>18</sup>, and noted that IS was a policy issue that was intertwined with other policy matters, for example HCFC phase-out and funding, and referred the issue to the informal group set up to discuss HCFC policy issues. The Executive Committee was of the view that future IS funding would need to be considered as part of a package of funding that had to be agreed in the context of HCFC phase-out. Accordingly, in its decision 57/36, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To take note of the Secretariat's paper (document UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63) on review of the current funding arrangements for IS;
- (b) To continue to fund requests for the renewal of IS projects up to the end of December 2010 at current levels pending final resolution of the matter by the Executive Committee at its 58<sup>th</sup> meeting; and
- (c) To request the Secretariat to continue its work on objectives, indicators and formats so that the results could be applied to requests for renewal of IS projects submitted by the countries from the beginning of 2010 onwards.

23. At its 58<sup>th</sup> meeting (July 2009), the Executive Committee considered the issue of the levels of funding for IS projects beyond 2010<sup>19</sup>. It was noted that since the adoption of decision 47/49, the Executive Committee had considered several policy papers on IS, and that implementing agencies had submitted a number of requests for the renewal of funding for IS projects beyond 2010 and, as a result, the Secretariat had been unable to recommend those projects for blanket approval. On this basis, the Executive Committee decided to approve IS renewals up to 31 December 2010 (decision 58/16).

24. At the 59<sup>th</sup> meeting (November 2009) in discussing the document on the overview of issues identified during project review<sup>20</sup>, the Executive Committee noted that the first HPMP submitted to the meeting, included funding in principle for IS to be approved as part of different tranches, subject to the conditions of a performance-based agreement. The Executive Committee was asked to consider whether to accept, where requested, the inclusion of funding for IS within the HPMP. The representative of the Secretariat recalled paragraph 3 of decision XXI/29. On this issue, the Executive Committee decided that Article 5 Parties had the flexibility to submit requests for IS funding either as part of their HCFC phase-out management plans or separately, as they so choose (decision 59/17).

25. At its 59<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Executive Committee also considered a document on IS: options for funding after 2010<sup>21</sup>, and decided to extend financial support for IS funding for Article 5 Parties beyond 2010 up to December 2011; and to allow Article 5 Parties to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HCFC phase-out management plans (decision 59/47).

26. At the 60<sup>th</sup> meeting (April 2010), in the context of the document on the overview of issues considered during project review<sup>22</sup>, the Executive Committee considered the policy issue raised on the

---

<sup>18</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63.

<sup>19</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/48.

<sup>20</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/59/11.

<sup>21</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/59/53.

<sup>22</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15.

funding of IS renewals. The Committee was invited to consider extending the period of renewal of IS projects for those approved at the 57<sup>th</sup>, 58<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> meetings in line with decision 59/47, and to requests for funding on top of current funding practices to account for additional responsibilities that the NOU expects to have when considering climate and ozone benefits. In its decision 60/10, the Executive Committee decided:

- (a) To extend the date for funding of IS projects approved at the 59<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee not exceeding two years up to December 2011 in line with decision 59/47;
- (b) To request the Secretariat to prepare a document on objectives, indicators and formats pertaining to requests for the renewal of IS projects for consideration by the Executive Committee at its 61<sup>st</sup> meeting; and
- (c) To consider the issue of the options for funding IS projects further at the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee.

27. At its 61<sup>st</sup> meeting (July 2010), the Executive Committee considered IS: options for funding and formats for renewal requests<sup>23</sup>, and decided:

- (a) To note the document on IS: Options for funding and formats for renewal requests (UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49);
- (b) To maintain funding for IS support at current levels, and to renew IS projects for the full two-year period from the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting, taking into account decisions 59/17 and 59/47(b) that allowed Article 5 Parties to submit their IS projects as stand-alone projects or within their HCFC phase-out management plans, and to review continued IS funding at those levels at the first meeting of the Executive Committee in 2015; and
- (c) To approve the revised format for IS renewals with the identified objectives and indicators attached as Annex XV<sup>24</sup> to the report of the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting<sup>25</sup>, and to request the bilateral and implementing agencies to use those formats for requests for renewal of IS projects submitted to the 62<sup>nd</sup> meeting and onwards (decision 61/43).

---

<sup>23</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49.

<sup>24</sup> Attached as Annex – to this document.

<sup>25</sup> UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/58.

**Annex II**

**MAIN DOCUMENTS ON INSTIUTIONAL STRENGTHENING**

<b>Document number</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>	<b>Title of document</b>
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/5/5/Rev.2	November 1991	Procedure for (presentation) of country programmes and project proposals to the Executive Committee
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/7/20	June 1992	Institutional strengthening
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/19/52 & Corr.1	April 1996	Guidelines for renewal of institutional strengthening projects
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/28/15	June 1999	Institutional strengthening projects: implementation of decision 27/10
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/30/6 & Corr.1	February 2000	Final report on the 1999 evaluation of institutional strengthening projects and draft follow-up action plan
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/32/18	December 2000	General principles for agreements between governments and implementing agencies on new and renewed institutional strengthening projects (decision 30/7 (c))
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/33/16	March 2001	General principles for agreements between governments and implementing agencies on new and renewed institutional strengthening projects (follow-up to decision 32/15)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/34/53	July 2001	Strategic planning: proposals on implementing the framework on the objective, priorities, problems, and modalities for strategic planning of the Multilateral Fund in the compliance period
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/35/61 and Corr.1	December 2001	Study on defining a starting point for determining the remaining ODS consumption eligible for funding by the Multilateral Fund: follow-up to decision 34/66(a)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/43/49	July 2004	Potential implications of subsequently increasing the amounts approved for institutional strengthening projects (decision 42/22 (b))
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/44/CRP.1	December 2004	Enhancing Article 5 countries national ozone unit capacity building in the final stages of the compliance period to the Montreal Protocol - Proposal submitted by the Government of China
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/45/47	April 2005	Enhancing capacity-building in the national ozone units of Article 5 countries in the final stages of the Montreal Protocol compliance period (follow-up to decision 44/64)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/47/53	November 2005	Preliminary results of an analysis of possible further action and policies required to assist compliance with all ODS phase-out requirements, including the review of institutional strengthening projects envisaged under decision 35/57 (follow-up to decision 45/55)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/49/38	April 2006	The relative merits of replacing the current requirements for submissions of requests for renewal of an institutional strengthening project with a simplified arrangement (follow-up to decision 47/49)

<b>Document number</b>	<b>Month/Year</b>	<b>Title of document</b>
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/53/61	November 2007	Paper on options for possible funding arrangements and levels for institutional strengthening support beyond 2010, and on opportunities to fine-tune the institutional strengthening renewal process (follow-up to decisions 47/49 and 49/32)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/54/13	April 2008	Desk study on the evaluation of institutional strengthening projects
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/56/8	November 2008	Final report on the evaluation of institutional strengthening projects
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/57/63	April 2009	Institutional strengthening beyond 2010: funding and levels (follow-up to decision 53/39)
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/58/18	July 2009	Institutional strengthening: options for funding after 2010 (follow-up to decision 53/39 and decision 57/36(b))
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/59/53	November 2009	Institutional strengthening: options for funding after 2010
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/60/15	April 2010	Overview of issues identified during project review
UNEP/OzL.Pro/ExCom/61/49	July 2010	Institutional strengthening: options for funding and formats for renewal requests

**Annex III**

**TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING FUNDING APPROVED BY COUNTRY AS OF  
NOVEMBER 2014**

Country	Status	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Costs (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase
Afghanistan	Non-LVC	809,987	0	809,987	Jul-04	Jul-13
Albania	LVC	697,137	5,460	702,597	Dec-01	May-14
Algeria	Non-LVC	1,416,209	50,311	1,466,520	Nov-93	Nov-14
Angola	LVC	616,500	45,202	661,702	Nov-02	Apr-13
Antigua and Barbuda	LVC	247,187	4,680	251,867	Nov-98	Nov-14
Argentina	Non-LVC	2,467,927	233,623	2,701,550	Jul-94	Dec-13
Armenia	LVC	478,812	34,711	513,523	Apr-09	Nov-14
Bahamas	LVC	273,333	6,500	279,833	May-96	May-14
Bahrain	Non-LVC	399,700	14,300	414,000	Oct-96	Dec-12
Bangladesh	Non-LVC	866,040	83,438	949,478	Sep-94	Dec-13
Barbados	LVC	572,630	29,244	601,874	Dec-94	Dec-12
Belize	LVC	548,700	11,505	560,205	Nov-99	May-14
Benin	Non-LVC	399,999	15,167	415,166	Nov-95	Dec-13
Bhutan	LVC	370,000	0	370,000	Jul-04	Dec-13
Bolivia	LVC	706,676	27,604	734,280	Nov-95	Nov-14
Bosnia and Herzegovina	LVC	389,116	34,445	423,561	Mar-99	Dec-13
Botswana	LVC	324,719	11,726	336,445	Jul-94	Dec-12
Brazil	Non-LVC	2,177,072	215,150	2,392,222	Jun-93	Apr-12
Brunei Darussalam	LVC	290,000	10,400	300,400	Nov-98	Jul-12
Burkina Faso	Non-LVC	685,060	32,578	717,638	Nov-93	Dec-12
Burundi	LVC	363,200	8,580	371,780	Nov-98	Dec-13
Cambodia	LVC	693,335	0	693,335	Mar-02	Jul-13
Cameroon	Non-LVC	1,212,192	48,750	1,260,942	Nov-93	Dec-13
Cape Verde (Cabo Verde)	LVC	255,000	0	255,000	Mar-02	Dec-13
Central African Republic	LVC	295,520	9,880	305,400	Nov-95	Dec-12
Chad	LVC	360,000	7,800	367,800	Jul-98	Dec-13
Chile	Non-LVC	1,730,318	167,859	1,898,177	Jun-92	Apr-13
China	Non-LVC	4,079,453	397,759	4,477,212	Feb-92	Nov-14
Colombia	Non-LVC	2,395,042	234,206	2,629,249	Mar-94	Jul-13
Comoros	LVC	370,426	6,023	376,449	Nov-97	Jul-13
Congo	LVC	459,401	13,633	473,034	Jul-95	Dec-13
Congo, DR	Non-LVC	403,375	12,585	415,960	Mar-99	Dec-13
Cook Islands	LVC	257,500	0	257,500	Dec-04	May-14
Costa Rica	LVC	1,358,289	130,374	1,488,663	Oct-92	Dec-13
Cote D'Ivoire	Non-LVC	736,010	26,560	762,570	Jul-94	Nov-14

Country	Status	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Costs (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase
Croatia	LVC	694,635	21,866	716,501	Oct-96	Apr-13
Cuba	LVC	1,295,723	118,507	1,414,230	Jun-93	Dec-2013
Djibouti	LVC	348,000	0	348,000	Jul-02	Jul-13
Dominica	LVC	296,000	3,900	299,900	Nov-98	May-14
Dominican Republic	Non-LVC	1,063,997	33,540	1,097,537	Jul-95	Nov-14
Ecuador	Non-LVC	798,374	39,169	837,543	Mar-93	Nov-09
Egypt	Non-LVC	2,150,626	201,881	2,352,507	Jun-93	May-14
El Salvador*	LVC	289,480	14,495	303,975	May-97	Nov-08
Equatorial Guinea	LVC	120,000	0	120,000	Jul-06	Apr-09
Eritrea	LVC	140,000	0	140,000	Nov-05	Dec-12
Ethiopia	LVC	333,232	13,104	346,336	Oct-96	Nov-14
Fiji	LVC	526,820	14,277	541,097	Mar-94	May-14
Gabon	Non-LVC	415,520	9,880	425,400	May-97	Dec-2013
Gambia	LVC	406,744	9,126	415,870	May-96	May-14
Georgia	LVC	480,467	33,050	513,517	Nov-97	Apr-13
Ghana	Non-LVC	1,467,190	143,560	1,610,749	Oct-92	May-14
Grenada	LVC	220,500	3,900	224,400	Mar-00	Jul-12
Guatemala	LVC	772,000	59,800	831,800	Jun-93	Jul-10
Guinea	Non-LVC	399,878	15,167	415,045	Nov-95	Jul-13
Guinea-Bissau	LVC	270,000	0	270,000	Apr-03	Nov-14
Guyana	LVC	284,733	14,092	298,825	Nov-97	Dec-12
Haiti	LVC	370,001	0	370,001	Nov-02	Jul-10
Honduras	LVC	407,199	14,300	421,499	Oct-96	Dec-12
India	Non-LVC	3,525,385	333,427	3,858,812	Oct-92	May-14
Indonesia	Non-LVC	2,357,322	215,687	2,573,009	Jun-93	Dec-13
Iran	Non-LVC	1,678,348	159,299	1,837,647	Oct-92	May-14
Iraq	Non-LVC	538,641	0	538,641	Apr-08	Apr-13
Jamaica	LVC	451,200	20,020	471,220	Oct-96	Dec-12
Jordan	Non-LVC	1,504,484	117,313	1,621,797	Jun-92	Nov-14
Kenya	Non-LVC	1,272,841	84,054	1,356,896	Mar-93	Apr-13
Kiribati	LVC	240,666	0	240,666	Mar-02	Jul-13
Korea, DPR	Non-LVC	874,704	30,888	905,592	Feb-97	Dec-12
Kuwait	Non-LVC	542,800	0	542,800	Jul-02	Dec-12
Kyrgyzstan	LVC	828,630	0	828,630	Jul-02	Nov-14
Lao, PDR	LVC	423,200	8,580	431,780	Jul-01	May-14
Lebanon	Non-LVC	1,379,680	126,805	1,506,485	May-96	Nov-14
Lesotho	LVC	316,000	6,500	322,500	Oct-96	Nov-14
Liberia	LVC	468,672	0	468,672	Dec-03	Apr-13
Libya	Non-LVC	381,087	33,894	414,981	Dec-00	Dec-13
Macedonia, FYR*	LVC	752,671	76,048	828,719	Oct-96	Apr-09

Country	Status	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Costs (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase
Madagascar	Non-LVC	373,500	9,100	382,600	Nov-99	Nov-14
Malawi	LVC	580,048	23,355	603,403	Mar-94	May-14
Malaysia	Non-LVC	2,556,050	254,150	2,810,201	Mar-93	Jul-13
Maldives	LVC	437,003	5,363	442,366	Mar-94	May-14
Mali	LVC	420,052	15,167	435,219	Mar-98	Jul-13
Marshall Islands	LVC	273,178	0	273,178	Mar-02	Jul-13
Mauritania	Non-LVC	205,553	3,367	208,920	Sep-94	Apr-09
Mauritius	LVC	230,000	6,500	236,500	Jun-93	Nov-14
Mexico	Non-LVC	2,680,913	222,457	2,903,370	Jun-92	Nov-14
Micronesia	LVC	252,572	0	252,572	Mar-02	May-14
Moldova, Rep	LVC	565,338	10,400	575,738	Jul-98	May-14
Mongolia	LVC	462,898	8,580	471,478	Jul-99	Jul-13
Montenegro*	LVC	140,564	10,543	151,107	Jul-10	Jul-08
Morocco	Non-LVC	646,000	23,270	669,270	May-96	Nov-09
Mozambique	LVC	495,680	12,012	507,692	Dec-94	Jul-13
Myanmar	LVC	256,000	9,880	265,880	Nov-99	Dec-13
Namibia	LVC	456,472	13,382	469,854	Nov-95	Nov-14
Nauru	LVC	217,500	0	217,500	Dec-04	May-14
Nepal	LVC	475,733	8,060	483,793	Nov-98	May-14
Nicaragua	LVC	407,200	14,300	421,500	May-97	Dec-13
Niger	LVC	563,220	22,724	585,944	Dec-94	Dec-13
Nigeria	Non-LVC	2,055,087	178,985	2,234,072	Mar-93	Nov-14
Niue	LVC	265,100	0	265,100	Dec-04	Jul-13
Oman	Non-LVC	352,795	30,462	383,257	Dec-00	Dec-13
Pakistan	Non-LVC	1,754,277	152,841	1,907,118	Sep-94	Nov-14
Palau	LVC	255,333	0	255,333	Mar-02	Jul-13
Panama	Non-LVC	885,500	47,840	933,340	Jun-93	Dec-13
Papua New Guinea*	LVC	180,778	23,501	204,279	May-96	Apr-08
Paraguay	LVC	407,960	14,365	422,325	Feb-97	May-14
Peru	Non-LVC	493,618	29,458	523,076	Jul-95	Dec-12
Philippines	Non-LVC	1,593,622	89,469	1,683,091	Mar-93	Jul-13
Qatar	Non-LVC	239,237	21,460	260,697	Mar-99	Nov-09
Romania**		233,096	22,309	255,405	Jul-95	closed
Rwanda	LVC	322,748	0	322,748	Mar-02	Jul-13
Saint Kitts and Nevis	LVC	283,000	3,900	286,900	Feb-97	Nov-14
Saint Lucia	LVC	422,980	7,927	430,907	Feb-97	Nov-14
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	LVC	313,430	3,939	317,369	Jul-98	Nov-14
Samoa	LVC	356,000	3,900	359,900	May-97	Jul-13
Sao Tome and Principe	LVC	251,998	0	251,998	Nov-02	Dec-13



Country	Status	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Costs (US \$)	Date of Phase I Approval	Most Recent Approved Phase
Saudi Arabia	Non-LVC	500,000	0	500,000	Nov-07	Jul-12
Senegal	Non-LVC	1,473,703	53,170	1,526,873	Nov-93	Dec-13
Serbia	LVC	669,525	57,885	727,410	Jul-98	Dec-13
Seychelles	LVC	293,167	6,912	300,079	Jul-94	Jul-13
Sierra Leone	LVC	466,090	0	466,090	Mar-02	Apr-13
Solomon Islands	LVC	237,083	0	237,083	Mar-02	Jul-13
Somalia	Non-LVC	171,995	0	171,995	Mar-02	Dec-12
South Sudan	LVC	40,000	0	40,000		Dec-12
Sri Lanka	LVC	1,280,495	121,773	1,402,267	Mar-94	May-14
Sudan	Non-LVC	939,675	51,051	990,726	Mar-94	Apr-13
Suriname	LVC	403,332	0	403,332	Dec-03	Nov-14
Swaziland	LVC	305,664	8,752	314,416	Dec-94	Dec-13
Syria	Non-LVC	970,377	94,364	1,064,740	Jun-93	Nov-14
Tanzania	LVC	363,200	8,580	371,780	Oct-96	May-14
Thailand	Non-LVC	2,313,339	208,434	2,521,773	Mar-93	Dec-12
Timor Leste	LVC	160,000	0	160,000	Nov-08	Apr-13
Togo	Non-LVC	494,664	9,100	503,764	Nov-97	Dec-12
Tonga	LVC	236,266	0	236,266	Mar-02	Jul-13
Trinidad and Tobago	Non-LVC	454,317	42,155	496,472	Oct-96	Dec-12
Tunisia	Non-LVC	1,703,759	116,651	1,820,410	Oct-92	Apr-12
Turkey	Non-LVC	1,406,646	94,985	1,501,631	Oct-92	Jul-13
Turkmenistan*	LVC	299,631	1,120	300,751	Jul-05	Jul-10
Tuvalu	LVC	235,083	0	235,083	Mar-02	May-14
Uganda	LVC	67,000	8,387	75,387	Jul-94	Nov-14
Uruguay	Non-LVC	1,455,385	146,977	1,602,362	Jun-93	Dec-13
Vanuatu	LVC	239,500	0	239,500	Mar-02	May-14
Venezuela	Non-LVC	3,092,533	305,113	3,397,645	Mar-93	Dec-12
Vietnam	Non-LVC	1,153,132	41,642	1,194,774	Jul-95	Dec-12
Yemen	Non-LVC	1,191,214	30,940	1,222,154	Jul-98	Dec-12
Zambia	LVC	322,560	16,380	338,940	Mar-93	Dec-13
Zimbabwe	LVC	992,083	51,885	1,043,968	Jul-94	Apr-13
<b>Total of stand- alone IS projects</b>		<b>108,086,766</b>	<b>6,685,404</b>	<b>114,772,169</b>		
<b>IS-HPMP projects</b>		<b>614,755</b>	<b>46,107</b>	<b>660,862</b>		
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>108,701,521</b>	<b>6,731,511</b>	<b>115,433,031</b>		

\*Project closed. IS integrated into HPMP.

\*\* No longer classified under the Article 5

Table 2: Institutional strengthening components for countries with an IS project integrated into the HPMP

Country	Annual stand-alone IS funding per year (US \$)	Total IS funding in HPMP approved in principle (US \$)	Time period IS in HPMP	Is funding per year HPMP (US \$)	Amount of IS funding Allocated to Dec 2014 US \$
El Salvador	30,000	285,000	Jul 2012-Dec 2020	30,000	75,000
Montenegro	30,000	240,000	Jul 2012 – June 202)	30,000	75,000
Papua New Guinea	30,000	450,000	Jan 2011 – Dec 2025	30,000	120,000
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	66,268	600,000	Apr 2011 –Dec 2020	~66,268	248,505
Turkmenistan	38,500	327,250	July 2012 – 2020	38,500	96,250
Total	194,768	1,894,500		194,768	614,755

Note: Amounts do not include support costs.

Table 3: Grand total of costs of IS projects as at December 2014

Country	Project Cost (US \$)	Support Cost (US \$)	Total Costs (US \$)
Total of stand-alone IS projects	108,086,766	6,685,404	114,772,169
IS component of IS-HPMPs	614,755	46,107	660,862
Grand total	108,701,521	6,731,511	115,433,031

**Annex IV**

**Draft amended format for IS terminal reports and IS renewal requests**

**TERMINAL REPORT AND REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING FUNDING FOR [COUNTRY] FOR THE [REPORTING PERIOD]**

**Submitted by [Implementing Agency] on behalf of the Government of [Country]**

**1. National implementing agency/ ozone unit**

Name of national implementing agency / ozone unit and Ministry	
--	--

Name of current national ozone officer (NOO)	
Email NOO	

**2. List of approved IS projects / IS components of HPMP tranches and funding requested for next phase/tranche**

IS phase or HPMP (stage/tranche)	Duration (mm/yy – mm/yy)	MLF funding for IS (US \$approved)	MLF funding (US \$disbursed)

Requested phase/tranche	Requested period (mm/yy – mm/yy)	MLF funding requested for IS	

**3. Data reporting**

Reporting requirement	Year reported	Date submitted
Article 7		dd/mm/yy
Article 7		dd/mm/yy
Country programme implementation		dd/mm/yy
Country programme implementation		dd/mm/yy

4. **Describe the role and position of the National Ozone Unit (NOU)** within the national administration, the way its work is supervised and its access to senior decision-makers (this may include cooperation with steering committees, advisory groups or inter-ministerial bodies). Please attach an organizational chart if available.

--

5. **Project management unit.** Indicate the NOU/PMU modality in the country.

Project management unit modality	Comment
No PMU is operating	
NOU and PMU are constituted by the same team	
PMU separate from NOU - indicate the relationship between the PMU and the NOU	
Other (please describe)	

6. **Indicate the total number staff in the NOU:**

NOU staff during phase	Full time	Half time	Comment
Paid under IS support			
Paid under government			
<i>Total</i>			

7. **Is the unit fully staffed?** YES  NO

8. **Please provide comments on the continuity of staffing. Indicate whether the post of NOO is currently filled. Was there was a change of NOO during the phase, and did the new NOO receive any training?**

--

**9. List of training courses, public awareness events, and publication/information resources produced during the current phase (chronological order)**

Training event /target group	Date/period	Place

Awareness event /target group	Date/period	Place

Information product	Date issued	Availability e.g. website

**10. Please provide details on the status of the implementation of the activities approved from the previous IS phase. Include dates where applicable. Please indicate performance against any specific indicators agreed in the previous phase or HPMP tranche.**

Activities in current phase	Achievements in phase [x] (current phase)
<b>Objective 1: Efficient and timely data collection and reporting</b>	
- Monitoring customs import/export	
- Article 7 data reporting	
- Country programme data reporting	
<b>Objective 2: Adoption/enforcement of ODS legislation and regulations to control and monitor ODS consumption</b>	
Introduction of licensing and quota system for HCFCs	
Enforcement of control measures to sustain HCFC phase- out	
Monitoring illegal ODS trade (all ODS)	
Ratification of Amendments to the Montreal Protocol	

Activities in current phase	Achievements in phase [x] (current phase)
<b>Objective 3: Coordination with other national agencies/key stakeholders</b>	
Steering Committee	
Industry associations	
<b>Objective 4: Supervision of timely implementation of phase-out activities and reduction in ODS consumption</b>	
HPMP preparation or implementation	
<i>Project 1</i>	
<i>Project 2</i>	
<b>Objective 5: Awareness raising and information exchange</b>	
Information dissemination to key stakeholders	
International Ozone Day	
<b>Objective 6: Regional cooperation and participation to Montreal Protocol meetings</b>	
Regional network participation	
Open-ended Working Group / Meeting of the Parties	
Executive Committee	

**11. Please provide details on the status of the implementation of the activities approved from the previous IS phase or HPMP tranche. Please add specific indicators if necessary.**

Indicator	Evaluation		Comments /explanation of rating
	Yes	No	
1 Operational import control measures in place - compliance with quotas and bans			
2 Ozone protection issues integrated into national plans			

Indicator	Evaluation			Comments /explanation of rating
	By assigned meeting / due date	Within one meeting /month of assigned meeting / due date	Later than two meetings one month of assigned meeting / due date	
3 Project proposals submitted on time				
4 Completion of phase-out projects according to plan				
	By prescribed deadline	Within one month of deadline	Late submission	
5 Article 7 data reported by deadline				
6 Country programme data reported by deadline				

**13. Lessons learned, major achievements or further comments**

--

**14. Please provide details on planned activities for the requested IS phase. Please add specific indicators if necessary.**

IS activities planned in next phase /HPMP tranche	Expected result in next phase
<b>Objective 1: Efficient and timely data collection and reporting</b>	
- Monitoring customs import/export	
- Article 7 data reporting	
- Country programme data reporting	

IS activities planned in next phase /HPMP tranche	Expected result in next phase
<b>Objective 2: Adoption/enforcement of ODS legislation and regulations to control and monitor ODS consumption</b>	
Introduction of licensing and quota system for HCFCs	
Enforcement of control measures to sustain HCFC phase- out	
Monitoring illegal ODS trade (all ODS)	
Ratification of Amendments to the Montreal Protocol	
<b>Objective 3: Coordination with other national agencies/key stakeholders</b>	
Steering Committee	
Industry associations	
<b>Objective 4: Supervision of timely implementation of phase-out activities and reduction in ODS consumption</b>	
HPMP preparation or implementation	
<i>Project 1</i>	
<i>Project 2</i>	
IS activities planned in next phase /HPMP tranche	Expected result in next phase
<b>Objective 5: Awareness raising and information exchange</b>	
Information dissemination to key stakeholders	
International Ozone Day	
<b>Objective 6: Regional cooperation and participation to Montreal Protocol meetings</b>	
Regional network participation	
Open-ended Working Group / Meeting of the Parties	
Executive Committee	



**15. Financial report**

Item of expenditure	Budget for current phase or IS component of HPMP tranche	Disbursement (for current phase) (US \$)		Estimated budget for requested phase or IS component (US \$)	Government funding (in kind contribution) (US \$) IS activities	
		Actual	Obligated		Current	Requested
	US \$					
Staff (including consultants)						
Equipment						
Operational cost (i.e. meetings, consultations, etc.)						
Public awareness						
Other						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

**16. Government endorsement**

Action plan authorized by	
Signature of authorising authority:	
Title:	
Supervising Organization/Agency/Ministry:	
Date:	

FOR COMPLETION BY THE RELEVANT IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

**1. Submission of action plan to the Fund Secretariat:**

Name of implementing agency:	
Name of Project Officer:	
Signature of Project Officer:	
Date:	
Comments of the implementing agency:	

**2. Executive summary**

Please provide succinct summaries as indicated below. These paragraphs will be issued in pre-session documents for the Executive Committee Meeting. The views of the Executive Committee will be transmitted to the government concerned in a letter from the Secretariat.

Executive summary of terminal report (progress made in current phase):
Plan of action for next phase:
Views of the Executive Committee:

--

**Annex V**

**LIST OF COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT SUBMITTED A REQUEST FOR IS RENEWAL FOR SEVERAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Meeting at which current IS phase was approved</b>
Bahrain	UNDP	68
Barbados	UNEP	68
Botswana	UNEP	68
Brazil	UNDP	66
Central African Republic	UNEP	68
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	UNEP	68
Ecuador	UNEP	59
Eritrea	UNEP	68
Grenada	UNEP	67
Guatemala	UNEP	61
Haiti	UNEP	59
Honduras	UNEP	68
Jamaica	UNEP	68
Kuwait	UNEP	68
Mauritania	UNEP	57
Morocco	UNEP	59
Peru	UNEP	68
Qatar	UNIDO	59
Saudi Arabia	UNEP	67
Somalia	UNEP	68
South Sudan	UNEP	68
Thailand	IBRD	68